

Brig. Gen. Volney F. Warner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert G. Yerks, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Morris J. Brady, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth E. Dohleman, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Fix, III, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert J. Malley, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John J. Koehler, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald R. Keith, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Oliver W. Dillard, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Milton E. Key, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William R. Richardson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph K. Bratton, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William R. Wray, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Vernon B. Lewis, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William L. Mundie, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Carroll N. LeTellier, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph P. Kingston, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William A. Patch, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Wallace H. Nutting, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard A. Bresnahan, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard A. Thompson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert C. Kingston, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles C. Rogers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John G. Hill, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bennett L. Lewis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Homer S. Long, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Harris, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. William W. Palmer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. James L. Kelly, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. George E. Turnmeyer, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. James A. Johnson, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Jerry B. Lauen, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Oren E. DeHaven, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Greer, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. John F. Forrest, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. James B. Vaught, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Lee E. Surut, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. Wesley E. Peel, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Judson F. Miller, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Gerd S. Grombacher, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul T. Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James M. Rockwell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Judson F. Miller, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William R. Wray, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert J. Malley, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John G. Hill, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard A. Bresnahan, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George E. Turnmeyer, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James A. Johnson, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Fix, III, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James B. Vaught, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Oliver W. Dillard, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Otis C. Lynn, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William L. Mundie, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Homer D. Smith, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John G. Waggener, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Willard W. Scott, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John W. McEnery, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Sidney B. Berry, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Donn A. Starry, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Eugene P. Forrester, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William B. Caldwell III, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William A. Patch, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Greer, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth E. Dohleman, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul T. Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Oren E. DeHaven, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Willard Latham, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph K. Bratton, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Michael D. Healy, [redacted], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STRANGERS IN A GENEROUS LAND

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a most evocative and

humane essay which was published recently on the editorial page of the Washington Post. It focuses the American reader's heart and mind on the Vietnamese refugees who have come to our country to start their lives anew as did so many of our own forebears.

The essay is the work of a distinguished journalist, Charles Fenyevesi, who himself emigrated to America from his native Hungary in 1956, the year of the

anti-Soviet uprising. He is now editor of the National Jewish Monthly publication.

As the news media have demonstrated amply, there are Americans who, having established themselves here, would raise high the dikes and turn their backs on this newest tide of immigrants entering a nation built of immigrants. That response, even in a time of high unemployment and economic uncertainty, is fun-

damentally un-American and runs counter to our Judeo-Christian values.

While we now recognize the theory of "America as a social melting pot" to be historical wishful-thinking at best, perhaps we are indeed more fortunate that the separate ethnic and racial backgrounds and traditions which in their sum are America have remained distinct to the extent that they have. As with the Irish and the Jews, the Polish and the Italians and the Japanese who have preceded the Vietnamese to our shores, what truly matters is that they are ready to stake everything in a new future of self-improvement, which has been America's primary attractive commodity, as Mr. Fenyvesi observes.

Here is a well-educated, sophisticated Hungarian who found himself in the midst of a refugee tide nearly 20 years ago, who believes that "there is no strong reason why 150,000 Vietnamese refugees should not make it in America."

In his essay, this editor has also reminded us of a basic precept of humanity: What helps the refugee most in his struggle for self-improvement is the generosity of those who are established here—"the openness to the refugees that is basic to the American character and makes this country what it is."

I would like to share this essay with my colleagues who missed this timely reminder of the necessity to consult our consciences and our heritage as these newest strangers enter our society after 30 years of war in their homeland.

The essay, as printed in the Washington Post, follows:

STRANGERS IN A GENEROUS LAND

(By Charles Fenyvesi)

The refugee is seldom a hero. He may be a victim of discrimination or persecution, he might have been slated for martyrdom by an oppressive regime. But the majority of people flee their homeland to rebuild their lives in what they hope will be a more congenial environment. Their ranks include the foot-loose and the discontented, the ambitious and the crook, the dreamer and the realist, life's losers and those marked for riches and fame.

What matters is that they are prepared to recycle themselves. They are ready to stake everything they have and are by investing in a new future—a future of self-improvement, which has been America's number one commodity and which has attracted the Pilgrims set on building a Puritan Zion and the Irish fleeing from famine, Russian Jews denied elementary freedoms by the czar and Hungarians who "voted with their feet against communism."

Recommendations that the United States encourage the repatriation of Vietnamese refugees represent the last volley of American self-righteousness on Indochina. It is of the stuff of the presumptions that led to that war and prevented administration after administration from extricating itself. For the American inclination has been to see The War in terms of the good guys and the bad; if those who have fled South Vietnam are not heroes then they must be villains; economic or political war profiteers. The Vietnamese who succeeded in climbing aboard U.S. ships are penalized for their government's loss of a war, for dividing American society in a way that no other foreign war did and ultimately, for not being able to appeal to our sense of political and moral rectitude. If there is racism involved in the lack of welcome, there is also guilt for the bombings and My Lai—and the various

emotional reactions to such guilt. The Vietnamese refugees remind us that in Southeast Asia, America's missionary idealism failed, our sophisticated technology was defeated by a peasant society and our vaunted rationalism turned out to be inapplicable.

What is particularly difficult for people of good intentions to accept is that the Vietnam war presented no clearcut moral choice comparable to the one of joining or fighting Nazi or Communist dictatorship in Europe. Instead of being resisters, dissenters or freedom-fighters, in a scenario by James Michener, the Vietnamese refugees are the surging, faceless, inarticulate extras in a film that could have been directed by Sam Peckinpah or Francois Truffaut.

Perhaps it is because of the enormous cultural gap—how many Americans have heard of a book or read an article by a Vietnamese? Who can name one of their painters?—or because of the passions aroused in attempts to stop the war, but it is hard to visualize that there must have been Vietnamese who, like Pasternak's Dr. Zhivago in the Russian civil war, attempted to stay out of the conflict and be private persons. As for those who did take sides with the *ancien regime*, is it really necessary or feasible to clear them of charges—of killing Vietcong prisoners or trafficking in black market goods—before we can welcome them into American society?

Neither side in Vietnam has had a monopoly on good intentions or on atrocities. The system the winners are to impose may bring about a more just society and make for a bureaucracy less susceptible to corruption. But to fear a Socialist transformation of society is justified, for that process has never taken place, in Asia or in Europe, without great human suffering. Not to take part in making such history was the refugees' decision; it was their first American-style free choice—a vote cast for a way of life only dimly known.

There is no strong reason why 150,000 Vietnamese refugees should not make it in America. They will not be less virtuous and patriotic and a credit to what will emerge as a new minority in this land than previous migrations of refugees. They too will suffer from the corrosive effects of emigre politics, turn bitter and unreasonable, and find no important American group paying them attention. But the majority will opt for a pursuit of personal gains. The soldier will consider himself lucky if he can go back to farming. The lawyer will accept a job in the stock room. The corrupt bureaucrat will be too old to learn the tricks of his new country. There will be family arguments whether or not to open up a restaurant; daughters of respectable families will do less well than former bar-girls; children will be born who insist on speaking English. There will be complaints that the Vietnamese are clannish, unwilling to change and adapt—as well as fears among the Vietnamese that their community will disappear in the great compost pile of American humanity.

Like truck drivers and generals, refugees from various lands are much alike. Some learn to enjoy "All in the Family," wear torn sweatshirts Sundays and save furiously to send a son through medical school. Others remain refugees for the rest of their lives, nursing old wounds, living off memories of the life left behind and re-fighting the battles which made the flight necessary. A typical refugee dream is of going back to the old country and not being able to get out again—children born in the new land disappear and the relatives found in the old houses are stonyfaced, even hostile. There are refugees who never stop running for their lives: fires burn, the killing continues and the enemy cannot be vanquished.

In the morning, reality often seems bland, vacuous, insubstantial. The rustle of palm fronds, the scent of violets in the rain or the

golden sheaves of wheat recall another time, another world.

Forgetfulness helps. So do friendly neighbors, the shimmer of dogwood, the Buick station wagon that takes the family to the Fingers Lakes or the Grand Canyon, the possibilities of getting ahead and recognition by colleagues and new friends. But what helps most is the generosity toward the stranger—the openness to his strangeness that is basic to the American character and makes this country what it is.

A TRIBUTE TO JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, millions of people all over the world were saddened by the death earlier this month of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

Cardinal Mindszenty's death brought a special sadness to the people of my own congressional district because he had visited it only last summer.

Cardinal Mindszenty came to symbolize not only for the people of his native Hungary but for people of other countries of the world a depth of religious faith and a tenacity of purpose that were remarkable.

Cardinal Mindszenty's host in Indiana was a longtime friend, himself a distinguished religious leader, Msgr. John S. Sabo, the pastor of Our Lady of Hungary Church in South Bend.

Monsignor Sabo, in comments shortly before flying to the cardinal's funeral in Vienna, regarded him as a "wonderful man" who had "outlived every one of those who had anything to do with his torture."

Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to this remarkable figure who came to symbolize the tyranny of both nazism and communism, and I insert at this point in the RECORD several news accounts and editorials about Cardinal Mindszenty from the South Bend Tribune and "The Harmonizer," the official newspaper of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend.

The articles follow:

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY DIES

Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, former primate of the Hungarian Catholic Church, who died today in Vienna, Austria at age 83, was eulogized today by his longtime South Bend friend, Msgr. John S. Sabo, as "a wonderful man."

A spokesman at the palace of Vienna's Archbishop-Cardinal Franz Koenig said Mindszenty died in a Vienna hospital at 8:15 a.m. EST. The spokesman said the cardinal underwent prostate surgery this morning and died four hours later from heart failure.

A one-time major figure of the East-West controversy, Cardinal Mindszenty, a bitter enemy of communism, was long a refugee in the United States mission in Budapest. Communists had tortured him and sentenced him to life imprisonment in 1949 for fighting the Red takeover of his country.

Msgr. Sabo, pastor of Our Lady of Hungary Catholic Church, noted today that "he (the cardinal) outlived every one of those who had anything to do with his torture."

Msgr. Sabo, recalling Cardinal Mindszenty's visits with him in South Bend in 1947 and

last year, remembers serving as an interpreter for the cardinal at press interviews during Mindszenty's 1947 visit to Ottawa, Canada.

Mindszenty became an international figure during the 1956 Hungarian revolution when Hungarian freedom fighters released him from life imprisonment and Russian intervention in the revolution forced him to seek refuge in the U.S. Mission in Budapest where he remained for 15 years. He wrote in his memoirs that he would have remained there in perpetual asylum but that President Richard M. Nixon convinced him he was an unwelcome guest, a barrier to detente.

During his visit to South Bend last June, Cardinal Mindszenty visited area clergy and concelebrated the mass with them. He also visited the University of Notre Dame.

Pope Paul VI removed the cardinal as primate of Hungary and archbishop of Esztergom on Feb. 4, 1974. Cardinal Mindszenty emphatically denied that he stepped down voluntarily.

He was a symbol of lifelong resistance to Nazi and Communist tyranny.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY MOURNED HERE

The death of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty has special meaning here because of the large South Bend Hungarian community and the cardinal's visit here less than a year ago.

The former primate of Hungary suffered imprisonment by both Nazis and Communists. However, he became a symbol of the cold war after he was sentenced in 1949 on a trumped-up treason charge.

He remained in prison until the ill-fated Hungarian revolution in 1956, when he was released by freedom fighters. But he remained free only four days until Soviet forces put down the revolt and he began a 15-year stay as a refugee in the United States Mission in Budapest.

As times changed, Popes John XXIII and Paul VI sought his release, but the cardinal was reluctant to leave unless the Hungarian regime completely cleared him of the charges.

Nevertheless, he sadly agreed to depart his homeland for the last time Sept. 28, 1971, apparently as the result of an agreement between the Hungarian government and the Vatican under which his life sentence was suspended.

He traveled to Rome and eventually took up residence in Vienna, close to his own land where he was removed as primate by Pope Paul on Feb. 4, 1974.

Cardinal Mindszenty paid his second visit here last June, having come to South Bend in 1947, also. During his most recent stay he celebrated mass with area clergy, visited the University of Notre Dame and greeted hundreds eager to meet him.

His local host and friend, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John S. Sabo, pastor of Our Lady of Hungary Church, noted that Mindszenty had "outlived every one of those who had anything to do with his torture."

At the age of 83, Cardinal Mindszenty was not happy with the circumstances of his freedom or continued Communist rule in Hungary. His steadfast refusal to compromise his beliefs won him world-wide admiration.

IN MEMORIAM

The recent death of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty recalls a sad page in the contemporary history of the Church. It reminds me of the strange phrase of Chesterton about the "halo of hatred around the Church of God." Why halo, the symbol of holiness? Because those who hate the Church confirm its holiness. They do not hate it because it is evil but because it condemns what is evil in the designs and desires of men.

The great Cardinal will always be, in our time, an unforgettable example of the courage required to stand firm in the faith in

the face of tyranny, oppression, persecution, to suffer injustice in the cause of justice, to sacrifice his own freedom rather than surrender and submit to those bent on destroying the freedom of the Church. For that reason his memory is a blessing, his heroism a challenge, his life an inspiration, his death an appeal for our prayers not only for his happy repose with God but for some measure of his strength to bear faithful witness to Our Lord in a world that rejects Him.

SO WE KNEW

Someone has defined greatness in a man as that quality which causes people to see in him something of the divine. To know him is to be lifted up. It is to come a bit closer to Heaven while in his presence—if only for a fleeting moment.

Cardinal Mindszenty was former primate of the Hungarian Catholic Church and known throughout the free world for his unwavering opposition to Marxism. He voluntarily endured exile and accepted asylum in the American Legation in Budapest for many years to dramatize the brutal takeover of his native Hungary by the Communists in the late '40s.

But it was not because of these facts that he is to be considered a great man. They would account for his being well known, and even unforgettable as a historical figure, but not necessarily great.

Cardinal Mindszenty qualifies as a great man because one saw in him something of the divine. Just what made men see in him something of the divine is difficult to confine to one example or incident.

When the Cardinal visited the diocese almost a year ago we were struck with the thought that here was an unusual man—and would have thought so even if we were not aware of his background.

Our first glimpse of him was pacing the floor saying his breviary just off the lobby of the Morris Inn at Notre Dame.

With newsmen standing by ready to pounce upon him with question, with cameras and electronic gear lying about in organized confusion, with important people chatting away while waiting to be introduced to him—there he was praying, unperturbed, as in a monastery garden. So we knew he was a man of prayer.

During the interview he was most anxious to be understood as a pastor looking after his flock. He parried direct political questions. He could not be drawn into a castigation of his enemies. And he would not be drawn into any criticism of the Pope. So we knew he was a churchman, not a diplomat or worldly figure of sorts.

And then his references during the interview, to the wisdom and goodness of God. So we knew he was a man of God.

Adding just these elements together one began to see something uplifting in the man—yes, something of the divine.

Cardinal Mindszenty was a great man!
May He Rest in Peace!

A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE COUNCIL KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts State Council Knights of Columbus on May 17, 1975, at Boston, Mass., the council adopted a resolution urging all Members of the Massachusetts congressional dele-

gation to support the "right to life" of all persons from the moment of conception.

I am including the text of that resolution for the attention of my colleagues from Massachusetts, and all of the Members of the House.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas: America's greatest natural resource, its youth, is being decimated at the rate of almost four abortions every minute of every day; and

Whereas: The only solution to this wanton destruction of human life is an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; therefore, be it

Resolved: That the Knights of Columbus of Massachusetts, meeting in convention at Boston the 17th and 18th days of May 1975, urge all the members of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation to do all in their power to insure speedy enactment of an amendment to our Constitution which will guarantee the right to life from the moment of conception; and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all members of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation.

Adopted at the Annual Meeting, Massachusetts State Council Knights of Columbus on May 17, 1975, at Boston, Massachusetts.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT MASTER PLAN

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1975, the National Park Service held a public hearing in Patchogue, N.Y., on the draft master plan prepared by the Park Service for the Fire Island National Seashore.

The plan proposes, in part, that 6 miles of the western portion of Fire Island be deleted from the national seashore. I have strenuously opposed this proposal and will continue to do so. As I said at that hearing, this is not a master plan for the protection of Fire Island, it is a declaration of open season on one of our most vital natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I include my statement at that hearing in the RECORD:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT MASTER PLAN

I appear before you tonight with grave concern about the future of the Fire Island National Seashore. We have, in Fire Island, a unique natural resource. The preservation and protection of the Seashore has been, and I firmly believe must continue to be, a top priority for all concerned and responsible citizens and public officials. We must not waver in our support of the mandate of the Act of Congress which created the National Seashore. We must do everything we can to conserve and preserve for future generations the relatively unspoiled and undeveloped beaches, dunes, and other beautiful natural features on Fire Island.

Two months ago, the National Park Service (NPS) published a draft of a new master plan for the Fire Island National Seashore. This plan is intended to revise and succeed the master plan approved in 1965, shortly after the Seashore was first established.

According to the Park Service, this new

plan was developed after careful consideration of all relevant economic, social and environmental considerations. Allegedly, it reflects the experience which the Park Service has gained since 1964 in administering the Seashore.

If this is the Park Service's position, I reject it. This is not a master plan for the protection of Fire Island, it is a declaration of open season on one of our most vital natural resources. It is not a responsible document and it is not carefully drawn. It is instead an indication that whatever the Park Service has been doing on Fire Island for the last eleven years, it has not learned very much about the needs of the national seashore.

All of us here tonight know that the plan proposes the deletion of six miles of the western portion of the Seashore. How this proposal was arrived at, I am not sure. However, it is apparent to me that this master plan is not based upon a very conscientious analysis of all the facts.

As an example, let me direct your attention for a moment to an environmental inventory of the National Seashore commissioned by the Park Service in 1973. This study, conducted by Jack McCormick Associates and submitted in February of this year is generally considered the most complete environmental study of the area ever conducted.

I should also note that the Park Service paid in excess of \$80,000 for the preparation of the McCormick study. This, incidentally, is more than the combined cost of all of the other studies conducted in preparation of the Master Plan.

Gentlemen, this study reaches conclusions which run directly contrary to the draft master plan. The environmental experts at McCormick determined in their report that the boundaries should be extended, not contracted. Let me repeat, the environmental experts commissioned by the Park Service to prepare a study of the Fire Island National Seashore firmly believe that the boundaries of the seashore should not be contracted, as the Park Service proposes, but should be expanded in an effort to provide greater protection to this fragile natural resource.

Moreover, in the "General Introduction" of this study the consultants make it clear that they were verbally requested to include in the study recommendations and assessments on the possible alternative scenarios for future development of Fire Island. However, they were never furnished with either preliminary sections or copies of the draft master plan, or a written list of alternatives which the National Park Service considered feasible.

Thus, McCormick was commissioned to do a major environmental study—a study which should have been relied upon in assessing the environmental impact of the master plan—but, was not informed of the intention of the Park Service to "lop off" a portion of the western end of the Seashore. To say the least, this does not seem to be a very responsible way of preparing a master plan.

Furthermore, in the "General Introduction" of the Environmental Inventory, McCormick Associates, Inc., state that they were expected to "work closely with another contractor (to be selected) who would be charged with developing zoning standards for exempted communities on Fire Island. It is my understanding that section 3(a) of the Act establishing the National Seashore requires that the Secretary issue regulations specifying standards for "exempt communities" that are consistent with the purposes of the Act. It is also my understanding that the present standards largely incorporate local zoning regulations and that a need for new standards has existed for some time.

However, McCormick discloses in its report that no such contractor was ever selected and that no effort was made to develop new standards for exempt areas.

Why was another contractor not selected

to develop these standards, given the need for these standards and the fact that McCormick was led to believe such a contractor would be found?

How can we account for these things? Why does the Park Service propose to take action diametrically opposed to the strong recommendations of the most recent and most thorough environmental study of Fire Island conducted by an independent contractor? Why has the Park Service neglected to comply with the requirements of the Act of Congress creating the National Seashore?

On April 30th, I wrote a letter to Assistant Secretary Nathaniel Reed regarding these very grave questions. This afternoon I received the attached reply signed by Mr. Douglas Wheeler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Let me say that I am very disturbed by this reply. In this letter the Park Service admits that it abandoned plans to develop zoning standards for exempted communities. The Park Service explains that it decided instead to seek from Congress the additional authority to halt improper development by obtaining injunctive relief in the courts. In essence the Park Service received a mandate from Congress in 1964 to establish zoning standards, failed to fully implement it, proceeded to abandon all plans for establishing these Congressionally required standards, and now says, as an excuse, that it has a better idea. This is patently irresponsible and may constitute a violation of law.

The Park Service also states that it commissioned the study to provide data for its "boundary readjustment proposal." However, I should point out that the Park Service made its proposal a full month before the McCormick study was finished. And in the draft master plan's bibliography of studies conducted in preparation of the plan, the McCormick study is never cited. Furthermore, as I pointed out before, McCormick states that he was never officially informed of the Park Service's boundary readjustment proposal.

In an effort to make the facts fit their argument the Park Service goes on to state that when McCormick was asked if the proposed boundary revision would affect the island's resources the consultants answered that the island "had the capacity to handle increased development providing that existing zoning standards were maintained." (Emphasis supplied)

But, what the Park Service forgot to mention was that McCormick on page 396 of its study emphasized that without Federal presence in the communities these standards will probably not be maintained. Just what kind of double talk is the National Park Service involved in?

Finally, in the last paragraph of its letter, the Park Service says it "had attempted to weigh all the factors" in proposing and drafting this master plan. All the factors? How about the recommendations of the McCormick study? How about the abandoned study of zoning needs?

Maybe we could find a few answers if we delve a little deeper.

In Section VII of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, an alternative to your proposed plan is presented which explores the possibility of extending the Western boundary of the Seashore in a manner similar to the one suggested by McCormick Associates. It is made patently clear in the Impact Statement that by extending the boundary to incorporate the Historic Coast Guard Lighthouse located on land adjacent to Robert Moses Park, we would prevent the increased use of vehicles (one of the master plan's stated goals), prevent the construction of a major paved road in the area, prevent the creation of an urban strip such as that along Long Beach, and incorporate a significant historic resource (the only one on the island) into the seashore where it should belong.

And what reason is given for not adopting

this plan? Let me read from Page 296 of the Impact Statement:

"Given the existing park staff and level of funding, the management of the Fire Island Lighthouse unit would significantly impair the ability of the National Park Service to protect natural and cultural resources, maintain park facilities, and provide a variety of services to park visitors elsewhere in the seashore. In addition to providing visitor services, maintenance of facilities, and patrol of Federal lands in this area, park management would retain responsibility for issuing vehicle permits, investigating known or potential violations of Federal zoning standards, and addressing the concerns of community residents. Conflicts with local communities on matters pertaining to beach-erosion control, vehicle use, and enforcement of Federal standards would continue to divert management efforts from protecting and providing for a broad spectrum of visitor activities within the seashore district. However, the provision of adequate funding and personnel to meet these additional management responsibility could completely mitigate those adverse effects."

I think we are all aware of the fact that the National Seashore has expended nearly all of its financial resources on condemnations and acquisitions.

And I am sure we all know of the problems that have been encountered in controlling inconsistent land uses through the power of condemnation.

So, let's not kid ourselves, the issue here is not the deletion of the six mile tract, but rather the protection of a vital national resource. If this protection requires additional money or authority then let us authorize it!

What should happen if the Seashore continues to have financial problems?—do we continue to delete sections of the island from the Seashore until there is nothing left? Certainly not.

Then why even consider such an action? Perhaps controlling private development is an administrative pain in the neck and the NPS would rather not meet its statutory obligations?

I am sure you will agree that the Park Service has shown us that it would rather shirk its obligations to this valuable resource rather than seek those remedies which would make Fire Island the kind of recreation area it should be.

The Park Service has not fully considered the environmental factors as is claimed in the master plan.

The Park Service has not come to the Congress and openly requested the needed funds to create a truly outstanding National Park.

The Park Service has not lent any support to H.R. 3994, a bill introduced by Reps. Pike, Ambro, Solarz and myself that would increase the authorization for the Seashore and would grant the Secretary of the Interior the authority to seek injunctive relief against any nonconforming land use in exempted communities.

And the Park Service has made ill advised proposals based upon their own lack of initiative that will seriously jeopardize the future of Fire Island as a complete National resource.

The Park Service may not delete six miles of the Fire Island National Seashore without the approval of the Congress. Let me state that I will vigorously oppose any attempt to get such legislation through the Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C.

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOWNEY: Thank you for your letter of April 30 concerning Fire Island National Seashore.

The National Park Service shares your concern that the Fire Island resource be preserved. The proposals in the draft master plan are not intended to suggest that continued Federal presence on the island is not desirable. They, in fact, are intended to offer solutions to the problems that the National Park Service faces in managing the park. The needs of the communities as they relate to the broader needs of all of the people of the Nation for outdoor recreation is a particularly complex problem for which there is no simple answer. The issue is still open during the master plan review process and, ultimately, until additional legislation is enacted.

When the National Park Service issued the contract to McCormick and Associates for the environmental inventory, it was intended that an addendum to that contract would be issued for the development of model zoning guidelines. Work was not started on this study. As the general standards for zoning evolved to support the injunctive relief proposal during the master planning process, the intended indepth study on zoning standards was abandoned. The issue of zoning, as you are aware, is neither peculiar to Fire Island nor is it an easy question to answer. We believe additional legislative direction is needed to resolve the present conflict between Federal responsibility and the traditional local responsibility for zoning matters.

McCormick and Associates was requested to include in its study recommendations and assessments on the possible alternative scenarios for future development on Fire Island. Staff members of McCormick worked very closely with the Master Plan Team and were made fully aware of an alternative calling for boundary revision. In fact, one of the primary reasons that an environmental study was contracted was to provide data for a possible boundary adjustment proposal.

Before the decision was made to adjust the boundary, the contractor gave a negative reply when asked in a meeting if a boundary revision would adversely affect the physical resource in that portion of Fire Island proposed for deletion from the seashore boundary. The land resource in its estimation had the capacity to handle increased development providing that existing zoning standards were maintained. This factor and the planner's recommendation not to acquire the beach in front of the communities, plus the desirability of concentrating limited funds and manpower in the seashore district resulted in the decision to propose a boundary adjustment. The light-house tract would become a detached unit if the boundary were adjusted. The problems of managing a separate unit and the State of New York's capability to preserve this area were factors in the decision not to recommend Federal control of the light-house.

The McCormick study reaches conclusions about the need for Federal presence on Fire Island which do contradict the draft master plan. However, it is important to remember that the McCormick study was intended to provide background data for decisions. There are other important considerations in making these decisions beyond environmental concerns. For example, the contractor makes the recommendation that it would be desirable to consider expansion of the authorized boundary of Fire Island National Seashore to include the entire geomorphologic unit of the island. This is not a reasonable proposal due to economic and management limitations even though it does perhaps make sense from an environmental point of view. The Service has attempted to weigh all factors, including environmental, in coming to its recommendations.

Hopefully, we have responded to your concerns about the conduct of the master plan

for Fire Island. Thank you for your continuing interest.

Sincerely yours,
DOUGLAS P. WHEELER,
Deputy Assistant Secretary
of the Interior.

STATEMENT ON CYPRUS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Cyprus remains in its present inequitable and unjust form and nothing has happened to relieve the suffering of the Greek-Cypriots who were driven from their homes or to force the Turkish forces to retreat.

Immediately after the crisis began, the Congress ordered a cutoff of arms shipments to Turkey because of that country's aggressive actions. Although Turkey has refused to make any concessions, the Senate has approved legislation which would permit the arms flow to Turkey to resume.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a statement on the Cyprus situation by the officers of the Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia and the chief executives of member denominations of the council.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON CYPRUS

(By the officers of the Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia and the chief executives of member denominations of the council)

In September, 1974, we registered our disapproval of the intervention of foreign military forces in Cyprus and expressed our concern for the suffering and uprooting of thousands of people caused by the conflict. We called for settlement by negotiations of differences among the parties involved and diplomatic efforts by our government to restrain aggressive acts of foreign military forces on this island.

We note with deep regret that to this day the fate of the uprooted people in Cyprus has not been resolved. We urge the early and safe return of all refugees and displaced people to their homes, and we join the World Council of Churches' Executive Committee in asking that these same refugees and uprooted people not be used as "pawns in negotiations or become the object of political exploitation."

We regret, moreover, that the United Nations' request made more than five months ago for the speedy withdrawal of all foreign armed forces from the Republic of Cyprus has not so far been heeded. We view with concern the possible results of a bill (S. 846) passed by the Senate to open up channels for military assistance to the occupying power and fear that a measure of this kind might encourage further resistance to the U.N.'s request for withdrawal. We would therefore urge the members of the House of Representatives to resist all such legislative efforts.

We wish to reaffirm our previous statement and once more call upon our government to employ its legislative and diplomatic resources to restrain aggressive acts and support withdrawal of foreign military forces in Cyprus, and to cooperate with all efforts through the United Nations to bring about the peaceful settlement of differences.

Persons endorsing the statement include the following:

The Rev. John C. Shetler, Chairman, Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia, Conference Minister, Pennsylvania Southeast Conference, United Church of Christ.

The Rev. Dr. William A. Janson, Jr., Vice-President, Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia, President, Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod, Lutheran Church of America.

The Rev. Carl M. Kleis, Secretary, Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia, President, Philadelphia Classis, Reformed Church in America.

The Rev. Dr. Rufus Cornelsen, Executive Director, Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia.

The Rt. Rev. James M. Ault, Bishop, Eastern Pennsylvania Conference, United Methodist Church.

Francis G. Brown, General Secretary, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.

The Rev. William J. Brown, Executive Presbyter, Donegal Presbytery, United Presbyterian Church in the USA.

The Rt. Rev. E. L. Hickman, Bishop, First Episcopal District, African Methodist Episcopal Ch.

The Rev. John A. Limberakis, Archpriest, Greek Orthodox Community of Philadelphia.

The Rt. Rev. Lyman C. Ogilby, Bishop, Diocese of Pennsylvania, Episcopal Church.

The Rev. Harrison J. Trapp, Moderator, Pennsylvania Baptist Association.

THE RETURN OF THE REMAINS OF MARINE CPL. CHARLES McMAHON, JR.

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1975, the Massachusetts State Senate adopted a resolution calling upon the administration to secure the safe return of the remains of Marine Cpl. Charles McMahon, Jr. to the United States. Corporal McMahon, of Woburn, Mass., was killed in action at Tan Son Nhut Airport in Saigon, South Vietnam on April 28, 1975 and was one of the last Americans to lose his life in defense of the interests of the United States and the Republic of South Vietnam.

I am inserting the text of the resolution at this point in the RECORD, and would like to call the special attention of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense to this matter.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION—THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Resolutions urging the President of the United States to endeavor to obtain the return of the remains of Marine Corporal Charles McMahon, Jr. from South Vietnam

Whereas, Marine Corporal Charles McMahon, Jr. of Woburn was killed in action while guarding the interests of the United States at Tan Son Nhut Airport in Saigon, South Vietnam, on April 28, 1975; and

Whereas, Marine Corporal Charles McMahon, Jr. was one of the last Americans to lose his life in defense of the interests of the United States in Southeast Asia and in the Republic of South Vietnam; and

Whereas, The United States Marine Corps confirmed on May 7, 1975 that his earthly re-

mains were not able to be evacuated from the country because of severe problems and chaos in the final evacuation of American citizens from Saigon; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby requests that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense and the Commandant of the Marine Corps exert every conceivable effort, diplomatically and otherwise, to secure the safe return of the remains of Marine Corporal Charles McMahon, Jr. to the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, May 14, 1975.

MALPRACTICE INSURANCE

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, in a statement I recently issued, I discussed the problems connected with malpractice insurance and the very real need for reform in this area. Because my statement raises certain important factors connected with malpractice insurance, I am inserting it in the RECORD so that it may receive the attention of my colleagues:

MALPRACTICE INSURANCE

Sue somebody.

That describes the new national mood as Americans flock to lawyers' offices with a medical bill in one hand and a determination to cash in on somebody's misfortune in the other.

From auto accidents to malpractice suits, the avalanche of lawsuits and out-of-court settlements is costing Americans billions of dollars in court awards, higher insurance premiums, and doctor and hospital bills.

In the case of medical malpractice suits, it is weakening trust between doctors and patients and affecting the type of care and emergency service that the medical profession has willingly supplied for 200 years in this country.

Delicate surgery in which there is a high risk of death or permanent damage has made many doctors wary of proceeding because of the implicit threat that if anything goes wrong they may be heavily sued and driven out of the profession.

More and more we hear that doctors are practicing defensive medicine—ordering more consultations, X-rays and other expensive laboratory procedures because of an increase in unjustified malpractice claims. Simple, inexpensive medical examinations and diagnoses are becoming harder to find.

The rise in malpractice premiums has become so regular and so steep that it is one of the largest costs of practicing medicine. One insurance company in New Jersey recently imposed a 410 percent increase on malpractice insurance for hospitals in New Jersey.

Doctors are not taking the situation lying down. The two-week strike by some doctors in northern California symptomizes the spreading discontent in the medical profession. On one side, they feel the pressure from patients angered by rising medical costs, and on the other by runaway malpractice settlements that threaten them with financial calamity if they take necessary risks with a patient's life.

Suits against physicians have been increasing at the rate of 10 percent a year, higher than any other branch of business and the professions. These costs are being passed on to patients, health insurance companies and to the federal health care programs.

In some cases, patients, their lawyers and juries assume that physicians are gods and should produce medical miracles. If anything goes wrong, the doctor and the hospital are sued. The Journal of the Medical Society of New Jersey recently questioned the cause of medical malpractice suits. Their conclusion was that attorneys have been pressing more people to sue. Second was the growth of the "anything for a buck" philosophy, and third, the erosion of the traditional doctor-patient relationship.

There is no doubt that over-specialization has been partly responsible for the breakdown in trust between doctors and patients. The person undergoing surgery seldom knows the other consulting physicians called in on the operation and often even feels that they may be unnecessary.

The clash between the medical and legal profession over the increase in lawsuits and the cost of settlements is complicated. More physicians are engaged in group practice. Moreover, there are studies alleging that some surgeons are unnecessarily advising patients to undergo operations. Finally, many new medical procedures are being tried today that would have been impossible ten or fifteen years ago. It means that many high risk patients, who would have died without surgery in the 1950's are now being saved.

The facts surrounding the cost of malpractice insurance are by no means clear. For example, Dr. Norman Blackman, president of the Kings County Medical Society in New York, has claimed that only 18 cents of the doctor's insurance dollar goes to an injured patient. Eighty-two cents goes to lawyers, insurance companies, insurance brokers and for overhead. According to Dr. Blackman, the public is being legally fleeced. Naturally, the lawyers are protesting such claims.

Medical insurance coverage should, in my opinion, remain a private matter with regulation of the insurance industry left to the states. Federal takeover of malpractice insurance would guarantee no improvements; very likely, it would not multiply the confusion, the problems, the disputes and the costs to everyone.

The billions of dollars lost in the Medicare and Medicaid programs are a warning of what might happen if the federal government attempts to regulate medical malpractice. Instead of a rare strike by physicians in northern California, we might trigger nationwide protests by aggrieved doctors.

On the other side of the coin, patients who have received improper or careless treatment have a constitutional right to sue for damages. Incompetent physicians should not be shielded from responsibility by the code of silence in the operating room.

Suggestions that Congress enact a no-fault medical insurance system would be a mistake. It would stimulate a rash of small claims because of the ease of filing for compensation. In this event, insurance costs would go higher, and medical care would become more expensive and perhaps even more impersonal.

It seems to me that personal accountability is indispensable in the practice of medicine just as in the practice of law. Both professions should police themselves better to weed out those whose primary aim is to get rich and someone else's misery.

Congress should act on medical malpractice insurance only as a last resort, when the professions, the public and the insurance companies have exhausted their own patience, intelligence and good will. Even then, I have serious reservations that the federal government could provide American physicians and patients with a simple, workable and inexpensive plan for insurance coverage.

The best remedy is the cheapest: mutual trust and medical competence. It is something that money cannot buy and the government cannot provide.

FISH AND WILDLIFE'S EXPERTISE NEEDED

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with a number of colleagues in legislation designed to place all units of the National Wildlife Refuge System under the Agency of the Department of the Interior best equipped to provide the kind of administration needed. This would be the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, of course.

In Arizona, considerable ferment has arisen over decision of the Department to transfer Kofa Game Range from Fish and Wildlife to the Bureau of Land Management.

Pete Cowgill, outdoor editor for the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, has sharply attacked this action and details the case in three excellent articles on April 27, 1975. I wanted to share Mr. Cowgill's findings with my colleagues:

CATTLE GRAZING IN KOKA RANGE HARMS WILDLIFE

The Kofa Game Range was established by an executive order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt Jan. 25, 1939.

"... The following described lands are hereby withdrawn from settlement, location, sale or entry and reserved and set apart for the conservation and development of natural wildlife resources, and for the protection and improvement of public grazing lands and natural forage resources . . .

"... the range or preserve, being duly established . . . shall be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior so far as it relates to the public grazing lands and natural forage resources thereof: provided, however, that all the forage resources in excess of that required to maintain a balanced wildlife population within this range or preserve shall be available for domestic livestock. . ."

A Memorandum of Understanding was signed Oct. 15, 1940, by the Grazing Service (now called Bureau of Land Management) and the Fish and Wildlife Service covering the Kofa and Cabeza Prieta Game Ranges in Arizona Grazing District No. 3.

"It is mutually agreed that the livestock licensed and permitted will be held strictly to cattle and horses and that no domestic sheep or goats will be allowed.

"It is mutually agreed that wild horses and burros will be controlled.

"It is mutually agreed that the overall rate of stocking on the available cattle range shall not exceed three cattle yearlong per section and this rate will never be exceeded without the consent of the FWS after a joint examination of the area."

After 25 years of joint management an analysis of the Kofa and Cabeza Prieta Game Ranges was made by Hugh Harper, wildlife specialist for the BLM and George Wiseman, assistant regional supervisor for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

"Grazing lands of the Kofa and Cabeza Prieta Game Ranges are at best marginal so far as supporting a feasible livestock operation is concerned.

"Rainfall has an appreciable effect on the

quantity of forage which is available, for livestock use. Spring rains on occasion result in growth of some annual plants which may be utilized by livestock for brief periods of time. Such plants include eriogonum, plantago and aristida. Ranchers attempt to turn cattle onto game range lands during periods when these annual forage plants are present. In practice, the timing of the entry and removal of cattle does not . . . correspond too closely to the period of availability of the temporary forage source.

"Even when annual plant growth occurs, cattle utilize other plants which are needed by wildlife. After the annuals dry, other important wildlife plants are used extensively by livestock. The result has been abusive use of perennial shrubs and other plants important to wildlife on portions of the game ranges used regularly by livestock. Lack of fencing in the rugged terrain has resulted in trespass grazing of areas not included in grazing allotments. It is apparent the delicately balanced vegetative complex on the desert areas involved cannot support livestock and also maintain its inherent potential to serve wildlife.

"Preferred wildlife browse plants such as deernut, wolfberry and ratany are utilized extensively by cattle. Severe use of such plants was noted where livestock grazing occurs every year—as on the Crowder allotment.

"Present livestock use is occurring to the detriment of wildlife, representing an infraction of the directives of the establishing executive order.

"The following recommendations are made: the area should be administered solely by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. To accomplish conformance with the directives of the establishing executive order, livestock grazing should be phased out within seven years."

The above comments were dated June 17, 1965.

On May 25, 1972, a memo was sent by Bob Hernbrode Jr., then wildlife manager of the area for the Arizona Game and Fish Department, to Mike Yeager, G&F regional supervisor.

"In 1939 the Kofa Game Range was established by executive order to maintain a balanced wildlife population. It was further provided that excess forage resources not needed by those wildlife populations should be available for domestic livestock. To date no determination has been made as to what are maximum wildlife populations: what should be their forage needs; and what should be in excess to be available for domestic livestock use. Instead active allotments have been maintained which largely monopolize all available forage in some of the less rugged areas.

"Active cattle allotments negatively influence wildlife populations where they occur on the desert.

"Destructive use of important browse species is occurring throughout the cruising radius of livestock from the drought period watering sites. The reduced carrying capacity will again effect wildlife species, not in individual body condition, but in reduced herd size.

"With the development of water catchments desert mule deer numbers have increased substantially, thereby increasing their availability for sport hunting. Desert bighorn sheep have evolved from an unknown to the most coveted of big game animals in the last 20 years. Large amounts of money are spent directly and indirectly in pursuit of these species. Economically these two wildlife species and all other desert wildlife are highly valuable, perhaps more so than the livestock industry in these two desert areas."

Gerald E. Duncan, former acting refuge manager for the FWS, wrote a letter dated June 1, 1973, to William Brigham, secretary

of the Arizona Desert Bighorn Sheep Society.

"We have documented in our annual reports that we believed cattle operations on the Kofa to be taking excessive toll of grasses, forbs and browse plants which are valuable to wildlife as food and cover."

ON THE TRAIL

(By Pete Cowgill)

Can the Bureau of Land Management change its spots?

The answer, unfortunately, is "No."

It is inconceivable that this federal bureaucracy which for 35 years has been an active conspirator in the vegetational rape of the Kofa Game Range will suddenly smite down the nasty ranchers whose cattle roam much of the region.

History tells us that the BLM is blissfully wedded to the consumptive users of our public domain land: ranchers with cattle, sheep, goats, horses and other domestic livestock; miners and prospectors; timber cutters; and any other commercial users of the 450 million acres of public domain land in the western United States.

The BLM record in the Kofa Game Range has been abysmal, as far as wildlife values on the Kofa are concerned.

In 1965 a two-man team from the Fish and Wildlife Service surveyed the Kofa and stated that where cattle were grazing, the range was overused to the detriment of wildlife. The study recommended that grazing be terminated in seven years.

Two months later—July 27, 1975—the late Fred Weiler, then Arizona director for the BLM, wrote a six page memo to the BLM Washington, D.C., office commenting on the FWS study.

"I fully agree with the report in its recommendation that domestic livestock be, over a period of years, excluded from both of the ranges (Kofa and Cabeza Prieta)" Weiler wrote. "The annual use is small so, with time to adjust, the ranchers should not be duly affected. This proposed exclusion will not be easy for there will be strong objections on the part of some of the ranchers."

On April 14-15 I took a tour of the northeast quarter of the Kofa Game Range with Monte Dotson, FWS range manager, and Bob Weaver, wildlife specialist for the Arizona Game and Fish Department.

What we observed was very discouraging as far as wildlife values were concerned.

We went by corral after corral, salt lick after salt lick, windmill after windmill, catchment after catchment and the results were the same. The vegetation around them had been denuded by livestock. Next to the washes the jobo bushes were so severely browsed down that they were little more than remnants. Patches of big galleta grass were uniformly grazed 100 per cent.

Our visit was too early for many of the annual wild flowers to be in bloom. These are eagerly sought after by both cattle and wildlife. In particular, the brittlebush is a favorite of bighorn sheep but these colorful greyish bushes with their yellow flowers on tall stalks are readily browned by cattle up to five miles from their water sources; this includes nearly all of the flatter country in the range.

The Crowder Cattle Co. has a permit for 150 head of livestock on a yearlong basis.

Hoodoo Well is on a popular ram travel route. In the past the sheep have utilized this water source, according to Weaver. That is all but impossible now. The line shack has been improved and a wrangler lives there full time now. He has a large dog which further reduces the chance that any sheep or deer can get close to the water.

Willbanks cabin is about eight airline miles to the west in the very upper end of Hoodoo Canyon; it is about three miles east of Squaw Peak. There is a corral, windmill and line shack. We saw 19 mule deer does on the way over to the cabin. Even in this remote area

the vegetation along the wash was eaten down and the presence of anyone at the cabin would detract from the wildlife use of the water. Fortunately, the FWS has improved Squaw Tanks, one mile to the west. Here is a good source of water which cattle cannot get to.

One of the sorriest examples of the invasion of cattle improvements and the disregard for wildlife and wilderness values is at what Dotson called Crowder Dam No. 2 in Dry Well Wash. Two years ago the rancher wanted to build a corral here—far inside the proposed Kofa Wilderness Area boundary. The rancher, a BLM employe and Dotson went over the route and agreement was reached on an absolute minimum amount of road blading so a stock truck could reach the site. The BLM employe was supposed to go along when the rancher bulldozed in the road.

The verbal agreement was grossly violated as the bulldozer "dropped his blade at the start and ran with it down the whole way to the charco," said Dodson. A new corral was built.

According to Weaver it will not be long before the sides of the hills are denuded, as nearby washes have already been, by the invasion of the cattle.

It has been 10 years since Weiler agreed that grazing should be terminated on the Kofa. But things have gone the opposite way with new improvement built on sites which are recognized as valuable for wildlife.

It is quite obvious that BLM has not considered wildlife as the primary resources of the Kofa.

The record of the FWS is better. Many high tanks have been built and existing natural tanks have been expanded for the use of sheep and deer. A close watch is kept on the size and health of the sheep herds and hunt permit numbers are established. In the Kofas the number of ram permits has been 10 since 1963.

When the Kofa and Cabeza Prieta Game Ranges were established in 1939 two federal agencies were given administrative responsibilities.

The Grazing Service (now Bureau of Land Management) managed all resources except wildlife which was the province of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

On Feb. 5, 1975, Undersecretary of the Interior W. W. Lyon wrote to the directors of the BLM and FWS: "In line with recent proposals, hearings, and reports, the Secretary of the Interior has decided, and so directs, that the Cabeza Prieta should be administered exclusively by the FWS and that the Kofa will be administered exclusively by BLM."

"The secretary understands these areas which are being placed under administration of the BLM will continue to be managed as ranges and will be considered components of the National Wildlife Refuge System under directives as stated in the originating executive orders.

"The solicitor has ruled that there is no legal restraint which would limit BLM's administration of such areas. The record shows that the BLM can adequately and efficiently carry out this mandate."

The Federal Register of March 28, 1975, contained public land orders from Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior, carrying out the above transfers.

(In addition to the Kofa, Secretary Morton also transferred to BLM the Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Range in Montana and the Charles Sheldon Antelope Range in Nevada.)

Congressional reaction to the administrative transfers has been forthright and almost unanimously in opposition.

"As chairman of the Subcommittee of Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, I am greatly distressed over

this announcement," wrote Robert Liggett, a member of the House of Representatives from California on March 5. "Your action appears to be precipitous and poorly conceived.

"I fail to see how the division of any cohesive organization such as the National Wildlife Refuge System would prove to be other than chaotic."

On March 14 Congressmen John Dingell and Henry Ruess wrote to Secretary of the Interior Morton, "We think your decision to abandon this practice after more than 40 years and place these areas under exclusive jurisdiction of the BLM is ill-advised, contrary to the public interest, and in violation of the Congressional intention and understandings of the 1966 Act (which established the National Wildlife Refuge System).

Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana introduced S.B. 1293 on March 21. "I have always held the view that the FWS should be the sole administrator of the areas in question and have so communicated my feelings to the Secretary.

"I am introducing today a bill which would first establish the western game ranges by Act of Congress rather than by their present executive decree, and second ward sole jurisdiction to the FWS. This action has the support of 22 national conservation organizations plus co-sponsorship on short notice by my senior colleague Mike Mansfield, and the junior senator from Oregon, Bob Packwood."

House Bill 5511 was introduced on March 26 by Reps. Dingell, Leggett and Ruess. Commenting on the transfer of the Kofa to the BLM, Dingell said, "This is like appointing the fox to guard the henhouse.

"In the fifties the Eisenhower Administration attempted to dispose of a number of wildlife refuges, declaring them to be surplus. This effort was blocked by the outcry of citizens across the country. Again in 1970 the Nixon Administration tried to sell some 10 percent of our national wildlife refuge lands. This too was stopped by the public outcry which ensued.

"Thwarted in recent attempts to dispose of wildlife refuges outright, the Ford Administration has come up with a new, but most insidious way, of dismantling the refuge system. The program involved transfer of the three wildlife refuges to the BLM while keeping them as parts of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

"If we let this proposed pattern of administrative nonresponsibility go unchallenged, no unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System or National Park System is safe from administrative transfer to another agency for 'management.' If this proposed transfer is left unchallenged the intent and will of Congress will thus be subverted and ignored."

Members of Congress are not the only persons who have publicly expressed concern at the transfer. On March 18 a telegram was sent to President Ford signed by representatives of 25 Arizona-based conservation groups. "To give the primary management responsibility for an area that has been dedicated since 1939 to the protection of wildlife to an agency that is more responsive to the interests of miners and ranchers is a grave mistake.

"The history of the BLM activities in the Kofa under joint management arrangement with the FWS has been most disappointing.

"We urge you to overrule Secretary Morton's decision and to give the FWS primary management responsibility for the Kofa Game Range."

The Wilderness Society wrote to President Ford on March 25, "Why does Secretary Morton consider the FWS the appropriate agency to continue to manage the Cabeza Prieta as a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System but not the Kofa.

"This precedent, if allowed to stand, will be a dark blot on wildlife conservation history. We urge your prompt reversal of Secretary

Morton's decision as being contrary to the national interest."

Tucsonans who have expressed opposition to the transfer include John McComb, southwest representative of the Sierra Club; Jim Levy, former member of several BLM advisory boards; Richard Small, former executive secretary of the Arizona Wildlife Federation, and president of the Arizona Habitat Association.

COSTS OF FINDING, DEVELOPING AND PRODUCING CRUDE OIL IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, in the near future the Members of the House will be asked to make a series of major decisions with respect to oil pricing policy. In the RECORD for Tuesday, May 14, 1975, appears a series of remarks which I made on the question of oil prices. Included in those remarks were eight basic questions which I feel lie at the heart of the oil pricing issue. Subsequently I have attempted to call to the attention of my colleagues further information which focuses on answers to the questions which I have posed. To that same end I am today submitting for the RECORD a copy of some recent remarks by Mr. Robert Nathan before the Senate Committee on the Interior. Mr. Nathan's remarks represent the results of a thorough study of 15 years of data on the costs of developing domestic oil. It is another piece of evidence to be weighed in advance of our upcoming decision; I submit the testimony of Mr. Nathan herewith:

THE COST OF FINDING, DEVELOPING, AND PRODUCING CRUDE OIL IN THE UNITED STATES

(Testimony of Robert R. Nathan on petroleum pricing before the Senate Committee on the Interior, April 28, 1975)

In order to shed light on the price problem for new domestic oil, we have undertaken an analysis of the true economic costs involved in all aspects of new production of crude oil in this country. The results are both significant and provocative. It is quite clear that for some time oil prices in the United States have been at levels well below actual costs and this has had a discouraging impact on finding and developing new sources of oil supplies. These findings may not be good news for us, but it is essential that the facts be developed and aired in order to arrive at policies which will be compatible with moving toward the fulfillment of our national objectives of reducing our dependence on insecure sources for energy and reducing the unfavorable balance of payments resulting from heavy imports of crude oil and petroleum products. Simultaneously, we must take into account the longer run needs of consumers and the problems of general inflation.

The following observations relate specifically to the cost and price problems of new oil development in the United States and should help to shed light on a complex and sensitive subject. It should be noted that these problems are quite distinct from two other issues that must be addressed by overall energy policy; the problem of conservation by constraining demand; and the problem of preventing or offsetting unintended enrichment of producers of old oil or impoverish-

ment of consumers. Here we are dealing only with incentives and means to add to domestic supplies.

Unless oil can be sold by producers at prices sufficient to cover costs plus a return on the operator's capital investment sufficient to sustain exploration, then surely wildcat drilling in the United States will decline. It is the rate of return on capital investment that provides the driving force to sustain the level of exploratory activity. This, in turn, determines the level of our oil discoveries and production volume. It is in this context that we must take note of the huge cost increases that have been experienced in finding, developing, and producing crude petroleum.

The attached table, Exhibit I, provides data on the economic cost of finding, developing and producing crude oil in the United States for each year during the period 1959 through 1974. The oil (and related gas) reserves found each year represent the total quantity of usable reserves that are available for production attributable to all new wells drilled within that year. The total level of capital investment in drillings each year in the United States (excluding Prudhoe Bay) is also shown. Revenues from the sale of each year's discovered reserves of oil and their attendant costs were projected year by year over the calculated life of the reserve. The price at which each year's discovered oil was assumed to be sold over the life of the reserve was then determined to be at that level which would yield a discounted cash flow rate of return to the producer of 15 percent after payment of all costs, including income taxes. This is referred to as the "economic price," in that it represents the price necessary to induce wildcat producers to take the risks and incur the costs attendant on finding and developing new sources of crude oil.

In the calculations, all costs incurred in the drilling of dry wells as well as new discoveries have been taken into account. All tax incentives, such as intangible drilling costs and percentage depletion, as they actually existed in each year have been added to cash flow in arriving at the price needed to yield the 15 percent rate of return. The 1974 calculated price does not, therefore, reflect the increased costs and reduced capital accumulation which will result from the changes in percentage depletion rates and the 65 percent taxable income ceiling enacted in 1975. It does not take into account the 10 percent minimum preference tax on percentage depletion or the higher than 50 percent income tax bracket of many individual entrepreneurs.

An enterprise engaged in oil exploration is distinctly unique from most other kinds of business. It utilizes depleting capital as income and then expends the larger part of this income in ventures, many of which result in a negative return. Four out of five exploratory wells drilled are dry. A 15 percent return on invested capital must be regarded as an extremely conservative basis for calculating the economic price in an industry that is so speculative and risk-laden.

The year by year economic price and the actual prices received for oil discovered over the 1959-74 period are shown graphically in Exhibit II. As is evident, only in 1959 did the price actually received equal or exceed the economic price for new crude oil. The consequences of this price situation should have been anticipated. During this 1959-74 period the number of barrels per exploratory well drilled dropped by almost 50 percent. The level of drilling activity fell by 56 percent. The number of independent oil producers declined from an estimated 20,000 to 10,000. The price chart largely explains these declines. Reasonable returns from exploratory drilling involved real costs that far exceeded the prices at which oil was being bought abroad.

Despite the recent price increases in crude oil, the economic cost of new oil remained above the price actually received through 1974. If new oil prices were rolled back or if ceilings on new oil were set at levels below the economic cost, taking into account the cost effects of the changes already made in percentage depletion, we could well again experience the situation that resulted in the precipitous decline in the discovery of oil reserves over the past 20 years. Oil is more difficult to find than in the earlier years of the industry, but scientific techniques are increasingly sophisticated and costly. If the decline in domestic discoveries is to be reversed for any extended period of time, the existence of appropriate economic incentives—absent for so many years—is a necessary prerequisite for more exploration.

To the degree that exploration for new oil in the United States is discouraged, additions to reserves and domestic production will be at lower levels. This will leave the nation with the unpleasant choice of importing more oil from the Mideast and African OPEC countries or greatly reducing consumption. Reducing consumption should be pursued but it will entail sharply increased prices, sharply increased taxes, or rationing—or some combination of these. Despite the higher costs to obtain new domestic oil, the implicit price compares favorably with the price of imported oil and yields a large bonus in the form of national security. Approximately two-thirds of domestic crude oil is sold at the controlled price of \$5.25 per barrel; the remaining one-third is not subject to price ceilings. Production of

crude oil at uncontrolled prices comes to about 2.9 million barrels a day, accounting for some 17 percent of the total supply, including imports from abroad, needed to meet United States demand for petroleum products. The effect on consumer prices for all petroleum products that would result from lowering prices on the 17 percent share of the market accounted for by oil presently sold at market prices is clearly very limited.

The thrust of the foregoing analysis is clear. It costs a great deal more to find, develop, and produce oil today than ever in the past. If this nation is serious about reducing dependence on oil imported from insecure sources, it will have to pay sufficient prices to cover the true economic costs of exploration, discovery, development, and production.

EXHIBIT I

COST OF NEW OIL, TOTAL UNITED STATES, YEARS 1959 THROUGH 1974

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Year	Gross oil reserves (millions of barrels)	Gross gas reserves (billions of cubic feet)	Gross oil and gas sales	Royalty expense	Ad valorem and State taxes	Operating expenses	Adjusted gross income	Total invested capital	Intangible drilling cost	Depletion allowance	Depreciation	Taxable income	Investment tax credit	Federal income taxes	After tax net income	Net cash flow	Net cash flow discounted 15 percent	Gross oil price (dollars per barrel)	Gas price (dollars per thousand cubic feet)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
1959	3,793	4,594	\$11,740	\$1,467	\$680	\$1,893	\$7,700	\$3,630	\$2,341	\$2,362	\$857	\$2,139	0	\$1,070	\$6,360	\$3,000	0	2.86	0.194
1960	2,785	3,373	10,179	1,272	594	1,505	6,807	3,150	2,042	2,087	706	1,927	0	986	5,821	2,671	0	3.40	.210
1961	2,773	3,358	10,025	1,253	567	1,531	6,674	3,120	2,048	2,052	701	1,873	0	936	5,738	2,618	0	3.34	.227
1962	2,511	3,041	10,174	1,272	570	1,550	6,783	3,202	2,078	2,100	704	1,900	\$49	901	5,882	2,680	0	3.77	.233
1963	2,133	2,583	9,721	1,215	538	1,565	6,403	3,095	2,074	2,004	718	1,607	50	753	5,650	2,555	0	4.27	.237
1964	3,118	3,775	11,223	1,403	641	1,670	7,508	3,475	2,155	2,307	769	2,277	54	1,085	6,424	2,949	0	3.32	.231
1965	2,234	2,705	9,098	1,137	522	1,498	6,940	2,917	1,981	1,852	693	1,414	48	659	5,282	2,365	0	3.79	.234
1966	1,986	2,560	9,998	1,250	562	1,477	6,709	3,135	2,009	2,085	758	1,857	41	887	5,822	2,687	0	4.73	.236
1967	1,874	1,908	9,808	1,226	569	1,426	6,587	3,132	2,088	2,042	753	1,704	43	809	5,778	2,646	0	4.99	.240
1968	2,003	2,258	10,833	1,354	634	1,478	7,367	3,446	2,268	2,273	781	2,045	55	968	6,399	2,953	0	5.13	.246
1969	1,522	1,901	11,146	1,393	640	1,493	7,620	3,406	2,112	2,358	757	2,393	37	1,159	6,461	3,055	0	7.01	.251
1970	1,766	2,138	13,352	1,669	770	1,667	9,247	3,590	1,891	2,323	692	4,340	0	2,170	7,077	3,487	0	7.25	.257
1971	1,267	1,488	10,818	1,352	605	1,546	7,315	3,032	1,751	1,864	606	3,093	42	1,504	5,811	2,779	0	8.22	.273
1972	1,303	1,764	10,105	1,263	561	1,499	6,781	2,986	1,893	1,726	696	2,467	49	1,185	5,597	2,611	0	7.36	.293
1973	1,049	1,450	9,458	1,182	448	1,451	6,377	2,846	1,855	1,628	669	2,225	47	1,066	5,311	2,465	0	8.63	.279
1974	1,206	1,677	16,099	2,012	762	2,137	11,187	4,632	2,739	2,813	987	4,648	69	2,255	8,932	4,300	0	12.73	.449

Note: Figures are for total United States except Prudhoe Bay field in Alaska. All financial data expressed in constant dollars for year of initial projection. Columns may not add precisely because of computer rounding.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- Column:
 - (1) Oil reserves added by drilling plus expected upward revisions.
 - (2) Gas reserves associated with oil.
 - (3) Col. (1) times col. (18) plus col. (2) times col. (19).
 - (4) 12.5 percent of col. (3).
 - (5) Variable tax rate times col. (3) minus col. (4). Tax rate is approximately 6 percent.
 - (6) Direct operating costs including field labor and supplies, maintenance, general and administrative overhead.
 - (7) Col. (3) minus col. (4) minus col. (5) minus col. (6).
 - (8) Total capital investment attributable to oil reserves added in year including leasehold costs.
 - (9) Portion of total capital attributable to intangible drilling costs.

- (10) Includes cost and percentage depletion based on law at time of 1st yr projected.
- (11) Cumulative depreciation of tangible drilling costs and leasehold equipment.
- (12) Col. (7) minus col. (9) minus col. (10) minus col. (11).
- (13) Investment tax credit is variable for each year depending on law at start of year. Zero some years.
- (14) Col. (12) times 50 percent minus col. (13).
- (15) Col. (7) minus col. (14) or alternatively col. (12) minus col. (14) plus col. (10) plus col. (9) plus col. (11).
- (16) Col. (15) minus col. (8).
- (17) Col. (16) discounted at 15 percent per annum compounded annually. Must total zero.
- (18) Gross oil price at wellhead required for 15 percent discounted rate of return after Federal income taxes.
- (19) Gross gas price for the purpose of calculating coproduct credits

EXHIBIT III A

ECONOMIC PRICE OF NEW OIL AND PRICE RECEIVED FOR OIL

[In dollars per barrel]

Year	Economic price for new oil ¹	Price received for oil ²	Difference
1959	2.86	3.25	-0.39
1960	3.40	3.25	.15
1961	3.34	3.20	.14
1962	3.77	3.10	.67
1963	4.27	3.10	1.17
1964	3.32	3.10	.22
1965	3.79	3.10	.69
1966	4.73	3.11	1.62
1967	4.99	3.11	1.88
1968	5.13	3.16	1.97
1969	7.01	3.32	3.69
1970	7.25	3.40	3.85
1971	8.22	3.60	4.62
1972	7.36	3.80	3.76
1973	8.63	* 4.20	4.43
1974	12.73	* 10.50	2.23

¹ Col. 18, exhibit I.
² Price received for oil during year (east Texas field).
³ New oil.

EXHIBIT IV A

DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF CRUDE OIL AND NATURAL GAS LIQUIDS AND IMPORTS OF CRUDE OIL AND REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS, UNITED STATES, 1959-74

[In thousands of barrels per day]

Year	U.S. production	Imports into United States	U.S. consumption
1959	7,969	1,780	9,749
1960	8,194	1,815	10,009
1961	8,242	1,917	10,159
1962	8,496	2,082	10,578
1963	8,838	2,123	10,961
1964	8,976	2,258	11,234
1965	9,242	2,468	11,710
1966	9,720	2,573	12,293
1967	10,339	2,537	12,876
1968	10,796	2,839	13,635
1969	11,215	3,166	14,381
1970	11,549	3,419	14,968
1971	11,523	3,926	15,449
1972	11,861	4,741	16,602
1973	11,296	6,256	17,552
1974	10,781	6,083	16,864

A SALUTE TO THE BRONZE SHIELDS OF NEWARK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a very significant public service organization which has been in existence in my home town of Newark, N.J., since 1959. The name of this organization is the "Bronze Shields" and its membership is comprised of the black police officers of the Newark Police Force.

On Sunday, May 25, 1975, I had the pleasure of attending the third annual Bronze Shields awards dinner at the Robert Treat Hotel in Newark. Those chosen to be honored for their outstanding service to the community were:

Mr. Hubert Williams, director of the Newark Police Department, who received the 1975 Law Enforcement Award;

Mr. George Branch, community service aide for the Newark Housing Authority, cited for his activities in the youth services area;

Mr. Daniel W. Blue, Jr., executive director of the Newark Human Rights Commission, who received the 1975 Unity Award;

Mr. George Barrie, president and chief executive of Faberge, Inc., who was given the 1975 Community Service Award;

And, radio station WNJR, which was given the 1975 Special Service Citation.

These men are to be commended for the dedication and hard work which has gained them this deserved recognition.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that more than just these few award winners should be recognized at this time. I salute the entire membership of the Bronze Shields for their outstanding service to the city of Newark as "protectors of freedom and guardians of justice."

The people of Newark are indeed fortunate to have individuals such as these serving on the Newark Police Force.

STATEMENT BY BELLA S. ABZUG ANNOUNCING HEARINGS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 3, 1975, my Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights will hold a hearing on the status of Federal agency implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974. This act, signed by the President on December 31, 1974, becomes effective on September 27, 1975. The Privacy Act is a landmark enactment in the continuing effort to protect individual privacy. It is the first step taken to regulate the conduct of Government recordkeeping on American citizens and provides the individual access to their files, contains remedies for inaccurate recordkeeping, prevents unauthorized disclosures, and most importantly, requires that every single data bank—without exception—must be publicly described by the Government agency maintaining such data bank.

It is estimated that at least 2,000 data banks are maintained by Federal agencies. Each of these data banks must be publicly disclosed by this coming September unless the agency decides to discontinue use of the data and destroys the files. Thus, the magnitude of the effort necessary to prepare for compliance with the provisions of the act is evident.

The purpose of Tuesday's hearing is to determine how well the various agencies, under the direction of the Office of Management and Budget, are prepared to meet the complicated provisions of the act.

The Government Information and Individual Rights Subcommittee will take testimony from the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Defense, and

the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The hearing will be held in room 2203, Rayburn House Office Building, commencing at 9 a.m., Tuesday, June 3, 1975.

ZOIE SMITH: AN ACHIEVER

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, one of the longtime civic and political leaders in my district is Mrs. Zoie Smith of South Bend. I insert in the RECORD the following article, which appeared in the Tri-County News on April 25, 1975, on Mrs. Smith's outstanding contributions to her community:

ZOIE SMITH: AN ACHIEVER

(By Mary Fischer)

When her mother named her Zoie, she must have sensed that this child would be unusual in more ways than in name only. Now, at age 77 Zoie's achievements prove her mother was right.

Zoie Aubert Smith was born in Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana on July 12, 1897. Her father was a Baptist minister. At age 8 she was teaching a Sunday School class and showing the leadership that was to shape her life. The feelings in the church were friendly; fellowship made the church one big happy family. Everyone cared. There were no social justice programs . . . no recreation agencies . . . the church membership looked after each other. It was a place of renewal and encouragement.

With such a beginning Zoie was bound to continue in a service career. After finishing school she taught for two years in Houma, Louisiana, beginning as a grade school teacher and eventually becoming principal. Later, in Lafouch Parish, Louisiana she taught history and home economics. She has been helping all ages in these fields for years. In 1923 she came to South Bend.

When the Ku Klux Klan announced that they were going to parade through South Bend in 1925, Zoie was part of the group that harassed the KKK right out of town. The University of Notre Dame students were a big part of the rout. They gathered vegetables and stones to shower the Klansmen and send them hightailing out of town.

"They weren't all bad men," says Zoie, "just misled." I had a friend in Louisiana whose father was a Klansman. I saw a parade one day. Later on I was visiting at her home when her father came home, put away his robes, and came out to visit with us, very pleasant. It may have helped that I wasn't a Catholic!"

When Zoie came to South Bend in 1923 she planned to continue teaching. But blacks were not allowed to teach. So she got a job with the WPA as a sewing project supervisor. Later, when blacks were finally asked to work there, she was hired at Kingsbury Ordnance Plant. She left Kingsbury to work at Bendix where she became the first black woman machine operator.

All this time she was active in the church. She helped the Pilgrim Baptist Church through many crises including signing the mortgage note to remodel the church. She is the first and the only woman to serve as trustee of the Pilgrim Baptist church.

In helping people Zoie could not stop with church work. The blacks at this time were strong Republicans. They might still be if Herbert Hoover hadn't messed things up. In some speeches he made he swore that the Republican party was for everyone. In the

deep South he said that the Republican party was going to be "illy-white." When Zoie heard that she made a few speeches of her own. The blacks in St. Joseph county organized as the Colored Women's Democratic Club of St. Joseph County. After the election the men joined the club and after a few changes it was decided on the All American Democratic Club of St. Joseph County. Zoie was the first president and last week they unanimously voted to keep her there.

Zoie Aubert Smith is of average size and quietly elegant with a wry sense of humor, a lovely smile, and humble. But in justice . . . watch out. She has strength where it is needed.

Through her perseverance she saw the first black fireman and the first black policeman hired. That opened the door to other government jobs.

"There's so much to do in the world!" says Zoie. "How can any one be bored?" She starts her day, very early, with prayer. "I talk with God. I tell Him what I'd like to do and ask His help. If plans go awry, I don't worry. The Lord will handle things His way." And so she has done much that must have met with God's approval.

She has helped groups to organize and get things done. In the Fraternal Order of Oddfellow, she is director of Missions. This work covers the United States, Canada and the Islands. She founded and was the first director of the National Baptist Youth Camp and Senior Retreat in Constantine, Michigan. Several women's groups working in all areas of family living, got their start with her encouragement. She believes that the church is an important part of life and is charter member of the Council of Church Women of St. Joseph County. She was parliamentarian of the National Urban League. She is a charter member of the South Bend Urban League Guild.

When Zoie was showing the Sunday School class the way at age eight, she was only beginning a long job. She helped to reorganize the NACCP in 1924. When the REAL Services program came along she was ready to do the work of the Outreach Worker.

She has to travel to far places to keep informed and to inform others. Every five years the Baptist World Alliance visits different parts of the world. Zoie has been abroad four times, around the world once.

She's covered Canada, Hawaii, and the Bahamas. The next tour is planned for Sweden, Israel, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Nigeria. That's how Zoie keeps her "batteries charged." She'll come back a more vigorous and interesting president of the Northeast Senior Citizens Council.

Her mother was right. Zoie is an unusual and gifted woman.

HOMER HEACOCK: MONTEBELLO'S "MAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1975, Homer R. Heacock, an outstanding citizen of southern California and of the 30th Congressional District, was honored for his community service at the 21st annual All-Service Clubs Banquet, sponsored by the Montebello Jaycees. I also wish to express my appreciation to Mr. Heacock for his service to the community and to call it to the attention of our colleagues. Mr. Heacock's contributions have been in the fields of business, civic affairs, and serv-

ice organizations. His selection as "Man of the Year" was most appropriate.

As a director of the Montebello Chamber of Commerce for many years, Mr. Heacock worked for the development and betterment of the entire community. He has also served as the president of the Montebello Public Improvement Corp. since 1966, and is a past president of the Montebello Realty Board.

Mr. Heacock's service has not been limited to the world of business. He also served for years as a member of the Board of Education of the Montebello Unified School District. Through his sponsorship of the Little League "Heacock Realty" baseball team at Grant Rea Park, many of the district's young people have been given the opportunity to participate in organized sports.

Having long been a member of many service organizations in Montebello, Mr. Heacock has been the recipient of a number of awards. He received an honorary life membership from the Montebello Council of Parents and Teachers Associations in 1963, and was made the "Lion of the Year" by the Montebello Lions Club in 1973.

It is only fitting that now, after years of service to our community, Homer Heacock should be named "Man of the Year." His dedication can serve as an example for us all.

SALUTE TO RAY CHARLES

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, a very special event will take place in Los Angeles on Monday, June 9 at the Beverly Hilton Hotel. It will be a salute to Ray Charles sponsored by the National Association for Sickle Cell Disease.

This tribute will be hosted by actor McLean Stevenson, Singer Aretha Franklin is honorary cochairwoman of the event. Ray Charles will be honored for his long involvement in, and support of, sickle cell programs throughout the country with the first "Man of Distinction" award to be presented by NASCD.

Ray Charles was helping sickle cell groups throughout the country long before the general public was aware of this disease. He is a member of the National Advisory Board of NASCD and has been the honorary chairman of the Sickle Cell Disease Research Foundation, the local arm of NASCD, since 1962. For many years he has contributed time, money, and his legendary talent to the fight against this dread disease.

This will be the first major fund-raising event of the 4-year-old National Association for Sickle Cell Disease, a coalition of sickle cell organizations in the United States whose aim is to conquer this crippling and life-threatening blood disease.

Outstanding members of the entertainment, social and business worlds, including Dyan Cannon, Brock Peters, Lou Rawls, Jack Cassidy, Cher Bono, Raymond St. Jacques, Lola Falana, Jan Mur-

ray, Mable John, and Whitman Mayor are expected to attend.

So it is with special pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I call attention to the honor which will be paid to Ray Charles on June 9 and to the deserving charity which is sponsoring the event. It will be my great pleasure to join with Ray Charles' many admirers on this occasion. Our hope is to show something of our high regard for one of the world's great entertainers while, at the same time, contributing to the campaign against a killer disease which has not gotten the attention it deserves.

CONTINUED SUPPORT URGED FOR ISRAEL

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, the recent flurry of events in Indochina justifiably is prompting an internal reassessment of our Nation's foreign policy goals and our international commitments. There will be much soul-searching in the months ahead as our foreign aid programs—both economic and military—undergo scrutiny and challenges unparalleled in recent years. Much of this review will be couched in terms of "who are our friends?" and "where do we benefit most from our foreign aid investments?" On both counts, Israel deserves a continued high rating from the United States. While our economic situation and domestic needs may force budgetary restraints on all foreign aid programs, I certainly feel that assistance to Israel should remain high on our list of priorities.

A disturbing trend of late, however, is the tendency to connect aid to Israel with our former assistance to South Vietnam. The Buffalo Jewish Review in an effort to put the issue in perspective, on May 9 editorialized as follows:

ISRAEL IS NOT VIETNAM

The fall of South Vietnam to the Viet Cong has brought reports from Israel of fears about its implications for United States commitments to the Jewish state.

Actually, the connection between Vietnam and Israel was chiefly made by spokesmen for the Johnson, Nixon and Ford Administrations who wanted to persuade supporters of aid for Israel that they should also support aid for Vietnam. But some of the leading critics of American Vietnam policy have never accepted this connection. Indeed, the differences are so great that it is difficult to see how any linkage can exist.

Israel is a democracy. Its people are united in support of their state, and have shown a willingness to defend themselves. These things were not true in South Vietnam. Indeed, Israel has never wanted American troops to aid her and Zionist philosophy would almost forbid this. Israel has asked only for the arms and supplies she needs to defend herself.

While the American people were deeply divided about Vietnam, they have shown through their representatives in Congress a commitment to the survival of Israel.

Perhaps most of all, while there were differences over whether American security

depends on what happens in Southeast Asia, no one doubts that it is in America's interest to have a strong and viable Israel in the Mideast.

This does not mean that all will be smooth sailing for Israel. The Ford Administration is still exhibiting a coolness toward Israel and though the United States is still expected to provide Israel with economic and military aid, it may not be all that Israel wants.

But this has nothing to do with Vietnam and now that the war is over this Administration may be able to devote more of its time and energies to other areas, including the Middle East.

This time of reappraisal of our foreign policy goals is also the time to solidify our ties with friendly democratic nations. First and foremost, Israel is a democracy. It is engaged in a struggle for its national existence, not embroiled in a civil war. There are no tiger cages in Israel, no elections during which Government opponents face arrest. In this light, support of Israel promotes both our national interests and our Nation's ideals. In addition, in international forums, Israel has shown itself to be a reliable supporter of the United States on occasions when many of our European Allies were silent or withheld support.

These are times, too, of uncertainty in the Middle East, where the threat of war has never entirely receded in 27 years. However, as we continue to seek to promote a negotiated settlement in the Mideast, we have a moral responsibility to stand firm in our support for Israel's rights and we must keep pressing for a reciprocal willingness from the Arab nations to forge a real compromise, a real commitment to nonbelligerency.

Determined American demonstrations of our commitment to stand firmly behind Israel's just struggles are essential not only for maintaining the status quo and the balance of power, but for forging the path toward genuine peace in this troubled area of the world.

THE WAR POWERS ACT: HEARINGS SCHEDULED ON PERTINENT CONSIDERATIONS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, numerous editorial comments have appeared recently which raise interesting and pertinent questions regarding various aspects of the War Powers Act. All of these comments have been generated by the four reports from the President to the Congress in compliance with the act.

Of particular note in this connection is an editorial from the May 23 Milwaukee Journal, a copy of which I include at the end of these remarks. The Journal editorial raises the question of whether there was full and adequate compliance with the act's consultation provision contained in section 3. Beyond the Journal's comments, the issue has been the subject of considerable discussion and some controversy within the Congress as well.

There is, in short, an honest difference of opinion on what precisely the consultation provision calls for and what Congress intended when the act was adopted on November 7, 1973.

This and other issues were the subject of hearings held by the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs on May 7. Under discussion during that hearing were the President's reports of April 4 on the evacuation off the coast of Danang, April 12 relative to the evacuation of Phnom Penh, and April 30 regarding the evacuation of Saigon.

Since that time, of course, we have received the President's report of May 15 regarding the *Mayaguez* incident. In an effort to clarify some of the issues raised by that report, especially on the nature and extent of the consultation effort, the subcommittee will resume its hearings on Wednesday, June 4, at 2 p.m. in room H-236 of the Capitol. Our witnesses at that time will be the Honorable JACOB JAVRS, Senator from the State of New York, the Honorable JOHN F. SEIBERLING, Representative from the State of Ohio, and the Honorable Monroe Leigh, legal adviser of the Department of State.

Without prejudging the situation, I would only note that as the chief House sponsor of the War Powers Act I can say clearly that consultation was contemplated in all cases in which U.S. Armed Forces are to be committed into areas of hostility abroad. This understanding is contrary to what appears to be the administration's view that such consultation was required or desirable only in instances in which a section 4(a)(1) report would be anticipated.

It is these and other possible misunderstandings which the subcommittee will attempt to clarify and resolve during its hearings on June 4.

In an effort to be of assistance to my colleagues in the Congress on this war powers issue I wish to call attention to the availability of a recent committee print published by the House International Relations Committee under the title "The War Powers Resolution: Relevant Documents, Correspondence, Reports."

The article follows:

CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

How far can Congress go in shaping American foreign policy?

For many years, lawmakers largely failed to assert themselves adequately in this vital arena. Indochina was a tragic example. All too easily, with far too little questioning, Congress let presidents draw the nation deeply into that bog.

Recently, Congress has sought to be more active. Notably, in 1973 it barred all US combat activity in Indochina after Aug. 15 of that year. Later in 1973, Congress passed the War Powers Act, broadly aiming to assure "collective judgment of both Congress and the president" when military force is used overseas. On the whole, these were healthy developments. Yet two recent events—the *Mayaguez* incident and the Vietnam evacuation—show the difficulty in achieving a workable partnership.

In the *Mayaguez* affair, President Ford was mindful of congressional pronouncements. He pondered the 1973 Indochina combat ban and concluded—quite reasonably—that it was not intended to bar the rescue of Americans captured in an act of piracy. As for the War Powers Act, Ford dutifully informed congressional leaders of what he had already

decided to do about the *Mayaguez* and its crew. He also filed a prompt report with Congress after military action was completed. But did this really comply with the law, which says the president "in every possible instance shall consult with Congress before introducing US armed forces into hostilities"?

By all accounts, consultation was pretty thing—so thin that a regrettable precedent may have been set. But if Ford should have been more consultative, the slippery question is how much more. Certainly in situations where quick response, flexibility and surprise seem essential, extensive dialog in fine detail with 535 members of Congress is simply unrealistic.

The Vietnam evacuation further illustrates the problem. In the spirit of partnership, Ford asked Congress to provide both money and clear authority to evacuate endangered Vietnamese along with Americans. While South Vietnam crumbled, Congress wrangled. Dozens of amendments filled the air. Many a lawmaker played general, trying to link certain kinds of aid to certain military maneuvers under certain conditions. Finally, Ford was forced to rely on inherent presidential power and order evacuation without companion action by Congress.

From all this, a pointed lesson emerges. On urgent foreign policy issues, the presidency is still the government's decision making center—if only because it can move with a crisp singularity that a congressional multitude cannot hope to match.

This doesn't mean that Congress should lapse again into being a weak and silent partner on international questions. On the contrary, it should set broad policy outlines. It should prod, question, demand that presidents justify actions abroad. It should strive to clarify procedures for consultation under the War Powers Act. But it is impractical—and probably hazardous—to think that intricate details of emergency moves in far-away places can be sensibly hammered out on the noisy floor of Congress.

ARIZONA MOVES FORWARD ON SOLAR

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, pioneering efforts in utilizing the sun for heating and cooling, for food production and for water desalinization are being successfully pursued by the University of Arizona's Environmental Research Laboratory.

The scientific excellence guiding these efforts has won the U. of A. international recognition and invitations to establish activities in other countries.

Now the city of Tucson and Pima County have stepped in with further encouragement for ERL, calling on the laboratory to help design a solar heated fire station and houses for the Tucson market.

The encouraging successes of the laboratory are set out in a letter and memo by Carl N. Hodges, the lab's able director. I wanted to call these community accomplishments to my colleagues' attention:

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,
Tucson, Ariz., May 12, 1975.

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The Mayor and City Council of Tucson, and the Board of Supervisors of Pima County,

have asked us to inform you that they have both just contributed funds to our University laboratory for the development of a series of buildings utilizing solar heating and cooling.

This may be the first instance in the U.S. in which municipal governments are vigorously pursuing solar energy applications on their own initiative. Arizona should be very proud.

By way of background, the Environmental Research Laboratory (ERL) specializes in direct and indirect applications of solar energy technology. These have included a solar heated laboratory/office building on campus (1959); large-scale solar distillation of seawater (Puerto Peñasco, Mexico, 1962); very large-scale production of vegetables in controlled-environment greenhouses (Mexico, Arizona, California, Arabia and Iran, 1964 to date); and the experimental production of marine shrimp in controlled environments (Puerto Peñasco, 1972 to date).

Currently, in a rapidly developing series of related projects, ERL has built, is building or has in design five new and separate solar heated experimental buildings in Tucson.

Three of these are located at ERL's laboratories at Tucson International Airport. These are working laboratory/office spaces utilizing three different types of solar collectors and heat distribution systems. One structure has just been completed with in-house University research funding and the other two are in final design or early construction with University support which, hopefully, will be supplemented by federal funding from the new Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA).

The fourth unit will be a new suburban fire station for the City of Tucson, to be located not far from the Laboratory. The Mayor and City Council have just approved a grant of \$28,760 to ERL to work with city and private architects in the design of the fire station, which is to be built as soon as possible. ERL's energy-engineers are also drawing upon the talents of the University's College of Architecture in this project.

The fifth unit is a full-scale Tucson home in an existing suburban subdivision. Pima County has granted ERL \$5,000 (with a separate grant to the subdivision contractor) for the design and construction of a solar heating system integral to the home.

Paramount in the design of three of the five buildings above is an innovative solar-collector wall being developed by ERL. Vertical wall sections of double-glazed windows enclose air spaces which may contain venetian blinds or similar devices to provide privacy and additional heat retention. This creates a hot-air collector which appears to be merely a giant picture window. It is pleasing to the eye, requires no rooftop structures and, most importantly, permits complete see-through visibility from the interior of the building. ERL, however, also works with other types of solar collectors; each of the various systems has advantages and disadvantages peculiar to individual applications.

ERL is now discussing with ERDA the ways in which these and other projects may be coordinated and accelerated with new federal support. Of particular significance is the desire of the Mayor and City Council of Tucson to have us investigate solar heating and cooling of larger municipal buildings as well as existing and future publicly owned or subsidized housing units for low-income families. In the latter regard, such developments in Tucson would be of nationwide importance; the retro-fitting of existing buildings to solar heating is one of the major challenges facing the new national determination to utilize solar energy to supplement fossil fuels.

We will take the liberty of keeping your office fully informed of the progress of these

and related developments in applied technology at ERL.

Respectfully,

CARL N. HODGES,
Director.

BACKGROUND

The University of Arizona Environmental Research Laboratory was, until 1967, the Solar Energy Laboratory of the Institute of Atmospheric Physics. It was located in a solar-heated and night-radiation cooled office/laboratory building on the Tucson central campus. This 1,440 square foot structure was placed in full operation in 1959 and monitored and evaluated continuously for several years. The solar collector was a water circulating system built into the roof which was used during summer months to reject heat to the night sky. Heated or cooled water was stored in an insulated tank with a conventional heat pump used to raise or lower the water temperature additionally when necessary. The water was circulated through ceiling panels in the building for heating or cooling. The experimental laboratory was judged useful as a research tool and teaching aid, but the technique of energy conversion and use as well as the type of materials used (roof and ceiling of copper sheet with built-in water tubes) was not regarded as practical or economical even at that date.

Concurrently (1960), heat transfer studies at the Solar Energy Lab led to an experimental low temperature solar distillation plant on campus in 1962, funded by the Office of Saline Water. After successful testing, a larger scaled solar powered desalting plant was designed and built in 1963 under OSW sponsorship at the Laboratory's experimental station on the Mexican coastal desert at Puerto Penasco, Sonora, on the Gulf of California. This plant reached design capacity (3,000 gallons/day) and maximum efficiencies in 1965. It was converted the following year to operate on the waste heat rejected by the station's small engine-generator sets. In this mode, sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation and others, the humidification cycle desalting plant was operated another eight years. This was well beyond the time necessary for data generation, but the plant had become the sole source of daily drinking water for the Mexican shrimping village.

By 1967, studies indicated that a most efficient and cost productive use of solar radiation and high cost desalted water in desert regions would be the development of controlled-environment greenhouses for vegetable production, and such were added to the power/water station at Puerto Penasco. The Laboratory staff was accordingly augmented by the addition of plant scientists and technicians.

The successes at Puerto Penasco led subsequently to a larger integrated power/water/greenhouse complex designed and built by the Laboratory for the Persian Gulf sheikhdom of Abu Dhabi and various applications of the greenhouse components only in the U.S. and the Middle East. The largest of the latter is located in Tucson and operated by Superior Farming Company of California.

Also by 1967, the Laboratory's missions had altered to the point that the University changed its name to the Environmental Research Laboratory. With NSF funding, a new and larger laboratory/office complex was built for ERL off-campus at Tucson International Airport. Here more space has been available for the increasing number of experimental buildings and greenhouses. In addition, the location has proved perhaps uniquely convenient for demonstration projects and site visitors: ERL's adjacency to the airport terminal places the Laboratory 42 seconds by automobile or six minutes

via walking from the exist doors for disembarking passengers.

Unfortunately, the "old" solar heated Laboratory on campus was demolished in subsequent years for construction of the University's new Medical Center.

Beginning in 1973, when ERL as an activity was removed from the Institute and created a separate department of the University, the experimental station on the Gulf of California was converted from a desalting/greenhouse complex to a shrimp hatchery and series of controlled-environment raceways for production research with this high economic value species. Crustacea pathologists and nutritionists as well as marine biologists were added to the ERL staff. Solar radiation is employed in the enclosed raceways to stimulate the growth of selected algae for oxygen generation via photosynthesis to enhance the shrimp environment.

SOLAR ENERGY

ERL neither had nor solicited any funding for solar energy applications (other than greenhouse research) since the solar operation of the desalting plant in Mexico. During most of this eight-year period, however, at University expense, ERL maintained a modest but continuous overview of solar energy developments and literature. Beginning in 1973, a Ph.D. metallurgist/engineer on the ERL staff was assigned full time to this overview and to the task of devising practical applications, particularly in the category of home heating/cooling. A close contact was developed between ERL and local government and industry groups late in 1973 when, to increase public understanding of the "energy crunch" and its alternatives, ERL formed a University/community group called "Project POWER". This ad hoc organization stimulated (among other things) a rejuvenated interest in University and local government circles for the use of solar energy. Tucson, after all, used to call itself "The Sunshine Capital of the World."

In 1974, entirely with University funding, ERL began to build the first of the five new experimental solar heated buildings listed below. The interest generated by each led to the addition of the next.

Angled-collector experimental lab

This 600 square foot building at ERL utilizes an angled rooftop hot air collector of wire screens behind a single glazing of glass. Warm air is ducted through a porous ceiling and, via a heat exchanger, stores thermal energy in a 2,000 gallon underground storage tank for nighttime use. Summer cooling is achieved by a separate two-stage evaporative cooler. In either mode, rejected air from the building is drawn out at floor level and carried upward through hollow exterior walls for discharge at ceiling level, thus adding to the effective insulation of the interior. This experimental lab is used for office, conference and demonstration space.

Near this structure are test beds for other experimental solar collector panels. These include the window-collector as well as water circulating collectors behind different types of glazing.

Window-collector experimental lab

Also being built with funding developed by the University, this 1,200 square foot two-story structure is in final design by some of the faculty of the University College of Architecture in cooperation with ERL engineers. It will be located in the forecourt of ERL at the airport. This prototype structure will be the first to employ the window-collector in a large, two-story array. Interior spaces will be used for offices and demonstration areas as well as recording instrumentation, etc. Designed as a flexible research tool, the building can be modified in various ways. One unusual feature, for example, will be a rearrangeable loft floor which can make the

second story of the Window Collector Lab either a south-wall mezzanine, a north-wall mezzanine or a full second floor. This has required some ingenuity in the design of air-handling and other mechanical systems but will greatly enhance data collection. A below-grade concrete rock storage area will be used for heat-storage and an associated two-stage evaporative cooler will provide summertime cooling.

Window-collector prototype home

With a \$5,000 grant from the Pima County government, ERL is assisting a Tucson area quality builder and developer in modifying the design of one of his stock floor plans to include solar heating via modifications of the window-collector. The builder (John Miller Homes, Inc.) will construct the north-facing territorial-style home at his own expense and seek to develop cost-saving improvements in the window-collector, which will enclose a south-facing patio and increase the floor-space of the home to nearly 3,000 square feet. Other Tucson builders will receive similar ERL "extension service" support as necessary.

A suburban Tucson city fire station

A new fire station to be located in the general vicinity of ERL and Tucson International Airport is ready to be let out to architectural bid for design. The City government, extremely interested in the use of solar energy, has voted a \$28,760 grant to ERL so that University engineers and architects may assist city architects and the selected commercial architect in incorporating the window-solar collector or other solar designs and attendant mechanical systems in the fire station design. Cost/time criteria will be developed by the project team to compare the anticipated cost-efficiencies of the design against the more easily projected building and operating costs of a conventional fire station of similar size. The City is prepared to proceed with construction of the solar-heated station as soon as possible (early 1976) provided that building and operating cost projections are not wildly out of phase with "ordinary" projections.

The City government of Tucson is also interested (as is ERL) in the potential of solar heating larger public buildings. The City administration is in preliminary planning for a large new central library and has asked ERL to explore the possibility of federal assistance in funding part of such a structure.

Of equal or greater interest to ERL is the City of Tucson's desire to have the Laboratory actively investigate the potential of designing future public housing for low income families with solar heating; and, of more immediacy, the feasibility of retrofitting for solar heating approximately 600 of the City's existing housing units.

Attached greenhouse experimental collector

In November, 1974, ERL submitted to the National Science Foundation a proposal for "Residential Environmental Control Utilizing a Combined Solar-Collector Greenhouse". In program shifting between federal agencies, this proposal now appears to be part of the ERDA-ARS project "Solar Heating and Cooling of Greenhouses and Rural Residences" being administered through the USDA-ARS Rural Housing Research Unit in Clemson, South Carolina. ARS-Clemson notified ERL (letter dated March 31, 1975) of proposal acceptance.

The gist of this proposal was to modify one of the existing attached greenhouse chambers at ERL's main laboratory building to isolate it and adjacent office spaces from the Laboratory's total energy environmental control system. The greenhouse chamber would be used as a solar collector for the office spaces as well as for food production. An evaluation would be made of the economic feasibility of developing such units for residential applications to save on fossil

fuels, enhance the quality of life and make some contribution to food supply.

ERL's present scale of effort in these solar energy related activities, supported by the own funding, is approximately at the following annual level: 30 man-months engineering; 12 months attached-chamber horticulture; 3 months architecture; 24 months graduate research assistance; 24 months technical, shop and construction assistance; and 11 months of administrative and clerical support.

ROSARY HILL COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT: THOMAS A. MURPHY OF GENERAL MOTORS ON WHAT THE FUTURE HOLDS FOR THE CLASS OF 1975

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging to those in Congress who are active in the struggle to restore America to its once-great economic status in the world community and to stop the erosion of economic freedom occasioned by the growth in Government intervention in the economic affairs of the people to learn of efforts being made by private citizens to attain those same objectives.

Freedom is not easily preserved, and one reason for this is that our Nation—and too many of our lawmakers—have failed to note the profound meaning of our founding documents: That rights are inalienable and that liberty is indivisible. All aspects of freedom and liberty are interrelated, integrated. There cannot long exist political freedom without economic freedom, and vice versa. To the degree that we continue to let our economic freedom slip away from us, the loss of political freedom will be the inevitable consequence. It is the anticipationalist mentality which is the principal cause for the erosion of our economic freedom—and our prosperity.

On Sunday, May 18, I had the honor of sharing the platform at the commencement exercises of Rosary Hill College in Buffalo with Mr. Thomas A. Murphy, chairman of the board of the General Motors Corp. Tom Murphy grew up in the Buffalo area and was returning to give the commencement address to the graduating class of Rosary Hill of which his niece was a member.

In his remarks he addressed himself to the substantial impact of the state of the economy on the lives of our people—especially those just now entering the job market. He talked in terms of how far too many of our people fail to appreciate how the rise and fall of the economy affect their lives, and how we can never meet our Nation's social, economic, and environmental objectives unless we have sufficient capital accumulation—an accumulation impossible without business profits and incentives for savings.

I think Tom Murphy's remarks are well worth the attention of my colleagues, and I include the text of his timely address in the Record at this point:

REMARKS BY THOMAS A. MURPHY

A great many people will be honored here today, most notably you, the members of the Class of 1975. And I will join in paying tribute to every one of them. But no one in this hall will be more honored than I am right now. It is one thing to be invited to speak at a commencement by an institution's board of trustees, the president, or the faculty, but it is on an entirely different order of distinction to be selected by the students themselves. I am grateful, and I think you would have to be my age and identified as closely with the business community as I am to appreciate how profound that feeling of gratitude is.

In his letter announcing my selection, Dr. Marshall suggested some of the probable reasons behind the choice.

First and foremost, he wrote, "students are becoming more serious about the vocational side of their lives. They are beginning to understand some economic realities and some of the threats that are posed to our traditional free enterprise system of government. 'Secondly,' he continued, 'the automobile industry is one of the leading economic indicators in the country and closely related to the potential energy crisis. Students, as well as many others in the academic world, now understand a little more of the important role you play in their everyday lives.'"

Dr. Marshall then went on to suggest several other reasons behind the selection, including the traditional one—that I am a local boy who somehow confounded all the experts in career guidance by doing a little better than expected. I also managed to confound C. Northcote Parkinson, whose advice in selecting candidates for important positions was simply—reject anyone under 20 and over 50, plus anyone called Murphy.

In response, I want to underscore some of the threats to our free enterprise system of government and commend everyone here at Rosary Hill, and especially you students, on your levelheadedness and your economic sophistication. I wish more Americans were as wise and enlightened.

Just last Wednesday, I read the results of a government-funded study of public attitudes towards our economic system. Twenty-four percent of those interviewed—and, by projection, 24 percent of all Americans—do not know how to define the term "private enterprise." They don't know what it means. Even more disturbing, but probably not more surprising, a great majority express negative attitudes towards our free enterprise system, including 56 percent who say they would like to see more government regulation of private business.

The coup de grace came with this final statistic: despite our national unemployment rate, which is hovering around nine percent, and despite the troublesome lack of capital accumulation which we need to finance business expansion, to promote economic growth, and to underwrite our ambitious and costly programs in energy development and clean air and water, a staggering 37 percent of the American people can't think of any way in which their lives are affected by the rise and fall of business profits. All of these social, economic and environmental objectives depend upon capital accumulation, and capital accumulation is impossible without profits. But these people do not see how profit affects their lives.

You can understand why I am so ready to commend the levelheaded and economically sophisticated academic community here at Rosary Hill.

Many of you graduates will now be going on to graduate school, and others will be looking for your first permanent jobs. Some of you may have already found that first job—I sincerely hope so.

As Mrs. Maier noted, I wasn't any more fortunate than you in choosing a graduating

year. I received my diploma back in the 1930's, and therefore I know what it is to look for a job in this kind of labor market. But don't despair.

We at General Motors think our country's economy is poised for the inevitable upturn. Unemployment may continue at depressingly high levels for a while, but it seems clear that the worst is behind us. Unsold inventories, which have been blocking production for many months, took a dramatic drop in the first quarter of this year. Consumer spending, and the confidence needed to sustain it, are both gaining in strength. So are our balance of payments. So is personal income. The national inflation rate is down, and if it drops by as much as four percent this year—a reasonable prospect—it would mean the equivalent of two extra weeks' pay for every wage earner and pensioner in America.

For most Americans, that will represent a greater degree of financial aid than the generous tax rebates now being milled out by the federal government.

Other economic indexes are also showing improvement. By the fourth quarter of this year—and perhaps even sooner—we think the signs of national economic recovery will be unmistakable.

So, 1975 is not such a bad year to graduate after all. You may have to take odd jobs here and there until the position you really want opens up, but from our view at General Motors the prospects look pretty good for you—at least in the not-too-distant future. And the long-term future is rich with promise—never doubt that.

I come here today in a variety of capacities. No man or woman, including the chairman of General Motors, is just one thing and one thing only. We are all a complex tangle of genes and experiences, beliefs, and personal biases. And we act and think accordingly.

For example—and not necessarily in this order—I stand before you now as a man who loves his God, as mysterious as that Being is; a man who loves his country, with all of its imperfections; a man who loves his wife, as full of wonder as he is that she could possibly return that love; a man who loves his children, despite the reflections of himself that he sees in them; a man who loves his fellow man, even those who don't understand and appreciate free enterprise and a man who loves his work, including that much maligned and completely indispensable thing we call the automobile.

I am all of these things, and this afternoon I would like to reflect all of these different capacities of mine in what I have to say to you. To recapitulate what Mrs. Maier said earlier, I am Thomas Aquinas Murphy, son of John and Alma O'Grady Murphy, born not a hundred miles from the campus of Rosary Hill. In fact, when I was walking the streets of Buffalo as a boy, there was no Rosary Hill. I'm a whole lot older now, and I hope a whole lot wiser. But on balance, all things considered, I don't think I have changed all that much.

Other things change, but human beings hardly change at all. Not really. From generation to generation, we pass things along—some good, some bad—and in this country, at least, we make things a little easier in a physical and material way for our children—as we should. Things change all around us—the kind of economy we have, the kind of music we listen to, even the kind of cosmic self-image we have—the way we view ourselves in relation to the government, to time and eternity, to the universe. But so much of what we are doesn't change, and if you doubt that you have to wonder why we find so much of current application to our lives today in the writings of men and women who lived a hundred and even a thousand or more years ago.

For that reason, I would like to share some thoughts with you young people—humbly and sincerely—hopeful that the gap between

various small grants and by the University's generations is not enough to separate us as human beings.

The first thought I would like to share with you has to do with the learning process—not the formal education some of you have completed today, but the life-long school we all attend, the school that knows no graduation and that lasts for as long as the mind lasts.

As an employer, I am ultimately responsible for the development and advancement of thousands of young people like yourselves. I know the value of knowledge and experience, and for the good of General Motors I do all I can to make sure that our most promising young employees are moved from assignment to assignment and from staff to staff to give them the variety of new knowledge and experience that will equip them for greater and greater responsibility.

Don't stagnate. Don't stay in one job for too many years or you'll find your mind curling up along with your personal vision and self-esteem. Above all—Think. Forget the television and think for yourselves—that's why you were sent to college, that's what you were taught and should have learned, and that's why your parents made so many sacrifices.

And every once in a while, give the products of your thinking a little workout. Get up on your feet and tell people what you have on your mind. When I was your age I was scared to death of public speaking. I still am—but I try to do it nevertheless. This is the age of communication. Virtually everything we do in business, in local government, in church, in social groups involves working with and communicating with others. To be silent today is to be disenfranchised.

So, get up and speak—thoughtfully and honestly.

And don't be afraid of making mistakes—or of admitting them, either. In my experience, it is not the number of mistakes you make but your batting average that counts. If you are right at least half the time, you'll win wide respect. And remember that you learn as much from goofing-up as you do from a victory—perhaps even more.

Books will continue to be a part of your learning process, but the people you work with, and live with, and play with will be even more important. But you have to give them a chance. You have to recognize that they might have something to tell you. Communication involves listening as well as speaking, and learning as well as informing. There's an old saying that bears on this point, and it goes something like this: "It's remarkable to see what you can learn, after you think you know it all."

Among the people you should be careful to give a chance to, and learn from, are your parents. Now, I know what you're thinking, but it's not true. I'm not just being diplomatic. As proof, let me point out that both my mother and my wife are here in the audience—so I have to be sincere. My brother is also here, and so is his daughter, Mary Murphy, who is graduating with this Class. I sincerely hope she, above all, is listening.

What I have to say on the subject of parents can be summed up in a quotation generally attributed to Mark Twain. We all know Mark Twain. There have been few more independent thinkers in America. But even so, the great iconoclast is reported to have said: "When I was a boy of 14, my father was so ignorant I could hardly stand to have the old man around. But when I got to be 21, I was astonished at how much he had learned in seven years."

So don't ignore your parents. What you

can't learn from them in conversation, you can learn from studying the pattern of their lives. There is no greater source of knowledge than a human life.

And take pride in them, as they do in you, as you should in yourselves. Pride is not a vice, at least not in moderation. In fact, it is indispensable to the development of many virtues, including industry and initiative. Strive to do your best, and take pride in whatever you do. Pride in yourself is not the easiest thing to achieve, but, believe me, it is essential. It is frequently the only thing that will keep you going in adverse circumstances.

The rest of what I have to say on this great and solemn occasion has to do with you and the society we all live in. It's not perfect—far from it. We are reminded of its shortcomings every day of every year, in every news report we see and hear. But it's the best we have—and not only the best we have, but the best any people have ever had, anywhere and at any time in history.

But we are all agreed that it is not perfect. So, let's improve it. We have enough critics of our system in this country; we need more doers. Criticism in moderation, constructively offered, can be a positive force in society; when carried to excess, it can sap initiative. And I think that is partly what is happening in America today.

The American people have been through a lot in the past decade or so, not the least of which was a divisive war in Vietnam. More recently, they experienced the resignations of their President and Vice President, and the longest and deepest economic recession of the postwar period. It is not surprising that they have lost confidence in a wide range of institutions, public and private alike.

In time, they will find institutions and causes of sufficient integrity to restore their belief, but meanwhile they can be best described as looking for a better way.

Some government officials have stepped into this vacuum and have adopted a series of values and priorities which they assume match the people's mood. I, personally, think they have seriously misjudged that mood—in urging more and more government direction upon private industry, for example, and in restricting the range of free consumer choice in the marketplace.

The net effect is that the areas of our private lives and affairs over which the government is assuming jurisdiction are growing, while the private domain left to the people for independent decision is shrinking. It seems to me at times that the more strictly controlled—but less free and less advanced—societies of Europe and Asia are being held up as models for America. And I say to those who espouse such models, consider this: what we define as the poverty level in America is the average family income in Russia.

This trend of economic and political thought concerns me very much, and I would like to enlist your help and support in changing its direction. When the private and public sectors of our society work in cooperation with each other—as they have done so often and so successfully in the past—there is no problem that can stand before this nation's tremendous resources. But when they are at loggerheads with each other, we inevitably witness an inexcusable waste of those valuable resources—resources we need desperately for other purposes, such as economic growth.

But that is only part of the penalty. Other consequences concern me even more. For example, I ask myself, what is this thing we call America, anyway? Of all the nations of the world and of history, what does America have to offer posterity that others have not offered? It certainly is not air conditioning,

or space exploration, or mile-long shopping centers, impressive as they may seem. Rather, it is our success in making freedom work in a highly complex, pluralistic society. That was, is, and always will be the great American contribution to history. It is our most profound achievement. And the coming Bicentennial should remind us of that. Remember—America is great only because America is free, and it's up to each of us to keep it so.

I think one of the problems is that some public figures today believe and preach that there has been a shift of power in this country. They point to big business, big labor, and big government with the clear implication that before such forces the people have become powerless. This is nonsense. The people still hold the reins of power in this country, and that is why their loss of confidence in many of our private institutions has led to a steady growth in government influence. It is not that they trust government more—quite the reverse. It is that they have little trust in anything, and they have been willing to stand by while government stepped into the vacuum and extended the range of its influence.

As I stand here on this stage, I hope and pray that you graduates are as concerned about this growing trend of government intrusion in our private lives and affairs as I am. We are approaching the Bicentennial, and as we do so, there are many questions we in America should be asking ourselves. Do we know where we are heading politically and economically? Are we in control of that direction? Are we satisfied that we are gaining more than we are losing when we encourage greater government control over our private activities?

Unfortunately, I think some Americans are. I think some Americans welcome the move towards a greater degree of statism in this country. And many more of us, unfortunately, are unaware of what is taking place. The loss of our hard-earned personal liberties is proceeding so gradually that we hardly notice each tragic disappearance.

It was James Madison who once said, "There are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations." And, remember, this was a revolutionist talking.

More recently, one of our senators back home in Michigan, Senator Robert Griffin, put it this way: "In the long course of history, freedom has died in various ways. Freedom has died on the battlefield, freedom has died because of ignorance and greed. But I should like to suggest that the most ignominious death of all—is when freedom dies in its sleep."

We live in a great country, rich with opportunity and with a record of progress and a standard of living that are the envy of the rest of the world.

We have advanced this far because of our fundamental freedoms, and, as optimistic as I am, I would feel even more optimistic about the future if more of us—particularly you young people—were concerned about the preservation of those freedoms. Because on them rests not only our past but our future as well—your future. My strong hope and belief is that the coming Bicentennial will prompt a lot of us to do more serious thinking about our freedoms than we have in the recent past, and that the simple, uncomplicated and altogether extraordinary idea of freedom will once again begin to excite every American.

Thank you all very much—and, once again, my profoundest and most sincere congratulations to you members of the Class of 1975.

ERROR IN COSPONSORSHIP

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, through a clerical error, I was listed as a cosponsor of H.R. 7010, The Defense Economic Adjustment Act.

Without passing on the merits of the bill, and to avoid misunderstandings which might later arise, I wish to state that I did not cosponsor this legislation.

OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce to my colleagues that an industrious and far-sighted community group in my district has been singled out by the Department of Agriculture for outstanding achievement. The group I speak of is the Sumter County Rural Development Committee, which was presented the Department's Distinguished Service Award last week here in Washington.

The committee received the award, according to the official citation, "for demonstrating that people from different areas of endeavor and with strong individual interests can make important contributions to improving rural life by working cooperatively on programs of mutual concern."

When the Sumter County Rural Development Committee was formed in 1961, the country was plagued with problems typical of hundreds of rural counties across the country. The population was dropping, income was low, economic opportunities were few, new industries were staying away and public services and facilities were poor.

But now, thanks largely to the committee's dynamic leadership, Sumter County is prospering. Industrial parks, hospitals, and recreational facilities have been built. The county's forest products industry was expanded. New kinds of farm crops are being produced. Employment has doubled and family income has nearly tripled. A countywide water system plan and solid waste disposal system have been developed. A transportation system has been set up for the county's elderly persons.

There is much more, but I think you have got a good idea of the tremendous progress that was made through the hard work, dedication and perseverance of the people of Sumter County. They now have pride in the present and hope for the future. Their success should serve as an inspiration to citizens in rural areas throughout America.

LUNCHEON SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES W. SYMINGTON

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be present recently as the Helen Childs Boyden Science Center was dedicated at Deerfield Academy. We were treated to a very moving speech by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman JAMES W. SYMINGTON, himself a graduate of Deerfield Academy.

His tribute to the late Helen Boyden captured so well the spirit of this remarkable woman that I insert it, at this time, in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues, along with brief dedicatory remarks that I was called upon to deliver.

The articles follow:

LUNCHEON SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES W. SYMINGTON

I can see her—that quizzical look of mixed surprise, compassion, and feigned disappointment—a catch of breath, and then in those gentle, measured matter-of-fact tones, the devastating pronouncement, "The trouble you don't get into, you don't have to get out of." What a world of wisdom in that! What captains of industry and labor, what soldiers, kings and priests, what Congressmen, what Presidents might have found a better fate had they but heard and heeded the tender caution of Helen Childs Boyden—and what schoolboys! What is it about the great teachers that makes every one of their charges feel like a schoolboy in their presence ten, twenty, thirty years after graduation—no matter what empires have fallen to them in the interim? It is the shared awareness of the gap between the potential and the performance. Any man knows when he's doing his best, or less than his best, and if he ever sat in Mrs. Boyden's classroom he knows she knows it, too. That's power for you—the power to make a grown man uncomfortable about his shortcomings simply with the same wordless look she gave him when he was a boy. Perhaps because the boy is still hiding there, waiting, maybe even hoping, to be found out and set again on the right course.

Set again on the right course—what a happy prospect, and what an attainable one should enough good teachers be found to stretch the minds of our nation's young. I say "good" for the great would not be so if they were numerous. Frank Boyden knew a good teacher when he met Helen Childs, but he grew to know a great one, so decidedly so that it was he—and never her—who quoted with relish the inscription on her Smith College Honorary Degree—"To Helen Childs Boyden, who, with some small help from her husband, built a great school." Some of you may remember when ten years ago or so I described the Headmaster in his rumpled hat and fur-collared coat standing on the field after a game, after the song had been sung and the boys had left, standing there alone wiping his spectacles, "was it mist or memory, because here were the touchdowns, the home runs, the goal line stands, and the stifled pain of boys becoming men." And who helped him make men of those boys? Who helped him contain the conflicts in his own mind, the pressures, the sudden impulses of an embattled guardian of so many parental hopes, so many young teachers' expectations, and so many incorrigible boys!

"We've never lost a boy," he would say

with pride. "We don't believe in petty punishments. No such thing as a bad boy . . . Will the boy who threw the snowball through the old dorm window please come see me in the morning?"

Yes, she held him on that course while bringing up their own daughter and two sons and sending generations of the luckiest boys in the world out into it. Out into a world which today fears science as much as she taught us to love it. Today, as Prof. Loren Eiseley, our distinguished guest speaker has written in his "Firmament of Time," ". . . the scientific worker has frequently denied personal responsibility for the way his discoveries are used . . . and points to the evils of the statesmen's use of power. The statesmen shrug and remind the scientist that they are incumbered with monstrous forces science has unleashed . . . few men on either side of the curtain believe themselves in any sense personally responsible . . ."

A sense of personal responsibility for one's acts is what this school above all has tried to instill. If it is true as has been said that science and technology are essentially neutral, and simply answer the questions we ask, we must learn to ask the right questions, or at least the very best questions we can think of. We do ask, we must, buoyed up here at least by the memory of a lady who distrusted airplanes no more than she did horses, who stood tall and gentle in the classroom with a shawl over her shoulders, whose great eyes twinkled beneath the simple pulled back grey hair. Remember how she would touch back a few stray wisps, and say to the perplexed algebra student, "Victor, when will you stop trying to remember and start trying to think?" We'll try to think, Mrs. Boyden—but we can't help remembering.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN SILVIO O. CONTE

It is a great pleasure to be here today to participate in ceremonies marking the dedication of a new science center on the Deerfield campus to the memory of a great lady, Helen Childs Boyden.

As you undoubtedly know, Mrs. Boyden came to Deerfield seventy years ago, in 1905, as a science teacher. When she started, she was given this advice by the Headmaster:

"If you ever have any trouble with the boys, remember that I'll be on their side."

That Headmaster was Frank Boyden. Within two years, Frank and Helen were married. And this began the great Boyden era at Deerfield. Years after their marriage, Frank Boyden wrote this about his wife:

"She is much more important than I am. She has a wonderful sense of humor and deep affection for the boys. She has more influence on the boys than I have. She makes them want to do the work. Her judgment is excellent. It is interesting that a combination such as the two of us could get together. She could have been the head of any school." What a wonderful, loving tribute that was.

How well I remember the day seven years ago when many of the same people I see here today gathered to dedicate a new library in the name of the Headmaster, Frank Boyden.

But in order to preserve the memory of these two great educators it was hardly necessary to construct monuments. Their memories will live on in the hearts of the students they served at Deerfield and all who knew them.

Indeed, it was the Boydens who molded living monuments in the character and intellect of their young charges.

I have always considered it an unequalled pleasure to represent, in the United States Congress, a district with so many great schools. I feel closest, perhaps to Deerfield. Although I did not attend Deerfield, like my colleague and dear friend Jim Symington, I did the next best thing, I entrusted to

Helen and Frank Boyden the education of my son, John.

It is fitting that we dedicate this science center today to Mrs. Boyden. Here young men will be instructed in the same principles of science that she came to Deerfield to teach in 1905. But using this new facility their opportunities will be enlarged. Vistas for experimentation will be opened. In a center such as this a young scientist's mind can romp unhindered. Helen Childs Boyden always gave her boys her best—that is why it is so proper to provide this superb facility for all of the Deerfield boys in her name.

1975 MEMORIAL DAY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Americans across the Nation paid homage and honor to our heroic dead last Monday, May 26, 1975, Memorial Day.

It was my honor, privilege, and pleasure to address those in attendance at the 1975 Memorial Day ceremony at the Veterans' Administration Center at Wood, Wis. I also am pleased to report that many citizens in my district, the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, patriotically and actively participated in commemorating our heroic dead. It was most impressive to witness the large number of citizens who displayed the flag.

On Memorial Day in Milwaukee last week I heard one of the local radio commentators, Mr. Charlie Hanson of WISN, read his inspiring Memorial Day poem, which he composed especially for Memorial Day, 1975. I would like to include the poem as well as the address I delivered at the Veterans' Administration ceremonies at Wood, Wis., on Memorial Day, at this point in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

MEMORIAL DAY 1975—CHARLIE HANSON

I worry that each new generation

Will forget what the other ones gave

That there may be no veneration

For those people so young and so brave

Kids who marched off with our tears and our prayers

Always to save something or other

I worry now if anyone cares

Except a father and mother

I believe in my heart that my country is great

That there'd be no free world without it

But I don't want to see a love turned to hate

And I don't want others to doubt it

So—what can we do—to make sure that the past

Will continue to serve as it must?

And the honor and pride we thought always would last

Won't be buried and forgotten as dust

I dunno—of course we'll always parade

And stand at attention with pride

I just pray for our buddies so tenderly laid

In our earth, all our earth, where they died.

THE GLORY AND HONOR OF THEIR SACRIFICE FOR US

(Address by Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin)

It is a honor and privilege for me to participate in the 1975 Memorial Day ceremony at the Woods Veterans Administration Center.

Paraphrasing the quote of Benjamin Harrison, as reprinted in the inside of today's program, it is on this special day every year that we pause, reflect, honor, glorify and express sincere gratitude to the countless thousands who have made the ultimate sacrifice for us—so that we may continue to enjoy the blessings of freedom and liberty.

Memorial Day is a day of memory—a day of remembering that the men and women who died in the service of our great nation have immeasurably contributed to the freedoms and liberties which we enjoy. On our part we must continue to defend and preserve freedom for ourselves, our loved ones and for future generations. Thus, we will keep faith to their memory.

Memorial Day is also a day of thanksgiving—a day for expressing gratitude for the many fruits of life which we as American citizens enjoy only because throughout our history there have been young men and women willing to make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our country and our way of life.

This Memorial Day we have a special reason to be thankful . . . because, for the first time in many years we are not engaged in a shooting war. Our military involvement in the Vietnam conflict has ended.

In reviewing our long and difficult and tragic involvement in South Vietnam we inevitably come to the difficult but fair and reasonable question: Have our heroic dead in South Vietnam died in vain?

Like other difficult and complex questions, this question cannot be answered with a simple answer. As of this moment, fresh from the end of our military involvement in South Vietnam, a definitive answer is tenuous and uncertain. Ultimately, and only after a period of time will history be able to record a final and definitive answer.

In the interim, however, and in reverent memory of all the brave victims of our wars, including and especially Vietnam, I respectfully submit that they did not die in vain.

The victims of Vietnam did not fight and die for a monument—

They fought for a principle—

They fought for the preservation of freedom for their contemporaries and for the generations ahead—

They fought in the service of our nation so that the hopes and ambitions of the Founding Fathers might be realized—

They fought so that the Constitution upon which our form of government is based might stand today strong and sturdy as an assurance of our liberty and freedom—

They fought inspired by genuine concern for their fellow-beings, a commitment that is the ultimate form of man's humanity to man—

They fought because they feared the rebirth of totalitarianism which we had defeated in World War II at a great human sacrifice—

They fought for the many thousands of innocent South Vietnamese subjected to outside intervention and aggression.

Their work is done—ours remains. They have been vindicated—we remain to vindicate ourselves.

Our servicemen and women have given us a new vision, a feeling of brotherhood, the joy of freedom and the right to entertain new hopes.

They have given themselves as hostages for peace for us. As long as life remains in us, it must be our determination that they shall not have died in vain.

The most recent sacrifice for our fellowman was demonstrated just two weeks ago by the courageous action of our marines, Air Force and Navy in successfully retrieving the seamen and the freighter, Mayaguez, which was illegally pirated by the new communist government of Cambodia.

It is with pride that we extend our appreciation and congratulations to our brave

troops for their valor and courage. We are especially pleased that the ship's entire crew was rescued, including a fellow Wisconsinite, Mr. Salvatore Puntillo.

At the same time, we sincerely regret the loss of any servicemen and those injured in the operation, and join in sympathy to their loved ones. The American people are greatly indebted to and grateful for their sacrifice.

It is our sincere hope that this bold and successful action will prove to be a lasting deterrent against future similar acts of piracy and other violations of international law.

I believe that it is basic to our Judeo-Christian heritage that concern for fellowmen constitutes the highest degree of moral philosophy, and I submit that is the true definition of civilization. The sacrifice of our brave and valiant men, who fell in South Vietnam, Korea, World War II, World War I, remains vivid and untarnished even though, despite our good intentions, we were not always successful.

The price of death is always too high but if we remember why they fought it will at least give meaning to the sacrifice of our dead and maimed, and confirm and honor the conviction of many of them that they were risking their lives for the freedom of fellowmen.

It is worth recalling that even still today, more than 100 years after the Civil War, some people in the North and South still raise the same question, that is, have our heroic dead died in vain?

Our history books are full of stories of valiant soldiers of the north and valiant soldiers of the south, and even at times relatives fighting relatives, who immediately after the Civil War asked that same question. Our own Civil War clearly underscores the fact that it simply takes a long time to heal. In fact, the point is, while much has been accomplished, the world is still in the process of healing and therefore I believe we can properly and correctly state that while the sacrifice indeed was great, it was not in vain.

As we recall the great suffering and many deaths in the Indochina conflict we must not and will not turn our backs on the necessary act of humanitarianism on the part of the American people to assist the more than 100,000 South Vietnamese refugees in relocating in the world.

Some suggest that the refugees should be sent back to Indochina to face the consequences. I deeply regret such suggestions and am confident that our heroic dead who fought side by side with the Vietnamese and Koreans would not agree with this attitude on the part of a few of our citizens.

In my judgment, the free world has an obligation to help these unfortunate victims of the Indochina conflict. Understandably, they chose not to live under a communist form of government. In the memory of our heroic dead and as Judeo-Christian people regarding freedom, human dignity and self-determination, we should assist these unfortunate victims who voluntarily escaped from South Vietnam.

As a country of immigrants we have demonstrated in the past our capacity to assimilate similar refugees throughout our nation's history. Since World War II one million immigrants have been resettled in the United States. These include over 500,000 Cubans, 50,000 Hungarians, 300,000 Jews, and many other thousands of refugees fleeing political and religious persecution who have found a home in our beloved country and have contributed much to our economic and cultural well being. I am confident that our sense of decency and humanity will again prevail.

As we recall and memorialize the victims of war and aggression in man's history, let us not forget the thousands of disabled vet-

erans, many still confined to hospitals. Let us be mindful of the dependents and the widows and orphans of those deceased veterans whose lives were shattered in our nation's behalf. We must continue to do our utmost to provide hospital care and medical services to our thousands of disabled veterans.

Let me also take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Veterans Administration personnel and to the doctors and nurses in our veterans' hospitals whose work is often overlooked but who are giving the best of their energies, their knowledge and their skill in order to help and comfort the sick and disabled war veterans.

In the future, these efforts must be continued and expanded. As we look to the Civil War-vintage domiciliary, which is up yonder, we see that this dilapidated building underscores the need to provide adequate nursing and domiciliary facilities for our aged veterans. On my part, I have written to the new Administrator of the Veterans Administration, Mr. Richard Roudebush, strongly endorsing the recommendation of the professional administrative staff of Wood, that the Annex building be remodeled as a nursing home care unit to include approximately 250 beds. A new domiciliary is long overdue. There is certainly a definite need for additional facilities for the treatment and domicile of nursing care patients, and you may be assured of my continued support of efforts to remodel the Annex building, and to convert it into a nursing care facility to better serve the veterans in our state and community.

In conclusion, let us rededicate ourselves not only today, but always to the same principles and ideals to which those we honor today committed themselves. Let us leave here today grateful for the blessings we enjoy and with the determination to share them with others less fortunate. Let us go from here and continue what those we today commemorate fostered. Let us follow their example of seeking peace through greater understanding.

And as we memorialize those who gave the ultimate sacrifice and rededicate our efforts to assist our living veterans, we must in the memory of those who died, keep faith with them by serving our country in war and peace with the ultimate hope that future wars will be averted. In this present age of atomic and nuclear threats, we must endeavor to employ the best minds as we have done for example in medical science and space technology to seek the formula for peace. We must employ our talents to prevent war so that men can live in peace and harmony as the good book and divine doctrine call for. The greatest tribute to our fallen heroes is our resolve that by our actions and deeds these honored dead shall not have died in vain.

ESCONDIDO ONE OF NINE

HON. CLAIR W. BURGNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, The Chamber of Commerce of Escondido, Calif. is soon to be honored by joining a small list of chambers of commerce who have achieved the recognition of official accreditation from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The Escondido Chamber has a long

and impressive record of service to its beautiful and progressive community. Since its incorporation in April of 1919 this organization has taken on hundreds of projects which have benefited the community as a whole or deserving segments of the community. All of San Diego County and, indeed, all of California has benefited from their efforts.

Accreditation is an exclusive honor which demonstrates the strength of this chamber's record of accomplishment. There are only 283 accredited chambers in the Nation and only 92 in California. To achieve accreditation requires not only a review by local individuals but an on-the-site review by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Escondido is one of only nine chambers of commerce to be so recognized this year. It becomes the first chamber of commerce in San Diego County to achieve accreditation.

I draw the House's attention to this great accomplishment and I know that I can speak for the Members when I wish the Escondido Chamber of Commerce success and sincere congratulations.

BETTER SPEECH AND HEARING MONTH

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that the month of May, just past, was Better Speech and Hearing Month. This "cause" is one that we all should recognize as having no special "month" but as being something we can support the year around.

There are 20 million Americans, 1 out of 10 of our population, who suffer from impairments of hearing, speech, and language so severe that they have great difficulty with the functions in life that most of us take for granted.

A communications handicap in today's world is a most discouraging affliction. Fortunately, there is help available for many of these handicapped persons. I know that in my own area there are treatment facilities ranging from those serving people unable to pay a fee, to those at which the patient bears the entire cost.

The essential need is that more of those with impairments are made aware that they can be helped, that facilities are available, that modern science is making strides toward providing them with even more advanced aids and equipment.

Across the country there are dedicated men and women who are working to restore hope for those with communications handicaps. They go largely unsung, but are contributing much to our society. Speech pathologists and audiologists offer to the handicapped the road out, a chance for an improved life, a chance to take their place in a society where com-

munications has become of paramount importance.

Although Better Speech and Hearing Month is past, we all can be aware that a continuing effort is being made to find, diagnose, and correct speech and hearing impediments and impairments. All of us should help this worthwhile endeavor whenever we have an opportunity to do so.

SECOND DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the 5 months that I have been a Member of Congress, I have become increasingly aware of how important it is for a Congressman to offer a broad range of services and engage in a wide variety of activities with the aim of assuring that his or her constituents are fully informed and represented. Yet, unfortunately, many of the programs required to properly serve a congressional district are either inadequately funded by the Federal Government or completely ignored as to reimbursement. Our colleagues have employed many different means to raise the funds necessary to support their congressional office operations: Some, of independent means, can afford to spend thousands of dollars per year to pay for services; others have chosen to solicit contributions which are not publicly reportable because they are not "campaign expenditures." Some Members follow the letter of the law and do not discuss their methods of financing newsletters and other constituent service programs; others have chosen to go beyond the restricted disclosure requirements to reveal both the sources of their "operating" funds and the nature of the expenditures. I have chosen to adopt the latter policy, even though it goes far beyond the requirements of the law. I believe that my constituents have a right to know the source of every contribution I receive, even if it does not fall within the political sphere.

To implement this practice, I am establishing a "Second District Congressional Association." I asked the Internal Revenue Service for an opinion to guide me on the handling and reporting of any funds that the association raises. The exchange of letters, which partially describes the program we have initiated in the Second District, is reprinted below. I intend to follow the IRS opinion and in addition, to further report publicly the receipts and expenditures of the association.

The letters follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1975.

Mr. DONALD C. ALEXANDER,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER ALEXANDER: I am in the process of formulating a "Second District Congressional Association" which would consist of constituents from my District who

are interested in helping me defray the costs of direct mailings, questionnaires and newsletters, and various office expenses that are not covered by my Government allowance.

I would be interested, after enumerating the manner in which the funds will be handled and the proposed way in which they will be used, what would be the proper way for me to report these funds that I receive.

It is my intention that the funds will be maintained in a separate bank account that will be segregated from all other funds maintained by my office. The account will be handled by an individual outside my staff who will be charged with the responsibility of keeping the records and payment will only be made on the following office expenses which I incur.

Specifically, I would also be very interested in knowing whether the use of these funds meet the test of Sections 162(a) and 7701(a)(26) of the Code which I feel are "ordinary and necessary" for the operation of a Congressional office:

(1) Mobile office: Whenever possible, including every Saturday of the year, either myself or a member of my staff will tour a specific section of the District in a mobile office that the Association will purchase, and will record constituent inquiries which are to be followed up with case responses. This operation will require a driver and maintenance;

(2) Newsletters, questionnaires and direct mailings that consist of matters of general interest such as taxes, social security, energy problems, and other subjects pertaining to the affairs of the Federal Government;

(3) Transportation: This would include both myself and my staff members over and above the allotted trips back and forth from my District permitted by Government allowance;

(4) Entertainment and public information forums: Including meals and conducting special meetings where I, and occasional guests of the Association would discuss matters of general interest to my constituents and other subjects pertaining to the affairs of the Federal Government;

(5) Additional clerical assistance above the Government allowance of 18 staff members, should the need arise.

I might add that the direct mailings, questionnaires and newsletters will be sent to all my constituents, whether they have contributed to the "Second District Congressional Association" or not. Any excess in the fund at the end of any particular year would be carried over to the following year to be used for the same purposes. The annual costs I envision that the funds will be used for will be less than my annual salary.

Your expeditious review of the above mentioned items and manner in which the funds would be utilized will be very much appreciated by me personally.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

THOMAS A. DOWNEY,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 21, 1975.

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOWNEY: This is in reply to your letter of March 7, 1975 to Commissioner Alexander asking the proper method of reporting funds you will receive under the circumstances described below.

You state that you are organizing the Second District Congressional Association ("Association") which will consist of your constituents who desire to help defray the various expenses that you are not compensated for by your government allowance.

The expenses to be defrayed are: (1) The purchase, operation, and maintenance of a mobile office; (2) The cost of newsletters,

questionnaires, and direct mailings; (3) Transportation for you and staff members to the extent not compensated for by your government travel allowance; (4) Entertainment and public information forum expenses; and (5) Additional clerical assistance not compensated for by your government allowance.

The funds received by you for the above purposes will be maintained in a bank account that will be segregated from other funds maintained by you.

Section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides, in pertinent part, that gross income means all income from whatever source derived, unless otherwise excluded by law. The performance of the official duties of a Congressman in his trade or business as an elected official includes keeping his constituents informed with respect to the affairs of the Federal Government and his own official actions, and seeking opinions from them on pertinent issues. Thus, any amount received by a Congressman for the purpose of defraying part of the cost of reporting to constituents is a substantial benefit to him in that it offsets a portion of the cost to him of performing the duties of his office. Therefore, such amounts received by a Congressman for the purpose of defraying these costs must be included in his income under section 61 of the Code in the year received. See Rev. Rul. 73-356, 1973-2 C. B. 31 (copy enclosed).

As you are aware, under our system of Federal taxation, deductions are a matter of legislative grace. That is, Congress must make a specific provision for a deduction in the tax law and a taxpayer must show that he comes within the provision to be entitled to the deduction.

This concept of legislative grace is reflected in section 262 of the Code which provides that except as otherwise expressly provided, no deduction shall be allowed for personal, living, or family expenses. See, for example, *McDonald v. Commissioner*, 323 U.S. 57 (1944), 1944 C.B. 94.

However, section 162(a) of the Code provides that there shall be allowed as a deduction all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business. Among the items representing ordinary and necessary business expenses are traveling expenses (including amounts spent for meals and lodging other than amounts which are lavish or extravagant) while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business.

As defined in section 7701(a)(26) of the Code the term "trade or business" includes the performance of the functions of a public office. Thus, for the subject expenses to be deductible, they must be ordinary, necessary, and directly connected with or pertaining to the carrying on of the trade or business of being a Congressman.

Revenue Ruling 58-479, published in our Cumulative Bulletin 1958-2, at page 60, provides, in pertinent part, that in interpreting the requirement that an expense be ordinary and necessary in order to be deductible for Federal tax purposes, the word "ordinary" has consistently been given the connotation of normal, usual, or customary. An expense is ordinary where experience shows that payments for such items are the common and accepted practice in the field of business involved. An expense is necessary where it is appropriate and helpful in the development of the taxpayer's business.

Therefore, assuming that your mobile office will be devoted exclusively to your official duties as a Congressman, the expenses of operating and maintaining it will be deductible under section 162 of the Code.

However, with respect to the deductibility of the cost of the mobile office itself, section 1.263(a)-2 of the Income Tax Regulations provides, in pertinent part, that the cost of acquisition of machinery and equipment, and

similar property having a useful life substantially beyond the taxable year is a capital expenditure and is not deductible.

Section 167 of the Code allows as a depreciation deduction a reasonable allowance for the exhaustion, wear and tear (including a reasonable allowance for obsolescence) of property used in the trade or business.

Accordingly, if the estimated useful life of the mobile office is substantially beyond one year, you will be entitled to claim an annual deduction for the depreciation of such equipment under section 167(b) of the Code.

Regarding your second inquiry, the amounts expended in issuing such publications are ordinary and necessary business expenses within the meaning of section 162(a) of the Code.

However, under section 62 of the Code relating to adjusted gross income, with exceptions not here relevant, expenses attributable to the performance of a trade or business as an employee are deductible in computing taxable income.

Accordingly, the expenses in issuing these publications will be deductible by you only if you itemize your deductions.

With respect to your third inquiry, if the transportation expenditures to be incurred by you and your staff members in traveling to your Congressional district in excess of amounts allotted by the Government are directly related to the performance of your functions as a public official, such expenditures would be deductible under section 162 of the Code.

As to your fourth inquiry, even though a particular expenditure may meet the tests imposed by section 162 of the Code, section 274 of the Code imposes further conditions upon the allowance of deductions for expenditures of a type generally considered to constitute entertainment expenses.

In general, "directly related" entertainment is that which occurs while the taxpayer is engaging in a substantial and bona fide business discussion with a business associate. While there are activities which generally will be considered circumstances where there was little chance or no possibility of engaging in business discussion, such as entertainment at night clubs, theaters, and sporting events, this presumption can be overcome if the taxpayer clearly establishes to the contrary.

"Associated" entertainment is an entertainment activity which directly precedes or follows a substantial and bona fide business discussion. If the entertainment event and the business discussion occur on the same day, then the entertainment will be considered to have directly preceded or followed the business discussion. If it does not occur on the same day, all the facts and circumstances of the situation must be considered to determine whether the entertainment directly preceded or followed the business discussion.

Further, section 274(d) of the Code provides that no deduction shall be allowed for any item of entertainment, unless the taxpayer substantiates by adequate records or by sufficient evidence corroborating his own statement the following elements with respect to each expenditure: (a) amount; (b) time; (c) place; (d) business purpose; and (e) business relationship of person entertained. In addition, if an entertainment expense deduction is claimed because a substantial and bona fide business discussion was held during, or directly preceding or following, the activity ("directly related" and "associated" entertainment respectively), the records must establish the date, place, and duration of the business discussion; nature of business discussed; and identification of persons entertained who participated in such a discussion.

Therefore, entertainment expenses are deductible only to the extent the require-

ments of sections 162 and 274 of the Code and the regulations thereunder, outlined generally above, are satisfied.

Regarding your fifth inquiry, Revenue Ruling 73-464, 1973-2 C.B. 35 (copy enclosed), sets forth circumstances necessitating a member of Congress hiring additional personnel, the salaries of whom were deductible under section 162 of the Code as itemized deductions.

The Revenue Ruling states, in part, that an individual was elected to Congress to represent a large constituency, and was re-elected to successive terms over a period of years. Upon arriving in Washington to begin his first term, he found thousands of letters waiting to be answered. This unusually heavy flow of mail continued for his first two years in office. Moreover, because of the size of his constituency, he had substantially more than the average number of visits from constituents and telephone calls in addition to his normal legislative activities.

The Revenue Ruling provides further that the member of Congress exhausted his annual Congressional allowance for hiring employees and purchasing equipment, but found that the staff could not simultaneously eliminate the backlog of work and stay current with the continuing heavy workload. Thereupon, he hired additional staff employees, compensating them with his own funds. The services of the additional employees, were connected with the official duties of the member of Congress and were not related to his personal or campaign activities. The salaries were reasonable in amount for the services actually rendered.

Therefore, if the circumstances with respect to the operation of your Congressional office are substantially similar to those described in Revenue Ruling 73-464, and additional personnel are hired, and their salaries are reasonable in amount for the services actually performed, such salaries would be deductible under section 162 of the Code as itemized deductions.

In conclusion we would like to mention for your information the recently enacted Public Law 93-625 that added new section 527 to the Code. Under pertinent provisions of this new law which applies to contributions made after December 31, 1974, a fund established and maintained by an individual who holds any Federal elective public office for use by such individual *exclusively* for the preparation and circulation of such individual's newsletter shall be treated as if such fund constituted a political organization. In general, Pub. L. No. 93-625 provides that contributions received for this purpose are not includible in gross income, nor are deductions allowable for expenses paid by the fund.

Sincerely yours,
(S) BILLY M. HARGETT,
Chief, Individual Income Tax Branch.

THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY BANQUET OF THE COLUMBIA LODGE, SONS OF ITALY

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the 31st anniversary banquet of the Columbia Lodge, Sons of Italy will be held on June 7 at the Peninsula Social Club in San Mateo. At the banquet Mr. William B. Addiego will be their honored guest. I would like to congratulate Bill on his appointment as national chairman of the order's bylaws committee.

Bill Addiego has personally contributed to the Sons of Italy for many years in every capacity. Starting his life in the United States as an immigrant from Italy, Bill Addiego became a citizen at age 24 and continues to serve the country and his own community by his participation in the Elk's Club, the Italian American Social Club of Menlo Park, as director for the children's health home for retarded children and adults and as a member and former president of the Italian American Federation of San Mateo County as well as continuing his active participation in the Sons of Italy where he has served in every office of the lodge including two as venerable.

As a member of the San Mateo County grand jury, a board member of the Past Grand Jury Association of San Mateo County, chairman of the local draft board, commissioner for the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission of San Mateo County, and a member of the probation and parole board, Bill has helped to improve the quality of life within our community.

Bill resides in Redwood City with his wife, Marie, and their two daughters, Diane and Jeannine. This man who is being honored tonight possesses those qualities of diligence, energy, steadfastness of purpose and keen loyalty to his adopted country that characterized others who have become a part of the American dream.

JOHN ADAMS ATHLETIC DIRECTOR RETIRES AFTER 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Edwin Caldwell, former athletic director of John Adams High School in Cleveland, on the occasion of his retirement. Mr. Caldwell's years of service to the student body of John Adams cover the years 1936 through 1975. In that time he has served as football coach, athletic director, and as a teacher of social studies.

Mr. Caldwell graduated from Hudson High School and went on to take a bachelor of arts degree from Notre Dame, and a masters degree from Ohio State University. He arrived at John Adams in 1936 and coached the school's senate and city football championship teams in 1937 and 1939. World War II interrupted Mr. Caldwell's service at John Adams for 5 years while he saw action in both the Atlantic and Pacific with the U.S. Navy. He returned to teaching and coaching after the war, but was called on to serve his country once again during the Korean war.

In 1956 Mr. Caldwell was named as John Adams athletic director and held that post until his retirement this year. In 1960 he was named Ohio Athletic Director of the Year.

In almost 40 years at the school, Ed

Caldwell has won the admiration and the affection of students, faculty, and parents alike. He will be sorely missed, for his contribution was great. I take this opportunity to commend him for dedicating his entire career to the education of our youth, and service to the nation. I call on my colleagues to join me in wishing Ed Caldwell a happy and healthy retirement.

A REPORT FROM THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in February I was privileged to travel to the Middle East as a member of a special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. Our 11-day fact-finding mission was very successful, giving us a particularly good grasp of the military position of the countries of Israel, Egypt, Iran, and Saudi Arabia.

Since then the best summary of the situation in the Middle East that I have seen is a report by Hilaire du Berrier which appeared in the April 9, 1975, issue of the Review of the News.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The report follows:

REPORT FROM THE MIDDLE EAST

Your correspondent has just traveled through the Middle East, talking and listening, piecing together for *The Review Of The News* a picture of the realities of a very serious situation. Here is that picture as we saw it.

The Mediterranean: At stake in the struggle of the giants is the sea-lane which with the Malacca Straits forms Europe's waterway to the East. Before World War II the Mediterranean was a European lake. Russia's entry into the area began in 1950, when Moscow turned to the sea as a means of dealing with a potential enemy which possessed the atomic bomb—a bomb Russia did not have. Using German technology and designs supplied by agents in the West, Russia began a crash naval program. She worked with a frenzy to build fleets to carry her military credibility into the world's waters, and the drive to acquire distant bases became all important.

By 1967 Russia no longer regarded herself as bound to stick to her adjacent waters, and the permanent invasion of the Mediterranean began. From the Mediterranean her Navy ranged into the Indian Ocean. In 1969, Russian surface vessels were cruising the Caribbean, the following year they were off the coast of Guinea. Constant passage of Red warships through the Dardanelles has established a precedent which the West has meekly accepted. Soviet nuclear submarines accompanied by surface escorts now depart regularly from their bases in the Barents Sea to relieve units in the Mediterranean.

In late 1974, Russia's first aircraft carrier, the *Kiev*, joined a helicopter-carrier, thirty-some surface vessels, and a dozen submarines in the Mediterranean. At the time the American fleet in the area was composed of 40 surface vessels, 150 planes, and some 20,000 men, plus a landing party of Marines. The aircraft carriers *Saratoga* and *Independence*, supported by the helicopter-carrier

Guam, a missile-launching cruiser, and submarines armed with Polaris missiles completed the American force. It looked good on paper, but despite the disparity in numbers the U.S. force was out-weighted, outgunned, and in some respects obsolete.

The nations on the Mediterranean, the Aegean, and the Persian Gulf now await the reopening of the Suez knowing that Russia will then link up her fleet in the Indian Ocean with her units in the Mediterranean and move in on our Sixth Fleet.

Without the presence of the American fleet in the Mediterranean, Russia would by now have taken the Middle East to control the 600 million tons of oil produced there each year. America's Sixth Fleet makes possible the continued flow of petroleum to Europe. Without that oil, industry and agriculture there would grind to a stop; without industry and agriculture, Europe would quickly be starved into submission.

Behind the closed doors of ministries in Western Europe it is feared that in a crisis situation America may find herself with a weak President in thrall to the highly dangerous Henry Kissinger. They have been promised that in the event of war America's Polaris-bearing submarines, under the direct command of the President, will hit directly at Soviet Russia. Since the betrayal of South Vietnam became obvious, however, few Europeans have any faith in that promise. When the new "Liberal" Congress moved to cut our military aid to Turkey, the nation standing between Russia's land forces and Europe, many began to read the handwriting on the wall.

Malta: Mastery of the Mediterranean has for centuries been contingent on possession of the three strategic islands of Malta, Gozo, and Comino, clustered together 58 miles south of Sicily and 180 miles from the coast of North Africa. Malta and her two neighboring islands form a closed society in which everyone knows everyone else's business. Dom Mintoff, the Labor Party leader, put his henchmen to work ferreting out the secrets of prominent citizens and Members of Parliament. His rise to power was achieved by blackmail. Installed as Prime Minister in 1971, Mintoff has hastened Malta's move to the Left. When we were there recently, only a British frigate and destroyer lay in the harbor at Valletta where once whole fleets were anchored. Red Chinese workmen were arriving daily. On December 19, 1974, Libya's sword-rattling Colonel Muammar Qaddafi had been in Malta to coordinate plans for a \$200 million shipyard, to be financed by the Arabs and constructed on Britain's former Royal Naval Air Service base.

On January 7, 1975, Dom Mintoff was welcomed to Peking by a tumultuous crowd. A few days later it was announced that Communist China would send more technicians "to train Malta's new labor force." Red Chinese had already taken over the former British Army barracks and were appropriating the former Royal Artillery barracks. Before leaving for North Korea, Dom Mintoff spoke with Mao Tse-tung on "the warlike activities of the foreign imperialist base"—a base for which he was still receiving \$75 million a year under a N.A.T.O. treaty.

Supporters of Malta's opposition leader Borg Olivier lament confidentially that if Olivier takes a stand Mintoff will declare a state of emergency and the opposition will legally cease to exist. The only force standing up to the Marxist Prime Minister is Mabel Strickland, owner of the *Times Of Malta*. Mintoff cannot deport her, however, because she is not British but the daughter of one of the old noble Maltese families. To close down her paper would cause a furor among the tradition-minded Maltese. Mabel Strickland has her finger in the dyke, but she will not be able to hold off Mintoff and his Maoists forever.

The Red Chinese are so sure they are in strategic Malta to stay that top men in their Embassy have learned the Maltese language, a difficult tongue and useless anywhere else in the world.

Lebanon: This a helpless passenger nation aboard the drifting boat that is the Middle East. While a militant Israel poses a threat from the South, Marxist-ruled Syria is a permanent menace in the north.

Here the Arab banks, money-changers, traders, and property-buyers for the emirs maintain their alliances with the West. Key men of the drug world rub elbows with tourists, Israeli spies, and revolutionaries from Japan, West Germany, Turkey, Ireland, and other allies of the Palestinians.

Should the Government attempt to crack down on the 350,000 Palestinian refugees using south Lebanon as a sanctuary and Beirut as their base, their Moslem supporters would tear Lebanon apart. In such a climate no Lebanese counts on the police for security. Each block and hamlet has its cache of hidden arms. For everyone from Members of Parliament to taxi drivers, a revolver is as much a part of daily life as a wristwatch. And, here in Lebanon, grenades, explosives, automatic rifles, and rockets are provided for terrorists whom the Arab population regard as freedom fighters. Powerless to control the terrorists, President Seifman Franjeh has nonetheless warned: "Never in history did a dispersed people save themselves by destroying those who give them shelter." His plea fell on deaf ears.

To get an idea of the problem President Franjeh faces one has but to recall that in the Moslem hysteria which followed Nasser's death, police reported 26 killed and 160 wounded in Beirut alone by bullets, grenades, and exploding dynamite. Security forces privately admit that the figures were double those given.

Men who live with one eye on the money market and the other on Russia, Israel, and the Arabs, predict that the hardliners in Israel will never consent to give up the Arab holy places in Jerusalem, and sooner or later there will be another war. This time the Israelis will win decisively, and the Arabs will blame America. Leaders of the oil-producing states (not including Iran) will then place an embargo on oil exports to the U.S. and other Western powers which supported the Israeli cause. Regardless of whether America invades one of the oil-producing countries, the Soviet Union will reap political benefits from the resulting anti-Western wave. According to mystics in Beirut, after a long period of simmering hatred accompanied by growing opposition to the West's support of Israel, Islam will win the final round. The only catch is that Red domination of the Middle East may by then be complete and irreversible.

In the meantime, leaders of every faction plot to advance themselves. Libya's Muammar Qaddafi complains that only 40 percent of Arab terrorists operating out of Lebanon and Damascus are directing their attacks against Israel. The remainder are fighting each other or Arab regimes in the region, putting revolution in the Arab states before victory over Israel. Qaddafi wants the divided factions to unite into a single terrorist army dedicated to the destruction of Israel and any Arab leader who makes a move toward negotiation. The immediate result is trouble for Lebanon.

Half a million Lebanese live in the fertile southern region which constitutes a third of their country. Here also are the Palestinian refugee camps. Each time a Palestinian band financed by Qaddafi and encouraged by Syria makes a foray against Israel, a frontier village or the outskirts of Beirut are bombed in retaliation. Since June 1967 there have been thirteen major Israeli mili-

tary operations against Lebanon. This has pushed the Lebanese into clamoring for defense measures and Prime Minister Rashid Sohl is under pressure to buy arms at any price, even if he has to turn to Russian arms.

Sohl and his supporters argue that arming Lebanon would lead to fighting, and fighting would bring worse dissensions and dangers than the Israeli bombings. He has maintained that Lebanon's best defense is her weakness: As long as she does not become a military state, the 1949 armistice agreement with Israel provides legal protection against Israeli occupation. Lebanon could not withstand an Israeli assault.

Prime Minister Sohl's policy of weakness and reliance on diplomatic dissuasion has been under fire since early this year. First came a visit in mid-January from Syria's President Hafez al-Assad. Assad is afraid that Israel will establish a military foothold in southern Lebanon and turn the flank of the Syrian position on the Golan Front. He wants to send regular Army forces into Lebanon. Already Syria-trained units of the Palestine Liberation Army are bolstering the Palestinian guerrillas. If Sohl opposes them he will lose his Moslem support; if he yields to internal Christian pressure for a United Nations police force along the border with Israel, this will also be regarded as a renunciation of Arab cooperation.

Unless a settlement comes soon, Lebanon will face an internal explosion or involvement in a war in which she does not stand a chance. Perhaps both. In this atmosphere anti-American feelings have been on the rise, and our refusal to extend diplomatic courtesies to President Seifman Franjeh when he arrived in 1974 for a meeting of the U.N. General Assembly has not helped matters. The Lebanese President was detained, questioned, and further offended when police dogs were brought in to sniff his luggage as though he were a common hoodlum from some criminal drug ring. President Franjeh's ill treatment at Kennedy Airport was grist for the mill of Soviet agents stirring up anti-Americanism among the many Lebanese who have been driven by Israeli bombings to a rootless existence around Beirut.

Saudi Arabia: This is written the day after the tragic death of King Faisal Ibn Abd al-Aziz, whose name means "son of the servant of the loved one," the loved one being Allah. When men bowed to this great leader, he would bid them rise and reprove them by saying: "Bow to Allah, but to no man."

There is much more behind this senseless killing than the mental unbalance of the assassin, the nephew who walked the length of the reception hall to embrace his uncle and kill him. But for the moment, what is important to remember is that the assassination came on the heels of the breakdown of Henry Kissinger's peace negotiations, at a time when the only reproach the King's enemies could bring against him was that he had placed too much value on American friendship.

In the last months of Kissinger's "step-by-step" diplomacy all Islam knew that he only had one remaining argument in his bag of tricks that would have the slightest effect on King Faisal: If the oil shortage became too grave it could bring about the collapse of Europe and Communist parties would seize power in Italy, France, and Spain. The Mediterranean would become a Red lake and that was the last thing Faisal wanted. It was King Faisal who persuaded Egypt's President Sadat to throw out the Russians, and to the end Faisal continued to offer America a new "special relationship" in return for cooperation in opposing the growing influence of Moscow in the Middle East.

Palestinian Marxists had long talked of revolution in the conservative Arab states.

And the Russians, whom the King detested as atheists as well as Communists, had reason to wish his death. He had other enemies.

Israel's annexation of the old city of Jerusalem—third in holiness only to Mecca and Medina in Moslem eyes—had made the King's moderation toward America almost suicidal. Yet, Faisal continued to feel that patience was the answer, that in time Americans and Europeans would refuse to pay the price of supporting a state in which they have no economic interest. He was convinced Washington would come to agree with him that giving Israel more and more weapons would not lead her to make concessions.

Ironically, the King was one of the few Arab leaders to make no public comment on the notorious Kissinger talk of force as possible answer to oil "strangulation." A man close to King Faisal explained his silence by saying: "It is a desert custom to remain mute but dignified in the face of folly."

Kissinger and the bumptious newsmen he carried along to sing his praise had no such compunctions, even in Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia. Anthony Sampson, the British writer, tells how on the thirteenth day of his February 1975 tour of the Middle East, he arrived in Riyadh just ahead of Kissinger and his press crowd. Sampson called them Henry's "captive clique." They talked freely to Sampson. "Henry has assured them," he says, "that the talk of invasion, though never serious, has had its desired effect; there's been no recent mention of embargo."

There is a very real possibility that Henry Kissinger's talk of invasion had the exact opposite effect. The wise and humble man whose moral leadership was so great is now gone, and in his place is Khaled Ben Abdel Aziz, Faisal's brother. Many believe that real power will be in the hands of Fahd Ben Abdel Aziz, a half-brother of the late King. How great the changes will be remains to be seen. But one thing friends of the West agree upon: We have seen the end of an epoch. There is an Arab saying that all changes are for the worse.

It is feared that, with the failure to obtain from Israel the concessions which would have made peace possible, Washington has had her day in the Middle East. The mortal enemy of Communism and Russia is gone, and the Comrades hope that now Egypt and the Arab world will turn to the power which has been waiting to edge America out of the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

North Yemen: Colonel Ibrahim Mohammed el-Hamidi is the man keeping North Yemen out of the Communist camp. It was Faisal of Saudi Arabia who planned, encouraged, and financed the coup d'état of June 13, 1974, which made North Yemen a partner with Saudi Arabia in guaranteeing the Asian bank of the Red Sea for the West. The question is whether Faisal's successor will stick by the colonel who was Faisal protégé.

In the Sixties, American labor officials used the anti-colonialism stirred up by America, Russia, and the U.N. to drive the British out of Aden. Irving Brown, American labor's delegate to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in Brussels, and Jay Lovestone, former secretary-general of the Communist Party, U.S.A., made the Aden Trade Union Congress their instrument in Britain's former base at the mouth of the Red Sea. Brown's labor leaders, using their unions as an army, evicted the British and the Communists took control.

Red power was on the rise in the whole Red Sea area in 1962 when 18-year-old Ibrahim el-Hamidi left his village to become a soldier under the new Imam Badr. A short time later Colonel Abdullah Salal, commander of the Imam's guard, launched the Marxist revolution which Nasser sent seventy thousand men to support. For five years royalist supporters of the Imam tied down Nas-

ser's troops, until a truce was arranged and the Imam fled to exile in Saudi Arabia.

In the late Sixties the threat of Communist subversion on his Southern flank became more than Faisal could stand and a second coup d'état unseated Salal. Steadily, under Faisal's watchful eye, the man he had picked to save North Yemen from the Red camp forged ahead, moving in twelve years from simple soldier to second in command of North Yemen's armed forces. On June 13, 1974, Faisal's protégé was installed in Sanaa, the capital, where for years Yemen's Imams have sat on a carved throne under a suspended scimitar as temporal and spiritual rulers.

What South Yemen with its cluster of Peking agents does in the days and weeks ahead will indicate the degree of Red China's interest in the death of King Faisal.

FOSTER GRANDPARENTS PROGRAM

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest programs of recent years initiated by the Federal Government has been the foster grandparents program. It offers assistance to low-income men and women, age 60 and over and in good health, to provide love and attention to physically, emotionally and mentally handicapped children in institutions and private settings.

Foster grandparents work 4 hours a day during the 5-day week, devoting 2 hours daily to each of two children placed under their care. Tasks may vary, from feeding and dressing the children, playing games and reading stories, to helping with speech and physical therapy. The volunteers receive 40 hours of orientation training, are supervised by child-care teams in their assigned agencies, and attend in-service training sessions. And, for their work, foster grandparents receive a stipend of \$32 weekly, a transportation allowance, hot meals while in service, accident insurance and annual physical examinations.

As of September 30, 1974, 12,543 foster grandparents were serving in 156 projects in the 50 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia. And, under the Domestic Volunteers Services Act of 1973, their existence has been guaranteed through fiscal year 1976.

However, the President has recently proposed a cut of nearly \$3 million in this invaluable and unique program, a classic example of the shortsightedness of the present administration. I believe that it is vital that the House Appropriations Committee restore the foster grandparents program to its full funding and reject the proposed budget cut. Only then can we assure its maximum effectiveness and survival.

The foster grandparents program is one of the most worthy undertakings of the Federal Government; it allows elderly citizens to engage in the most useful work befitting themselves and children desperately in need of their assistance. If this country can afford to spend large

fortunes in other areas of questionable worth, we can surely afford to continue this investment in our elderly and our children.

BLACK LAWYERS IN THE UNITED STATES: (1840-1900)

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by J. Clay Smith, Jr. before the Law Librarians' Society of Washington, D.C., on May 21, 1975.

Mr. Smith is a 1967 graduate of the Howard University School (J.D.) of Law in the District of Columbia. He received his LL.M. from George Washington National Law Center, Washington, D.C. in 1971, and has completed all the course requirements towards his doctorate in law (S.J.D.) at that institution.

Mr. Smith, a native of Omaha, Nebr., served 4 years in the U.S. Army Judge Advocates General's Corp and was associated with the Washington, D.C. law firm of Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin and Kahn before receiving his present appointment—June, 1974—as Deputy Chief of the Cable Television Bureau at the Federal Communications Commission.

The address which I am privileged to present is about the black lawyers in the United States prior to 1900. As this Nation enters into its Bicentennial celebration and simultaneously celebrates the history of the land, it must pause to pay due deference to the American black lawyer, too, especially those who labored at bar prior to 1900.

I join Mr. Smith in calling on the academic community to expand its research so as to focus on the accomplishments of the pre-1900 black lawyer—for little is known about the contribution of these people to the causes of this Republic. I urge the citizens of Tennessee, black and white, to join in this research effort for most people in the Nation are probably unaware that Lutie A. Little was the first black woman—and perhaps the first black person—admitted to practice law in the State of Tennessee in 1897.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACK LAWYERS IN THE UNITED STATES (1840-1900)

(By J. Clay Smith, Jr.) *

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be your guest of and to speak at the Annual Dinner meeting of the D.C. Chapter of Law Librarians' Society. Libraries have always had a special meaning for me. During my undergraduate days at Creighton University, I worked as a "page" in the Business and Industrial section of the Central Branch Library in Omaha, Nebraska. Because of that experience, I realize the importance of the library system as the preserver of the past and guardian of facts and thoughts which may protect and secure future generations. So, I say to each of you librarians, whether you are employed by the Federal or State government, a law firm, university or law college or

in the private sector, thank you for your dedication and your vigilance in preserving the most valuable resource of our nation—thought.

This evening I will speak briefly on the subject of "Black Lawyers in the United States: 1840-1900."

* Before the Law Librarians' Society of Washington, D.C. at the Key Bridge Marriott, Rosslyn, Virginia, on May 21, 1975. Mr. Smith is the Deputy Chief, Cable Television Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

Many law librarians, who have worked in law firms, various branches of the federal government and in private corporations have probably seen the number of black attorneys using those libraries increase in the last 5 to 10 years. Although black people make up well over 11 percent of the overall population of the United States, there are only about 4,500 black lawyers in the country comprising 1½ percent of the collective bar, and maybe fewer. Burns, *Tyranny of American Law*, 407 Annals 156, 165 (1973). One study indicates that black lawyers constitute less than 1 percent of all practicing attorneys in the United States. Shuman, *A Black Lawyers Study*, 16 How. L.J. 225, 229 (1971). There is no doubt that there is and has always been a shortage of black lawyers in the United States to serve the needs of various communities in our nation. Houston, *The Need for Negro Lawyers*, 4 J. of Negro Ed. 49 (1935); Tollett, *Black Lawyers, Their Education and the Black Community*, 17 How. L.J. 326 (1972).

A few years ago, I became interested in the study of black lawyers at the bar, especially those attorneys who had argued the great civil rights cases of the '40's, the '50's and the '60's. I heard all kinds of stories from lawyers on how they had been physically abused while attempting to represent their clients. In fact, some of these lawyers had—in modern times—been run from their homes and out of cities and counties in their states while investigating or attempting to represent a black client. As a footnote, I might add that some of these stories included white attorneys, who with the black attorneys, were also run out of town.

While the lawyers of recent years certainly have struggled in the practice of their chosen profession, their predecessors at the bar—the pre-1900 black attorney—must also be given due deference because to some degree the pre-1900 black lawyer laid the foundation which future black lawyers would build upon. During my law school days at the Howard University School of Law and since being graduated from that institution, I have searched numerous sources trying to discover facts about black lawyers of yesterday, and to ascertain, to weigh the impact, if any, they had upon enhancing the quality of life minorities have had in the United States because of their legal efforts.

While my research is far from complete, it is my present judgment that the legal activities of the black lawyer, though few in number, has had a significant impact upon raising the quality of life for minorities in the United States and maintaining their faith in the republican form of government—even during the most repressive periods of American history. Secondly, it is also my preliminary finding that law as a business has become more attractive as a profession as black people have broken the barriers in higher education areas and upward employment levels in both the public and private sectors. Thirdly, the image and respect of the black lawyer *vis-a-vis* blacks has steadily increased as a result of their presence and performance both in and out of courtrooms.

However, in the early days, prior to broader acceptability of black professionals in our society, the life of the American black attorney was rather difficult. The first diffi-

culty of a black person seeking to better himself was learning how to read and analyze opinions of law where the emphasis of the case was based on English jurisprudence—something many Anglo-American attorneys with the finest educations had difficulty understanding. Another difficulty related to the exclusion of blacks from basically all major institutions of lower and higher education. Obviously, the intellectual study required to be an attorney was often too great to be obtained by studying law solely by candlelight. Another difficulty was that many white attorneys were unwilling to permit blacks to read law in their offices without whose supervision or vouch the bar association or the courts refused to admit a person to practice law. Yet another difficulty was related to black people themselves. Some black people felt that a black man's place was to learn a trade rather than to seek a profession, such as law.

However, even before the Civil War there were a few black men who came to the bar. While to date very little is known about the scope of these lawyers practices—the fact that they existed is itself enough to spur inquisitive minds to do additional research in the geographical areas in which they practiced. For example, Robert Morris was admitted to the Boston, Massachusetts, Bar about 1843. It is reported that he succeeded against great odds, becoming by 1863 a man of position and influence there, contributing to the civic advance of black people. F. Styles, *Negroes and the Law* 14 (1937); also, see Leonard, *The Development of the Black Bar*, 407 Annals 134-139 (1973).

Little is known about Macon B. Allen, but one historian records him as being admitted to the bar of the State of Maine in 1854. R. Adams, *Great Negroes Past and Present* 102 (1963), while another publication lists him as the "first Negro formally admitted (emphasis added) to the bar in the United States [in Worcester, Massachusetts, in May 3, 1845]" Ploski and Brown, *The Negro Almanac* 8, 829 (1966). Additional research is required to resolve this question of whether Robert Morris or Macon B. Allen was the first black lawyer admitted to practice in the United States, and whether the State of Maine or Massachusetts may lay claim to this historical honor. Perhaps Robert Morris was the first black lawyer in the United States or perhaps Macon B. Allen was the first black to formally pass a bar examination to gain admittance to the bar. Leonard, *supra* at 135.

John S. Rock was the first black to be admitted to practice the profession of law before the Supreme Court of the United States. He was sworn in on February 1, 1865. It is reported that as the Oath of Admission was read by Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase that "the rave to bury the Dred Scott decision was in that sentence dug . . ." Styles, *supra* at 14.

During the Reconstruction era black lawyers played a vital role in the Congress. It is reported that twenty-two to twenty-five Negroes sat in the U.S. Congress during the Reconstruction era. Styles reports that at least seven of these congressmen were lawyers; namely:

NAME, ELECTED, SERVICE, AND STATE

H. P. Cheatham, 52d and 53rd Cong., 4 yrs., South Carolina.

Robert Elliott, 42d Cong., 2 yrs., South Carolina.

John M. Langston, 51st Cong., 2 yrs., Virginia.

John R. Lynch, 43d, 44th, 47th Cong., 6 yrs., Mississippi.

Jas. E. O'Hara, 48th-49th Cong., 6 yrs., North Carolina.

Jos. H. Rainey, 44th et seq. Cong., 10 yrs., South Carolina.

Geo. H. White, 55th Cong., 4 yrs., North Carolina.

See Styles, *supra* at 19.

Whether Style's list accurately reflects the lawyer population in Congress is unclear. For example, Congressman John Roy Lynch, who is listed as being an attorney by Styles is said to have worked in a photographer's studio by one recent historian. J. H. Franklin, *The South's New Leaders* reprinted in *Black History* 311 (Edited by M. Drimmer 1968). One would tend to think that Professor Franklin, who has studied black history for years is correct. Franklin states, that after the Civil War "most of the Negro leaders were ministers . . . Here and there one found a Negro who had been trained in the law." *Id.* at 312.

According to one source, among the most brilliant of the post war congressmen was Robert B. Elliott "who had one of the finest law libraries in the South." Adams, *supra* at 102. Mr. Elliott was a member of the South Carolina Legislature and served as Speaker of the House of that body. While serving as a U.S. Congressman, Elliott argued for the passage of a post war Civil Rights Bill. Styles, *supra* at 15.

Johnathan J. Wright was an Associate Justice of the State Supreme Court of South Carolina from 1870-1877. Judge Wright "studied at the University of Pennsylvania and had been a respected member of the Pennsylvania bar before moving to South Carolina after the [Civil] War." Franklin, *supra* at 311.

One of the towering giants of the Reconstruction era, who today is still considered one of the most important men in American history is John Mercer Langston. It is John Mercer Langston, who alone, as a single force against amazing odds was pleading and representing the cause of black people prior to the Civil War. He was admitted to the bar in Ohio, September 13, 1854. It is said that in those days, few white men introduced black people at National forums; however, it is reported that William Lloyd Garrison, then President of the American Anti-Slavery Society, introduced John Mercer Langston, who then addressed the Society at its 22nd anniversary meeting in the Metropolitan Theatre, New York, on the subject of the evils of slavery and its abolition. Langston was admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States on January 17, 1867, on motion of James A. Garfield, who later became President of the United States. The life of Langston was filled with success as a lawyer, educator and Consul-General to Haiti, and U. S. Congressman from the Commonwealth of Virginia. Styles, *supra* at 14-15. He took his seat in Congress in 1899 after having served as professor of law (1868) and Dean of Howard University Law Department when it was formed on January 6, 1869. See R. Logan, *Howard University The First Hundred Years 1867-1967* 49 (1968) (actually Langston became Dean in 1870).

According to Professor Kellis Parker, a distinguished professor of law at Columbia, the "first effort to attract blacks to the legal profession was launched by Howard University . . . Howard University had a virtual monopoly on the production of black lawyers." Parker reports that by "1900 it had trained 328 of the 728 black lawyers in the nation." Parker and Stebman, *Legal Education For Blacks*, 407 Annals 144, 145 (1973). If Professor Parker's figures are correct, this means that for 30 years after the establishment of the Howard Law Department it had graduated on the average of 19 lawyers per year, or almost half of the total black lawyer population in the United States. See Leonard, *supra* at 138.

With the exception of a few lawyers, the 1800's of American history reflects little, if any, physical presence of the black lawyers in court rooms and before juries representing

black people. I have been unable to identify any black lawyers in the United States prior to 1843. Many of the black lawyers became law librarians or law clerks in white law firms, or businessmen and newspapermen. No doubt some black lawyers became low level clerks in local courts. Many of these attorneys probably used their law degrees to qualify for non-legal jobs. B. T. Washington, *The Negro in Business* 212, 219 (1907). However, the black lawyer did practice in some courts. Booker T. Washington reports in his book *The Negro in Business* that in Florida during the latter days of the 1800's or the very early days of the 20th Century that "The professions are represented among the colored population by three lawyers . . . The Negro lawyers seem to have the entire respect of the members of the bar and are accorded the same courtesies in the courts that are shown to white lawyers." (at 233). See also, Styles, *supra* at 16 (both books refer to attorney I. L. Purcell). This information on the respect and treatment of black lawyers in Florida is indeed a rare find because it is the only information that I have found on a positive note indicating that black lawyers prior to relatively recent times freely participating in the legal process in the South and parts of the North uninhibited by racism. Higginbotham, *Racism and the Early American Legal Process*, 407 *Annals* 1 (1973); Bell, *Racism in American Courts: Cause for Black Disruption or Despair*, 61 *Calif. L. R.* 165 (1973).

Black lawyers were also involved in politics not only because of the Reconstruction period during which blacks were permitted to and did become active therein, but because they knew and understood that law was both influenced by, and perhaps, determined by politics. While there are others that I could mention, one outstanding politician-lawyer comes to mind. His name was Judge M. W. Gibbs. Gibbs was born in Philadelphia in 1823. He spent most of his energies in business as a farmer and a clothing business. He was admitted to the bar in Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1873 and was elected a municipal judge—"the first Negro in the United States to hold such an office." Washington, *supra* at 219.¹ Booker T. Washington reports that after Judge Gibbs' election to the bench "he was prominent in the politics of that state and was delegate-at-large at every National Republican Convention . . ." From 1888 to 1897 he was Secretary of the Republican State Executive Committee. In 1877 Judge Gibbs was appointed Register of the United States Land Office at Little Rock and he was reappointed to this office by Presidents Garfield and Arthur. Washington, *supra* at 219-220.

Thus far I have not referred to any black women lawyers. There are few women lawyers between 1840-1900. I really do not think that historians really know the first black woman lawyer to be admitted to the bar in the United States. One historian reports that "Miss Charlotte E. Ray, daughter of Charles B. Ray, Negro Congregational Minister . . . was graduated in 1872, the first woman graduate of the [Howard] Law School." R. Logan, *supra* at 49. The same historian states: "Miss Ray is traditionally referred to as the first woman in the United States to graduate from a regular non-profit law school and also the first woman admitted to practice law before the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Both of these 'firsts' are difficult to establish. Records of the United States District Court of the District of Columbia do show that she was admitted to the bar of

the District of Columbia on April 23, 1872." Logan, *supra* at 49-50. Hence, Miss Ray may be the first black woman lawyer in the history of the nation. In 1894 Ida Platt became the first black woman admitted to the Chicago bar. In 1897 it is reported that Lutie A. Little was the first black woman at the bar in Tennessee, and the only black woman licensed to practice law in the South. R. Logan, *The Betrayal of the Negro* 316-17 (1969). The legal activities of these women are presently unknown to me; however, there is a need for someone to look at the records in the District of Columbia, Illinois and Tennessee to discover what, if any, impact these women had on the development of law in their states or on the nation.

In closing, let me say that in this twenty or so minutes before you that I have tried to highlight the names of a few black lawyers, who in the most difficult period of history for blacks in America, were pioneers of legal thought and legal strategy that would later result in great constitutional decisions. Some of the facts that I have given you this evening are not generally known by the legal profession and the public-at-large. These great names and events have unfortunately been excluded from history and law books. Hence, little is known about the struggle of black lawyers past or present.

I am using this occasion to call upon the academic community to focus their attention on a neglected area of study. In my way of thinking, there is no better group to share this knowledge with than law librarians because within the storerooms of your law libraries there probably exist valuable materials which touch upon the history and legal acumen of black lawyers in this country.

In these few moments I have not attempted to identify all of the key lawyers during the 1800's. In order to adjust to the economy of time, I have omitted a few names that should have been mentioned. While preparing this paper, I recognized that I probably needed a year's notice to adequately cover the universe during the period covered by this talk. Hopefully, one day I, or some other (enthusiast) will finish the factual development of this study which must be finished. Thank you.

A NEW NATIONAL SCIENCE POLICY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, recently an article in the *National Defense* magazine discussed the National Science Policy and Organization Act of 1975 which was introduced to the House by my colleague, the Honorable CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio, and myself on March 6, 1975.

I want to present the article now because hearings on the bill will begin June 10 in the Science and Technology Committee of the House and I feel that each and every Member of Congress and the general public should be aware of the various aspects of the bill. The article gives a brief, but good, description of that legislation.

The article follows:

A NEW NATIONAL SCIENCE POLICY

The National Science Policy and Organization Act of 1975 draws from two prior reports—"Toward a Science Policy for the United States," issued by the House Science,

Research and Development Subcommittee in October 1970, and "Federal Policy Plans and Organization for Science and Technology," issued by the full Committee on Science and Technology in July 1974.

In summary, the bill seeks to accomplish four things. First, it endeavors to enunciate a well-rounded national science policy. I am not aware of any prior statutory effort of this specific character. Secondly, it would establish a Council of Advisers on Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President—but with specially built-in discretionary powers as to use and organization vested in the President.

Thirdly, it would provide administrative unity and coordination of the essentially research and development agencies of Government, as well as Governmentwide oversight and budget review of R&D activities, through the innovation of a staff-function, Cabinet-level Secretary of Research and Technology Operations.

Fourthly, it would undertake to consolidate and make compatible the operations of the various Federal science information agencies by merging them into a single Government corporation with special ties to the private sector.

There are many reasons which form the backdrop of this bill. The following reasons, however, would seem to be cardinal to the issues of the day:

1. We recognize the prominent role which applied science has played in producing the great problems of modern civilization—the crowding and congestion, the excessive gobbling of natural resources, the dangerously shifting foundations undergirding the economy, the disruptive social and moral influences abroad in the land, and so on. Indeed, such recognition was directly responsible, and in large measure, for the concept of technology assessment and the formation of the legislative office which now bears that name. We know the need to understand as best we can all the probable impacts of technologies as they develop—good and bad.

2. We are further aware, particularly as we look about and see the critical problems facing us with regard to food, energy, national security, economic strength, and the like, that the solutions to our problems depend in some way upon the judicious use of better technology. Former Presidential science adviser, Dr. Edward E. David, has put it succinctly:

"Can we be sure that science and technology will find the answers? Can we be sure that solutions to our problems exist? No, but we can be sure that nothing but science and technology can find them if they do exist. To put it as bluntly as possible: science and technology must answer our problems. If they don't, nothing else will."

This may be overstated, but its germaneness to the needs of our era has been recognized, openly or tacitly, by every administration of the past 45 years.

3. We have, finally, arrived at the solid conclusion that a statutory base of some kind is essential to bring order and stability to the Government's use of science and technology. For science and technology are elements of our contemporary culture as pervasive and important as economics or education or labor or environment. Like them, science and technology are interwoven into all the major missions with which Government is involved. Like them, science and technology should be fabricated concretely and statutorily into the managerial and policy structure of our National Government.

We have no desire to force a science advisory mechanism on the Executive Office which the President may find distasteful or foreign to his mode of operation. That is wheel-spinning. But we are inclined to believe—having watched the handling of science and technology on an ad hoc basis by a long succes-

¹ George L. Ruffin, who received his law degree from Harvard Law School in 1869 was appointed judge in the municipal court of Charlestown, Massachusetts—reportedly, "becoming the first Negro to hold a judicial position in the North." Leonard, *supra* at 137.

sion of administrations—that a firm science and technology policy is needed; a dependable though flexible science advisory system is needed; and a high-level, influential base for the definition and coordination of such governmental activities as are inherently devoted to or dominated by science and technology is also needed.

Our evidence strongly suggests that these are all integral parts of a single theme and should be treated together.

The bill asserts an obligation of Congress to set the policy of the Federal Government which the President will execute. Title I puts into explicit language a set of science and technology policies for congressional and public consideration. What is offered is a first try at a very large, difficult, and perhaps controversial task—a specific delineation of national goals in science and technology plus policies and procedures for achieving them.

The bill proposes to relate these goals to the still broader goals of our society. For if we do not ensure that science and technology serve our goals as a nation, we are ignoring the lessons of history. The principle proposed here is that of expenditure of public funds must be for definable and accepted public purposes, understood and agreed.

Title II of the bill would make available to the President a new instrument for translating into action the policies enunciated. This is a Council of Advisers on Science and Technology. The intention is to design a body whose collective wisdom will focus on ways to use the resources of science and technology to advance the programs of the President, to create a central point for policy within the Executive Office, to provide a scientific input for the deliberations of other councils within that office, to advise the President and the Congress of current progress and long-range plans and opportunities for the social uses of science and technology, and to evaluate the effectiveness of all Federal research and development programs.

The rationale here is not to insist upon a particular style of scientific support for the President but to suggest a method of mobilizing expertise which will be clearly advantageous and will commend itself to the Executive Office.

Under this bill, the President could use the Chairman of the Council as a personal science adviser if he so desired. In any case, the Chairman would speak for the best public use of science and not as an advocate for science.

Most important, this title carries a limited reorganization authority so that the President—or his successors—may revise the advisory mechanism, unless Congress dissents, to suit his particular needs and methods.

Title III of the proposed statute is a new variation of a concept first suggested about a century ago and periodically revived in one form or another ever since. It is the creation of a Department of Research and Technology Operations.

Unlike previous proposals for such a Department, the present scheme does not call for the transfer to it of most scientific and technological functions which support the missions of existing departments. While the new Department would stand ready to assist other departments in the conduct of their scientific activities on request, and to review the total allocation of Government funds to research and development activities, it would in no way usurp the scientific decisionmaking and operational functions of other departments.

In the case of particular agencies whose fundamental purposes are scientific or technological, a consolidation in the new Department is proposed.

The rationale is that the need for new and often massive scientific and technological programs has been repeatedly demonstrated over the past three-quarters of a century. We have seen various new agencies created to

manage such programs, sometimes loosely attached to an existing department, and in recent years more often made a separate agency.

In the first category are the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and then the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. In the second category are the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and, most recently, the Energy Research and Development Administration.

As times goes on, it is likely that more and more new technological enterprises will need to be added to this roster for the encouragement of technologies only dimly perceived today. The burden of the President is heavy enough without the creation of additional new agencies reporting separately to the White House. At the same time, management of large scientific enterprises within the administrative structure of existing departments can be difficult when their relationships are not obviously and closely functional. Gathering these two classes of research organizations within a single department should result in improved administration. It should also assure informed, qualified, and uniform supervision of the proliferating R&D enterprises within the executive branch—as well as provide a place in the executive branch for further additions of functions without creating new independent agencies until the need for such has been established.

The agencies comprising the department would retain their administrative structure; their missions would be unchanged; they would control their operations as they now do—subject to the "general supervision and direction" of the Secretary.

Finally, it is here, at Cabinet level, that the role of advocacy for science and technology settles in—where the voice for the scientific mission can be heard with consistency, clarity, relevancy, and influence. That voice does not exist today.

Admittedly, the concept of the department is not traditional. It is more of a staff than a line operation. It has not been tried before. However, we believe it is workable and is worthy of careful consideration.

Title IV of the proposed bill would establish one other institution to be added to the agencies gathered by Title III into the new Department. This is an institution to provide a service which has been repeatedly sought by Congress since at least 1950.

It is a plan for a Government corporation to ensure the fullest possible use of the scientific and technological information generated at public expense.

The rationale of Title IV is that this information should not gather dust in files but should be put to use as promptly and as efficiently as possible.

Moreover, the nature of the information process is such that it requires close cooperation between Government and private entities. Thus the corporation is directed to establish close liaison with all pertinent elements of the private sector.

Abundant evidence has shown that information management today is resulting in wasteful neglect of available knowledge and the funding of needless research to repeat findings already in the literature. This waste is no longer tolerable.

The rationale of Title IV is that scientific information management is recognized by the Congress as a vital part of the whole scientific and technological process. It must be efficiently carried out. We are abundantly supplied with many technologies for managing, sorting, retrieving, and transmitting information. But we need a channel through which to combine the best of these technologies with the human skills of judgment, discrimination, information-structuring, and updating.

In summary: The proposed bill is intended to provide a focus for mature discussion of a national need. It has been framed with care. Advice on its content has been drawn from many well-informed sources. Nevertheless, it is not to be considered a finished product but rather a stepping stone toward a genuine science policy.

TIME FOR APPRAISEMENT

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, although I do not frequently insert items in the extensions section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I was particularly impressed by a column written by Bill Curry which appeared in the Waynesboro Record Herald on May 30, 1975. I commend it to my colleagues as both thought-provoking and timely:

TIME FOR APPRAISEMENT!

(By Bill Curry)

As the celebration of this nation's 200th birthday approaches it appears to be an appropriate time to also look at the future along with recalling the past.

In the past several months I have studied many economic forecasts—as well as appraisals of trends in government. Based on what I have read I am more than a little pessimistic about the days ahead.

It is becoming increasingly popular these days to place all the blame for the radical changes in policies affecting the daily lives of Americans on Congress and the White House. But who elects these people? The answer is obvious and it naturally follows that the electorate has been irresponsible and pathetically apathetic.

In keeping with observing the Bicentennial it is a good time to take a look at the political creed of the American colonist. It was short but substantial.

He believed that God made all mankind originally equal: That He endowed them with the rights of life, property, and as much liberty as was consistent with the rights of others. That He had bestowed on His vast family of the human race, the earth for their support, and that all government was a political institution between men naturally equal, not for the aggrandizement of one, or a few, but for the general happiness of the whole community.

This was indeed a noble but simple set of principles. Somewhere along the path of history some changes in the thinking or an attitude of indifference has evolved in the minds of the majority of our citizens.

I am convinced that we now have a political system that keeps in office and rewards legislators who deliver short-term benefits to the most vocal of their constituents. At the same time, these politicians are unable, too stupid or too selfseeking to cope with long-term economic and political problems requiring sacrifice by themselves and the voters.

Basically we have become a nation of escapists. We are ignoring the many problems facing us.

In discussing this subject there is the temptation to attempt placing in focus a long list of ills facing the Americans through their government but there is hardly enough space available to elaborate on all of them.

But there is one aspect of the United States government that is indeed a travesty on the democracy as envisioned by those who signed the Declaration of Independence. I am refer-

ring to the insidious growth of federal and state bureaucracies.

Altogether, bureaucracy is America—federal, state and local—accounts for almost 15 million civilian workers. In effect, one out of six American workers now is on the public payroll, while adding muscle through unionization and voting power.

It is the federal bureaucracy, however, that mainly sets the pace for the others in money and authority.

There are approximately three million of these men and women—almost rivaling in number the American colonists who angrily rose in rebellion against bureaucratic harassment by a British king's representatives two centuries ago.

Today these people reach deeply into the lives of 212 million Americans from cradle to grave.

An article in U.S. News and World Report last November carried a headline: "Washington's Bureaucrats: 'Real Rulers of America.'" Here are a few sentences concerning the rising power of those holding federal positions:

"They grant, withhold or revoke broadcasting licenses, slap penalties on erring taxpayers and tell employers whom they must hire. They decide on loans to needy countries and welfare payments to needy Americans. They print the nation's money, and get back much of it—42 billions this year (1974)—for their own salaries, fringe benefits and allowances.

"They count noses, keep records on births, marriages, divorces genus Americanus, and pass judgment on such products as armaments, food and medicines.

"In the view of some scholars, bureaucrats are becoming the real rulers of America day by day—the new mandarins' who match in power the elite bureaucracy that served the emperors of China and controlled that nation for centuries. . ."

One observer in Washington pointed out that the federal bureaucracy has offices in approximately 425,000 buildings in the U.S. and most countries of the world. "Nobody knows what all the civil servants are doing, or trying to do," he lamented.

All these various agencies function under laws that are found in 16 volumes of "The United States Code," filling 11,749 pages.

And the frustrating aspect of the whole problem is the fact, sadly enough, that several Presidents, members of the Congress and cabinet members have been helpless to cope with the menace to good democratic government!

Oddly enough, the creators of this Frankenstein's monster, the politicians elected to high office, now find themselves at the mercy of what has evolved from their selfishly playing the game of politics. They have permitted unionization of employes which will eventually result in their becoming practically impregnable.

Also, the nearly 15 million bureaucrats are becoming aware of the fact that if each one of them could influence two other votes, it would add up to almost 44 million votes, or more than half the number cast in the last presidential election—a pressure weapon of potentially fearsome magnitude!

As I mentioned, the Bicentennial year would be a most propitious and appropriate time for a serious appraisal of where we are today economically and the state of our government. Even the most confined optimist must recognize that we cannot proceed along the same paths in the years ahead.

As a starter, a new constitutional convention should be assembled in 1976 to redefine the goals of U.S. society, reform the political system—with a one-term 10-year presidency, six years for House members and 10-year terms for senators.

In addition, the President should be authorized to appoint a nonpartisan board consisting of the best business and academic brains in the country for the purpose of establishing long-term policies.

At least these suggestions, if implemented, would represent a start toward slowing down this country which in many ways is headed for economic and political disaster.

HOBART ROWAN'S ANALYSIS ON ENERGY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Hobart Rowan's analysis of the current situation with regard to energy programs leads a reader to only one conclusion. If the Congress does not produce good energy legislation then the Congress will share with the President the blame for the consequences of his bad energy program.

THE BILL FOR OIL IMPORT DUTIES, DECONTROL
(By Hobart Rowan)

President Ford is playing the confrontation role of the late Harry Truman to the hilt in his squabble with Congress over its "do-nothing" role on energy. And many Democrats have been playing cheap politics with energy, betting that any gasoline price rise next summer can be saddled onto Mr. Ford.

But if you put aside the political brinkmanship and look at what the President has done and proposed, the only conclusion is that it adds up to economic disaster.

President Ford has not only tacked on another \$1 a barrel to crude oil import duties (making it \$2 in all, thus boosting the average price of a barrel of imported crude oil to about \$13.50) but will send a plan to Congress for the decontrol of "old" domestic oil, now \$5.25 a barrel.

These steps, rationalized as a way of cutting demand and providing a stimulus for increased production, actually will have an enormous inflationary effect on the economy. They also raise serious questions about recovery from recession.

Administration assurances that price rises and decontrol will have a minimal impact on inflation are totally unrealistic. A "fact sheet" put out by the Federal Energy Administration, for example, claims that decontrol would result in no change at all in the coal and natural gas prices!

A new study by Lawrence Kumins of the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress shows that each \$1 added as an import oil charge costs consumers and industry \$6.1 billion on an annual basis. This includes the impact on that part of domestic oil production which is uncontrolled, and parallel rises in unregulated natural gas and in coal.

A similar calculation is made by former Budget Director Charles Schultz, now at the Brookings Institution.

Thus, the \$2 worth of import duties so far promulgated by President Ford will cost about \$12 billion. If you count the "ripple" effects as these basic higher fuel prices work their way through the economy, Kumins estimates the bill at \$18 to \$24 billion on an annual basis.

But there's more: If the President succeeds in getting \$5.25 "old" oil decontrolled over a two-year period (and legislative possibilities are that he probably can accomplish that), old oil would of course rise \$8.25 a barrel to the \$13.50 price.

"Old" oil production has been running at about 5.5 million barrels a day. The increased cost would amount to \$16.5 billion (and coal and unregulated gas would go up some more).

Adding in the ripple effects, Kumins puts the cost of decontrol at \$24 billion a year, worth 2½ to 3 points on the inflation index.

Meanwhile, each \$1 of added import charges could push the index up 0.7 to 0.9 per cent, making the total inflationary impact a potential 3.75 to 4.75 per cent when all costs are fully effective at the end of a two-year decontrol program.

Rep. Toby Moffett (D-Conn.), who released Kumins' study, said that 89 per cent of the overall cost to consumers would go to oil, coal, and gas producers as extra profits.

It should be remembered that, when President Ford originally presented his decontrol scheme, plus new import duties of \$1, \$2 and (ultimately \$3 a barrel, the enormous drain of purchasing power from consumers, corporations and government entities was to be offset by an elevator, Rube Goldberg tax rebate system.

But there are no offsets to the \$1 that was imposed on Feb. 1, and none proposed for the \$1 that will be imposed today, along with 60 cents a barrel on refined product imports.

Moreover, the windfall profits tax that the President proposed in January, when he first put forward decontrol of "old" oil, now has been modified to include a plow-back provision, which simply means that there will be no meaningful windfall profits tax on those who reinvest in energy production—which they would be doing anyway because of the incentive of high prices.

The ultimate absurdity, of course, is that, if the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries makes good on a rumored \$2-a-barrel price increase of its own, that will boost the price to \$15.50. Such a level is so outrageous that Mr. Ford might be forced to withdraw \$1 or \$2 of the imported duties.

But how, then, could he complain of an OPEC \$13.50 price, which merely would be at the level he himself had set?

The essential elements of a real energy program still include some direct limitation on imports so as to weaken the cartel; government action to allocate reduced supplies; a legislated efficiency requirement for gas-guzzling cars; other conservation measures in heating and air-conditioning; and a shift to other forms of energy, especially coal, while new sources of oil are being developed.

This would require a dramatic change in American life-styles that are based on brutally wasteful energy practices. Ford's program will do nothing to bring about such a change. It will only raise hell with the economy.

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, a young constituent of mine sees the contradiction of certain efforts to deny an American citizen the right to bear arms. His voice against these efforts is with the majority of persons in my district and in my State. I share his sincere letter with my colleagues:

DEAR GENTLEMEN: I am just a common middle class American citizen who very much enjoys his citizenship in such a great and wonderful nation; a land of great freedom, joy, opportunity, advancement and higher education, to name just a few. A free nation upon the mountains. Yes, a nation in which we are free to worship Almighty God by the dictates of our own conscience. Is not this same God spoken of on our currency—"In God We Trust"? It certainly must be important for us as a people to be free, for we find on every dollar and coin spent in or

out of these United States the words—"In God We Trust", or, "Liberty".

So let us pause for a moment and think of the abundance of life that we do have and how we obtained it. Just think for a moment that every time we toss a coin, or spend a dollar, we are constantly reminded of a freedom and trust that we all share. The freedom is Liberty, and the Trust is in God. That God that made us free, even from the beginning! Let us all trust in God so he will bless America for which we sing in that great and wonderful song, "My Country 'Tis of Thee"!

We know that in the great history of this country we find great and inspired men, such as Columbus who discovered this great land of America, the new world. And the Pilgrims who came after, looking for a place to worship their God in peace. And, of course, the great men who founded this land, our Founding Fathers, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and so on. Men who had great hopes and dreams for this land and its people, and thus, they drew up a document and called it the Constitution of the United States. A document stating our rights and freedoms as an American Citizen. Our rights to own and bear arms, our rights of free speech, and even the right to take a drive on Sunday afternoon and spend time with our families.

There have been many men in the course of our country's history who have exercised their right to own and bear arms, by leaving by their own choice, their homes, towns and hamlets to rally around the flag. Many have given their homes, lives and limbs in wars to defend and withhold the right to own and bear arms, whether it be a rifle or pistol, and many of the other rights which we now enjoy.

I am only sorry and sad to know that there are a few men who want to take this right away—the right to own and bear arms. I, as a free citizen of this great country, am opposed to any person or thing working against the rights of the people. It would be unfair to those who have died fighting to preserve the right to own and bear arms, for they would have died in vain.

I am particularly opposed to any move by Congress to take away my right and privilege as a free citizen to buy and own ammunition or bullets for hand guns. It is my right as a free citizen to protect my home, property and family from intrusion.

I am just thankful that we have good men such as yourself in Congress fighting to preserve our rights. May God bless you in your efforts, I pray.

Sincerely yours,

GERALD N. KARLSON.

ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the problem of illegal aliens is no longer confined to the southwestern States. It is a problem that has reached national proportions and affects the economy of nearly every State. It is no longer a problem confined to the ranks of agricultural jobs for many aliens now hold jobs as skilled craftsmen. It has been estimated that these illegal aliens hold 1 million jobs—jobs that should be held by some of the 9 million unemployed citizens. Because of the severity of this problem I have cosponsored legislation introduced by Chairman

CXXI—1044—Part 13

PETER RODINO that would make it illegal to knowingly hire an illegal alien.

I offer to the attention of my colleagues an article from the May issue of Nation's Business that concerns this problem:

HOW ILLEGAL ALIENS ROB JOBS FROM UNEMPLOYED AMERICANS

During 37 years of Marine Corps duty that included four in the top spot of commandant, Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr. was not a man to throw up his hands in the face of a challenge.

But now, as head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, he bluntly concedes that mastering the major difficulty facing his agency is "totally beyond our capabilities—just totally."

Gen. Chapman, who was named immigration commissioner in 1972 after retiring from the Corps, is referring to the huge—and growing—problem of illegal aliens.

"It has reached what I consider really alarming proportions," he told Nation's Business. "There are literally millions of them here."

How many millions?

"My best guess is seven to eight million, with at least one million holding jobs—many of them good-paying jobs—at the same time eight million Americans are out of work."

"It's a moving target, increasing very substantially every year. Ten or 15 years ago, there were a few hundred thousand, nearly all in agricultural jobs in the Southwest. If things don't change, there will be 13 million to 15 million, scattered all over the country, within the next three or four years."

Last year, 800,000 foreigners who entered the country illegally were caught and sent back, but Gen. Chapman thinks that's only a third to a half of the total number who came in.

How do they evade detection?

By swimming the Rio Grande to Texas in classic "wetback" fashion, or walking across the 800-mile Southwestern land border between El Paso, Texas, and the Pacific.

"MARRIAGE" MILLS

Or by using more sophisticated techniques. There are millions of aliens in the country who have:

Entered legally as tourists or students and simply stayed on after their visas expired.

Been smuggled in on boats or in hidden compartments of trucks by organized rings charging up to \$700 each.

Used fraudulent passports, visas or other documents.

Employed the services of brokers of bogus marriages, who arrange for an alien to "marry" a U.S. citizen, enabling the foreigner to qualify for permanent residence in this country. Charges for such services run as high as \$1,500. The U.S. partner to the "marriage" may enter into several such arrangements a month—without benefit of divorce.

Most of the illegal aliens are Mexicans, but the number coming from other countries has been growing steadily, and today every part of the world is represented. Significantly, half or more of those holding jobs in the U.S. are not Mexicans, Gen. Chapman says.

He adopts a somewhat sympathetic attitude toward the majority of these people who so frustrate him and the agency he leads.

Noting the lengths to which they go to get here, he says: "The attraction of a job in this country is so great that no risk and, apparently, no price are too high for them."

He adds: "Most of them are good, hard-working people who look to this country as the only place where they can earn a decent living. You can't blame them very much for that."

"Our investigators checked out a cleaning

crew in a big Chicago office building recently and found 41 of the women working there were Polish citizens. I don't doubt they were probably the best cleaning woman anybody has ever seen. I really mean it."

Illegal aliens, he says, "send money back to their families, save, and in most cases, eventually go back home and live relatively well."

But many never go home and many more might stay—and bring in relatives—were it not for the fear of being caught, Gen. Chapman says.

If the nation doesn't effectively deal with the problem of illegal aliens, he warns, "if we just throw open our doors, it wouldn't be many years before we had India's population problems."

WHERE YOU FIT IN

For the businessman, the issue has many facets.

While it is a crime for any aliens to represent themselves as American citizens, and for most of them to accept employment in the U.S. (the exceptions, of course, are limited to aliens legally in the country—and only to some of them), an employer commits no crime by hiring one, nor is there any obligation on the employer's part to ascertain a job applicant's nationality.

Many employers unknowingly hire "illegals," as they are called. A small number, Gen. Chapman says, hire them knowingly.

The general notes that such hirings can have short-range economic benefits for an employer: "He pays lower wages than he would have to pay Americans; and sometimes the working and living conditions he provides are substandard."

But, Gen. Chapman adds, "we are all subsidizing" any savings an individual makes in labor costs by hiring an alien: "That worker sends his children to school, his family uses hospitals and other public facilities, and he might even go on welfare. And many are paying no taxes at all."

The California Social Welfare Board estimated after a 1973 study that illegal aliens in its state were receiving \$100 million a year in welfare payments and services. Nationally, that figure is in the billions, the Immigration Service estimates.

In a pilot program that the Service conducted jointly last year with Internal Revenue, 1,700 illegal aliens suspected as tax dodgers were found to owe \$250,000 in income taxes, and \$168,000 was actually collected.

Another adverse economic impact: The effect on the U.S. balance of payments of dollars which Gen. Chapman says are conservatively estimated to total 1.5 billion a year—earned here and sent back to the aliens' home countries.

"So the taxpayers as a whole are footing the bill for whatever an employer saves by hiring illegal aliens," the general says.

Another reason that aliens are hired for certain jobs, he points out, is that "the employer can't get an American to do his farm work or punch his cattle or whatever he needs help for."

A farmer or other employer unable to recruit workers who are U.S. citizens can take advantage of a Labor Department program under which aliens are brought into the country to work for short periods. But paperwork is involved for the employer.

"The local labor office of the state employment service is required to give certification if the farmer can't get American laborers, but in point of fact the farmer often doesn't make the request," Gen. Chapman says. "Why should he? Why should he go through all the damn red tape when he probably has 200 fellows standing right outside his main gate ready to go to work, and there's no law that says he can't hire them?"

A BURDEN FOR BUSINESS?

The Immigration Service is backing legislation, introduced by Rep. Peter W. Rodino

Jr. (D.-N.J.), making it an offense to knowingly hire an illegal alien. A job-seeker would have to certify to the prospective employer that he is a U.S. citizen (or that he's in the highly limited category of legal aliens entitled to obtain employment in this country—in which case, he would have to produce documentation).

If he's American, the job-seeker's statement can be oral or written, as the employer wishes. The Justice Department at one point wanted the measure to include a provision requiring all U.S. applicants for work to produce papers identifying them as citizens—a move criticized as smacking of a police state. The new Attorney General, Edward H. Levi, scratched the idea.

After posing the question and receiving the answer, the employer would have no further responsibility under the law—the burden would shift to the employee, who could be punished for misrepresentation.

On the other hand, an employer found to have knowingly hired an illegal alien would be liable to a warning for a first offense, and to a fine, imposed by the Immigration Service in a noncriminal proceeding, of up to \$500 per alien for a second offense. For a third offense, the employer would face a criminal misdemeanor charge with a maximum penalty per alien of a year in jail and a \$1,000 fine.

Challenges to the Rodino bill have come from the American Farm Bureau, the nation's largest employer of farm labor, which favors keeping illegal aliens out but proposes other ways than the pending legislation, and from religious organizations urging "amnesty" for illegals already here.

At its annual meeting last February, the Farm Bureau adopted a policy statement that said in part:

"We continue to oppose legislation that would put the burden of proof on employers as to whether a person is an illegal alien. We feel . . . [it] would place an unwarranted burden for law enforcement on employers . . . and would prove to be unworkable and ineffective in solving the problem of illegal aliens entering this country.

"This is no longer a farm employment problem. Most illegal aliens in almost every area of this country are working in nonfarm occupations.

"Instead of shifting the burden of enforcement to employers, we favor legislation that would make it illegal for any public agency or public official to approve or provide public services to illegal aliens. Tightening up procedures involved in the issuance of Social Security cards and requiring that those who apply for welfare, food stamps and other such social services show proof of their legal status as citizens or legal aliens would be more effective in locating such aliens and in discouraging their entry than other plans that have been advanced."

A Farm Bureau spokesman explains that employers may not be able to cover themselves under the law as easily as it might seem. For one thing, he says, many previous laws have been passed with official assurance of a minimal impact on businessmen—but the impact has turned out to be much more burdensome and costly because of rules drafted by enforcing agencies.

The United States Catholic Conference is the largest of organizations urging amnesty—granting illegal aliens now in the country legal status with the right to work and eventually become citizens. Most of these foreigners came to this country, these organizations say, at a time of economic boom, filling lower-paying jobs that Americans shunned.

Gen. Chapman questions the general amnesty approach on the ground that providing it would lead to recurring demands to allow later waves of illegal aliens to stay on. But he thinks special consideration might be given aliens who have been in the country for a decade or more and have deep roots here. Basically, however, he wants to confront the problem as it now stands: "I have

told Congress several times that, with the Rodino bill and a couple of thousand more agents, we could do a number of things—one of which is to open up a million jobs for unemployed Americans."

The commissioner gives these insights into his current manpower difficulties.

Electronic devices that detect the presence of humans and relay the information to a headquarters (equipment originally developed for Viet Nam battlefields) have been installed at many points along the Southwestern land border but the Border Patrol is spread so thinly that half the alarms go unanswered.

There are fewer than 1,000 immigration investigators—officers assigned to nab foreigners who have managed to get into the country illegally—compared with the estimated eight million illegal aliens. There are 200 investigators and an estimated one million illegals in the New York City area; 100 investigators and a half-million illegal aliens in Chicago.

But it's not just a question of manpower, Gen. Chapman emphasizes.

"How can you man 6,000 miles of land border, not to mention two seacoasts?" he asks. "You'd probably have to have officers standing shoulder to shoulder. And you could turn the entire Marine Corps into immigration investigators and it wouldn't provide enough personnel to sort through 215 million people to locate seven to eight million illegal aliens when, at the same time, two or three more were coming in for every one you found."

He adds: "What we need more than anything else is the Rodino bill to make it illegal to hire them knowingly."

In pressing for the legislation's passage, Gen. Chapman bears down heavily on the opening up of jobs for Americans.

It's a mistake, he says, to dismiss the alien problem by saying that the illegals are just filling menial jobs Americans would spurn in any event.

"At one time, it was generally true that nearly all the illegal aliens working in this country were Mexicans doing stoop labor," he concedes. "But that's not the case anymore. Only about a third of the million aliens holding jobs are in agriculture. The biggest concentration now is in industry and the service fields."

FROM PLUMBING TO INVESTING

He slides across his desk a long list of recently caught illegal aliens.

It includes a Greek earning \$12 an hour as a plumber; two other Greeks receiving \$9.71 an hour as painters (and arrested while working with a crew painting the Statue of Liberty); a wirephoto operator from Trinidad, \$6 an hour; a Jamaican carpenter, \$7; a jeweler from Colombia, \$4.49; an airline office worker from Japan, \$4; a real estate secretary from Germany, \$5 an hour; and an art restorer from Israel, \$9 an hour.

Also on the list: a restaurant owner, a bookkeeper, an auto mechanic, a computer technician, an investment adviser and the director of a university residence hall.

One recent investigation turned up four illegal aliens working as janitors in a private Washington, D.C., office building where a major tenant is—you guessed it—the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

THE DISAPPEARING ARTS

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an article by Art Detman, Jr., entitled, "Should Business and Government Finance the Arts? The Disappearing Arts."

The article appears in the May 1975 issue of Mainliner magazine, published by United Air Lines.

Mr. Detman is a contributing editor for *Dun's Review*.

The article follows:

SHOULD BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT FINANCE THE ARTS? THE DISAPPEARING ARTS

(By Art Detman, Jr.)

The next time you complain about the high price of a ticket to the symphony or opera, to the theater or the ballet, consider this: even when you buy the most expensive ticket in the house, you're not paying your own way. The arts, whether the performing arts or the fine arts, require big subsidies to exist, and right now the outlook for such subsidies is uncertain.

The immediate cause is the overall economic situation. Prices keep rising—12.2 percent last year alone—while business activity keeps falling. As a result, arts organizations throughout the country find themselves paying more for just about everything while facing reductions in their funding.

A Ford Foundation study predicts that deficits of arts organizations will increase threefold to sixfold over the next seven years. If the arts are to continue at their current level, that means subsidies must increase three to six times. One reason for the expected increase in deficits is that foundation support is likely to decline. Ironically, the Ford Foundation itself is sharply decreasing its future grants, primarily because the value of its investment portfolio plunged from \$3.4 billion in 1973 to about \$2 billion in 1974. Ford plans to reduce its total giving by 50 percent over the next four years, from \$200 million to \$100 million. Currently, Ford gives about \$11 million to the arts, and it's not yet known how much this will be cut.

Altogether, the nation's 30 largest foundations saw the value of their endowments (mainly stocks and bonds) decrease by a fourth in 1974. Nonetheless, their income from these securities remained about the same, and so no immediate decrease in grants is expected. "But if business has another rotten year in 1975," warns George Baker of the Council on Foundations, "then the foundations' income will drop, too. And the programs that they have been supporting, including those for the arts, will suffer a cutback."

The double whammy of inflation and recession comes at a time when support of the arts in the U.S. is finally growing. The federal government's National Endowment for the Arts, which didn't exist ten years ago, has a \$75 million budget. New York's Council on the Arts has \$34 million, more than double last year's figure. Foundations are giving roughly \$200 million a year. Business, by one reckoning, devoted \$144 million to the arts in 1973, probably more in 1974. Meanwhile, symphonies, dance companies and other arts organizations are performing to record numbers of ticketbuyers.

For all that, these figures are far less impressive than they seem. The National Endowment's \$75 million, for example, would not buy a single new intercontinental bomber. New York's newly swollen budget is less than what West Germany's government gives to the theater alone. That \$144 million from business comprises both philanthropic dollars and advertising dollars; it shrinks to insignificance when compared with after-tax profits of \$70 billion in 1973.

SUBSIDIES FOR SURVIVAL

The basic problem of financing the arts is much more than just inflation and recession. The plain fact is that Americans have never given much to support the arts. Why? Probably because America is such a young nation and has grown so fast—in population, in territory, in commerce, in technology. There has been little time left over for the arts. As a result, Americans generally are

indifferent to the arts. "We revere our sports heroes because they seem to support the whole male chauvinistic idea of the all-American man," says Lloyd E. Rigler, a Los Angeles businessman and a major arts supporter. "But we view the arts as not very masculine."

This antipathy extends into the business community. People like Rigler often must first justify the arts before they can ask for money. "The arts are that imaginative force that really gives us the spirit to live," says Rigler. "We can't live by business alone. We have to have food for the soul."

In more tangible terms, Rigler and others argue that the arts nurture new ideas and help train people in the commercial arts, such as advertising and industrial design. Moreover, local arts organizations can make outlying communities attractive to executives who manage factories and branch offices and who otherwise might resist such assignments.

Even so, if business pays its own way, why can't the arts? It's an appealing proposition in a country dedicated to a free marketplace. But it just wouldn't work, any more than self-supporting police departments, schools or libraries would work. The cost would exclude all but the wealthy from enjoying the arts. For example, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra plays to 230,000 seats during the winter, with a top price of \$16, and 74,000 during the summer, with a top of \$7.50. If the Symphony could sell every ticket, winter and summer, at \$16, it would gross only \$4.9 million—vs. an annual budget of over \$7 million.

Clearly, only subsidies will permit the arts to survive, even in the best of times—and now is not the best of times. Foundation support appears to be waning. Support from individuals (who give even more than foundations) is uncertain. Government support is likely frozen at its present level. That leaves only business as the major source for the necessary increased funding required in years ahead. "Business is doing a lot for the arts," says Goldwin A. McLellan, president of the Business Committee for the Arts. "The climate has changed tremendously in the last few years. But we don't think that business is doing nearly enough yet. It has to increase its support because there are arts organizations suffering financial woes all over the country."

MORE FOR THE ARTS

Although corporations can make tax-free charitable contributions up to 5 percent of their pre-tax income, most give around 2 percent, and very little of this goes to the arts. "In the minds of management," says one businessman, "it just doesn't look right to shareholders. They are afraid of being criticized." But if the arts are to flourish, management will have to convince shareholders that such contributions are not only proper but in their best interest.

At the same time, business must expand its technical aid to arts organizations. Across the country, management experts, accountants and lawyers—all on business payrolls—are helping arts organizations develop into efficient operations. "This is one of the greatest forms of business support," says McLellan of the BCA. "Even a local repertory theater is big business nowadays and requires professional management."

To encourage business support of the arts, each year BCA, in conjunction with *Esquire* magazine, cites up to 30 companies that have made outstanding contributions to the arts. Nominations have grown from a trickle eight years ago to a flood in the hundreds. "The judges have a heck of a time coming up with the winners," says McLellan. The latest group includes such national companies as Borg-Warner, Exxon, Ford Motor, Hallmark and IBM.

A dramatic example of how a businessman can revitalize an arts organization is what Louis Sudler did for the Chicago Symphony.

Sudler, a real estate man (the John Hancock building, among others), became president of the struggling orchestra company in 1966. He overhauled its business procedures, brought in Sir Georg Solti as music director, extended the season to 52 weeks, increased contributions (especially by fellow businessmen) from \$350,000 annually to \$1.8 million and boosted ticket revenues from \$600,000 to \$2 million. The public's attitude changed from lukewarm to enthusiastic; when the Symphony returned from a triumphant European tour in 1971, it was given a parade through the Loop.

The overseas success of the orchestra underscores a bitter irony. Americans don't wholeheartedly support the arts, yet American arts are unexcelled in quality. The world's top five—perhaps six—symphony orchestras are in the U.S. The world center of dance is in New York City. American opera, ballet and theater companies can equal the best from any other land. Yet we clutch the pursestrings tightly, probably more out of ignorance than meanness. If America is to retain preeminence in the arts, and if more Americans are to enjoy the arts, this attitude will have to change. The next 18 months could prove crucial.

CLOSEUP PROGRAM

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this House to the closeup program, which has just completed its fifth year of bringing students and teachers to Washington for a close look at the workings of their Government. It is a program that has been greeted with enthusiasm by students and teachers alike, and we should take a careful look at just what it does.

We are all aware of the feeling of alienation which many people experience today. They sense a distance between themselves and their Government, and consequently decline to participate in politics. Disenchantment with the "system" is nowhere so prevalent as among our young people.

The closeup program has sought to involve students in the governmental process. The students and their teachers spend an intensive week of seminars in Washington. They are given the opportunity to listen to, question, and talk with representatives of the Congress, the executive branch, the press, lobbyists, the diplomatic corps, and others involved in the Government, and they gain a sense of how the process works.

I am especially enthusiastic about Close-Up now, because this year, for the first time, students and teachers from the Denver-Boulder area of Colorado participated in the program. Mr. Stephen Janger, the director of Close-Up, and Ms. Beryl Hall, who organized the Colorado program, were very enthusiastic about expanding into Colorado, and I, and the residents of Colorado, owe them many thanks for their hard work and unflagging good spirits. I would also like to single out Jim Pierson and Bill White, Jefferson County, Colo., educators who spent an enormous amount of time and energy to help make this year's program a success.

Mr. Speaker, when I have spoken with

groups of Close-Up participants I have been impressed by their enthusiasm, by their interest, and by how well-informed they are. During their week here these young people clearly acquire an increased understanding of the governmental process. We hope that they carry away with them a lasting interest in it as well. The most important aspect of this exciting program is, I believe, that the 285 Coloradans who participated this year will go back to Colorado and talk about the program and what they have learned. Each of them has a real obligation to remain well informed, to continue his or her interest in how our Government works, and to relay this new enthusiasm to others. I hope that they will urge others to participate in Close-Up as it continues to expand in Colorado next year. And I trust that each one of this year's participants will become actively involved in the political process. In order for our system to work properly, we must have an informed and active citizenry. Close-Up, I think, provides a good start.

THE FRANKFORD ARSENAL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Army has decided to close down the Frankford Arsenal in Philadelphia. The reasons put forth are economy and the efficiency and modern operation of other facilities as compared to Frankford.

So far the Army has not been able to justify these claims and has been evasive in answering the questions put to it about the proposal to shut down Frankford.

A series of articles by Hoag Levins, a reporter for the Philadelphia Daily News, has raised serious questions about the reasons for the Army's decision to shut down the Frankford Arsenal, one of the finest installations of its type in the Nation.

At this time I enter into the RECORD the first of Mr. Levins' articles. On subsequent days I will be entering the remainder of the pieces he wrote about the arsenal. The material follows:

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Jan. 13, 1975]

INSIDE FRANKFORD ARSENAL—WHAT WILL BE LOST IF ARMY CLOSES IT DOWN

(By Hoag Levins)

If you fear fires, enjoy movies, drive a car, work with metal or value your vision, the Frankford Arsenal may have changed your life.

If that surprises you, it just shows that you—like most Philadelphians—don't really know what has been going on inside the arsenal for the last decade.

The super-secret research center is no longer an arsenal, the Daily News discovered in a series of visits last week inside the walls.

The center, to be closed by the Defense Department by 1977, long ago quit manufacturing the bombs and bullets for which it became famous during World War II.

With the same secrecy which characterizes all its internal moves, the arsenal has

developed a core of scientists, engineers and technicians who now work in one of the most unusual research and development centers in the world.

The arsenal at Tacony and Bridge Sts. today is thought of in the same terms which evolved during the 1940s when workers dispatched trainloads of munitions to fight a war.

A place of mystery and a self-contained city, the arsenal had its own generating plants, fire department, hospital, water and sewerage systems and police force. Even in emergencies—such as munitions explosions—it didn't let outsiders in.

Today the 110-acre complex's gunpowder storage houses—with three-foot-thick concrete walls—have been converted to workshops and warehouses.

The arsenal's famed bullet shops are abandoned, its thousands of machines and assembly lines covered with canvas, heavy grease or layers of dust. Its bomb foundries and artillery shell works are occasionally used only for experimental work.

"We should have changed the name of the place for the sake of accuracy and called it 'Frankford Research and Development Center,'" explained Seymore Miller, the arsenal's technical director.

Miller's office is decorated with munitions memorabilia celebrating arsenal accomplishments during his 25 years there.

On the wall, bullets of every size and shape are displayed, some cut down the middle to show their powder charge. One long narrow box traces the development of a bullet, from the first formless metal blob to finished, highly polished bullet. On the desk a special rack holds 20-millimeter shells, their tips colorfully decorated in red, green, purple and yellow.

"What we do now is develop a new item of munitions, test it out and create the tools needed to produce it on a large scale. Then we send them all off to the government-owned, company-operated plants around the country that long ago took over the actual production."

Miller is not happy about the Arsenal's closing.

"They are not closing a storage arsenal. They're closing down a repository for engineering expertise. When you move this operation someplace else, very few of our people will actually move with it. You'll have plenty of equipment, but you won't have the people who have spent a dozen years gaining the experience you need to do this sort of work."

"The Army is dealing with building and equipment. You can build a building and buy equipment anywhere. The capability here is the man who knows what to do with that equipment. He is the capability of our mission. It'll take ten years or more to create more like him in some other location. This move doesn't make sense, no matter how you look at it."

Miller's frustration is echoed in office after office throughout the arsenal.

"The Army is going to hurt itself and Philadelphia by closing this installation," said Joseph McCaughey, top civilian executive of the arsenal. "I'm most fearful that it will lose our cadre of young, aggressive engineers and scientists."

"They are the future of the field. People are the mission. This thing is about people and experience, not equipment and old buildings," said McCaughey.

A visitor can sum up the story of "this thing" from the intersection of Reese St. and Worth rd.

That intersection—not far from McCaughey's office—serves as a symbolic crossroads in time for the arsenal and its 158 years in Philadelphia.

A stone's throw away is Building No. 11, which a small plaque indicates is more than 100 years old and still in use. Eight other nearby buildings date back to the arsenal's beginning.

Encircling a large grassy parade mall, the

buildings occupy 9.5 acres of some of the most historic land in Philadelphia. Even the U.S. government cannot make changes on this area without the approval of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

A stone thrown in the opposite direction will fall just short of Building No. 109—a more modern structure typical of many of the laboratories and workshops which sprawl across the Arsenal grounds.

In the basement of No. 109 is an ultra-modern communications center where, on Nov. 22, a rattling teletype announced the decision to close the arsenal and eliminate 3,500 jobs.

The arsenal's historic background, so * * * become a disadvantage. The Army decided its "outmoded" facilities could no longer keep up with modern research demands. There is a counter-argument.

Said Dr. David Rosenblatt, director of the arsenal's Pitman Dunn laboratories:

"It's difficult for some people to visualize, but the sort of work we do here now is aimed at the future. With the close of the facility, the results might well take until the 1980s to show up, when the Army begins to look for new systems and developments and sees that there is this five-to-ten-year lag when not much was done in the way of research. That's how long it would take to just get back to normal level of operation on current projects."

Throughout the complex's 240 buildings, more than 1,500 engineers and technicians work at research projects ranging from lubricating oils to laser beams.

The arsenal's engineers have been granted more than 1,000 patents, and their ideas have been involved in the Mercury, Gemini and Apollo space shots. Equipment developed at the arsenal went to the moon with Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin in 1969.

During the last five years, the arsenal has been awash with rumors, false hopes, political promises. Throughout the buildings and labs, a visitor finds an air of unreality as workers doggedly push ahead on projects they will never finish.

"You've got to do something," explained one gristled technician. "For years we've been hearing all this crap. You get numb to it. I work like this because . . . well, I don't want to think about what it's going to be like when I don't have any work."

In the main headquarters building, Joseph M. McCaughey leaned back from his enormous desk, pressed his finger tips together and nodded solemnly.

"We're in a difficult period right now," admitted McCaughey, the arsenal's top civilian executive. "The arsenal is to be closed for sure. But they haven't cut our work load. We're going on just like before."

"We have no time schedule for closing. We don't know what missions will be transferred. The future of the people working here is totally up in the air."

"Obviously, that has an overall effect on the morale."

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Jan. 13, 1975]

"THE STREET THAT BEAT HITLER"

(By Hoag Levins)

Out past the dangling gray ash of his cigarette, ghosts were dancing down Craig rd.

"You shoulda' seen 'em. There was so many people here it was like a sea of people in this street," said the man eagerly. His rough hand gestured broadly down the length of deserted Craig rd. which cuts its way through a cluster of red brick industrial buildings inside Frankford Arsenal.

"This here is the street that beat Hitler. There was bullets coming out of these buildings like you couldn't believe. It was like a beehive here," he said, flicking an ash into the gutter and shaking his head at the memories.

Behind him a four-story building bore the

date 1865 in stone above the massive double-entrance doors. Like much of the arsenal, Craig rd. was planned and built around the time of the Civil War.

Craig rd. workers turned out the paper and powder wards needed by Union Army riflemen. Some 57 years later, operations along the street's "Bullet Row" had changed considerably and centered around the production of the new metal bullet cartridges used by the Allies throughout World War I. By the 1940s, Bullet Row housed one of the most massive munitions manufacturing operations in the world.

Every round of small caliber ammunition fired by American troops during World War II came along Craig rd. At the peak of the war, more than 22,000 people worked in three shifts round-the-clock. They made 8 million bullets a day.

"You could feel it when you came to work. It meant something to be part of the arsenal. We were working to save the world."

"That sounds silly as hell now, but that's the way it was then," said the Craig rd. watchman, walking back up the steps into Building No. 215.

Inside the building, one finds the arsenal—that-used-to-be. It lies quietly beneath a heavy layer of dust, surrounded by the malls of cold grease and old wood.

Row after row, lines of small wooden cubicles await a shift of workers which have not come for a decade. Hundreds of women sat here each day as an overhead chute dropped an avalanche of brass casings past each station for one final check.

Room after room, floor after floor, building after building, the idle machinery waits. Here and there, one finds an old apron on a rusty nail, old hair pins beneath a bench, or a few battered boxes of loose brass shells, an industrial ghost town.

Further down, like square-shouldered steel soldiers, giant 2,000-ton presses stand two and three stories high.

"It took three months just to get that one press in place," said one worker, jabbing his grease-blackened hand authoritatively at the monstrous machines. "Imagine them moving this stuff out of here to somewhere else. This is just one building—there are dozens like this one, all full," he said, disappearing around a corner.

"It depends on how you want to look at it," said William Lennox, walking through the chilly factories, his hands deep in the pockets of his coat. "The army is talking about idle buildings. We look at them as potential factories. In peace, no one wants to hear about arsenals or bullet shops. In war, suddenly they become popular as hell. One day we're going to need these factories and we're not going to have them."

Lennox, who is the Arsenal's information officer, has worked there 29 years. His father worked there before him, and his father's father before that.

In a nearby mallroom, Eleanor Duzenski, who came to the arsenal in 1941 as a patriotic 18-year-old girl with nine brothers in the service, said:

"It was important to work here in those days. I wanted to have a hand in the war effort along with my brothers. Here, we were fighting for the same thing . . . end the war and bring the boys home."

PLANT COULD HELP SAVE WHALES

Scientists at Philadelphia's Frankford Arsenal may save the world's endangered sperm whales.

For centuries, the 60-foot-long whales have been mercilessly hunted for their oil, one of the finest quality lubricants yet discovered. The whales are on the endangered species list but are still hunted because of heavy demand for their oil.

Studies at the Arsenal's Pitman-Dunn laboratories may soon change that. Scientists found that an oil made from Jojoba plant seeds has the same lubricating qualities as sperm whale oil. Jojoba plants only grow in the arid southwestern U.S. where Indian

tribes are now considering jobba as a cash crop because of the arsenal's findings.

Ironically, the same arsenal which 100 years ago supplied muskets and bowie knives to fight the plains Indians may now provide a living for some of their descendants.

LOYALTY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, last month the mayor of DeSoto, Tex., the Honorable Charles Harwell, addressed the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 8913 on loyalty. I was very impressed by the mayor's words and would like to share them with the general public and my colleagues in Congress.

The speech follows:

LOYALTY

It is a pleasure and an honor to be the recipient of your gracious invitation and to speak on a subject that is near and dear to our hearts. "Loyalty" is a word we all know. It is a subject we need to reaffirm from time to time. I notice your motto is "It's not the price you pay to join, but the price you have paid to be eligible to be a member of VFW" that is important. This is the theme I bring to you. Whether we be at war or peace, when we have pride and self respect and loyalty, we cannot be conquered.

Can we see loyalty? We see loyalty in the actions of people. Sgt. Alvin York was Loyalty personified. Loyalty is the spirit and fibre of the Great and Noble American Nation! Loyalty is the strength and devotion that catapults us to national greatness. Loyalty is the tie that binds and the healer of wounds. Loyalty is the solidifying agent that binds a great nation of diversified peoples, ideals and aspirations into one gigantic force. We expect and demand loyalty in our business, our political, school and military life. We must have loyalty if we are successful. We do not always receive loyalty and we know the consequences. When we do receive Loyalty we know it is the backbone of all our hopes, dreams and aspirations. Our great friend "Loyalty" called our nation into being! This brave, courageous ally called us to National greatness. It will be the same gallant friend Loyalty that calls us again to greatness. For without "her" there shall be no tomorrow for the America we know. That great and grand idea called Loyalty becomes a mighty force beating upon the Anvil of Time and Circumstances culminating in the power of the American Nation, personified in her millions of brave sons and daughters, who time and time again bring utter and complete devastation to those enemies of America and all civilized humanity.

So it is, standing head and shoulders above all whom we need, expect, and receive Loyalty is the American Fighting man. There are no individuals or groups of individuals who ever have, ever can, or ever will, match or surpass the Loyalty that you, the American Soldier, renders to America. You, the American Soldier, the "Guardian of Freedom", here and around the world are the bulwark of all Human Liberty. It is you who are Loyalty Personified. He who takes the oath of all oaths and that pledge of all pledges, he who utters those words, "I am an American Fighting Man", he who prepares for the supreme sacrifice which is demanded by loyalty, it is he who is loyalty personified.

Who else could call us to such sacrifices, such heroic deeds but that grand lady called "Loyalty"? The American soldier still believes "Eternal Vigilance" is the price of liberty as in 1776 when the rag tag farmers came from behind every plow, tree and rock to beat the

mightiest army in the world. The American soldier with his gracious compassion, his unflinching courage, his astounding military genius, his tenacious ability to hold a position in the face of overwhelming opposition, his outstanding ability to attack, attack and counter attack, when others would withdraw, with his complete and unswerving dedication to the great and noble American nation, he is loyalty. And so it is you the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America who are indeed Loyalty Personified, those brave and gallant soldiers of America who have given so much and expected so little. You who have borne so much and suffered battle scars of a thousand firefights, you who have borne the broken hearts and suffered the intense agony of the crushing pains and fears of battle, it is you that we honor, you that we lift up, you that we salute today, you are "Loyalty Personified". You who have waded the muddy swamps of the Rhine, you who are the heroes of Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor, Kasserine, Cassino, the Solomons, Gulf of Leyte, Bastogne, Normandy and Okinawa, you who trudged the dusty tank trails, climbed blistering hills and stormed the sandy beaches in the face of withering firepower, you who marched with frozen feet and were blown apart by land mines, you who received depth charges and were blown out of the sky, you who battled the hellish flame throwers and the never ending snipers, you who raised the Stars and Stripes on Iwo Jima and liberated France and England, you who broke the impregnable Siegfried line, and defeated the unbeatable Luftwaffe and crushed the uncrushable Panzer divisions, you who hammered the Germans into submission May 1945 and prostrated the Empire of Japan, August 1945, so that freedom might live today. It is you who are Loyalty Personified.

I reiterate it is an immeasurable honor for me to be here and a humbling experience to speak to such a distinguished group of American patriots. It is loyalty that calls men to greatness. Loyalty calls men to participate in the most devastating war known to mankind. Even though to the participants it has become a cloudy memory and to many of the younger generation a myth, it would behoove us to remember it, tell it to our children and their children, for it was our finest hour.

World War II touches the lives of all those living today and will continue to do so for generations to come! It affected our laws and society and our way of life as a nation. It opened the nuclear age and made major contributions to American military tradition at its best! This war was called forth by Loyalty as none other has been since 1776. It was a war fought for a cause well understood. Our participation was well defined as the immediate result of a sudden, damaging blow to our military forces. But oh, how our forces rallied and healed their wounds! My, how the homefront leaped to the factories, how our fighting men in the air, on the sea and on the land carried the fight to the ruthless enemy of America and all civilization. This was loyalty personified. It is not only an inspiring story, it is the gruesome saga of the great and noble American Fighting Man! It was truly global in scope, massive in manpower and destruction, rich in heroic deed, bloody with countless examples of man's inhumanity to man, sacred in that the American soldier performed as tempered steel and was referred to by the Japanese as "Their beloved Conqueror". It is the story of millions of men and women surging in battle across continents. This indeed is the story of Loyalty Personified.

I would like to bring to your remembrance a few great and crucial speeches in American History in which Americans were called upon through Loyalty to render the supreme sacrifice. The stirring lines from FDR's historic speech—"Yesterday, December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy, the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire

of Japan. Always will we remember the character of the onslaught against us. No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory!"

Americans, so largely isolationists at heart, girded themselves for the greatest industrial and military effort in their history, indeed this was—Loyalty Personified. So obvious was the effect of Roosevelt's speeches on American and British morale that the German and Japanese tried again and again to distract attention from them by diversionary air raids. Even though the United States emerged as the most powerful undisputed leader of the free world, still again and again, we summoned our friend "Loyalty" to call America's sons to be offered on the Altar of War for again and again we must resist the arch enemy of freedom. As the American Fighting Men trudged the rugged hills of Korea and passed over the frozen dead still chasing an elusive enemy, it was during that campaign that nothing less than treason demanded that the commander of the US 8th Army, the Commander of UN Forces in Korea and the Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Japan be relieved of his commands April 11, 1951. But then, that brave ally "Loyalty" demanded that the old soldier address a joint session of the US Congress, although this was unheard of in the annals of American History. He thought surely there must be enough patriots still in Congress to come to the aid of America's gallant sons who so desperately needed them. He began—

"Mr. Speaker, Distinguished Members of Congress, I stand on this rostrum with a sense of deep humility and great pride—humility in the wake of those great architects of our history who have stood here before me—pride in the reflection that this home of legislative debate represents human liberty in the purest form yet devised. Here are centered the hopes and aspirations and faith of the entire human race. I do not stand here an advocate for any partisan cause, for the issues are fundamental and reach quite beyond the realm of partisan considerations. They must be resolved on the highest plane of national interest if our course is to prove sound and our future protected. I trust, therefore, that you will do me the justice of receiving that which I have to say as solely expressing the considered viewpoint of a fellow American. I address you with neither rancor nor bitterness in the fading twilight of life, with but one purpose in mind, to serve my country. Once war is forced upon us, there is no other alternative than to apply every available means to bring it to a swift end. War's very objective is victory, not prolonged indecision. In war there is no substitute for victory. I have just left your fighting sons in Korea. They have met all the tests there, and I can report to you without reservation that they are splendid in every way. It was my constant effort to preserve them and to end this savage conflict honorably and with the least loss of time and a minimum of sacrifice and life. Its gowing bloodshed has caused me the deepest anguish and anxiety. Those gallant men will remain often in my thoughts and my prayers always."—And thus came to pass the saying "Old Soldiers Never Die, They just fade away."

And so we see "Loyalty" as she lifts the vision of America in the great wars. Then, we see loyalty again cutting through the jungles of Vietnam in a thousand firefights against a ruthless, faceless enemy with a never ending savagery which boggles the minds of civilized people. But even before America was born we see Loyalty aflame in the hearts and minds of a handful of patriots. In the most crucial speech in American history Patrick Henry addressed the House of Burgesses in 1775. He stunned the audience with a commanding appeal to that brave and noble ally "Loyalty". He said—

"Our chains are forged! Their clanking

may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable—let it come—I repeat Sirs—let it come! Gentlemen may cry peace, peace, peace, but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that Gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death!" Loyalty was personified in Patrick Henry on that day as none other. He took his seat. No murmur of applause was heard. The effect was too deep! After a moment the cry "To Arms" seemed to quiver on every lip and gleam from every eye. Richard H. Lee rose and supported Mr. Henry but his melodious speech was lost amid the agitations of that ocean which the Master Spirit of the Storm had lifted high! That supernatural voice still sounded in their ears and shivered along their arteries! They heard in every pause the cry of liberty or death! Loyalty was aroused. They became impatient of speech. Their souls were on fire for action. The resolutions were adopted. Loyalty was abounding. Patrick Henry, Richard H. Lee, Richard C. Nicholas, Benjamin Harrison, Lemuel Reddick, George Washington, Adam Stevens, Thomas Jefferson, Isaac Zane, Edmund Pendleton were appointed to prepare the plan called for by the last resolution. Loyalty had united with bravery, courage and love of freedom to bring forth this great and noble nation that we love. Loyalty—this is our hope.

With Loyalty we will be able to hew out of the mountains of despair a stone of hope and with this hope, we will be able to transform the jangling discord of our nation into a solid force of greatness so that our children and their children may enjoy the freedom that we inherited. Listen with the spirit of your ears as the 35th President of the United States appealed to the hopes, the aspirations and to the loyalty of this great nation.—

"We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth, from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has passed to a new generation of Americans born in this Century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace—proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of these human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today—at home and around the world—Even now the dark shadow of tyranny surrounds us. The next ten years will determine whether freedom survives or Communism conquers. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its nation's Loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe. Now the trumpet summons us again, not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are, but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation, a struggle against the common enemies of man, tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself. Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort? In the long history of the world only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility. I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation, for the energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it and the glow from that fire can truly light the world. And

so my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country. With a good conscience as our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land that we love."

As the President appealed to that brave ally "loyalty" to defeat Communism, so let us remember only our great friend "Loyalty" will be able to rise up in total resistance to the insidious International Communist Conspiracy of which he spoke.

Americans are not as concerned today with Loyalty as we should be. Today a prairie fire of narcotics and pornography sweeps the country. Our communist enemies in the UN humiliate us. We have suffered 80,000 battle deaths since World War II without being told that we are in a war for survival against the international communist conspiracy. We raise up Marxist assassins who confide in the bullet and bomb as the final argument against fellow Americans. We coddle young criminals who have made school teaching a hazardous occupation. The "Communist Daily World", March 27, 1975 (page 2) news item: "Students to get credit for study of Marxism." For the first time in the history of the university of Minnesota, students get credit for courses in Marxism taught by Professor Erwin Marquit, who is state chairman of the Minnesota communist party and who was a candidate for governor of Minnesota in 1974 on the Communist party ticket. When we see a rattlesnake we can walk around him before he strikes. When we see a speeding automobile, we know not to get run over. We can avoid them. But our worst enemy is the hidden enemy, the Godless atheistic, communist philosophy which will destroy our youth, our will to survive—yes—and will destroy our loyalty to the great and noble American Nation. The sack that holds freedom is sewn with threads of the living and dead. It is only sewn by loyal Americans, no namby pamby fence straddlers ever sewed a thread but they do pull out threads. The land of the pilgrim's pride will not survive without Loyalty—Loyalty to America and the ideas and ideals that made us great.

Benjamin Franklin in 1787 was asked what kind of a government the Constitutional convention would give us. "A Republic if you can keep it."—Let's keep it. As we look to yesteryear we see how they kept it—by eternal vigilance. We see Loyalty summoned forth time and time again by our leaders. Today patriot leaders in the military have either been relieved of their commands or forced to retire. Today patriotic civilian leaders have been gunned down by Marxist assassins. So, let us vow to raise up loyal leaders from City Hall to the Court House to the State House to the White House and demand from every elected official that he or she promote loyalty to the American Nation, loyalty to our ancient heritage and remember, if America is saved again, it will be by you who saved her before. Let us stand with pride and salute Old Glory when the National Anthem is played, while chills run up and down our spine. Let us nurture Loyalty to America as the first and last hope for the freedom of mankind. I reiterate that it is a humbling experience to be the recipient of your kind and gracious invitation and to speak with such a distinguished group of American Patriots. "Thank you for saving America." Please join together in effective political action to save her again.

INSIDE THE MIDDLE EAST—III

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for my colleagues' attention the

third and final installment in the series "Inside the Middle East" by the K-Thorpes of Evanston, Ill., chronicling their trip to the Middle East with the Second Editorial Conference on the Middle East.

The article follows:

TWO VIEWS OF LEBANON

(By Jane K-Thorpe and Lee K-Thorpe)

We were walking in the shoes of the peacemaker a few weeks ago, catching glimpses of Henry Kissinger and his beautiful red, white and blue 707 in Cairo, Damascus and Israel. And, like Kissinger, we were talking peace.

Our dusty, camera-laden group—32-strong, all journalists and communicators from the U.S.—was attending an editorial conference on the Middle East convening in five countries of that troubled area. Judged important because of our media pipeline to the American people through our respective papers and networks, we were meeting with heads of state and national leaders in Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Israel.

We asked our key question everywhere: Is peace realistically possible in the Middle East? We asked in palaces and in taxicabs, in ministries and in refugee camps, in Suez, in the souks (markets), wherever we could find people who understood our language and were willing to stop and talk to us.

It seemed a short and simple little seven-word question, but the responses it drew, especially in "high places," were lengthy, convoluted and full of abstractions and conditional phrases. On one point, however, all were agreed: Everyone wanted peace. Every statesman in the Middle East described his country as peace-loving. Still, the louder the cries for peace, the more perfectly in unison they sounded, the stronger grew the counterpoint in our ears—strains of distrust and fear, from Arabs and Israelis alike, that no promise, no agreement, written or otherwise, can be absolutely trusted. Nothing, they seemed to feel, can realistically guarantee a lasting peace.

No head of state said those things to us in these words. They talked, instead, of peace as possible, but only "barely possible." The attitude we observed most often was one of "guarded optimism," a favorite phrase that gave us little comfort. Only a bit of hope—better, of course, than no hope at all.

Now, with the world's attention on shuttle diplomacy and step-by-step unilateral disengagements, the focus is moving to the problems of the more moderate Arab states in negotiating for peace without offending the radical, hard-line Arab countries and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Positions differ, political fortunes are on the line, and the problems and potential roadblocks, as everyone must know by now, are many.

For Israel the risks are probably the greatest, and opinion within the country is understandably most divided. Asked to give up territories of important military and economic value in return for pledges it tends to distrust, pressed for the rights of Palestinians (no one is clear on what, in effect, this means), its back is to the wall.

Our trip began in Lebanon, host country to most of the refugee Palestinians. Over 400,000 men, women and children are living by choice in primitive camps in and around Beirut and elsewhere in Lebanon.

The Palestinian refugees are, according to Dr. Charles Malik, a Lebanese statesman now teaching at Beirut's American University, "politically more powerful than any other group in the Arab world. They are armed better by far than the small Lebanese army, and they hold considerable wealth.

"Frankly," said Malik when asked how it is that Lebanon has been unable to control PLO terrorist activity, "Lebanon is simply not able to cope. We cannot control the

Palestinians and we would not if we could." Malik, who served some years ago as President of the 13th Session of the UN General Assembly and was a member of the UN Security Council, went on to say that "it would, indeed, be against the character of the Lebanese people to interfere.

"The Lebanese," he said, "are not fighters. We want to live in peace with the Palestinians, and we think of our country as offering a refuge for the persecuted, unwanted, kicked-out people of Palestine."

These attitudes, commendable as they seem on the surface, are frightening. They will surely prove to be stumbling blocks to peace when it is time for Secretary Kissinger to begin negotiations for peace in Lebanon. How can a nation which considers one of its major problems to be "working out a stable mode of existence for the Palestinians in our midst," which admits its unwillingness to censure (certainly a doubtful position from any moral point of view) and its inability to control a wealthy, well-armed, stronger "country within its country"—how can such a nation act independently at the peace table?

The Palestinians, who have come late, perhaps, to an appreciation of good public relations and the favorable influencing of public opinion, are determined not to become absorbed in the Lebanese community, refusing both Lebanese and UN housing, among other benefits, for reasons of strengthening political pressure and dramatizing their condition. Many have also refused employment and denied themselves available community services; health care, schools and other services.

On our second day in Beirut we visited a PLO refugee camp situated on a craggy hill near the center of the city. We were taken there by a young married couple from the United States, expatriates and passionate champions of the refugees. The couple were members of "Americans for Justice in the Middle East," which, we learned, is an organization founded at the end of the 1967 Arab-Israeli War for the purpose of balancing what it believed (and still believes) a bias in the American press against the Palestinians. More than half the members of the Beirut-based organization are in the United States.

Our eager volunteer guides (who had come to meet us at our hotel the evening before, less than an hour after our arrival in Lebanon) led us now past the crude stone huts of the Palestinians, excitedly talking to us both at once and introducing us in rapid Arabic to their friends in the camp. We tried to understand what we were being shown, to absorb the feelings and tensions all around us while holding on to every sight and smell and sound.

It was a windy day, and on Beirut's beaches high ocean breakers had been rolling in over the jetties all morning. The air was cold, too, and storm clouds were gathering over the refugee camp. Yet the women, young and old, and children, shivering, barefoot in their rubber thong sandals (dime store variety), crowded the doorways to have a look at us.

Black pipes ran along the stone paths, leaking cold streams of water, and inside the huts we could see small cooking fires burning here and there and pallets for sleeping or maybe sitting, but little furniture. Were these the wealthy Palestinians? Their wealth, obviously, is earmarked for other things—like arms. Not simple comforts.

A stone statue, the life-size figure of a guerrilla fighter in militant posture, dominated a fork in the stone path. Right arm outstretched, the figure held aloft a rifle.

No picture taking, we were told as we made our way uphill to the camp's clinic, a rude stone building not unlike the simple low huts all around us, only somewhat larger

and two stories high. Grandly named Haifa Hospital, it had been established in 1970 to provide emergency surgery services; to treat "certain illnesses;" to serve the paralyzed and permanently disabled, and to provide an outpatient clinic for those within the camp—all free.

The hospital serves between 25 and 50 patients "at all times," and is staffed by three doctors in general practice and three medical specialists, all volunteers living within the camp or in other camps. In addition, other physicians, not Palestinians, sometimes volunteer a few hours a week, we were told. And this is not strange, remembering that the majority of the Lebanese people are deeply sympathetic to the Palestinians and their state of homelessness.

"Profound sympathy," said Dr. Malik, "is felt by the Lebanese for the Palestinian cause—independent of the means they (the PLO) use. The word 'terrorist' is your term. Here they are called freedom fighters."

We looked in the doorway of a 10-bed ward, instantly interrupting conversations among the room's three or four patients and their visitors.

Back outside we resumed our climb along the stone walls, tripping over the water pipes, meeting the openly hostile gazes of the men, now, come out to see the foreigners. There were no smiles for American visitors here; we were representatives of Israel's support and strength, its big power friend, the United States.

Black-margin posters on the walls of the huts and on trees and fences reminded us, as they must daily remind the refugees, of the dead; pictured were the faces of young men killed in the raids, names and ages, dates and places of death noted below. Our guides translated the obituary posters' Arabic lettering for us.

Near the top of the hill we came to the camp's school, a two-room building heated by an oil stove, its efficiency lowered by cold gusts of wind blowing through the paneless windows. Twenty children attend classes here; they range in age from three to 10 years and they are taught by volunteer teachers, women and young girls, who live in the camp.

Little children of all complexions and coloring, the boys dressed in the thin, printed cotton pajamas that are their customary daytime clothing in all of the Arab countries, solemnly repeated the words of their teacher as she held up a green block, then a red block, then a yellow. They sat around an oval table, aware of our attention but unembarrassed by us, learning the names of the colors in that most difficult of languages, Arabic. When they are older they will learn to write; not the Arabic they speak, but the classical Arabic of the printed and written word, almost another language. Meanwhile, kindergarten projects decorate the classroom walls, as in schoolrooms everywhere.

Crayoned pictures of guns and bloody scenes of fighting, and rifles and pistols cut out of construction paper are on display. The teaching violence seems to be a part of education here, absorbed easily, no doubt, in this bitter place.

Education for the children is optional and free to the refugees. Many choose not to send their children to the camp's school, nor to the free schools of Lebanon which would receive them. Some go to work outside the camp, but for most of the children camp life is all they have ever known.

This column begins the first of a question and answer series based on questions people have asked concerning our recent trips to the Middle East. Our trip began in Lebanon.

(1) How do the people of Lebanon see their country in relation to the rest of the Middle East?

Lebanon believes it is the intellectual center of the Middle East. The free enterprise economy and bank secrecy policy have helped make it a commercial and banking center, and Lebanon is also noted for its universities and cultural life. The Lebanese feel that their pluralistic and educated population of about half Moslems and half Christians helps to make Lebanon a country of moderate viewpoints, encouraged to develop in a climate of freedom of thought strongly influenced by the West as well as the East. By contrast, the Lebanese feel that the Syrians are "difficult" and "warlike," as most of the people in other Arab countries we spoke to told us. Lebanon feels particularly threatened by Syria militarily. The most serious problems facing Lebanon are the Palestinian refugees living in their country since their presence acts as a potential for war between themselves, the other Arab nations and Israel. Besides making Lebanon insecure militarily, the Palestinian refugees' presence has prevented Lebanon from dealing with its own problems, such as social and economic inequality and political corruption. Although they believe other Arab nations have difficult problems, the Lebanese feel they are able to deal with theirs more effectively.

(2) How strong a group are the Palestinian refugees within Lebanon?

According to Charles Malik, a Lebanese statesman and former president of the United Nations, the Palestinians are "politically more powerful than any Arab country." There are about 400,000 Palestinian refugees in Lebanon who maintain a strong and well-equipped army, whereas the Lebanese army is small and weak. Malik states, "The Palestinians in Lebanon are very wealthy," yet we noted that they use their resources to increase their military strength rather than deal with the urgent social needs of their fellow Palestinians. They are in effect a country within a country in Lebanon, and they govern themselves according to their own laws. Another Lebanese statesman pointed out that the Palestinian refugees are probably not as strong militarily or financially as is claimed but that their inflated political strength has given rise to strong fears in the Middle East and these fears are used by the Arab governments as a threat to the West.

(3) How do the Lebanese feel about the Palestinians living in their country?

The Lebanese think of their country as a refuge for persecuted peoples and they feel a great deal of sympathy for the Palestinians; yet they do not want them to live in Lebanon. The average Lebanese citizens we spoke to said that the Palestinians' presence in most of the south of Lebanon is not an "occupation" of their country. The Lebanese villages are not endangered by the Palestinians but only by the terrorists among them. A fragile agreement has been reached between the Lebanese and their "guests," as they call the refugees. But there is also a great deal of friction and insecurity caused by their presence.

(4) Do the Lebanese want the Palestinian refugees to leave Lebanon?

Some of the Lebanese would accept the Palestinians and help them become part of their society, especially those who have settled and found jobs. The majority of the Lebanese people we spoke with, including both statesmen and private citizens, feel that the refugees should return to Israel, or possibly a state in the West Bank. Most of these Lebanese share the PLO's vision of Israel as a secular, democratic state, as they claim theirs to be. The Lebanese feel that the Palestinian refugees' problem is an area concern and not only Lebanon's. They feel Israel should bear a larger burden than the other Arab countries and that Lebanon has done

its part. As one of our tour guides put it, "We are not ready to battle." But it was also stated that Lebanon militarily is not able to expel the Palestinians from its land, and so the Palestinian "guests" remain.

(5) How important is the problem of the Palestinian refugees to peace in the Middle East?

The statesmen and leaders with whom we spoke in Lebanon were unanimous in stressing the importance of the problem of the refugees. Gassan Toueni, editor of An Nahar, a leading Middle East newspaper, and Charles Malik were particularly insistent that Israel and the U.S. should negotiate directly with Yassir Arafat, the PLO leader, whom the Lebanese regard as the spokesman for the Palestinians. They claim he is a moderate in relationship to potential leaders who are reckless and foolish. Some go as far as to say that once the problem of the refugees is solved, the wider problems of the Middle East will also disappear. Almost all of those we spoke with felt that speaking with the PLO is essential to peace. However, when we asked Malik why Israel should meet with the PLO as a political entity if Arafat will not recognize Israel, the lack of an answer revealed a double standard. The PLO's terrorist tactics are considered understandable in order to call attention to a situation, and Toueni compared the Palestinian struggle to that of the Jews fighting for Israeli independence from the British in the 1940's. Although the Lebanese feel that dealing with Arafat is necessary to peace, they give no assurances. Everywhere we went we asked, "If Israel met with the PLO, returned to the pre-1967 borders, gave up the requested territory and allowed Jerusalem to be internationalized, would Israel be recognized as a sovereign state and would non-belligerency resolutions be agreed upon?" The response was, "We could discuss it after Israel complied," and that recognition of Israel is not "obligatory."

(6) How would the Lebanese leaders feel toward Israel even if Israel complies?

There is deep and strong hostility toward Israel on the part of the Lebanese leaders. While they separate Jews and Zionists in theory, in practice they consider all Israelis "imperialistic Zionists," and the U.S. is also considered imperialistic for supporting Israel. A feeling has developed that without Israel, the Arab nations' other problems would also vanish. Lebanese Prime Minister Rashid el-Solh stated that Israel is a threat to peace which can only be ended by converting Israel into a secular state. Lebanese leaders also indicated that Israel represents a threat to Lebanon's position as the intellectual and commercial center of the Middle East, and they feel that an influx of Palestinian Arabs into Israel would help to preserve a balance between the two countries. In spite of their hostility, the Lebanese we spoke with also felt that they have more in common with the Israelis than any other Arabs because of their intellectual level and cultural background. The PLO speech writer, Dr. Nahil Shaath, educated in the U.S., feels that the Jews and Palestinians are particularly alike, both being persecuted, intelligent and industrious peoples. Some Lebanese leaders speaking to us privately told us they had Israeli friends, particularly among the university professors of both countries and as a result of writing and travelling. But they refused to speak of this publicly, not wanting to "rock the boat."

(7) How does the Lebanese "man on the street" feel toward Israel?

The average citizens feel the military threat of Israel but are less adamant than their leaders in their hatred of Israel. They are sympathetic to the Palestinian refugees' cause but many are also sympathetic to Israel's situation, although they are afraid to speak out for this viewpoint. Most of the people we spoke with want peace more than anything else, and stated that they would

support any political agreement with Israel, the U.S., or other nations toward that end. The private citizens of Lebanon and other Arab countries are surprisingly uncommitted to the official positions of their leaders, partly because many do not read the newspapers. They use the name "Israel" instead of "Palestine," unlike their leaders. They are often vague and uncertain as to how to achieve peace, but they feel that their country needs peace. They view the Palestinian refugees as a people rather than a political entity, unlike their leaders, who view them as a force for achieving the Arab goal, but they also feel threatened by the PLO militarily.

(8) What solutions do the Lebanese offer for the Arab-Israeli conflict?

As one leader said, "There is no rabbit to pull out of a hat," and in fact no proposals we heard would allow Israel to remain a sovereign Jewish state. The PLO leader Shaath called for a secular state in Israel with both Arabs and Jews. When asked what would happen if the populations became unbalanced, he stated that the Jews could survive in a predominantly Muslim state as they do in the U.S. despite a non-Jewish majority and some discrimination against Jews. Once the "Zionists" are expelled, he feels, the "Palestinians can live with their Jewish cousins in harmony." Malik stated the PLO goal similarly: "... for present day Israel, plus the West Bank, plus Jerusalem, plus the Gaza Strip, to form one democratic secular state based on equal rights for all to which the Palestinians would be permitted to return." Malik did not consider the possibility of Israel as a Jewish state specifically. Among average citizens we spoke with some also mentioned the possibility of a separate Palestinian state in the West Bank or elsewhere, but the PLO and Lebanese leaders we spoke with did not mention this possibility. It could be that all there is in common between the Israelis' and Arabs' objectives at this point is that everyone deeply desires peace. But there would be a better chance for peace if more innovative solutions would be conscientiously considered.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6860

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer several amendments to H.R. 6860, the proposed Energy Conservation and Conversion Act, when it is considered by the House. The text of these amendments appeared in the Extensions of Remarks of the May 19 RECORD.

One of these amendments, which would repeal percentage depletion for those who receive royalty income from oil and gas properties, was misprinted. For the reference of my colleagues, I am inserting the text of the correct version of this amendment.

The text follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6860

By Mr. GIBBONS:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

SEC. —. REPEAL OF PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ON OIL AND GAS ROYALTY INCOME.

(a) Subsection (d) of section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to persons entitled to percentage depletion on 2,000 barrels of oil per day) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Royalty income excluded.—Subsection (c) shall not apply to income derived

from a nonoperating mineral interest as defined in section 614. In applying such definition for purposes of this paragraph, the taxpayer's share of the costs of production of the oil or gas shall be treated as zero if his percentage share of such costs is substantially less than his percentage share of the production."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to income received on and after the date of enactment of this Act.

WHY AMERICA IS BECOMING AN ARMED CAMP

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted, I insert the enclosed article from TV Guide magazine:

NEWS WATCH: WHY AMERICA IS BECOMING AN ARMED CAMP

(By Patrick Buchanan)

The recent hour-long NBC documentary "A Shooting Gallery Called America?" is a simplistic, emotional, singledimensional *cri de coeur* against the handgun in America society. As one critic put it, it uses "every cinematic trick in the book." As gun-control propaganda, it was powerful stuff. As a substantive explanation of a complex phenomenon, it was a failure.

We saw and heard more pistols fired in that one hour than in a lifetime of Clint Eastwood police films. We saw gripping scenes of parents whose adopted child was killed in a gun accident. We saw a police officer break down in tears over the loss of relatives and comrades to handguns. We saw graphic footage of police shootouts, and bank robberies in progress. We saw bodies in the morgue still oozing blood from bullet wounds. We saw one old codger talking in animated and cheerful anticipation of filling the belly of some future assailant full of lead.

We saw and heard two of the most callous thugs ever interviewed on national television testifying clinically to their utter indifference killing during the daily routine of their criminal careers. But the thugs were stronger arguments for rewiring the electric chair than for new controls on guns. Indeed, the satanic brutality they exhibited was itself a powerful advertisement for guns to protect honest citizens.

NBC's statistics were impressive: 40 million handguns out there in Middle America; two and a half million added to the armory yearly; a handgun death every hour.

But what NBC failed to explore with sympathy or understanding is why.

Those millions of handgun purchases each year represent millions of votes of no confidence by the American people in the criminal justice system of the United States. They are more an effect than a cause of crime. The massive inventory of private weapons is a mountain of testimony to government's utter failure to protect the life, home and property of the average citizen.

An there are more reasons than simply affection for firearms why Americans oppose gun controls. One of them is the source of the proposals. Invariably, they are advanced as the solution to the crime crisis by people who seem to oppose every other proposed solution. It is the armed criminal, not the armed citizen, whom this country fears. Yet, whenever it is proposed that automatic added sentences be applied to any criminal using a weapon during his felony, or an automatic death sentence be imposed upon any individual who kills during the course of a felony, the vanguard of the gun-control

lobby suddenly asks to be excused. To millions of Americans, gun control is the respectable, but ineffectual, "law and order" position of the liberal elite.

Would gun controls reduce crime? Certainly, limited controls, like banning the so-called "Saturday Night Special," would do little but raise the price of quality firearms available by the millions. A price rise is not going to deter a criminal, to whom the price of his weapon is a cost of doing business. And a few extra dollars is not going to deter a citizen who thinks he is buying protection of himself and his family.

What about confiscation of handguns, with a criminal penalty attached to ownership? Would that reduce crime, or would it, like Prohibition, make lawbreakers out of millions who would prefer to keep their weapons illegally in today's climate than to give up the protection they believe they have? In this observer's judgment, there is a measure of truth in the bumper stickers that read "if guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns."

Certainly, confiscation of handguns would have little effect upon the 10,000 persons who use them to commit suicide each year. They could buy a rifle or a bottle of pills. What of the 1600 gun accidents? Many of these are hunting accidents, with rifles. And is it right for government to confiscate the weapons of tens of millions because a few hundred are so careless with them each year as to take their own lives?

What of the statistic that shows the likelihood at six-to-one that the individual shot with your handgun will be an acquaintance or family member? Well, most Americans are already instinctively aware of that statistic. Which is why they do not have guns in their homes. But what is happening in society is that the fear of the rapist, the armed robber and the juvenile terrorist is rapidly overcoming the apprehension of Americans about having a gun in their homes or offices. And one is hard put to blame them.

NBC is guilty of a common political sin. It has dealt with the symptoms of a national problem, rather than the cause. The cause of the "gun problem" is fear, that same fear of crime that has produced a boom market in the sale of watchdogs, burglar alarms, triple locks and long guns. Until this society begins to deal with the crime crisis in earnest, America will remain an armed camp, no matter the disarmament decrees handed down by Congress. It is said that in New York City, where the gun laws are the most stringent, there are something like a million weapons in private hands.

Since gun-control legislation is a burning issue in this Congress, and NBC has taken—even if it refused to declare—a point of view, the right of rebuttal would seem to have been created, under the Fairness Doctrine, by this documentary.

Here in this Nation's capital, which was, until not too long ago, known as the "crime capital of the world," one is hard put to say to some store owner, who may have been beaten and robbed half a dozen times, that he has no right to a weapon to give himself the protection the police and government are no longer able to provide.

One may walk away from this documentary, produced by Lucy Jarvis and narrated by Carl Stern, with the impression that all these gun purchases represent a sort of gun lunacy in America. But that is not the case.

The explosion in gun sales represents the very rational decisions of very rational but frightened Americans who have concluded, with justification, that their government cannot protect them, and, therefore, they had best provide for their own protection.

The sentiment is widespread. Indeed, one recalls that not too long ago, here in the capital of the West, the Chief Justice of the United States was awakened late one night

by reporters banging at his door, and he greeted them in pajamas, with pistol in hand. They claim today the revolver was a toy. Perhaps—but pistol in hand is exactly the way Judge Roy Bean would have greeted a similar late-night caller in the more secure Wild West days years ago.

NUCLEAR ENERGY OVERSIGHT HEARINGS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1975

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the jurisdictional rules of the House of Representatives give the special oversight function of "reviewing and studying, on a continuing basis, all laws, programs, and Government activities dealing with—nonmilitary nuclear energy and research and development including the disposal of nuclear waste"; and this function has been assigned by the committee to its Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment, which I chair.

Members of the subcommittee have unanimously decided to give this new responsibility the highest priority. We have begun our work with an intensive series of hearings covering 4 days during the last week in April. In these hearings we tried to cover the entire range of problems associated with the development of nuclear power reactors, to set forth in laymen's terms the long-range and short-term risks and benefits, and to pinpoint the areas of greatest concern.

Dr. Brian O'Leary of the subcommittee staff has prepared a summary of our first hearings. The summary follows:

SUMMARY OF NUCLEAR ENERGY HEARINGS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The hearings started with Nuclear Regulatory Commission Chairman *William Anders* who reviewed the mission and organization of the newly-established N.R.C., the nuclear power plant licensing process and the approach the N.R.C. is taking to regulatory questions. Under hard questioning by Subcommittee members, *Anders* did acknowledge that some issues are not yet resolved in all areas and expressed concern over the nuclear-waste disposal problem. Nevertheless, he felt that the major safety and safeguard problems were sufficiently answered and that plants should continue to be built.

Consumer advocate *Ralph Nader* reiterated his reasons for being opposed to an increased reliance on nuclear power: a pattern of AEC suppression of some of its safety reports (one report stated that a major reactor accident could result in as many as 45,000 deaths), flaws and neglects in the Rasmussen report on reactor safety, and the lack of a long-range plan to dispose of nuclear waste. *Nader* recommended energy conservation and increased use of solar energy and other alternatives. He suggested that Congress should stop issuing new construction licenses for nuclear power plants, decide whether plutonium should be rejected, stop funding the breeder reactor, and repeal the Price-Anderson Act. In the question period, Chairman Udall asked, "Feeling as strongly as you do . . . why don't you push for closing down existing nuclear plants?" *Nader* replied this would be his preference

if he thought it politically possible. *Nader* said he would provide the Subcommittee documentation supporting his charges.

In the afternoon of April 28, Senator *Mike Gravel* testified that the anti-nuclear movement was the "most significant developing political force in the nation today", noting that 500,000 persons have signed a nuclear safeguards initiative which would put it on the ballot. It calls for a phase-out of nuclear plants if certain problems are not resolved and full nuclear liability insurance provided.

Roger LaGassie, ERDA's Assistant Administrator for Planning and Analysis, discussed that agency's forecast of electrical energy growth. Even in the low growth scenario (about 5.8% per year) the use of electricity would be three times as large in the year 2000 as today. The nominal estimate was 7% per year based on recent history.

Robert I. Smith, President of Public Service Electric and Gas Company and speaking on behalf of the Edison Electric Institute, projected a 6% per year electrical growth rate and argued that nuclear power would be considerably less expensive than fossil fuels because of low nuclear fuel costs. When questioned by Chairman Udall on government subsidies for the nuclear industry, in particular the Price-Anderson Act, *Smith* felt that utilities would be willing to take on the insurance responsibilities themselves if Price-Anderson were repealed.

The last witness of the first day was *Daniel Ford*, Executive Director of the Union of Concerned Scientists, who testified that safety requirements and lower-than-expected capacity factors for nuclear power plants have tipped the economic balance in favor of fossil fuel plants—even in the wake of increased oil and coal prices.

APRIL 29

The first witness on April 29 was Dr. *Norman Rasmussen*, director of the recent AEC-funded reactor safety study. He defended the accuracy of his report and argued for the report's conclusion that the frequency and consequences of major light water reactor accidents are "very small compared to the other risks which society accepts."

The next witness, Dr. *Henry Kendall* of the Union of Concerned Scientists, took issue with this conclusion and called for "convincing evidence of full resolution" or reactor safety issues as a prerequisite for public acceptance. He noted that emergency core-cooling systems (ECCS) have never been tested experimentally under the expected conditions of operations. Adequate simulations of and confidence in the effectiveness of cooling accidents are minimal. *Kendall* cited the recent American Physical Society study and other studies which show a greater number of cancer cases resulting from a major accident than that calculated by *Rasmussen*. A debate between the witnesses ensued under questioning.

The final witness that morning was Dr. *Herbert J. C. Kouts*, Director of Safety for N.R.C. He said that a substantial safety research program for ECCS accidents does exist and the first experimental tests will begin later this year. Even so, he said that it would be difficult to calculate absolute accident probabilities.

That afternoon, Representative *Fred Richmond* (D-N.Y.) condemned the recent shipment of plutonium through New York City and the abundant risks in flying and driving such a toxic material through high population areas. He questioned the viability of nuclear power and recommended that there be an immediate five year moratorium on nuclear construction.

Dr. *James L. Liverman*, ERDA's Assistant Administrator for Environment and Safety, testified on the waste disposal problem. Under active consideration is permanent disposal of high level solid wastes in salt formations—

perhaps in eastern New Mexico—which would not have the same water contamination problems that the formerly proposed Lyons, Kansas site would have had. The Federal Government has assumed responsibility for this problem and will replace its WASH-1529 environmental statement with another draft available in 1976. If approved, a pilot retrievable storage facility will be constructed in a salt deposit in the hope that it will become an operating permanent site around 1990. Dr. Livermore also explained that the near-term above ground waste storage tanks at Hanford, Washington have been redesigned to prevent leaks.

Professor David Rose of MIT testified on new initiatives in nuclear waste disposal while acknowledging that the hazards of the wastes and their long time horizon present serious social problems which must be solved. Dr. Rose summarized the characteristics of materials involved and possible solutions. Of particular interest would be recycling plutonium and other long-lived high level radioactive materials through reactors, thus turning a 500,000-year problem into a 500-year problem.

Robert Thorne, ERDA's Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Nuclear Energy, testified on the liquid metal fast breeder reactor (LMFBR) development program. He defended ERDA's view that this option "offers the nation a well-advanced technology which when fully commercialized will be a safe, clean, reliable and economical electric power generation system" and that its advantages far outweigh its disadvantages. The total LMFBR R&D costs are estimated \$10.6 billion with almost \$500 million requested for fiscal year 1976. Thorne argued that limited supplies of uranium and large electrical growth projections make LMFBR development ERDA's top energy priority.

Dr. Thomas Cochran, staff scientist at the National Resources Defense Council, condemned the LMFBR program because it was premature, expensive, the wrong energy priority (versus solar energy and other options), and it would add to safety and safeguard problems of nuclear materials. He argued that the LMFBR would not be commercially competitive until about 2020—when other new alternatives would also be ready.

Dr. Hans Bethe, on the other hand, argued that the energy problem of the U.S. and all the Western World could not be solved without "full use" of the nuclear option. Present estimates of limited uranium resources and the increase in the number of light water reactors could use up most of our nuclear fuel by early in the 21st century. Bethe urged study of breeders which would extend the uranium supply one-hundredfold or more. He noted large discrepancies in cost estimates for breeders and discussed safety advantages and disadvantages of the LMFBR. He felt that the nuclear explosion potential of the breeder was minor and "easy to contain" in the reactor vessel. He suggested that a joint effort with Canada in developing an advanced CANDU reactor would present a lower cost alternative to the LMFBR.

That afternoon, Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky testified on peaceful nuclear explosion (PNE's). He noted that PNE's provide no economic advantages over conventional explosives in all commercial applications explored. Moreover, the safety problems could be very severe. The difficulty is, some countries are interested in PNE's for prestige value and for potential military use. The non-proliferation treaty does not obligate us to share PNE opportunities with other countries, but it would be difficult to design a comprehensive nuclear test ban that does not also prohibit PNE's outright because of their value in verifying military tests. Panofsky urged critical scrutiny of the export of PNE's.

Dr. Anne Cahn discussed the implications of the planned introduction of nuclear reactors into the Persian Gulf and Middle East.

Her basic thesis was that "the United States could and should be doing more to structure the incentive systems so that non-nuclear weapon states choose not to pursue nuclear weapons options". Of particular concern is the introduction of nuclear enrichment and reprocessing facilities to other countries. She urged that Congress prohibit any agreement for cooperation between the United States and Iran that did not deal with reprocessing in a regional or international framework.

Mason Willrich of the University of Virginia Law School noted that the number of countries with operable nuclear power reactors will double to 30 by 1980. He urged collocation of enrichment, fuel fabrication and chemical reprocessing plants under multinational or U.S. management for reasons of economy and safeguards. Exports of American nuclear materials should be subject to safeguards no less stringent than those in the U.S.

Commissioner Victor Gilinsky of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission described stringent new standards safeguarding 19 facilities licensed for the possession of over four pounds of plutonium or eleven pounds of highly enriched uranium.

J. G. Speth of the National Resources Defense Council opposed a plutonium recycle economy on grounds of safeguards and safety. His arguments were based on past experience, resistance to these pressures by the nuclear industry and the general difficulty of achieving both standards at once. As plutonium recycle was economically marginal anyway, Speth concluded that the use of plutonium fuel was a technology that was "too risky and too demanding" to be pursued.

Dr. Theodore Taylor discussed ways in which plutonium and highly enriched uranium could be safeguarded against theft—highly-guarded barriers, co-location of fuel fabrication and reprocessing plants, special shipment techniques, and the spiking of these fissionable materials with intensive gamma ray-emitting materials which would make theft highly risky. Taylor argued that a rather massive safeguard system would cost less than one per cent of the cost of generating electricity but was concerned about whether such high standards would be politically possible. He disagreed with Speth that these safeguards would be tantamount to creating a garrison atmosphere.

A. E. Schubert, President of Allied General Nuclear Services which is building the Barnwell, S.C. nuclear reprocessing plant scheduled to begin operating next year, urged the rapid development of reprocessing technology, because: (1) spent fuel piling up in storage pools threaten to close down many existing nuclear power plants and need a place to go (Barnwell is the only place); (2) the Barnwell facility could provide the reprocessing industry the experience it needs to enter a plutonium economy; and (3) reprocessed plutonium and highly enriched uranium promise virtually unlimited fuel for electrical power generation. Schubert argued that government indecisions and changes in regulations have severely interfered with bringing the Barnwell plant on-line.

Dr. Marvin Resnikoff of the Sierra Club questioned the cost-effectiveness of reprocessing unless the price of uranium goes up considerably. Government subsidies tend to mask some of the costs of reprocessing. He also argued that experience has shown very high levels of radioactive release from the Nuclear Fuels Services reprocessing plant (now closed) and felt that the newer technology of the Barnwell facility would not make much difference.

Dr. William Rove of EPA testified on plutonium toxicity at expected levels of release. Plutonium, he said, has induced cancers in laboratory animals but has not yet been identified in humans—even near the upper limit of the current range—although induction periods might be long.

THE "MAYAGUEZ" INCIDENT AND THE CONSTITUTION

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, a number of serious constitutional questions have been raised by the President's use of military force in recapturing the *Mayaguez* and its crew several weeks ago. The distinguished constitutional scholar, Raoul Berger, Charles Warren senior fellow in American legal history at Harvard Law School, analyzes the most significant of those questions in an incisive article published in the New York Times of May 23, 1975.

Professor Berger challenges the President's assertion that he was exercising his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief in ordering military action against Cambodia. He points out that historical precedent reveals no inherent presidential power to undertake hostilities for the protection of Americans abroad. The President, Berger asserts, must be held strictly accountable to the provisions of the War Powers Act which require that he consult, not merely inform, the Congress before taking military action.

Professor Berger's brilliant analysis hints at the more fundamental question of whether the War Powers Act constitutes a further surrender of Congress' constitutional warmaking powers to the Executive, rather than a reaffirmation of those powers as originally claimed by its proponents. In light of the *Mayaguez* incident, Congress will have to take a long and hard look at the meaning and effectiveness of the War Powers Act in the months ahead.

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1975]

THE MAYAGUEZ INCIDENT AND THE CONSTITUTION

(By Raoul Berger)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Once more Congress has abdicated its constitutional responsibility, carried away by a wave of "rally round the flag" fever. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee hastened to set its seal on the President's "exercise of his constitutional powers" in sinking Cambodian patrol boats in order to regain the captured merchant vessel *Mayaguez*.

What powers? President Ford invoked his "constitutional executive power and his authority as Commander in Chief." His counsel, Roderick Hills, explained that Mr. Ford "acted under his constitutional war powers to protect the lives and property of Americans."

We are not, of course, at war with Cambodia, so that resort to the "war powers" is far-fetched; and those powers were by design very limited.

As to "protection" of Americans abroad, President James Buchanan recognized in 1859 that the power to afford such protection resides in Congress. He advised Congress, "I deem it my duty to recommend the passage of a law authorizing the President to employ the naval forces for the purpose of protecting the lives and property of American citizens passing in transit across the Panama routes."

The Act of July 27, 1868, directs the President, when citizen is unjustly deprived of his liberty by a foreign country, "to use such means, not amounting to acts of war, to ob-

tain the release, and promptly to report to Congress."

Suppose that the patrol boats that the United States sunk, instead of belonging to Pnyng Cambodia, had been those of the Soviet Union. Is it for the President alone to make the fateful judgment that may plunge us into war? Such situations call for the "collective judgment" of President and Congress, as the War Powers Resolution of 1973 requires.

That requirement is not satisfied by merely "informing" selected members of Congress of the forthcoming hostilities, but by genuine "consultation" before a decision is made, as is stated in the conference committee report on the resolution.

By his invocation of the "constitutional executive power" and that of "Commander in Chief," Mr. Ford apparently signals that he does not consider his "constitutional" powers to be limited by the resolution, a view that seems to be shared by the Senate committee. Of course, if the President possesses the "constitutional powers" to which he lays claim, they cannot be limited by Congress, and the President is free to sink us into yet another Vietnam quagmire.

It is idle to look to the words "executive power" for war-making authority, for the powers comprehended therein were painstakingly enumerated by the Framers of the Constitution. In that enumeration the sole grant of "war power" is contained in the words "Commander in Chief," a limited grant.

Because opponents of the Constitution raised the specter of "detested" monarchical power, Alexander Hamilton downgraded the grant, explaining that the words "Commander in Chief" merely made the President "first General."

Louis Henkin, professor of constitutional law at Columbia University, has justly observed that generals "even when they are 'first' do not determine the political purposes for which troops are to be used; they command them in the execution of policy made by others"—by the Congress, as the Founders made abundantly clear.

The power to "declare war," meaning, as Justice Joseph Story stated, the "power to make and carry on war," was lodged in Congress exclusively. The purpose, James Wilson explained to the Pennsylvania ratification convention, was to guard against being "hurried" into war, so that no "single man [can] . . . involve us in such distress." It was designed, said James Madison, to hobble the "executive propensity to war." In addition to "commanding" troops in a war so "declared," the President is authorized to repel an invasion, and by the terms of the War Powers Resolution an attack upon the armed forces. Manifestly, the bombing of the Cambodian patrol boats falls in none of these categories.

Does the President have an "inherent right," as his counsel Mr. Hills postulates, to undertake hostilities for the "protection" of American citizens and property? President Buchanan did not think so. The constitutional records disclose that the Founders jealously insisted on a Federal Government of enumerated, strictly limited powers.

Defending the Constitution in the Virginia ratification convention, Gov. Edmund Randolph said that the powers of the Government "are enumerated," that it "has no power but what is expressly given it." In the same convention, it was stated that the "legality of any power" is to be tested by the question, "Is it enumerated in the Constitution." Such citations can be multiplied, and they are reinforced by the pervasive Colonial distrust of executive power. To conjure up an "inherent" executive power in the teeth of the Farmers' studied efforts to limit it is to charge them with leaving the barn door wide open.

When the claim to "inherent power" was made in support of President Harry S. Tru-

man's seizure of the steel mills to prevent a strike during the Korean war, it was emphatically rejected by Justice Robert H. Jackson.

In what is considered his finest opinion, Mr. Jackson stated that the Framers "made no provision for exercise of extraordinary authority because of a crisis." Emergency powers, he said, "are consistent with free government only when their control is lodged elsewhere than in the executive who exercises them"—that is, in Congress. Claims of "inherent power" are a euphemism for stepping out of bounds, for exercise of a power that was not conferred. Such claims, particularly when they assert power exclusively lodged in Congress, endanger our democratic system.

The paramount harm that flows from this fresh Cambodian adventure is the disruption of the constitutional allocation of powers, the invasion of powers confided exclusively to Congress. Approval by individual members cannot make such invasion constitutional. The Supreme Court has declared: "One branch of government cannot encroach on the domain of another without danger. The safety of our institutions depends in no small degree on strict observance of this salutary rule."

Richard M. Nixon has taught us anew that power grows by what it feeds on, and that to condone unauthorized expansion is to undermine the foundations of our democratic society.

It is a reproach to Congress that, having just shaken us loose from a disastrous war, sustained in no small part by Congressional acquiescence—it is once more ready to approve a Presidential exercise of its own power. Thereby it gives its sanction to yet another dismal "precedent" that future Presidents will not be slow to invoke against Congress.

A LOOK AT GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., OF CALIFORNIA

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the Washington Post carried an interesting and informative feature story on the new administration in Sacramento, Calif. While I have an advantage of knowing about many of the items that David Broder described in this article, I know my colleagues have not had as much an opportunity to observe these developments. Because I believe what is happening in California has national significance, and lessons for all levels of government, I would like to share this article, entitled "Governor Brown: An 'Honest Approach,'" with my colleagues.

I must admit that I have been pleased with the developments in California since we have changed administrations, but I do not believe my attitudes merely reflect my partisan interests. Governor Brown is truly trying new approaches to serve the people. At this time I insert the article from the May 31 issue of the Washington Post in the RECORD:

GOVERNOR BROWN: AN "HONEST APPROACH"
(By David S. Broder)

SACRAMENTO.—A strange, cryptic press release came out of Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr.'s office on May 7, announcing that he had just vetoed a bill to delete the legal requirement

that the formal name of a garbage and refuse disposal district must contain the words "garbage and refuse disposal district."

The veto message said: "The present law accurately states the case. I see no compelling reason to sanction yet another governmental euphemism. Accordingly, I am returning the bill unsigned."

Jerry Brown's five-month-old administration wants to be known as one which calls a garbage dump a garbage dump, and not a sanitary landfill. And that is one of several reasons why it may be called America's first post-Vietnam government.

The 37-year-old Brown and the intellectually precocious men and women with whom he has surrounded himself see themselves as members of a new generation.

A year ago, Brown told this reporter that the main difference between him and his Republican opponent, Houston I. Flournoy, was that "he is a politician of the '60s and I am a politician of the '70s. He started politics with Camelot, and I came to politics out of the Great Society, the Vietnam war and Watergate." Brown and his colleagues have reacted to the atrocities of the previous political generation, including those perpetrated against the language by government.

The Great Society gave America such inflated slogans as the "war on poverty" and "model cities." Vietnam was the place where warfare was called "pacification" and assassination was disguised as "termination with extreme prejudice." The scandal-stained Nixon government was, of course, a "law-and-order administration."

So Brown says "the central principle that guides me is an attempt to restore confidence in government, and that means taking the most honest approach possible. That sounds trite, but there's a lot of sloppy thinking in government, even where there isn't deliberate deception. The most certain way to restore confidence is to insist on a relentless honesty in every step. That is more important to me than any program."

Although Brown disdains euphemism, his own statement is a euphemistic elaboration of the "No More B—S—" slogan used by Norman Maller and Jimmy Breslin in their semi-serious New York City campaign in 1969 and by Fred Harris in his abortive 1972 try for the Democratic presidential nomination.

The difference, of course, is that Maller and Breslin and Harris never had to govern under that restriction, and Brown is stuck with running the biggest state in the union, a government whose budget dwarfs most of the nations of the world.

But he is not alone in his approach. In the post-Watergate election of 1974, any number of candidates ran on the platform of "relentless honesty," voluntarily making public their personal income tax returns, as Brown has done, and demonstrating their disdain for the perquisites of office.

In Massachusetts, newly elected Gov. Michael Dukakis ignores his official limousine and rides the trolley back and forth from home to office. In Maine, newly elected Gov. James B. Longley rejects \$11,000 of his \$31,000 salary, and stops his car in a snowstorm to help a motorist change a tire.

But none has outdone Brown, a former Jesuit seminarian, in wearing the hair shirt. Since taking office in January, he has cut back the salaries and the size of his personal staff, refused all gifts, sold the executive jet he inherited from Ronald Reagan, turned in his limousine for a 1974 Plymouth and turned down the executive mansion being built to Reagan's design, in favor of a starkly furnished little apartment across the street from the Capitol.

However sincere these gestures, they have an inevitable tinge of public-relations gimmickry. As one fellow-official here said of Brown, "He's a single guy with a \$50,000 salary. He's not hurting."

The more interesting question is whether

"relentless honesty" as a principle of government translates into anything different from what has gone before.

At this early stage of the Brown administration, the answer is: clearly yes, it is different in method and manner, and perhaps, but not certainly, in substance and policy as well.

The most striking and controversial characteristic of the new governor is his inquisitor-general style. A man with little of the personal charm or gift for small talk of his father, who was governor from 1949 through 1966, Jerry Brown looks at every piece of government business like Ralph Nader inspecting a used Corvair.

He is skeptical of anything brought him by his own staff. As Donald E. Burns, a Yale law school classmate recruited from Washington, D.C., to head the business and transportation agency says, "He hates to be told, 'Jerry, just sign this. It's routine.' To have him do that is a mark of favor, a grant."

Anecdotes flourish about his desire to put his personal stamp on every piece of business that passes through his office. A Democratic Party official who arrived with a routine statement for the governor to issue on behalf of a candidate in a special legislative election was astonished to be called in by Brown for an intensive grilling on the candidate's views and qualifications—at the end of which Brown turned to his typewriter and rewrote the endorsement in his own words.

The scrutiny has been even more intense when proposals have come from outside his own circle. Unlike Reagan, who liked to delegate the detail work and to keep a comfortable schedule of office hours, Brown is a workaholic who seems to get a second wind about 9 p.m.

Often, the result of that scrutiny is scathing criticism or even scrapping of programs it was assumed that Brown would support.

Dissatisfied with the evidence presented by scientists in 35 hours of hearings in his office on the effects of an automobile anti-pollution device, the governor ordered new field tests made. When they showed only marginal impact, far short of the original promise, he reversed his campaign posture and killed the program.

A similar fate may befall the \$100-million annual federally financed law enforcement assistance program in California, which Brown is now threatening to end.

Gary Davis, the governor's 32-year-old executive assistant, says that program is in trouble because "it's a perfect example of the way the government keeps shifting its justifications in order to keep a program going, just the same as in Vietnam."

Davis picks up a copy of the original Great Society legislation and says: "Read the first five words: 'To reduce and prevent crime . . .' Now, that's what we said it was for. Now, \$190 million later, we've got half-way houses and treatment centers and helicopters and computers and planning and evaluation. And more crime than we had when we began. Hell, last year we spent \$5 million to evaluate local grant applications and we rejected one of 500. That's make-work. And what Jerry's saying is that if the government isn't going to do what it says it's going to do with the money, it ought to be honest with people and let them decide if they want to finance marginal projects of police departments."

Brown himself has administered the same shock treatment to education in the state, showing up, well-briefed, at both committee sessions and regular meetings of the governing boards of the state's vast college and university systems, on which he is an ex officio member, and raising detailed, time-consuming and often critical questions about budgets, programs and results.

He told University of California officials they were using a "squid process" to cloak their objectives in academic gobbledegook and startled college trustees by asking, "Why

in the world are salaries more for administrators than teachers when the basic mission of the university is teaching?"

By posturing himself as the amateur confounding the experts, the skeptic striving to understand the jargon of bureaucrats, Brown has played to the sentiments of thousands of voters cynical about big government. Public opinion polls show his popularity has risen sharply since his unexpectedly narrow victory over Flournoy last November.

But he has disturbed and disillusioned many who backed him in the belief that he would be automatically supportive of programs ostensibly aimed at such traditional liberal goals as improved environment, social welfare and education. "They thought he would be his father's son," said one Democratic Party leader, "and that was their mistake."

California teachers, who were among Brown's biggest financial boosters, are bitter at his personal intervention to kill a cost-of-living increase in school funds. A fellow state official, known for his own tough tactics, says "Jerry's screwed his friends worse than I ever screwed my enemies."

But Charles Manatt, the state Democratic chairman, says, "He's doing precisely what he said he was going to do during the campaign." And it is a fact that in that 1974 interview Brown said, "I've seen government all my life, and I'm not bemused by it. I take a somewhat jaundiced view of the ability of government to perform."

Members of Brown's circle have trouble themselves defining what is Democratic or liberal about his administration, though most insist its basic impulses are "humanitarian" and "progressive."

"What confuses people," says legislative aide Marc Poche, "is that just because it's been part of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier and the Great Society doesn't mean that Jerry Brown signs off on it."

That the Brown formula escapes categorization is obvious. In the space of 48 hours, one hears radically different characterizations of the new governor.

"I don't think he knows what he is," says a major California AFL-CIO official, who backed him last November. "We took him to be a liberal, but we were startled by his saying that money is no solution to the problems of our society, and that people better lower their expectations of what government can do. We don't know if this is just talk, or what."

But a top staffer in the United Auto Workers calls Brown "the first real radical to be elected in years, and a forerunner of what's to come. The guys in our union, who haven't been turned on by anything in politics for 12 years, are turned on by him."

An officer of the state's largest banking corporation says, "We've been pleasantly surprised by Brown. He talks like a liberal but he acts like Reagan. Mainly, he's very businesslike. He cuts through the rhetoric and gets to the heart of an issue."

But a liberal academic says scornfully, "He's done nothing, you understand, but his rhetoric is offensive. He feeds the public prejudices and adds nothing to the understanding of issues."

A Democratic Party official says, "There's no one in his office you can talk politics with, and if any of his dad's old political cronies are behind a project, it's sure to kill it with Jerry."

But a leader of the California GOP says, "He's been good. People are after me to attack him, but what am I supposed to attack him on? He's doing a real good job of getting to that silent majority vote, and if I attack him, I just make them mad."

Because Brown echoes some of Reagan's anti-spending rhetoric, he is, Gray Davis concedes, sometimes jokingly called "Son of Cut and Trim."

But Tom Goff, chief of the Los Angeles Times Sacramento bureau, wrote that "Brown's assault against state spending is an assault on the Establishment—not only in government but throughout society in general. It seeks change in priorities, in concepts, in methods and most of all in values. Reagan's forays against spending and taxes were purely in defense of the Establishment as he saw it. He sought no basic change beyond that which would reduce the number of dollars being spent . . ."

Brown has filled his administration with young anti-establishment lawyers who would have been totally out of place in the Reagan era.

Probably no one in the Brown circle symbolizes the contrast more clearly than J. Anthony (Tony) Kline, a Yale law school classmate of Brown's who formerly headed one of the anti-poverty law firms with which Reagan feuded throughout his eight years in office. Now, as Brown's legal affairs secretary, Kline is spearheading the dispute with the federal government over offshore oil drilling and fighting with the state's legal establishment over Brown's refusal to fill some 65 judgeship vacancies until agreement is reached on higher productivity from the sitting judges.

Kline is a man who challenges conventional wisdom on everything from fluoridation of water to rehabilitation of prisoners (on both of which he has doubts) to the optimism about the future growth of America, which he is sure is ill-founded.

"The governor and I believe that things are going to get a lot worse than they are now," he says. "While it was a growth economy, the American dream was tenable—even for the bottom quarter of the population. But we are in hard times now, and we're going to have to learn to postpone instant gratification of our desires. Maybe, we'll have to learn that the American dream must be redefined."

In this, and in similar comments one hears from Brown and his associates, there is a challenge not just to the programs but to the values of older Democrats, who believed the mission of government was to provide more adequately for people's needs, however broadly they were defined.

Rose Bird, a classmate of Brown's at Berkeley and a former Stanford law professor and public defender, named as California's first woman cabinet member, suggests why the change may have taken place:

"The governor has jumped a full generation," she says. "Instead of being in their 45s and 50s, this is a government of people in their late 20s and 30s. We were trained in our universities to be skeptical, and we have lived through enough history in the last 10 years to be very skeptical of government itself."

"The rule around here," she says, "is to question every assumption." Kline and others in the inner circle of Brown's classmates say they and Brown acquired that habit during the Vietnam years.

"We didn't learn anything from Vietnam," Kline adds, "if we didn't learn that putting in more technology and money doesn't remedy a lack of motivation and commitment. California is a lot like Vietnam in that respect. Our problems will be solved only by people who are willing to sacrifice . . . Sometimes I think the most radical thing to do is do nothing."

But doing nothing is not a luxury that is allowed the governor of California. And even in Brown's own circle there are questions whether this experiment in generational change and value-challenging can succeed.

"He's after revolutionary change—through process—," says Donald Burns, "and he realizes it probably can't be done."

"It might be a good idea to try this approach first in a state the size of Montana,"

adds Marc Poche, shaking his head at the scale of problems in a state where a million people are now unemployed.

Assembly Speaker Leo McCarthy, a Brown ally, says guardedly that Brown's challenges to existing programs and organizations "are entirely appropriate as long as they lead to a definable policy in the reasonable future. I think the governor realizes he can't just ask questions."

Despite the Brown administration's intention to provide more responsive government, even a casual visitor encounters numerous stories of minor decisions being delayed by Brown's refusal to delegate authority. An old friend notes that the governor and his major appointees have a conspicuous lack of administrative experience, and he questions whether Brown can let others take over running policy areas after his own intensive involvement has ceased.

An even more fundamental question is whether the many organized groups that view government as a source of benefits will accept Brown's ascetic calls for sacrifice as a substitute for the help they thought they would receive. "You can't make the teachers mad one week, the public employees the next, labor the third, and the welfare people the fourth, and hope to survive," another elected state official says.

All these groups have powerful representation in the legislature, whose members are somewhat puzzled by Brown's disinclination for the normal give-and-take of legislative bargaining.

Noting this, some Sacramento observers predict Brown will end as another John Lindsay—a well-meaning idealist, surrounded by bright thinkers, but destroyed by political naivete.

So far, however, Brown's footwork has been fast. The farm labor legislation which Rose Bird drafted, she says, "a fair bill, not one distorted to anticipate the pressures of the legislative process," is about to become law—thanks to some hard and effective bargaining with the representatives of the growers, the Teamsters, Cesar Chavez' farm workers.

Brown has actually achieved more in the way of legislation than his own rhetoric would suggest. A bill ending the state's oil depletion allowance is law, and others creating a major and innovative housing subsidy program, providing collective bargaining for public employees and tightening business tax exemptions are moving forward.

Despite these successes, Brown refuses to play the part of a traditional programmatic liberal. "People ask me, 'What's your program?'" he says. "What the hell does that mean? The program is to confront the confusion and hypocrisy of government. That's what's important."

The remarks came during the course of an "interview" in an inexpensive Japanese restaurant here, which was actually more of an open-ended conversation with fellow-diners. During the two hours, Brown joined in freestyle verbal wrestling with a labor organizer, a karate teacher and an artist among others, on subjects ranging from art subsidies, to the fallacies of Daniel Bell's pragmatic realism to ethics of legislative favor-swapping.

The atmosphere was that of a college bull session, and the only strain was that a reporter felt in recalling that this was, indeed, the governor of the biggest state to whom one verbal sparring partner said, without rebuke, "Frankly, that's a lot of crap. I can't believe you believe that."

Among other things Brown said was this: "Vietnam is the prime example of how government can get off the track with all that systems analysis stuff. We're process-oriented here, too, but the idea that a few experts can tell everybody what to do, I just question. Vietnam tells you that programs and planning and technology and

money are not enough—any more than charisma and being hard-nosed are enough.

"Ultimately, people have to believe in some ideal," he said, "and they have to believe you're leveling with them. You can't win hearts and minds through planning and technology. In the final analysis, people will support only what they believe.

"Open government means more than Proposition 9 (the California initiative he endorsed last year, which has strict controls on conflict-of-interest, lobbying and corrupt practices). It means opening up the argument so the options are laid out. The whole fault in Vietnam was that our government didn't trust the people to make the right decisions.

"You ask me what I want. I want to be the governor of the 54 per cent of the people who didn't vote at all last year. The largest constituency of all is the constituency of no confidence, and that constituency is important to remember. I don't know if we can satisfy them. Probably not. But wouldn't it be something if we could?"

PRESS URGED TO DIG OUT FACTS ON RESPONSIBILITY FOR VIETNAM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, many in our country are now saying that no blame should be assessed for the defeat which the United States and the free world suffered in Vietnam.

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, for example, declared that, "This is not the time for either the executive or the legislative branch to begin pointing the finger. Let us recognize that there is enough blame to go around and that it affects all."

The fact is that those who told us that the people of South Vietnam really wanted to live under communism were wrong. Those who told us that the Soviet Union and Communist China wished to live in peace were wrong. Those who argued that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese were "humane" and "progressive" while the South Vietnamese were brutal and tyrannical were wrong. It is fair to say, I think, that those who misled the Nation so seriously be held accountable. If we endure the loss of South Vietnam without learning any lessons from it, our loss will be that much greater.

John M. Fisher, the president of the American Security Council, has called for a "national assessment of the reasons for the tragic loss of Vietnam."

Fisher said:

This is the first war America has lost in its 200-year history. If we want it to be the last, we must analyze the reasons for this defeat promptly and carefully. I urge the press to be just as diligent in digging out the facts on how we lost Vietnam as it was in digging out the facts in the Watergate case.

To those who say that we should not consider these questions and fall into the destructiveness of partisan charge and countercharge, Mr. Fisher replies that:

Calling for no recriminations is the same as calling for a coverup. Only those who feel

they might be vulnerable should want to hide the reasons for defeat.

I wish to share with my colleagues the news release issued by the American Security Council and containing John Fisher's call for an assessment of responsibility with regard to Vietnam, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

PRESS URGED TO DIG OUT FACTS ON RESPONSIBILITY FOR VIETNAM

WASHINGTON, MAY 2.—John M. Fisher, president of the American Security Council, today called for a "national assessment of the reasons for the tragic loss of Vietnam."

"This is the first war America has lost in its 200-year history," Fisher said. "If we want it to be the last, we must analyze the reasons for this defeat promptly and carefully. I urge the press to be just as diligent in digging out the facts on how we lost Vietnam as it was in digging out the facts in the Watergate case."

He said that "this is vitally important because we are now facing other tests in places like Thailand, South Korea, Portugal, Latin America and the Mideast. If we are defeated in these areas too, the psychological momentum of Communist victories may soon give us only two choices—World War III or surrender."

"Calling for no recriminations is the same as calling for a coverup," Fisher said. "Only those who feel they might be vulnerable should want to hide the reasons for defeat."

Fisher said he would ask the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council to "review our crumbling and discredited foreign policy and to make recommendations as to what must now be done."

"If we would permit North Vietnam to breach the Paris peace accord, then why should Moscow not feel free to violate the SALT agreements," Fisher asked.

"The clear answer as to whether the Communists can be trusted to keep other detente agreements, such as SALT, can be found in Vietnam," he said.

"Our actions in Vietnam and elsewhere in the world have added up to a policy of phased surrender," he charged. "Our failure to take action against North Vietnam is especially significant to our allies around the world."

He pointed out that Thailand, the Philippines and Greece have already announced changes of policy with regard to U.S. bases in their countries.

"If our national leaders do not understand the implications of the tragedy in Vietnam, the policy-makers of nations in the Middle-East, Far East, Western Europe and Latin America will certainly have no difficulty understanding after the fall of Saigon," Fisher said.

"If it can be argued," said Fisher, "That we do not have the military strength to follow any other policy than that of acquiescence to defeat in Southeast Asia, then we must ask why—why do we not have the sufficient strength?"

"America fought in Vietnam against the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff," Fisher said. "They held that the U.S. should not engage in a land war in Asia unless we intended to go all out to win."

"The Joint Chiefs were overruled and a policy of gradual escalation was followed by a policy of gradual withdrawal. The predictable result was defeat.

"We owe a thorough and honest assessment of the reasons for this defeat to the 54,000 Americans who died in Vietnam, to the many thousands more who were wounded, and to every citizen we ask to serve in defense of our country," Fisher said.

The American Security Council is a private organization supported by more than 150,000 citizens interested in strengthening National Security.

SENIOR CITIZENS AND THE
ECONOMY

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, I held a day-long public hearing in my district on senior citizens and the economy. I heard testimony from more than two dozen witnesses, including heads of senior citizen organizations, agency directors, and some very outspoken individuals representing themselves. The hearing room was packed with interested older Americans anxious to be heard by their Congressman as well as by the various public officials who were also in attendance.

Mary Voyse, chairman of the Federal Legislative Committee LIZ, New York State Retired Teachers Association, wrote a letter which was read into the testimony at the hearing. Within the letter she stated that her organization favors specific legislation to aid senior citizens. Peg Haliday, chairman of the FISH Volunteers of Babylon was at the hearing. She spoke of specific problems encountered by senior citizens. I include this testimony in the RECORD.

TESTIMONY

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to read into the testimony a letter from Mary Voyse, Chairman of the Federal Legislative Committee LIZ, New York State Retired Teachers Association.

"My dear Mr. Downey,

"My name is Miss Mary Voyse. I am Chairman of the Federal Legislative Committee of the Long Island Zone of the New York State Retired Teachers Association. This association is part of the National Retired Teachers Association which, with the American Association for Retired Persons, has over 2,000,000 members. The NRTA-AARP has a joint committee on federal legislation. Mr. C. B. Murray represents New York State on this committee and Mr. Cyril Brickfield represents it in working on legislation for Congress. But now I am speaking for the Long Island Zone.

"We favor the following legislation now.

"1. A comprehensive health plan. Last year we favored the Comprehensive Medicare Reform Act of 1974, sponsored by Senator Ribicoff.

"2. Exemption of the first \$5,000 of pension or annuity from federal income tax.

"3. Correction of the Social Security Supplemental Law of 1974 so that increases in income due to it do not cut off the elderly indigent from other help.

"4. Allow those over sixty-five to earn any amount and not have to return part of their Social Security to the government as they do now if they earn more than \$2,400. Senator Goldwater favors this.

"5. A built-in cost-of-living adjustment on the income tax forms to increase the retirement allowance.

"6. Housing legislation to help retirees get good housing at fair prices, introduced last year by Representative Hugh Carey.

"7. Every effort to stop the cost of living spiral and to meet the energy crisis, but care must be taken not to overburden the aged.

"8. Legislation to see to it that the elderly get a fair share of Federal Revenue Sharing funds given to states and communities to be used for such services as transportation, legal aid, nutrition, recreation.

"9. Larger retirement income credit on income tax forms.

"10. Legislation with states to control abuses in nursing homes.

"11. Continuing the Older Americans Comprehensive Act and Nutrition for the Elderly Act.

"We hope to keep in touch with you as these matters are brought before Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. We have another speaker. She is Peg Haliday, the Chairman of the F.I.S.H. Volunteers of Babylon.

Ms. HALIDAY. I am here as a representative of F.I.S.H. of Babylon which is a nonprofit helping-hand organization and which, over the past five years, has had considerable contact with out senior citizens.

The overwhelming problem that they face is lack of adequate income to assure the most basic of living needs. It is totally unrealistic in the light of today's economy.

We would like to see more consideration given to low-cost senior citizen housing and also the establishment of some form of transportation—either a mini-bus service or the use of school buses—to aid these people in getting to shopping, nutrition and recreational centers. Towns erect recreational facilities for their senior citizens but neglect to provide an adequate plan for getting them there.

Getting back to the question of finances, the stories that come to our attention are heartbreaking and a disgrace. Repeatedly we are told of senior citizens who try to save on their electric bills by not using electric lights and instead use only the light from their T.V. sets in the evening. There are those who have a glass of milk at night and call it dinner and even those who have, on occasion, resorted to eating dog food.

THE CHAIRMAN. Thank you all for being so patient and waiting so long.

I have one other announcement to make. Mary Scalice, who was sick earlier this morning, is in Southside Hospital and is doing fine. I'm sure you will happy to hear this.

Let me thank you all again for your participation. Your remarks and your testimony are what will make this session. In fact, they will be an inclusion in the record and a committee report.

You've helped make the case for me with the facts that I have heard from you. You have a real message to tell me, and I will tell this to my representatives. Hopefully, we will be able to do some of the things that have been suggested here today.

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S
NEW YEAR'S MESSAGE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the last public messages of Chiang Kai-shek was his New Year's Day message to his people, as printed in Parliament Monthly for January 1975. In my view, it was particularly good for putting the China question in proper perspective. Therefore, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. His message follows:

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S NEW YEAR'S
DAY MESSAGE

My fellow countrymen:

We have never ceased to encounter difficulties and have faced innumerable obstacles and challenges at every step of the way in carrying out our Founding Father's instruction to "establish and safeguard the Republic with the Three Principles of the People." In celebrating the 64th year of the establish-

ment of the Republic, all of us—military and civilians alike—must bring to bear our moral confidence and moral courage and forge from these a common will and united effort.

Since the Founding Father and our other forefathers put in motion the wheel of our National Revolution and established the Republic, we have never ceased trying to uphold and advance our cultural tradition. We have never spared any effort in expanding the people's rights through the implementation of democracy and constitutional government. Nor have we failed to strive to the utmost to improve the lives of our people and pursue national economic construction in which the primary consideration is the life and well-being of the people. In our lengthy struggle against traitors and aggressors, we have always exerted ourselves to ensure the survival of our nation and people. We have, in other words, been engaged in an all-out undertaking to carry out the Three Principles of the People at the same time the Chinese Communists have been exerting themselves to destroy the Three Principles. The Communists have time and again pretended to support the Three Principles in an attempt to destroy both the principles and the National Revolution.

Mao Tse-tung claims to be engaged in class struggle. Actually, countless political, economic and social gaps and injustices have grown out Mao's class oppression. The developments and extent of this are beyond the imagination of a capitalistic society.

No one knows how much of our national cultural legacy has been destroyed under the slogan of "destroying the old" during the course of the "great cultural revolution." Yet the Chinese Communists have shamelessly boasted of the Chinese cultural tradition, which they really hate, and shown it to the world as an instrument of their international united front operations.

Mao is now trying to hoodwink other countries with the pretense of holding the "national people's congress" and drafting a "constitution." He is, furthermore, so brazen as to write his own name into the "constitution" openly and to heap all manner of totalitarian titles on his own head, thereby giving rise to a farce without parallel in human history. No one can say how many times the Chinese Communists have made believe they were "greeting the opening of the fourth national people's congress" or have shouted slogans of "holding the people's congress as soon as possible." In fact, they are still unable to stage this ugly farce.

We are aware that the struggle against Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsia-ping and many others smashed the administrative and party machinery of the Peiping regime a long time ago. The reinstatement of Teng Hsia-ping, who was discredited and cannot call his soul his own, only proves that the wicked Mao is at his wit's end. The ruthless post-mortem criticism and struggle against Lin Piao and the remnants of his influence will shake down the "mountain stronghold" that the regime built with the help of the gun barrel. So it is that the Communist cadres have shouted: "Maoists have ruthlessly dragged us out for struggle. We must eventually pay them in their own coin, and if we charge no interest, that will be lucky for them." On the other hand, Chiang Ching and her company have shouted plaintively, "Those who oppose us will rebel, regardless of whether we curtail their power." In brief, the specter of contradictions and increasing inflexibility within party, administration and military, and the pent-up hatred and fury of the people cannot be changed. If there is any change, it will be for the worse. Whether the "People's congress" is held will make no difference. Failure to convene the "congress" will reflect the vast dimensions of Peiping's internal crisis. If the "congress" is reluctantly held, the forcible installation of Mao's

wife, Chiang Ching, in a position of power, or the moving of Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao and others to the fore in the hope they can seize power for Mao from various "mountain strongholds," can never terminate internal strife. To the contrary, this would signal the beginning of large-scale disruptions, disorders and massacres in which "alliance with this or that mountain stronghold would be sought in order to struggle against the others."

All of us know that "tyranny" and disorder" accompany each other and develop cyclically. The outcome of tyranny is great disorder. The worse the disorder, the crueler will be the tyranny. Disorder marks a rebellion against tyranny—a seizing of power from the tyrant. Tyranny is a means of holding onto power and preventing its seizure by others. The tyrant must resort to ever more tyrannical measures to suppress rebellion. Mao Tse-tung has engaged in power seizure throughout his life. If Mao loudly proclaims someone to be his "close comrade-in-arms," that is the moment at which Mao is most afraid of him and seeks his expeditious removal, fearful that his own power will be taken away. This is also a time of the most gruesome persecution and killing. Consequently, every cadre is caught up in the grip of fear and suspicion and does not know which is the right road to take. Nor does the cadre know to which chieftain he should give allegiance in order to escape the fate of being dragged out for struggle or being killed. The natural tendency is for him to turn on Mao and liquidate him with even greater savagery than the Russians showed in destalinization. As an ancient saying has it: "Tyranny against the people will result in the loss of one's life and the destruction of the state." This will be history's judgment on Mao.

Notwithstanding this, the people of the world are tending to keep their eyes glued on developments concerning convocation of the "national people's congress." They continue to deceive themselves by gazing into a mirage, although they know that in truth the disorder cannot be ended. In my recent Constitution Day message, I made it clear: "We people of the Republic of China possess a Constitution written in accordance with the wishes of the whole body of the people and we have a central government and local governments organized under this Constitution. So long as we can uphold this legitimacy it will not matter whether the 'people's congress' is convened. Such a 'congress' could only expedite collapse and intensify calamitous changes within the Peiping regime."

I must tell my fellow countrymen, military and civilians alike, that in sustaining the moral confidence and courage of National Revolution based on the Three Principles, we cannot depend on the muddle-headedness and disorder of the enemy. Nor can we base the peace and security of any part of the free world on the exploitation of international relations—the seeking of contradictions among enemies to play off one against another. Our confidence and courage are built upon the self-awakening and self-determination of our people—on the reconstruction of our conscience.

So long as we understand that the Three Principles must be carried out, that our national culture must not be destroyed, that our 700 million compatriots must be freed from the Communist hell and that we alone must control and defend our national destiny, we shall never be deceived by any mirage and shall never be swayed by momentary gain or loss. This is the responsibility of all our countrymen to their history and their conscience.

Our Founding Father's will to build the Republic, abolish the unequal treaties and establish constitutional government was suc-

cessfully implemented by national unification following the Northern Expedition and by our victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan. Tragically, the Chinese Communists then undertook their rebellion and reign of tyranny. The strong country we sought and were building up was turned into a land of evil and poverty; the people we intended to make free and happy fell into an abyss of misery and terrorism. The living space of the Chinese people has been transformed into a barren wilderness, and the spiritual and cultural realm has been turned into an empty desert. These developments require that we rededicate ourselves to the directive of our Founding Father to "make the weak country strong and the sad people happy," engender the great awakening, take up the great task of defending the Republic, overcome all obstacles and meet all challenges.

Fellow countrymen: If we look only at the road beneath our feet, we shall find that it is rough and tortuous; we shall feel as though we may stumble at any time. However, if we take every step with firm stride and look forward, we shall be happy to see that new roads are opening up at every turn and that the sky is bright. We have reached the starting point of a new era—the beginning of our successful suppression of Chinese Communist wickedness and the establishment of a new China through construction in our bastion of freedom and the reinforcement of our strength.

WELL-KNOWN NEWSPAPERWOMAN RETIREES

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, recently Mrs. Anne McIlhenney Matthews Andrade announced her retirement from the Buffalo Courier-Express after nearly four decades in the newspaper business.

Widely known and greatly respected, her distinguished career has been marked by great versatility, evidenced in the following, abbreviated biographical data:

BIOGRAPHY

Anne McIlhenney Matthews Andrade—known professionally as Anne McIlhenney. Currently listed in Who's Who in the East; Who's Who in American Women; Dictionary of International Biography; Foremost Women in Communications.

Newspaperwoman; former swimming champion; Major in Women's Army Corps in World War II, Bronze Star recipient; active in numerous civic, social and philanthropic activities.

Began Army career when Women's Army Corps was formed in 1942; first woman Chief Public Relations Officer in U.S. Army; participated in news coverage and public relations on staffs of General Eisenhower, General Mark Clark, General Patton; and during Korean War served with her husband, the late Burrows Matthews, Editor of the Courier-Express, on the staff of General Matthew Ridgeway in Tokyo and Paris, until Mr. Matthews's resignation to aid in General Eisenhower's election as President.

Recipient of more than 30 awards for journalism; special citation and Pulitzer nomination for successful efforts to revise the Penal Code to tighten loopholes for criminals; Erie County Bar Association "Liberty Bell" award; honorary Doctor of Letters degree from Rosary Hill College of Buffalo; VFW Community Service Award; American

Legion Citation; Buffalo and Erie County police officers' service award.

Member of Overseas Press Club; Board of Directors of Buffalo and Erie County Public Library; former president and current director of Niagara Frontier Press Club; one of first women members of Sigma Delta Chi; first woman appointed to Board of Directors of Buffalo unit of Association of U.S. Army; member of University Council of Niagara University.

Born in Philadelphia; came to Buffalo in 1920; educated in Buffalo and Paris; now resides with husband, Michael R. Andrade, in Eden, New York.

Mr. Speaker, 600 of her friends turned out last week for a gala testimonial dinner, described in the Courier-Express on May 26:

600 SALUTE C-E EX-COLUMNIST ANNE MCIHENEY MATTHEWS

Anne McIlhenney Matthews Andrade needed no introduction on Sunday night, for her confident voice announced her entry into a crowd of nearly 600 well-wishers at a testimonial dinner given by her many friends.

The crowd comprised a galaxy of the renowned drawn from Buffalo's business, religious, culinary, press and law enforcement communities, all gathered to pay tribute to one of the area's favorite columnists—and a mainstay of The Courier-Express, covering every kind of story imaginable for 52 years.

Her column appeared under the byline Anne McIlhenney Matthews. She married Michael R. Andrade, an Eden resident, in 1972.

The dinner was held at the Pellamwood House, 3300 Transit Rd., West Seneca.

TOP ASSIGNMENTS

"I always got the top assignments," said the columnist, praising The Courier-Express, "never those women's assignments."

Mrs. Andrade briefly spoke of her career before the evening's program began, recalling her fondest journalistic achievements as guests interrupted her to remind her of those they remembered best. Mrs. Andrade retired in January 1975.

"I had every job on the paper," she said. "I started in the sports department (she was an expert swimmer and a swimming coach for many years) and was the only woman on the paper. Later on I moved to cityside, covering stories other than sports.

"I remember that I got the states penal law changed in many ways"—most of which eliminated technicalities that were allowing criminal suspects to go free—"including getting it changed so you could protect your own home from intruders."

"YOU GOT US 911"

"You got us 911, too, Anne," one guest chimed in.

"That's right," she said, "I was the first person in the area to suggest that the police use the 911 system," referring to the use of one central police telephone number for emergency calls.

She also spent 13 years in Hollywood as a columnist for The Courier-Express and spent World War II as one of the first Women's Army Corps members to be assigned overseas. Once there, she was assigned to help the many correspondents covering the war for American news agencies—and that included helping them out of scrapes, too.

"The Courier-Express gave me the opportunity to do everything," she said, "every beat. I covered murder trials, crime news, politics, you name it."

The impact of her stories in The Courier-Express could be judged by the number of distinguished guests who paid \$15-a-plate to honor Mrs. Andrade. Among those at the head table were such dignitaries as State Supreme Court Justice Frederick Marshall, Erie County Sheriff Michael Amico, the Rev.

Msgrs. James Healy and Joseph Shieder, and author Taylor Caldwell.

COCHAIRMAN OF EVENT

*** were former Buffalo Police Commissioner Frank N. Felicetta and Brig. Gen. Edward Murphy.

The Courier-Express was represented by Howard W. Clother, assistant publisher; Douglas L. Turner, executive editor; Thomas Schaeffer, advertising director; and Robert Giabelucca, circulation director.

The Master of Ceremonies, Special Asst. State Atty. Gen. Thomas Cleary, turned over the speaking duties to Jack O'Brien, a syndicated columnist from New York City, who had the desk next to Mrs. Andrade's when they worked together at The Courier-Express.

"TOUGH AND SMART"

"Anne always had the reputation of being like a Mark VII tank," O'Brien said, "but there was always a little girl inside there. She was tough and smart. When she entered the WACs there was something commanding in her demeanor—and she was put in command of her unit. She was always involved in crazy marvelous escapades—She's a swash-buckler."

"Anne was a liberated woman from the day she was born."

Mr. Speaker, Anne McIlhenney Matthews Andrade will be greatly missed in the public arena she has served so capably, but she has only good wishes for the future as she enjoys her well-earned retirement.

BEN R. FERGUSON

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I learned recently with great regret of the death of Ben R. Ferguson.

Ben worked in the difficult and troublesome field of development. He was one American who succeeded in crossing the cultural barrier to work directly with the rural poor in Asia, inspiring them to improve themselves through their own efforts. Hopefully, the lesson he tried to teach the rural people with whom he worked is being learned by our aid agency, AID—Americans can do much to help developing countries, but only if people and governments are willing to help themselves.

I would like to enter into the RECORD the following article that appeared in AID's newspaper, Front Lines, May 1. It captures the spirit of this remarkable man. He was a man of courage, but stubborn, a man of wit and wisdom, but uncompromising. Above all, he believed in people.

The article follows:

BEN'S FRIENDS RECALL THE MAN AND HIS WORK

(By Alexanderina Shuler)

Ben R. Ferguson—AID's "living legend"—died Thursday, April 10, at the Sloan Kettering Institute in New York following surgery for cancer of the esophagus. He was 66.

Ben, who disliked being addressed by formal titles as much as he disdained bureaucracy and its formalities, is famous among people working in international de-

velopment, particularly in the agriculture field. Among his most notable contributions is the self-help "Program Development" concept introduced to the Pakistanis when he was stationed in East Pakistan from 1961 to 1966. The idea is a model for AID agricultural programs in a few developing countries.

Following a memorial service for Ben at the Western Presbyterian Church in Washington on April 15, three of Ben's friends and former colleagues reflected on their years of friendship with the agricultural advisor—former Assistant Administrator Donald M. McDonald, Edgar "Ted" Owens of the Asia Bureau and George Laudato of the Yemen Desk.

Described by friends as "incorrigible and stubborn to the point of pig-headed, except he always seemed to be right," Ben's philosophy included the strong belief that little if anything was impossible if one went about it properly.

When Ben arrived in Pakistan in 1961 he brought with him nearly 25 years of experience as an agricultural extension agent, having owned and operated a 2,220-acre ranch with 400 head of cattle and a breeding flock of 1,200 ewes. The ranch also produced 250 acres of potatoes annually.

Mr. McDonald remembers that when Ben applied to work for AID "he didn't qualify on paper. But someone noted—fortunately, for the Agency—that he had been an extension agent with a railroad out west which was the key to his being hired."

Ben's first task in Pakistan was to train 1,200 extension agents. But he soon found that while the agents were learning the material, they seldom applied the new methods in the field.

Ben decided that existing AID agricultural programs needed to be rebuilt "from the bottom up" to provide the vital link between knowledge and application.

"PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT"

"Program Development" was the result. Ben felt the first step was for the villagers to identify their problems. Initial assembly meetings turned into gripe sessions with complaints focused on the lack of assistance provided by the local and national governments.

Ted explained what followed.

"Once they got their complaints out of their systems Ben would ask them: 'What are you going to do about it?' and urged them to decide what they wanted. The next step was to find out how to get it. That's when Ben finally would step in."

"Up until this point he would sit back and watch what he had instigated. Now was the time to advise and guide them toward the resources that were available. He would suggest, in a very off-handed manner, 'why don't you go see the agriculture advisor in the district capital about some fertilizer.'"

Sometimes Ben would find that his hint was not taken and he would boom out "why didn't you see the man I told you about" and make some gentle "threats."

"The next visit you can be certain the work was well in progress," Ted recalls. "It had a snowball effect. People suddenly realized their capabilities and were instilled with self-pride. It soon expanded into a community effort to help each other as well as their own individual cause."

"You don't tell people what to do," Ben said. "You don't begin by making people fit into your way of doing things. You begin by making the farmer think about what he wants and needs. It may take some doing, but he's got to decide for himself. Then, you help him get it with the idea that this is only the beginning. He can do a lot for himself. Once he gets the hang of it, he'll do more."

Ben's colleagues recall an average day for him was about 14 hours and often more. He worked right alongside local farmers in the fields.

Ben received AID's Superior Honor Award for his outstanding work in helping the farmers and villagers in the Mymensingh area.

"The people loved him," Ted said. "In spite of his gruff exterior, he had a magical charm about him. I think it was because he had such a genuine, deep respect and love for people—a quality that simply can't go undetected."

FAST FRIENDS

When the two men first met in Dacca in 1961, Ben took one disappointed look at Ted and said "someone told me you were different. But to me you look just like another bureaucrat."

They became fast friends, working side by side with Ted handling the red tape and Ben carrying out what started out as mere words on paper into the fields, into better crops and new schools.

"You know how you read books on how to be a manager and administrator, and organizer?" George Laudato asks. "Well, Ben never needed a book. He was a natural organizer. He had a phenomenal psyche, he sparked automatically with people."

"He was tenacious," Mr. McDonald insists. All three men recall going out on field inspection trips with Ben.

"We were on the road in Vietnam many times," George recalls, "when it would start getting dark, meaning it was time to go home, Ben would persist—just one more village. Soon it was three or four and finally the inevitable happened one day. We got caught in the middle of a military operation which sent us scrambling under the jeep."

"I told you this would happen Ben," George admonished his friend.

"Yeah, but at least we're not a few villages behind," Ben retorted.

"I used to warn Ben too," Ted says. "When I suggested once that we were bound to get shot at he quipped, 'Maybe they'll miss!' Nothing fazed the man."

"I remember the time he was returning from My Tho where he had spent the day working with the local farmers", Mr. McDonald says. "There had been a Viet Cong ambush on the road. Ben was everywhere—comforting the dying, trying to save the wounded, protecting the frightened. He didn't really talk about it on his return until word began drifting in of what he'd done. When pressed, he said 'Yes, there was an ambush . . .' and that after awhile there were so many spent bullets lying around that, in anger, he started throwing them back and that seemed to put an end to the shooting." For his efforts, Ben received the Secretary of State's Award for Heroism. "How many other awards he earned for helping people but did not receive I don't know," Mr. McDonald says. "But I think there must have been many."

George notes that "Ben would sum up his contributions with 'I learn as much as I teach. Maybe more.'"

Ben Ferguson had an impact on more than the local people in developing countries.

"In Vietnam there were a lot of young people, both in the military and in humanitarian work, he converted as a result of just one briefing," George says. "His workday in Vietnam was 18 hours long but he never was too busy to take time out to answer questions, to explain, to go over things. He never turned anyone away. He was admired and respected by everyone."

Ben's observations about the rural Vietnamese was interesting, George adds.

"He once said that the best men in Viet-

nam are the women! They hold the receipts, they pay the bills, they handle the family finances. Ben often said 'let the old man talk but listen to mamma.'

"He was very emphatic about the important role he felt women played in economic and social progress and this was long before the Percy Amendment existed."

Ben went to the Philippines without his three friends but Ted says they kept in close contact and continued to work together in spite of the distance.

"Chapter II of my book, 'Development Reconsidered', is Ben", Ted says. "The whole self-help concept and how you go about instilling self-realization into people is there, based on his work."

In the Philippines Ben set out to do what he had succeeded in accomplishing in his two previous assignments. In a municipal procedural guideline called "Local Development Through Local Initiative by Local People" Ben said.

"... barrio people are willing to do their share to help uplift themselves from the morass of poverty and squalor . . . and to develop and improve their community. . . to work. . . to produce more by accepting modern techniques . . . and to pay more taxes if governmental leaders and technicians will show them how and help them on their own ground in the barrio."

"There were two ways of doing things when you dealt with Ben," according to Mr. McDonald. "The Ferguson way or the wrong way. Lord, was he stubborn! Compromise to that man meant agreeing with him."

Ben Ferguson's work, his philosophy and the kind of man he was is a matter of record. About 10 years ago AID decided to make a movie which would show the U.S. foreign aid program in action. Ben was filmed as he went about a typical day's work, from sunrise to long past sunset.

SIMPLE CUP OF TEA

The 20-minute movie—"A Simple Cup of Tea"—caught his spirit through and through, according to Mr. McDonald. "His infectious optimism, his good humor, his devotion to people, his compassion, gentleness and his stubbornness, his stamina and wisdom and even his irreverence was all there in living color."

At the end of each day of filming, hours late in moving on, there always was a final delay—to drink a simple cup of tea with the local farmers.

"Ben Ferguson was an extraordinary human being," Mr. McDonald said at a memorial service last month. "But there always was just enough of a touch of human frailty to make him true. He helped cause hope to replace despair, self-confidence to conquer resignation and energy to overcome lethargy. And that's what Ben did all the years I knew him in parts of the world where that message still is most needed. He inspired people—sometimes quietly, sometimes not so quietly, but invariably, he inspired them."

Born in Memphis, Tenn. in 1909, Ben graduated from high school in Ordway, Colo., and received a B.S. degree in animal husbandry from Colorado State University in 1931. He studied law at the University of Colorado and educational administration at the University of Denver.

He is survived by his wife, Etna, of 501 York Town Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22207. Other survivors include a daughter, Mary Lou Hankins; a son, Dr. Benjamin Ferguson Jr., and six grandchildren. Mrs. Hankin's husband, Al, is a rural development advisor in the Ecuador Mission. Dr. Ferguson served as a physician on contract with the Vietnam Mission in the late 1960s.

Donations may be made to "Wade Hall, c/o Ben Ferguson Memorial Fund", New State, Room 4218. The funds will be forwarded to Passa Municipality in the Philippines.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, by arrangement with Chairman Thomas B. Curtis and the staff of the newly created Federal Elections Commission, I am attaching herewith a copy of the Commission's "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" being placed in the Federal Register. Because of the widespread interest in the Commission and its rules, I believe this method of keeping a greater number advised will be useful. Additional materials will be made available as soon as possible. I suggest my colleagues may find it useful to retain these materials because of ongoing certainty of public inquiry that this program has, and will, elicit. The material follows:

[Federal Election Commission, 11 CFR, Chapter II, Implementation of Federal Election Campaign Act, Notice 1975-2]

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-443, 2 U.S.C. Section 431 et seq.). The FEC is responsible for the administration of, for obtaining compliance with, and for formulating policy with respect to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the Act), and Sections 608, 610, 611, 613, 614, 615, 616, and 617 of Title 18, United States Code (the Act and these Sections are collectively referred to herein as the "Statutory Provisions"). Pursuant to these responsibilities, the FEC is preparing regulations to implement certain of the Statutory Provisions; the FEC proposes to make rules with respect to some or all of the aforementioned matters. Such regulations will be designed to insure that all persons and organizations subject to the Statutory Provisions are equally treated, and that the public interest requiring a clear development of constitutional safeguards is saved.

Any interested person or organization is invited to submit written comments to the FEC concerning any part of this Notice. The facts, opinions, and recommendations presented in writing, in response to this Notice will be considered in drafting regulations related to the Statutory Provisions.

Set forth below is a general description of the subjects and issues that the FEC believes require the most immediate attention:

I. PROCEDURES

A. Comments should be directed to whether or not the Commission has the authority to issue regulations generally for 18 U.S.C. §§ 608, 610, 611, 613, 614, 615, 616 and 617, similar to its authority with respect to Title 2, or whether the Commission can only issue regulations in respect to Title 18 so far as there is a question of:

- (1) General policy;
- (2) Where such regulations are necessary or appropriate in connection with the reporting requirements under Title 2; or
- (3) Where there are parallel references in Titles 2 and 18.

B. Comments should be addressed to general rulemaking procedures of the FEC and consideration should be given to the manner in which comments should be solicited, hearings (if deemed appropriate, the timing, location and duration of said hearings), and the manner in which notices and regulations shall be made public.

C. Advisory opinion requests. Among other considerations, comments should be addressed to whether or not the FEC should have a procedure for issuing opinions to other than the categories of opinions to other than the categories of persons listed in 2 U.S.C. § 437f(a). See generally 2 U.S.C. § 437f. See generally 2 U.S.C. § 437f.

D. Complaints. Comment should be addressed to whether or not complaint hearings such as those contemplated by 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4) should, if ever, be closed to the public. Additional comments as to the entire complaint procedure may be submitted.

E. Comments are invited concerning the manner in which requests under the Freedom of Information Act should be processed.

F. The regulations and procedures necessary to carry out the provision of 2 U.S.C. § 439a requiring disclosure of excess contributions and any other amounts contributed to an individual for the purpose of supporting his activities as a holder of Federal office.

II. DEFINITIONS

A. "News story, commentary of editorial" is used in the definition of "expenditure" under the Act at 2 U.S.C. § 431(f) and in 18 U.S.C. § 591(f) but is not mentioned in the definition of "contribution" in 2 U.S.C. § 431(e) of the Act and 18 U.S.C. § 591(e). Comments may be addressed to the issue of whether a "news story, commentary or editorial" is to be included in the definition of a "contribution".

B. "Debt" is not defined in the Act or in Title 18. Comments may be addressed to the distinction between "debt" and "loan" and "anything of value". In this regard comments are solicited concerning "debts" incurred in the normal course of business and consideration should be given to both contingent fees and 18 U.S.C. § 610. In addition, comments may be addressed to the question of whether both the expenditure of the proceeds of a loan and the repayment of the loan itself are "expenditures for the purposes of 2 U.S.C. § 431(f) of the Act and 18 U.S.C. § 591(f); similar attention should be given to a "debt". [See 2 U.S.C. § 436(c).]

C. "Slate cards" are defined in 2 U.S.C. § 431 of the Act and 18 U.S.C. 591 to require the listing of three or more candidates and costs involving such cards are excluded from expenditures. Comments regarding further definitions of "slate cards" may be concerned with the treatment of slate cards that include partial slates and the printing requirements of such cards in regards to the size and type of print of the cards.

D. "Unreimbursed payment for travel expense" is used in 2 U.S.C. §§ 431(e)(5)(D) and 431(f)(4)(E) of the Act and 18 U.S.C. §§ 591(e)(5)(D) and 591(f)(4)(E), but is not defined. Comments may be addressed to the issue of whether or not the \$500 limitation regarding unreimbursed travel expenses is applicable to travel to a campaign site, to travel expenses at or near the campaign site, and to living expenses at said campaign site.

E. Comments are invited with respect to interpretive rules governing the application of 18 U.S.C. § 608(e), the "independent expenditure" limitation, including the definition of the word "directly or indirectly, on behalf of a particular candidate" in 18 U.S.C. § 608(b)(6) so as to make it clear that only truly independent expenditures will be considered under 18 U.S.C. § 608(e), and the scope of activities covered.

F. "Ordinary and necessary expenses incurred . . . in connection with his duties as a holder of Federal Office" is used in 2 U.S.C. § 491(a) but is not defined. Comments may be submitted concerning the distinctions between "ordinary and necessary expenses" and political expenses, whether or not there should be time limits placed on the use of excess funds prior to and after an election,

whether or not a distinction should be drawn between a declared and non-declared candidate for reelection and other matters concerning 2 U.S.C. § 439(a).

G. Comment is invited as to whether the term "new party" as defined in 26 U.S.C. § 9002(8) includes only organizations that formally considered themselves political parties and nominate candidates for a number of offices, or whether it includes any political organization which serves as the principal campaign committee for a presidential candidate which does not qualify as a "major party" or "minority party" under 26 U.S.C. § 9002(6), (7).

III. COMMITTEES

Persons and/or organizations commenting on this section should attempt to suggest ideas and recommendations that will allow local committees to file relatively simple, although comprehensive, reports that will not require extensive backup material or a professional staff to maintain said backup material or prepare the required reports. One purpose of the Act is to encourage widespread participation in the political process, and to such end the FEC will attempt to avoid any regulation tending to limit the economic feasibility of local committees.

1. Comments are invited concerning allocation of expenditures among candidates by multi-candidate committees and by hybrid committees contributing to both non-Federal and Federal candidates.

2. Comments are invited concerning filing requirements for multi-candidate committees and local and State committees, both Federal and non-Federal. Comments may involve whether such committees are required to file and/or register with the FEC and/or file with a principal campaign committee. Standards for such filings may involve the degree of control and/or fund interchange among various committees.

3. Comments are invited concerning the issue of whether local and State party committees are required to register with the FEC.

IV. ELECTIONS

1. *Unopposed Primary Nominations.* Comments are invited to discuss whether or not a candidate who is unopposed on the last day of filing for a party nomination and otherwise qualifies to be the nominee of a party should be entitled to the same expenditures under 18 U.S.C. § 608(c) (1) during the primary period as a candidate running opposed in the primary.

2. *Independent Nominees.* Comments are invited to discuss whether or not candidates not chosen by a primary election, who may [or may not] be required to secure nominating petitions before appearing on the general election ballot, should be entitled to the same expenditures under 18 U.S.C. § 608(c) (1) during the primary period as a candidate running opposed in the primary.

V. CAMPAIGN DEFICITS

1. Comments are invited to discuss whether or not contributions made after January 1, 1975, the effective date of the Act, should be allowed to reduce the campaign deficit in existence prior to January 1, 1975 and whether or not such contributions should be counted toward the limits of the next "election".

2. Comments are invited to discuss whether or not the 1974 Amendments to the Act should be applied to a run-off election held after January 1, 1975 but arising out of an election in 1974.

3. Comments are invited to discuss whether or not contributions received after an election to retire a deficit should be counted for the election just completed. Comments are invited to discuss how businesses should be allowed to deal with valid business debts which a political committee

or candidate cannot pay due to lack of campaign funds or expenditure limits.

VI. NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

1. Comments are invited on the method which should be used to determine payout schedules and amounts.

2. Comments are invited to discuss the treatment of "in kind" contributions, such as reduced room rates, reduced car rental, payment of expenses to site selecting committees, and reduced charges for use of convention halls.

VII. PUBLICATIONS

Comments are solicited on the number, type and orientation of materials which the Commission should publish to serve as guides to compliance with the laws in the most convenient form and efficient manner.

Comments with respect to additional matters not specifically mentioned are also invited.

Comment period.—Comments should be mailed to Rulemaking Section, Office of General Counsel, Federal Election Commission, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463 by July 1, 1975. For further information call (202) 382-5162.

EULOGY TO JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 6 it was my sad duty to announce to my colleagues the death of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, a man whose memory will live forever in the annals of freedom.

At a Requiem Mass celebrated in St. Matthew's Cathedral by Archbishop William W. Baum, many friends and colleagues gathered to mourn the loss of Cardinal Mindszenty. The Very Reverend Dr. Ladislaus Iranyi, Provincial of the Piarist Fathers, delivered a very moving eulogy which captured Cardinal Mindszenty's devotion to human freedom and dignity. The eulogy follows:

EULOGY TO JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

"For Zion's sake I will not be silent, for Jerusalem's sake I will not be quiet, Until her vindication shines forth like the dawn and her victory like a burning torch!" (Is., 62,1.)

Almost a year ago, Cardinal Mindszenty offered a concelebrated Mass here and received an unparalleled tribute from the clergy and faithful of Washington.

Now we are meeting again around this altar to say farewell in our own fashion to him, who has outstripped us in the race for eternity. In these few words I want to recreate the image of this great Man, leader, shepherd and prophet of his people, cardinal of this Church and father of all.

He will be remembered as a great and solitary hero in the middle of the twentieth century; as a prophet in an age of false prophets.

He warned us continuously since 1919, that human freedom and dignity were threatened; the same freedom and dignity that are today in many places all but destroyed.

He warned us against the perils of industrialism and communism alike, and today our complex society is labouring with the

problems of both. He warned us (since the 1930's), when nationalism and communism were a fashion, that these are not easily destroyed—today both are still shadows over man's hearts.

His life of eighty-three years was a real following of Christ, a veritable way of the cross. His life comes to our mind in the words of St. Paul: "with my many labors and imprisonments, with far worse beatings and frequent brushes with death. Times and times I was beaten—endangered by my own people—by false brothers—enduring labor, hardship, many sleepless nights, in hunger and thirst, in frequent fastings, in cold and nakedness." (II. Cor. 11, 23-28)

His sixtieth birthday found him in communist prison, his seventieth in the refuge of the American Embassy in Budapest, his eightieth in "complete and absolute exile" in Vienna.

The summary or better: the sense of his life could be summed up also with the words of St. Paul, words, which greeted him a year ago in the prayer breakfast honoring him here in Washington—and there is a lesson for all of us in it:

"If we are afflicted it is for your encouragement and salvation, and when we are consoled it is for your consolation, so that you may endure patiently.

We do not wish to leave you in the dark about the trouble we had—we were crushed beyond our strength.

We were left to feel like men condemned to death so that we might trust, not in ourselves, but in God.

We have put our hope in Him who will never cease to deliver us. But you must help us with your prayers, so that on our behalf God may be thanked for the gift granted us through the prayers of so many." (II. Cor. 1, 3-12.)

His life, the details of which you know so well, bears the earmark of the great commitment . . . so aptly expressed by Belloc:

"That great word which every man Gave God (before his life began)."

"I stand for God, for the Church and for Hungary.

This responsibility has been imposed upon me by the fate of my nation which stands alone (so lonely), an orphan in the whole world. Compared to the sufferings of my people, my own fate is of no importance." (From his last pastoral letter.)

"It was a sacred word, he said, Which comforted the pathless dead, And made God smile when it was shown Unforfeited before the throne."

He took a sacred oath that he will be true to himself, that he will carry out faithfully the mission God gave him, that he will—with his characteristic fervor—challenge the men of his age with the word of God. This commitment he kept unforfeited.

No human flattery, no love of ease, no weariness of conflict made him break the pledge he gave to his God, his Church, his Nation.

"I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have redeemed my pledge"—Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty would not wish us to say more of him. There are very few of whom Paul's words could be said so truly.

Those heavenly graces which he received from God, he has now given back to God; his soul contemplates eternal horizons. Yet, while he rests with God, if any thoughts of his still turn toward earth, surely they will turn next to his beloved country towards this place and dwell like a benediction over this altar. May the prayers of our blessed Lady, St. Matthew and the Saints of Hungary win him, now and hereafter "light happiness and peace"! Amen!

MARXISM - LENINISM-MAOISM-ARTHUR KINOY THOUGHT, THE NIC, PART III

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my Extensions of Remarks of May 13, 1975—14158-14159—and May 16, 1975—14906-14908—provided background, position papers, and a summary of current organizing activities of the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People—NIC—a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist preparatory organization which calls for the eventual "necessity of armed struggle" against our constitutional form of government and free enterprise economic system.

As was reported in detail at those times, the National Interim Committee, founded and led by Arthur Kinoy, is energetically involved in building a coalition of revolutionary socialist and Maoist Communist groups.

One of the most important groups being courted by the NIC are the Maoist revolutionary Congress of Afrikan People—CAP—whose leader, LeRoi Jones recently proclaimed:

Mao speaks of three magic weapons: vanguard party, united front, armed struggle. In the U.S. today we have none of these. We must develop all three.

A second, and larger organization with a proven record of revolutionary violence working closely with the NIC and CAP is the Puerto Rican Socialist Party—PSP—Partido Socialista Puertorriqueña.

The Puerto Rican Socialist Party, a self-proclaimed revolutionary Marxist-Leninist vanguard party, has worked with leading members of the NIC for several years. The association of the two groups appears to have developed from the legal representation afforded the PSP by Arthur Kinoy, Mark Amsterdam, and other National Lawyers Guild activists associated with the Center for Constitutional Rights in New York City.

It is interesting to observe the complex interweavings of the NIC, which appears to be attempting to build an American Maoist party; the Soviet-dominated Communist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA; and the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, which although characterized in internal CPUSA documents as "essentially Maoist," has restrained itself under the tutelage of Cuba and continues to enjoy the support of the Soviet-controlled world Communist movement.

The National Interim Committee and the PSP jointly operate the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee—PRSC. The NIC, PSP, and CPUSA all sent delegates to Havana, Cuba, in March of this year to participate in the planning of an International Conference of Solidarity with the Independence of Puerto Rico to be held September 5-7, 1975, in Havana, under the auspices of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council.

A meeting of the International Preparatory Committee for the Conference

of Solidarity was held in Havana, March 30-31, 1975. A reported 79 delegates from 28 countries and 12 international organizations attended. The U.S. delegates included:

Alfredo Lopez, a principal organizer of the PSP in New York who formerly headed the Carlos Feliciano Defense Committee and now is executive secretary of the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee—PRSC.

Frances M. Beal, a member of the PRSC national board who is a leading member of the New York-based Third World Women's Alliance—TWWA—and is editor of its newspaper, Triple Jeopardy; she was formerly active with the Student Nonviolent—now National—Coordinating Committee—SNCC.

Arthur Kinoy, of the National Lawyers Guild and National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People, in his capacity as a PRSC board member.

Helen Allison Winter, representing the American Committee of the World Peace Council; she is the international affairs secretary of the CPUSA.

Roque Ristorrucci, representing the American Committee of the World Peace Council; he is presently both education director of the New York State Communist Party and executive secretary of the CPUSA youth group, the Young Workers Liberation League—YWLL.

Anthony Monteiro, another member of the World Peace Council American Committee delegation, has an interesting career in violence and revolutionary activity. Monteiro was in 1967 one of four Revolutionary Action Movement—RAM—members indicted in Philadelphia for plotting to poison police, assassinate police officers, local and national officials, and blow up city hall. By 1970, after a trip to North Vietnam and Moscow, he openly proclaimed his membership in the CPUSA and has twice run for Congress on the CPUSA ticket; a member of the Central Committee of the Young Workers Liberation League, Monteiro also serves as executive secretary of the National Anti-Imperialist Movement in Solidarity with African Liberation—NAIMSAL, the CPUSA front for obtaining support from American Negroes for Marxist African guerrilla forces.

Dr. Noel Colon Martinez, president of the Puerto Rican section of the World Peace Council.

Delegates attended from the Soviet Union, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam—North Vietnam—and other Communist countries.

The International Preparatory Committee delegates elected a secretariat for the solidarity conference which includes members of both the PSP and the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee, and adopted a draft agenda. The three main points for discussion at the Havana meeting of the International Preparatory Committee were, in their words:

The colonial cruelty of Puerto Rico and the strategic importance of the liberation of the Puerto Rican people and other people to the world struggle against North American imperialism; (2) The struggle of the Puerto Rican people for their sovereignty and inde-

pendence; (3) International solidarity with the just struggle of the Puerto Rican people.

A keynote presentation was made at the meeting by Dr. Noel Colon Martinez of the World Peace Council Puerto Rican Committee. Puerto Rico Libre, the monthly bulletin of the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee, reported:

[Dr. Colon] offered a somber picture of his stricken nation, and enumerated the disastrous social and economic effects of colonial domination. * * * He emphasized that no peace is possible so long as the Yankee colonial war is maintained and that the Puerto Rican people will continue to exercise their right to the war of liberation in every form necessary to their survival and to the triumph of their centennial struggle.

We see again in this statement the Leninist precept that in the struggle against the free enterprise system and democracy, any means necessary will be used to win. Lenin, in his essay "Guerrilla Warfare," pointed out:

Marxism differs from all primitive forms of socialism by not binding the movement to any one particular form of struggle. It recognizes the most varied forms of struggle. * * * To attempt to answer yes or no to the question whether any particular means of struggle should be used, without making a detailed examination of the concrete situation of the given moment at the given stage of its development, means completely to abandon the Marxist position.

Arthur Kinoy's contribution to the Havana meeting of the International Preparatory Committee was a speech which "dealt with the indivisible nature of the struggle of the Puerto Rican people and the United States masses against oppression and exploitation at home," for which sentiments he was given a standing ovation.

Comrade Monteiro, who apparently has a broad range of experience with active support for terrorism, also delivered a speech on behalf of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party's drive for an "independent" People's Republic of Puerto Rico. Monteiro's bombastic speech, reprinted in CPUSA's World Magazine supplement to the Daily World, makes most of the usual Communist points about Puerto Rico.

Stressed particularly is the linking of "détente" and "coexistence" with the Communist's requirement that the United States abandon its defense commitments abroad, demolish any defense bases not located on the U.S. mainland, and disarm. In other words, the Soviets and their allies would prefer the Americans to voluntarily disarm and surrender to Marxist-Leninist totalitarianism rather than to resist.

The Communist-bloc countries are quite aware of the strategic importance of the defense bases located in Puerto Rico, and Monteiro's speech contains the usual slanders about "militarization," "imperialism," et cetera.

Anticommunism—that is to say resistance to Marxist-Leninist totalitarianism—is, as usual, smeared by association with militarism, reaction, and assorted other terms with negative connotations in Monteiro's speech.

The following excerpts from Monteiro's speech are offered as a sample of the cur-

rent Communist line in the World Peace Council.

Comrades: The U.S. colonial domination of Puerto Rico attests to the barbaric character of the present ruling circles in our country. The facts—which I need not repeat—shatter the demagogy of U.S. imperialist propaganda to the effect that the imperialism rooted in the U.S. is somehow different, somehow democratic and peaceful. The Puerto Rican case is without question that of a classical colony. Here the world's peoples witness examples of perhaps the most savage oppression in our hemisphere. This shameful oppression originates in our country, is carried out by the imperialism based in the U.S. For this reason, comrades, we of the U.S. delegation wholeheartedly endorse this preparatory meeting and the proposed Congress for Solidarity with the Independence of Puerto Rico.

But we welcome, and recognize as quite appropriate, the initiative of the World Peace Council. For, in our opinion, the global struggle for peace is the point of intersection of the most noble aspirations of all the people. The struggle for and attainment of detente and peaceful coexistence are strategic to the process of liquidating the remaining remnants of colonialism, of defeating fascism and militarism, of creating a positive international environment for the acceleration of the struggles for democracy and social progress. It is, however, also true that the realization of detente as an irreversible process leading to peaceful coexistence between states with differing social systems is possible only as colonial oppression is terminated. Hence, national freedom and global peace are parts of a single whole. Colonization, and the colonial domination of Puerto Rico in particular, is therefore a threat to world peace, as well as a violation of international law and contemporary norms guiding the relationships between peoples.

The new correlation of world forces, which is made possible in the first place by the strength and growing unity of the world system of socialist states, headed by the mighty Soviet Union, creates extraordinarily favorable circumstances for the independence struggle within Puerto Rico and building international solidarity with the Puerto Rican people. U.S. imperialist domination of Puerto Rico is today incompatible with this new global correlation of forces. Moreover, the elevation of the Puerto Rican independence struggle further weakens U.S. colonization of Puerto Rico and is providing the decisive link that will break the chain of U.S. colonial oppression of Puerto Rico. The world embraces the just and noble struggle of the Puerto Rican people.

Comrades, allow us to be quite frank. This meeting is decisively important to the people of the United States. The actions of the U.S. people are important. Because it is U.S. imperialism that imposes colonial domination on the Puerto Rican people, the fulfillment of our responsibility is fundamental.

U.S. imperialism seeks to preserve colonialism in Puerto Rico as a strategic beachhead in the policy of neo-colonial containment of the Latin American liberation process. In fact, this neo-colonial aggression is an attempt to roll back the historic gains of the Latin American peoples, and in the first place, to liquidate socialism in Cuba, the first land of freedom on our hemisphere. This policy orients upon the militarization of Puerto Rico as a step in the militarization of the entire continent, as a base for counter-revolution, reaction and anti-Communism. U.S. imperialism plans to utilize Puerto Rico as a staging area for the liquidation of popular democratic governments of the continent, as in Santo Domingo. This policy is evidenced in its most criminal and brutal expression in the overthrow of the Popular Unity Government in Chile, and the murder of Dr. Salvador Allende.

Monteiro's long speech pointed with pride to the work of the National Conference for a Drastic Cutback in the Military Budget, held April 5-6, 1975, in Chicago, and organized by members of the CPUSA long active in the work of the World Peace Council which was reported on in my remarks of and concluded:

To our comrades and to the people of Puerto Rico, of Chile, Cuba, and all of Latin America, to the fraternal peoples of Vietnam and Cambodia, of Korea, to the peoples of the Mid East, Africa and to the peoples of all continents, we, the U.S. peace movement, pledge our enhanced activity in our common cause of liberation, these actions, our dear comrades will be our common witness of the death of U.S. imperialism.

This alliance of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People is especially interesting in light of the vehement denunciations of the NIC by CPUSA leaders. As has been noted previously, a substantial proportion of those now associated with NIC were formerly either members of the Communist Party or were on the fringes of the CPUSA. The defection of militant organizers with years of experience is a serious blow to the CPUSA.

But despite faction fighting and mutual charges of "deviationism" or "revisionism," all Marxist-Leninists can agree, given a properly motivating cause, that the true "class enemy" is the United States.

In light of these various alliances and factional quarrels, the history of the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee is of interest.

The Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee—PRSC—had its founding conference March 1-2, 1975, on the campus of Rutgers University, Newark, N.J., a university where Arthur Kinoy has been a professor of law for a number of years. Alferdo Lopez, the PRSC executive secretary, characterized the committee as "an organization, in the United States, in support of the national liberation struggle in Puerto Rico."

The Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee developed from a reorganization of the Committee for Puerto Rican Decolonization—CPRD—which had been created in August 1973, by groups and individuals active in the Communist Party's front in the prison and civil rights movement, the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression—NAARPR—in which the PSP has played an important role.

The Committee for Puerto Rican Decolonization, in turn, had its antecedents in the Committee To Defend Carlos Feliciano, which was supported by both the CPUSA and the PSP. Carlos Feliciano, a member of the violent Puerto Rican Nationalist Party, had served a prison sentence in Puerto Rico for his part in the abortive 1950 revolution in that island. He was arrested in New York and was charged with several bombings attributed to MIRV, an independentista terrorist organization. After a series of trials in which he was represented by William Kunstler, Arthur Kinoy's law partner, Feliciano pleaded guilty to the lesser charge of possession of explosives and

was sentenced in 1973 to a 4½-year prison term which he is now serving.

On May 29, 1974, to develop broad radical support for the PSP's Puerto Rican Solidarity Day rally in Madison Square Garden on October 27, 1974, the Committee for Puerto Rican Decolonization and the Puerto Rican Socialist Party created an expanded group, the Puerto Rican Solidarity Day Committee—PRSDC. Many of the PRSDC national board members were associated with Arthur Kinoy's NIC, and now continue to serve on the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee.

Among the approximately one hundred delegates who attended the founding of the reconstituted Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee were representatives of the PSP, the leading political force in the organization; the Congress of Afrikan People; the Maoist revolutionary October League; the Third World Women's Alliance; NIC; the National Committee to Free Los Tres, a militant Chicano organization also associated with NAARPR; El Comité, a Puerto Rican organization from New York City's Upper West Side; and the weekly newspaper, Guardian, a Maoist publication.

Also present, according to the Guardian, were "a significant number of people who could reasonably be described as having political views closely associated with Prairie Fire—who—play an active role in the organization."

The Guardian correctly noted that Prairie Fire is the title of a political statement produced by the Weather Underground Organization, the clandestine apparatus of new Left terrorists who profess their admiration for the forms of Marxism-Leninism practiced in Cuba, North Vietnam, and the Peoples Republic of China.

The Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee agreed to develop campaigns around "workers struggles in Puerto Rico, repression against Puerto Rican people and the independence movement in the United States and Puerto Rico, the genocidal population policies of U.S. imperialism and freedom for Puerto Rican 'political prisoners.'"

The PRSC elected a national board a list of whose members include:

At-large members: Ella J. Baker; * Amiri Baraka * [LeRoi Jones], CAP leader working with NIC to form a common electoral strategy; Frances M. Beal, Third World Women's Alliance; Clyde Bellecourt * American Indian Movement (AIM); Ben Chavis, NAARPR and United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice; Walter Collins, * executive director, Southern Conference Educational Funds (SCEF); Dave Dellinger; * David Garcia, St. Mark's Church, N.Y.C.; Corky Gonzales, Crusade for Justice; Jim Haughton, * Fight Back; Phil Hutchings; Arthur Kinoy; * Yuri Kochiyama, * Asian Americans for Action (AAA); Beverly Leman; Bob Lewis, * NLG and United Electrical (UE); Antonio Rodriguez; Awusu Sadaukai [Howard Fuller], African Liberation Support Committee (ALSC); Irwin Silber, Guardian; Annie Stein; and Jose "Che" Velazquez, PSP.

PRSC coordinators include: Ted Glick, * also an NIC traveler, Washington, D.C.; Tamt Gold, N.J.; Cathy Graham, Hartford, CN;

* Persons who are members or who have numerous interlocking associations with the NIC.

Fannie Hicks, Chicago; Julie Nichamin, N.Y.C.; Venceremos Brigade and NACLA-East, and an old Weather Underground contact; Belen Molinari, Buffalo; Ivelise Padin, Los Angeles; Tony Rostain, New Haven, CN; Anne Sills, Boston; and Alfredo Lopez, executive secretary.

The Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee national staff, which produces its monthly bulletin, *Puerto Rico Libre*, previously the publication of the CPRD, includes: Maggie Block, Rosa Borenstein, David Burd, Bill Henning, Sally Hamann, Lally Lopez, Liz Mestres and Vicki Wheeler.

The emphasis placed by the PRSC on "workers struggles" is derived, no doubt, from the close relationships between the lawyers who act as NIC organizers, the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, and the United Workers Movement—MOU—Movimiento Obrero Unido—in Puerto Rico whose coordinator and president, Pedro Grant, is also a member of the PSP Central Committee.

Puerto Rico Libre states:

One can easily understand why the colonial government of Puerto Rico is threatened by the MOU. At a time when Puerto Rico is suffering a major economic crisis, the MOU is building a united trade union movement capable of and active in coordinating island-wide strike support. The MOU was formed on October 16, 1972, out of a labor committee organized by a group of labor union leaders which sought a vehicle for unity in the trade union movement.

The MOU now has some 40-member unions and about 100 locals. These include the Boilermakers Union, Island Union of Electrical Construction and Industrial Workers—UITICE, Union of Workers of the Cement Industry, Amalgamated Meatcutters Union, the Congress of Industrial Unions, the Union of Petrochemical Workers, Union of United Firefighters, Puerto Rican Workers Guild, Puerto Rican Industrial Maintenance and Service Union, Ready Mix Workers Union, Union of Housing Fund Employees, Union of Fomento Company Employees, Union of Professional Employees of the Electrical Authority—AFF, APATE, and the National Workers Union.

The National Workers Union—UNT, Union Nacional de Trabajadores, has been represented by attorneys from Arthur Kinoy's Center for Constitutional Rights—CCR—since 1973 in a National Labor Relations Board dispute. UNT President Arturo Grant and UNT Secretary-Treasurer Radames Acosta, both leading members of the PSP, are charged with violating an NLRB injunction against an illegal strike.

Radames Acosta, in an interview in *Puerto Rico Libre*, said of the UNT and MOU:

We're working to reach our basic goal of uniting the Puerto Rican workers. We believe that the creation of a *Central Unica de Trabajadores* (Central labor organization made up of all the island's unions) is essential.

Puerto Rico Libre reported:

To achieve this long-term goal, one of the union's officers, Osvaldo Romero, is also the Southern area coordinator of the MOU (Movimiento Obrero Unido) ***. It is hoped that the MOU will act as a catalyst for the eventual formation of this [Marxist-Leninist] workers' central.

As an indication of the revolutionary militancy of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party which the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People is supporting so actively, the reports in the radical press of the MOU's Mayday rally in San Juan, Puerto Rico, is on point.

On May 1, the MOU led some 15,000 demonstrators in a rally on the steps of the capitol building in San Juan. These demonstrators were joined by a torchlight parade of 5,000 which marched from the harbor area in solidarity with striking dockworkers to the main MOU rally which was "dedicated to the victories of Vietnam and Cambodia, working women, the Puerto Rico Cement strikers, the Puerto Rican Telephone Co. * * * strikers, and all struggling workers here as well as throughout the world."

Speakers included Efrain Fernandez president of the Cement Industry Operators and Quarry Workers Union, who announced that the southern area MOU would stage "a massive act of solidarity with the telephone workers." He also said:

Eighty percent of the workers do not have a fighting organization at this moment . . . and that is the fault of the capitalist system in this country.

Fernandez was arrested in Puerto Rico on April 9, 1975, on charges of violating the Federal Explosives and Firearms Act. His \$11,000 bail was posted by the treasurer of the Independent Union of Petrochemical Workers, an MOU affiliate.

The principal speaker was MOU coordinator Pedro Grant, who is also secretary-treasurer of the Boilermakers Union which he helped organize 11 years ago. Grant said:

Today is a day of extraordinary importance for the working class of the world. Today we also celebrate the triumph of the peoples' forces in Vietnam against three imperialisms citing the defeats of the Japanese, French and "now the U.S. imperialists." And he declared that "the Puerto Rican people also are with the Vietnamese."

Grant continued saying that the MOU cannot be stopped "because it is the instrument which will lead to the destruction" of the free enterprise system.

The NIC and PSP's Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee sponsored a U.S.-speaking tour by Pedro Grant from May 15 to 31. The tour included engagements in many areas where the PSP have followings including New York City; Newark, N.J.; Hartford and New Haven; Boston; Buffalo; Chicago; Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, the intense revolutionary organizing by these three groups, the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People, the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, and the Congress of Afrikan People, active across the country and each calling for armed struggle to overthrow our constitutional form of government and free enterprise economic system, is clearly a matter for intensive investigation by the House Judiciary Committee which now has jurisdiction over matters of internal security.

We need to know the extent of the threat posed by these organizations, whether new laws need to be drafted,

and whether the appropriate existing laws are being properly enforced.

TRADE COMMISSION LISTENS TO PEOPLE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1975

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the U.S. International Trade Commission conducted 2 days of hearings in southwestern Pennsylvania to determine what impact relaxed trade concessions to foreign manufacturers would have on the local economy and the working force. Its visit to Pittsburgh was one of a series scheduled on this critical issue throughout the United States.

Unfortunately, because the House was in session I was unable to personally attend the proceedings in Pittsburgh, although I have an intense interest in the problem of foreign imports and our local domestic markets. Nevertheless, I want to commend the Trade Commission for venturing forth from the hallowed halls of Washington to listen to those most affected by sudden and drastic changes in our Nation's trade policies—the people!

In particular, I want to publicly recognize the efforts of Mr. Daniel Minchew and Mr. Will E. Leonard for bringing the Commission's hearings to Pittsburgh.

When the Commission first announced its schedule of hearing locations in January, neither Pittsburgh nor the State of Pennsylvania were included on the list. I was highly disturbed by the omission because the area not only is a massive industrial center but it also is home to approximately 30 major corporations.

I wrote the Commission chairman, requesting the itinerary be revised or expanded to include Pittsburgh. Regrettably, the request was rejected. However, a few weeks later I was informed the Commission had reconsidered and would be coming to Pittsburgh the latter part of April. It is my understanding Mr. Minchew and Mr. Leonard were primarily responsible for the Commission's change of heart.

I sincerely appreciate the interest of these two men, whom I have never met, for I deeply feel southwest Pennsylvania, which is a blend of white and blue collar workers, is vulnerable to any upsurge in the importation of many foreign-made products.

By coming to Pittsburgh, Mr. Minchew and Mr. Leonard provided a great service to our people by listening to their opinions. They also provided a service to our President for by having the advantage of personal interviews with people directly involved in the question of international trade, they will be able to furnish a broader, more comprehensive set of facts on which high echelon officials may base their decisions.

I am confident the information Mr. Minchew and Mr. Leonard collected during the Pittsburgh visit will prove helpful to them in making their recommendations to the President.