

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 27, 1973:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. John V. Brennan, U.S. Marine Corps, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps,

in accordance with article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 27, 1973:

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be general

Gen. John D. Ryan, XXXX-XX-XXXX FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICA: IT IS NOT SICK, JUST BEWILDERED

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Daily Californian of July 6, 1973:

AMERICA: IT'S NOT SICK, JUST BEWILDERED

(By Arpad Kadarkay)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The fireworks have been lit, the Fourth of July speeches given, the picnic baskets emptied, but what was it that we celebrated? The following article, written by Prof. Arpad Kadarkay, a Hungarian immigrant who teaches political science at Occidental College, gives one American's view of this country's meaning. It is reprinted with permission of the author and the Los Angeles Times.)

In his inaugural address, President Nixon noted that the time has come for all Americans to "renew our faith in ourselves, and in America." As a naturalized citizen, such renewal of faith is a privilege for me.

I am American, not by birth, but by heart, by choice. I am in debt to America. To repay my debt, partly in small coin, I would like to speak to those who find so very much wrong with America and so very little that is right.

Of late, America, Europe's child—her Cinderella brought to bloom by a kindly magic—has been declared ugly. The pathology of American society fills the pens of our best writers with paradox, irony, pathos, even poetry. They find the American illness so great that the most high-minded doctors have been called to diagnose and write the death certificate.

I want to speak on behalf of Cinderella.

Her mourners say that America is dead, her dream a patchwork of racial-urban strife, poisoned by self-interest, rotted by surfeit and indifference, maimed by violence. I am told that the great aspiration is spent; America is only another crowded nation, not even able to maintain order. America is only a power, not a society, not a culture. We have gone, I am advised, from primitiveness, from childhood and innocence, to decadence—a far poorer record than that of Rome.

These gloomy soothsayers are as old as the nation. They thundered in Jefferson's time, in Lincoln's time, in Roosevelt's time, in Truman's time. Every society has its share of doomsday prophets who convince themselves that they sit at the edge of Babylon and thus must cry that judgment day is at hand.

Well, this is not it. Not yet. Rather, this country is a vast experimental laboratory of human relations for the 20th century. We are, in a sense, defining and creating the 20th century for much of the world.

Unless seen in this light, America cannot be understood at all. It is not a sick society, but merely a bewildered society. And rightly so. For we are the first mass society where

three revolutions have converged simultaneously, the industrial-scientific revolution, jamming us together and thus increasing the tension of daily living; the communication revolution bringing us face-to-face contact; and an educational revolution, raising our level of expectations and demand for freedom and mobility.

Just consider the impact of these revolutions. For generations Europe had sharpened its appreciation of beautiful things and trained itself to reflect on the meaning of human existence. The result? A thin layer of Europeans achieved a cultured leisure—the Old World "douceur de vivre." The American way is different.

We are not becoming less democratic, but more democratic. Perhaps there are too many people—too many untrained cooks in the kitchen. Yet Americans are the most natural workers-together in the world. We claim to live by the system of private enterprise, while in fact we are the supreme cooperative society. The Communist countries, founded on cooperation, have to coerce their people to work.

Our standards of expectancy have risen. But since Americans are perfectionists, dissatisfaction will continue, as well it should. We have lifted the massive center of ordinary people. Mass society, so often abused, and widespread affluence, so often mocked, are living examples of this. Yet no one pretends to be fully satisfied—a sure sign of health.

Our common health hinges on the complex chemistry of individual freedom. I am unable to understand the thrust of the sufferings and strivings of Western man over the last centuries save in terms of this kind of achievement. We have not managed to journey all this way for nearly three centuries—across oceans and continents and, more recently, through space—because we are made of sugar candy.

I am a teacher. Loudly and persistently I am told that American education is in crisis. What a compliment! To me this is the unique character of free education—not in the money sense but in the real sense. It enables us to measure progress by enumerating shortcomings and by drawing critical attention to failures.

Its very purpose and subject matter are crisis-prone. This is part of the creative process. Crisis in education is an unbroken Western tradition—the root of its strength. Since creativity proceeds from the known to the unknown, education will always be in crisis until the well runs dry.

Some say that America has pursued a tragic course, having tried in vain to realize the dream of a free society. But in so vast an undertaking, success cannot be measured in absolutes. We are only mortal, not gods.

As mortals, we are always shackled by our own failures. One glaring mistake has been Vietnam, but it was not typical of America—and now we have gotten out from under its yoke. Another failure has been racism—much more difficult to overcome. But I believe it will be, for the simple reason that whereas most of the older generation regarded racial equality as only logical, the younger one considers it perfectly natural.

The criticism of America, though loud enough at home, is even louder from abroad. One reason is that millions the world over judge America by different standards—higher

standards—than they do other countries. They do not shout advice to Russia and China, whatever their misdeeds, for the same reason that the crowd in the bullring shouts advice to the bullfighter but not to the bull.

Here on my desk I have some weighty books by learned authors proving that America is like the Roman Empire—ripe with decline and fall. Perhaps. But Rome had lasted a thousand years.

OIL AND WATER MAY NOT MIX, BUT OIL AND PROFITS CERTAINLY DO

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to mount, says a Wall Street Journal story today, "that the June quarter was the most profitable ever for the oil industry."

The story continues:

Operating at capacity levels, 15 of the bigger oil companies have reported earnings gains for the period, many of them spectacular.

Among the latest to report, with earnings increasing 24% to 174%, were Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), Standard Oil Co. of California, Atlantic Richfield Co., Continental Oil Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., Marathon Oil Co., Ashland Oil Inc. and Commonwealth Oil Refining Co.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the entire story at this point, as well as a number of items from the Journal's digest of company earnings reports:

MORE OIL FIRMS LIST JUNE QUARTER SPURTS IN NET, SIGNALING RECORD PERIOD IN INDUSTRY

Evidence mounted that the June quarter was the most profitable ever for the oil industry.

Operating at capacity levels, 15 of the bigger oil companies have reported earnings gains for the period, many of them spectacular.

Among the latest to report, with earnings increasing 24% to 174%, were Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), Standard Oil Co. of California, Atlantic Richfield Co., Continental Oil Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., Marathon Oil Co., Ashland Oil Inc. and Commonwealth Oil Refining Co.

Indiana Standard's second quarter earnings spurred 37% to \$121.3 million, or \$1.74 a share, on an 11% gain in revenue to \$1.53 billion.

For the six months, Indiana Standard's net rose 29% to \$242.5 million, or \$3.48 a share. Revenue gained 11% to nearly \$3 billion.

Improved prices and increased sales volume for refined products, higher world-wide chemical sales and increased production of crude oil and natural gas liquids were chiefly responsible for the gains, John E. Swearingin, chairman, said. "Everything we have is running virtually at maximum levels, with all

operations at record first half levels," he said.

Atlantic Richfield's earnings soared 50% to \$68.4 million, or \$1.20 a share, in the second quarter. Operating revenue rose 14% to \$1.07 billion.

Its first half net was up 51% to \$118.7 million, or \$2.09 a share, on a 9.4% gain in revenue to \$2.07 billion.

STRONGER PRICES, HIGHER SALES

Robert O. Anderson, Atlantic Richfield chairman also cited stronger product prices and higher sales volumes, which offset higher costs and increased taxes he said. First half net was the equivalent of about 1.5 cents per gallon of products sold, Mr. Anderson said. He said Atlantic Richfield expects continued improvement in the second half, but the rate of gain isn't expected to match the first six months.

Continental Oil's June quarter net increased nearly 24% to \$51.7 million or \$1.03 a share, on a 17% gain in revenue to \$1.03 billion. Continental's six-month earnings rose nearly 18% to \$99.2 million or \$1.7 a share, while revenue gained 13% to \$1.69 billion.

"The second quarter earnings gain was due to improved performances from the company's world-wide petroleum and chemicals activities," John G. McLean, Continental chairman said. "These improvements were partially offset, however by reduced earnings from coal operations, currency translation adjustments and higher interest charges."

Phillips Petroleum's second quarter earnings climbed 25% to \$46.4 million, or 61 cents a share, and revenue rose more than 8% to \$694.8 million. First half net was up nearly 24% to \$89.8 million or \$1.19 a share, while revenue increased 8% to \$1.37 billion.

MARATHON LISTS RESULTS

Marathon's net June period earnings surged more than 65% to \$27.6 million or 92 cents a share, while revenue rose more than 23% to \$363 million. First half net jumped nearly 58% to \$51.7 million or \$1.73 a share, and revenue rose 20% to \$717.9 million.

J. C. Donnell II Marathon's chairman, said the second half earnings improvement "cannot be expected to be as great," although the full-year's results should be "substantially improved" from 1972.

Ashland Oil's earnings for the fiscal third quarter, ended June 30 increased nearly 36% to \$22.3 million, or 89 cents a share on a revenue rise of 16% to \$517.6 million. For the nine months, Ashland's earnings rose more than 28% to \$60.8 million or \$2.40 a share, on a 12% increase in revenue to \$1.44 billion.

Commonwealth Oil's second quarter net increased 174% to \$7.1 million or 50 cents a share, on a 34% sales gain to \$99.2 million. Its six-month earnings were up 95% to \$9.9 million or 67 cents a share, on a 36% rise in revenue to \$190.3 million. But Norman C. Keith, president, called Puerto Rico's new price controls on gasoline "discriminatory and confiscatory," and said they will substantially affect the company's profits if continued in their present form.

ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO. (N)

Quarter June 30	1973	1972
Share earns.....	\$1.20	\$0.81
Sales and revenue.....	1,069,760,000	940,291,000
Net income.....	68,401,000	45,674,000
6 month share.....	2.09	1.39
Sales and revenue.....	2,067,319,000	1,891,246,000
Net income.....	118,704,000	78,716,000

CLARK OIL & REFINING (N)

Share earns.....	\$1.19	\$0.14
Sales.....	96,369,000	68,445,000
Net income.....	8,413,000	964,000
6 month share.....	1.87	.25
Sales.....	180,243,000	138,513,000
Net income.....	13,259,000	1,769,000

COMMONWEALTH OIL (N)

Quarter June 30	1973	1972
Share earns.....	\$0.05	\$0.16
Sales.....	99,154,492	173,844,275
Net income.....	7,062,725	2,576,264
6 month share.....	.67	1.31
Sales.....	190,270,888	139,665,584
Net income.....	9,868,775	5,050,584

CONTINENTAL OIL CO. (N)

Share earns.....	\$1.03	\$0.83
Revenue.....	1,029,877,000	883,485,000
Net income.....	51,703,000	41,799,000
6 month share.....	1.97	1.68
Revenue.....	1,961,080,000	1,737,355,000
Net income.....	99,180,000	84,388,000

MARATHON OIL CO. (N)

Share earns.....	\$0.92	\$0.56
Revenues.....	362,981,000	293,694,000
Net income.....	27,557,000	16,644,000
Average shares.....	29,905,790	29,930,014
6 months share.....	1.73	1.10
Revenues.....	717,857,000	595,961,000
Net income.....	51,722,000	32,796,000

PHILLIPS PETROLEUM (N)

Share earns.....	\$0.61	\$0.49
Revenues.....	694,802,000	641,453,000
Net income.....	46,372,000	37,105,000
Average shares.....	75,495,024	75,017,252
6 months share.....	1.19	.97
Revenues.....	1,374,610,000	1,277,345,000
Net income.....	89,820,000	72,700,000
Average shares.....	75,453,930	74,922,103

STANDARD OIL CO. CALIF (N)

Share earns.....	\$2.14	\$1.51
Sales and revenue.....	2,001,846,000	1,603,543,000
Net income.....	181,700,000	128,321,000
6 months share.....	3.94	2.96
Sales and revenue.....	3,776,463,000	3,114,856,000
Net income.....	334,500,000	251,310,000

STANDARD OIL CO. IND. (N)¹

Share earns.....	\$1.74	\$1.26
Revenues.....	1,527,242,000	1,379,774,000
Net income.....	121,349,000	88,273,000
Average shares.....	69,733,521	91,910,263
6 months share.....	3.48	2.70
Revenues.....	2,997,000,000	2,700,000,000
Net income.....	242,500,000	188,000,000
Average shares.....	69,747,696	69,582,144

¹ Adjusted for a 2 percent stock dividend in February 1973.

² On a fully diluted basis, per-share earnings in the 6 months were \$3.36 in 1973 and \$2.62 in 1972.

Note: (N) New York Stock Exchange (A) American Exchange (O) Over-the-Counter (Pa) Pacific (M) Midwest (P) PBW (Na) National (B) Boston (D) Detroit (T) Toronto (Mo) Montreal (F) Foreign.

A "p" or "b" following exchange designation indicates company has only preferred shares, or bonds or debentures in public hands.

STALLED FIRE FIGHT

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the environmental radicals are at it again. Recently, a fire destroyed over 1,000 acres of grazing land in Oregon because bureaucratic regulations prevented the local ranchers from using the necessary equipment to stop the fire. The following article appeared in the Idaho Statesman:

OREGON RANCHER COMPLAINS BLM RESTRICTION STALLED FIRE FIGHT

(By Betty Hopper)

DANNER, OREG.—Restrictions on the use of equipment in a fire which burned more than 1,000 acres of grazing land in the Danner area last weekend stirred a protest Tuesday.

The fire was west of Jordan Valley near Antelope Reservoir.

Oran (Shorty) Raburn complained Bureau of Land Management officials refused to let ranchers use equipment on the federal land to make trails to stop the fire.

He said the fire was first noted at about 6 p.m. Friday on his place. "We notified BLM and they arrived with a pumper at about the same time we arrived with our cats (Three, including neighbors).

"The fire boss said no cats would be allowed to fight this fire," Raburn said, "but on my own property I went ahead and with a neighbor, we put the fire out on the west side. Another cat was sent to the other side to make a trail to put it out over there.

"After this side was out, we stayed guard for awhile, but were wondering why the fire seemed to be growing on the other side. When we went over there, the cat and the pumper truck were parked in the roadway—the fire boss had prevented the cat from going in."

Raburn said more than 1,000 acres, (he estimated 1,500) were burned, but "if they had let us go ahead, only 200 or 300 acres at the most would have been burned."

George Gurr, manager of the Vale District of the BLM, said 1,050 acres were burned, including 419 deeded acres, 620 acres of federal land and one acre of state land.

He defended the BLM's position on fighting fires. "Our men have the authority to make the final decision on how a fire will be fought in federal lands. If he feels he cannot use certain equipment, he makes that decision. He is trained to know how and what to do."

Raburn said he objected to "environmentalists" saying the trails to prevent fires from spreading cannot be made. "Those trails grow right back into grass the next year," he said.

He said, "The big problem now is what do we do about the next fire? Everything here is bone dry and there will be more fires. We'd been better off this time if we hadn't called BLM. Some decisions will have to be reached shortly on how we are going to save the land when fire strikes."

He said his feed will be scarce this year because there is such a small amount of irrigation water that he will have only one cutting of hay and with the tinder dry land, the "cheatgrass will go."

He said the Malheur County Cattlemen's Association, Oregon Cattlemen's Association, Cattlefax and Rep. Al Ullman have been notified of the problem of fire fighting and are now investigating it.

"None of it makes sense," he said, "to stand by and let the grass burn when you have the equipment there to put it out, but are ordered not to use it. Nothing else can stop these fires except dozers and blades and they won't let us use them."

Gurr said that BLM contracts with ranchers prior to the fire season for rental of their equipment in case of fire. "If it has not been rented, we can't be responsible for equipment or the man in case of trouble."

He said in the fire last weekend, "the man in charge apparently felt there was a better way to fight the fire than to make more roads in the county nobody wants."

He said the issue in this instance is not the quality of the land (Raburn had said the grass was knee high) nor the amount of land, "but the fact that we are responsible on federal lands. We want cooperation from the ranchers. We do not say that cats can't be put into operation, but we do say they must

be used under our direction and in this case other alternatives were selected."

Raburn said he had been on fire guard for many years and had lots of experience in fighting fires. Pumps aren't any use unless they have a road to follow, he said.

Raburn who runs about 750 cows, said he was the loser in this fire although two neighbors lost 20 or 30 acres of grazing land, "but we don't know when or where the next one will be. The next fire is the problem now."

Mr. Speaker, the BLM and their allies in the Environmental Protection Agency have gone too far.

The EPA is destroying our environment, not protecting it. How many more acres of forest and grazing land will be destroyed by fire because Federal regulations are protecting it from the local residents. This kind of nonsense must stop; it is a perfect example of Government gone wild, fueled by environmental emotionalism.

CONYERS OPPOSES PHASE IV GUIDELINES

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's recently announced phase IV guidelines will work a serious hardship on the service station owners of Michigan. Because of special circumstances in Michigan, the phase IV freeze on retail gasoline prices will be particularly inequitable and will force many service station owners to close their businesses. The price freeze plus the already limited supply of gasoline will constitute a severe inconvenience to the motorists of Michigan, a State which relies heavily on its automobile industry for its economic well-being. In recognition of the inequities imposed by the phase IV guidelines, the entire congressional delegation from Michigan has addressed a letter to the Director of the Cost of Living Council urging that the Council favorably consider a request from the Service Station Dealers Association of Michigan to enable owners to exercise a pricing option which would more accurately reflect market conditions. This is an important request which will benefit both service station owners and motorists in Michigan, and because of its importance I would like to enter our letter to the Cost of Living Council in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1973.

Dr. JOHN T. DUNLOP,
Director, Cost of Living Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. DUNLOP: It has come to our attention that the Phase IV guidelines for the retail price of gasoline will cause a great economic hardship on the service station owners of Michigan. Prices will be frozen at August acquisition costs plus the average profit per gallon based on sales of January 10, 1973.

A temporary price war among Michigan service station owners drove January 10th profits down to 5.6 cents per gallon. This

compares to an August 14, 1971 per gallon profit of 8.24 cents. In addition, due to the fuel shortage, gas allocations to dealers are limited to eighty percent of previous sales further reducing profits. Under these conditions, many service station owners will be forced to close which will only cause additional inconvenience to Michigan motorists.

It is our understanding that when price controls were first imposed under Phase I, those retailers engaged in price wars were granted an option date to compute Phase I prices which accurately reflected market conditions. We also understand that the Service Station Dealers Association of Michigan has petitioned for such an option date based on June 1 to June 12, 1973.

In view of these circumstances and the obvious hardships which would result from Phases IV controls as now written, we urge your favorable consideration of their request.

We look forward to receiving your earliest reply.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senators.

William S. Broomfield, Elford A. Cedberg, John J. Conyers, John D. Dingell, Gerald R. Ford, William D. Ford, Garry Brown, Charles E. Chamberlain, Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Marvin L. Esch, Robert J. Huber, Martha Griffiths, James Harvey, Lucien N. Nedzi, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Edward Hutchinson, James G. O'Hara, Philip E. Ruppe, Guy Vander Jagt, Members of Congress.

CONSTITUTIONAL PREROGATIVE AND THE "NIXON TAPES"

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's days of crying "separation of powers" are numbered. Special Watergate Prosecutor Archibald Cox has subpoenaed the "Nixon tapes" and as Joseph Kraft points out in his column today, President Nixon's last line of defense is utterly without merit.

Although the President makes the case, that as Chief Executive he can deny Senator ERVIN's legislative committee access to these tapes on the theory of separation of powers, no such justification exists in regard to the Cox investigation. Mr. Cox was appointed by Attorney General Elliot Richardson, and Mr. Richardson was appointed by President Nixon and all are members of the executive branch of Government. Thus, there is no rationale for invoking the doctrine of separation of powers. In fact, Prosecutor Cox is merely fulfilling his duties as a Nixon appointee in thoroughly investigating the criminal charges he was hired to investigate.

Kraft concludes: Cox is in the best legal position to request the tapes, and should Nixon refuse to release them, Cox—

Can dramatize what more and more people are coming to understand—that the fit place for dealing with the President's role in Watergate is an impeachment proceeding.

I am including at this time the full text of Mr. Kraft's column:

Cox's TAPE CASE

President Nixon might have half a leg to stand on if he were only battling the Senate Watergate Committee over access to the tapes of his phone and office conversations. But unfortunately for the President, special Watergate Prosecutor Archibald Cox is also after the tapes.

Cox has an overwhelming case. If he is forced to press it all the way, he is in a position to engage the Supreme Court, divide the Administration and push Congress further down the road to impeachment.

The Cox case for access to the tapes is more weighty than the case of the Watergate Committee for a variety of legal and political reasons. For one thing, there is the separation of powers issue.

Nixon is the head of the executive branch of government, and the Senate Committee is part of the legislative branch. Each branch is entitled to a certain confidentiality in its deliberations.

Thus there is at least the color of an argument for the proposition that Nixon can keep the inner deliberations of the White House away from the Senators. If nobody else, tenacious lawyers can confuse the issue by arguing that the doctrine of executive privilege entitles the President to withhold the tapes from the committee.

But Cox is part of the executive branch. He was appointed by Nixon's Attorney General, Elliot Richardson, with the assent of the President. To claim, as the White House is now doing that he would breach the separation of powers by using the tapes for proceedings in court is absurd.

It is like saying that if the President and Ron Ziegler decided to bump off Pat Nixon, a duly authorized special prosecutor would be denied access to the evidence because of executive privilege.

For apart from eliminating the phony constitutional issue, Cox's position heightens the true issue—the criminal issue. The basic fact in the fight for the tapes is that they contain evidence of criminal action. For example, the tape of the President's meeting with John Dean and H. R. Haldeman on Sept. 15, 1972, which Cox has specifically requested, will show one of three things.

Either Dean committed perjury in telling the Senate Watergate Committee he was congratulated by the President for his role in the cover-up. Or Dean and Haldeman participated in the cover-up (and the obstruction of justice) without the President's knowledge. Or all three were involved in the crime of obstructing justice.

There is no excuse in the common law or the Constitution for any person to withhold evidence of a crime. Indeed the present Supreme Court, in an opinion last June, cited Jeremy Bentham's dictum that not even the Prince of Wales or the Archbishop of Canterbury by the Lord High Chancellor could withhold evidence of a crime.

But Cox's mandate, as an official of the Justice Department, is precisely to investigate crime. His directive from Attorney General Richardson gives him "full authority for investigating and prosecuting . . . all offenses arising out of the 1972 presidential election." Thus, in resisting Cox's demand for the tapes, the President is standing on the weakest possible ground. He is refusing the most fundamental of his duties. He is refusing to execute the laws.

Finally there are the politics. Unlike at least some members of the Senate committee, Cox does not have an axe to grind. He has not aired grievances to the press or the public. Not even Nixon, in the fullness of his self-compassion, can argue that Cox has been trying to "get" him.

In these circumstances, Cox is in a strong position to go after the tapes. He is going to ask the courts to subpoena the material. He will surely be able to take the case to the Supreme Court, perhaps convoked in extra-

ordinary session this summer. It is hardly thinkable that his request will be denied even by the Nixon court.

In addition, Cox has some credit to draw on inside the Administration. Attorney General Richardson, in particular, is under pressure to stand up for his man. If he doesn't, he will show himself to be a complete White House fink. If he does, there will be additional pressure on the White House to give way.

Lastly, Cox can go public. Apart from the few documents he has already released, he has an abundant correspondence with J. Fred Buzhardt, the White House counsel on Watergate. It runs from the end of May to the present. It shows who has been careful, responsible and patient in an effort to discover what happened. It shows who has been uncooperative.

What all this means is that Cox not the Senate committee, should lead the battle of the tapes. He has by far that best case. He can give Nixon and his legal hirelings a taste of the truth that they will never forget.

If he does not finally acquire the tapes, he can dramatize what more and more people are coming to understand—that the fit place for dealing with the President's role in Watergate is an impeachment proceeding.

AMERICAN PROSPERITY?

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the other day we began to witness what may go down in history as the most disastrous rises in food prices in American history.

After 5 years of tinkering with a national economy they do not understand, the administration economic wizards have finally succeeded in creating the worst of all possible worlds.

We appear to be headed for a recession which will surpass those of past years. Lumber prices are out of sight and we are unable to construct adequate housing for millions of Americans. Yet logs cut in national forests are shipped to Japan.

Wool is skyrocketing in cost, causing clothing prices to rise, yet raw American wool is shipped abroad for fat profits.

We are paying much more for bread and related products because of the Russian grain deal, which it now seems involved windfall profits for a few major grain trading companies.

Most of all, we have watched as the most affluent society in the world has been confronted with shortages. Only this administration could have taken bulging warehouses and converted them to empty store shelves; hamburger at \$1.25 per pound and eggs at almost \$1 per dozen; pork products increasing by 25 percent over the weekend and chicken over the same period going up some 10 cents per pound, shooting the price of the average drumstick up to 50 cents.

Inflation is climbing at an alltime rate. Interest rates are at obscene levels, with a prime rate of 8½ percent leading the pack. Mortgages are virtually out of reach of practically every American family save a wealthy few.

Abroad, the dollar is losing value daily and becoming an object of financial

questioning rather than a sought after currency.

Our troops in Europe have been reduced to penury and inability to compete for necessities of life because of this state of affairs.

Meanwhile, Earl Butz, that good friend of the consumer, admits that prices will rise and that meat will be seen less on the tables of working people. Of course, that will not affect him directly, because he is immune to the trials confronting the average working man and woman.

Wages lag far behind prices, as the largest corporations in the Nation announce the greatest profits in industrial and commercial history. Fine reading for majority stockholders. Sad news for the scores of millions of consumers and workers whose labor and deprivation has gone into guaranteeing coupon clippers continued luxury.

What do record profits mean to the workingman who cannot afford to buy his children decent shoes? Or to a wife who can only afford hamburger twice a week? Or to the harassed commuter working a second job to make ends meet?

Unenlightened tinkering with a healthy economy has brought about financial and economic catastrophe second only to the Great Depression of the thirties.

The American people are coming to understand fully that for the past 5 years we have had government of the few, by the few and for the few; who profit by the travail of the many.

The administration, safe within a cocoon of security, has not come into contact with the realities other Americans confront daily. They have no idea of what it is like to struggle to put bread on the table, clothe the family and better one's lot in life.

We must have a rollback of price hikes, strict controls on all prices, and a policy of raw materials and commodities for Americans before any are shipped abroad for foreign consumption.

SHORTSIGHTEDNESS OF SUDDEN EMBARGOES

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the way in which export controls were recently imposed, particularly on agricultural commodities, represents a dramatic reversal in American export policy. Assurances were given to us and the world that existing export contracts would be honored and that we would consult with our trading partners before taking any action. Nevertheless, the administration's decision was to break contracts and move unilaterally to the still-reverberating shock of our trading partners.

These kinds of international jolts which have become the hallmark of the administration's economic style indicate that basic economic decisions are the outcome of short-term political consid-

erations rather than long-term policy planning. Stumbling from one crisis to the next, from emergency to emergency, from constant denial to unexpected affirmation, can only exacerbate our long-range international economic difficulties. Short-term remedies are no solution to a long-range problem.

The international economic world is a delicately balanced environment. Unexpected jolts to one part of the system bring predictable reactions from others which will most assuredly impose long-term costs on ourselves. There is the cost to the international stability of our currency, to the American farm sector which received 16 percent of its receipts from exports last year, to our ability to expand our export markets so necessary to our balance of payments, and to our trading partners whose cooperation we so definitely need in a world of growing interdependence.

What makes this most recent chapter in our economic stumbling so tragic is that it might well have been prevented by a farsighted administration dedicated to the imperative of long-range economic planning. For at least the last 5 years, we have been aggressively pursuing an expansion in our agricultural exports; but, the surplus mentality of the administration's agricultural state of mind until most recently has stubbornly resisted any meaningful attempt to increase agricultural supplies.

We waited so long that all moderate options were foreclosed. It was certainly no secret that the world demand for protein had been dramatically increasing and that the stimulus of two dollar devaluations would make American commodities just that much more attractive. A farsighted administration would have been prepared for this increased demand, and even if it were not entirely prepared, it would at least have gone to our trading partners to seek their cooperation in helping us bear some short-term costs for the long-term benefit of all. Instead, we have had a policy leading to rising prices, broken contracts, and the slaughtering of baby chicks.

Mr. David J. Steinberg, executive director of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, understands well the economic interdependence of the modern world and the need for long-term economic planning. His recent testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Policy makes the basic point that we simply cannot afford to use our trade policy as the whipping boy for our domestic failings. His remarks are well worth our attention.

TESTIMONY OF DAVID J. STEINBERG

We impose export controls pretty much the way we impose import controls—poorly, meaning irresponsibly. We reduce the flow of imports and exports almost as if what is involved is plumbing, not the profound policy issues that demand astute analysis and meticulous management.

The recent controls on exports of scrap steel and various agricultural products should be made as equitable and as temporary as possible. This effort should receive the close, cooperating attention of the affected industries, the Administration and the Congress. But it is not too soon to ponder the serious trade policy implications of these

controls, the shortcomings in our approach to these issues, and the need for reform. The major trade legislation now before Congress is called the Trade Reform Act of 1973. The trade reform to which we should be giving our attention is even more far-reaching than what seems intended in that important legislative proposal.

No aspect of national trade policy is more crucial to our image, our leverage and our overall ability to advance the total national interest than the standards we employ in restricting imports as an aid to domestic adjustment and in restricting exports as an aid to price stabilization. Waiting for crisis to arouse government attention to the impact of imports on our weaker industries, or to the adequacy of supply to meet marketing commitments at home and abroad, can hardly be called responsible policy. Nor can readiness to restrict imports or exports in response to overly permissive criteria for such extraordinary measures be called a responsible answer to these problems. Certainly recourse to import or export controls without a coherent, comprehensive, constructive attack on the real problems and real needs of the particular sectors of our economy cannot be said to meet the exacting test of responsible approaches to these issues.

IMPORT CONTROLS

The instances of irresponsibility in our recourse to import controls seem as many as the imports that have been restricted. A few recent examples are illustrative.

We restrict imports of textiles but have no coherent policy dealing with the real problems and needs of this large and important American industry. We restrict imports of steel, but have no coherent policy dealing with the real problems and needs of this large and important American industry. The fact that these import controls are through export-control arrangements with supplying countries does not alter the fact that these are import restrictions. Thus, we have a textile trade policy but no textile policy, and a steel trade policy but no steel policy—no policies that include and require a deliberate effort to phase-out these trade restrictions.

Imports of petroleum were restricted 14 years ago, but there was no coherent policy dealing with the basic problems and needs of the petroleum industry—with the national security issue (the need to establish a secure mobilization base) which officially motivated these import quotas. If a coherent petroleum policy, in the context of a coherent energy policy, had been adopted as the policy framework for such import controls, the present energy crisis might have been averted or at least ameliorated.

In the agriculture area, Congress established controls on meat imports in 1964, even though most of these imports—used for hamburger and luncheon meats—are complementary to, not competitive with, U.S. production. There was never a coherent cattle policy including a deliberate effort to terminate such restrictions. The quotas have now been suspended to help combat inflation. But repeal of this legislation is necessary to induce foreign suppliers to program adequate production for the U.S. market at a time of world-wide shortage. Suspension of the quotas is not enough. The interest of Congress in this issue is less than impressive.

Dairy imports were progressively restricted, but without a coherent dairy policy aimed at freedom for the American consumer no less than justice for American dairy farmers. Cheese import controls were recently eased by Executive Order as an anti-inflation measure. But the farm bill now before Congress would tighten the controls, and the version passed by the Senate would limit dairy imports to 2 percent of consumption. Is this any way to prepare for trade negotiations? Is this any way to fight inflation?

EXPORT CONTROLS

Our recourse to export controls is no more impressive than our recourse to import controls, doing comparable harm to our trade position and our trade policy objectives. In the case of agricultural products, we seem to have waited for a crisis, then to have employed crash answers which are the usual by-product of such mismanagement. Poor crops in various parts of the world contributed to the shortages that led to the controls. The sharp drop in Peruvian fishing was another factor. But mother nature is only partly to blame. Planning for the contingencies of a clearly inflationary American economy, and for exports so crucial to our balance of payments, appears to have been less than adequate. Our basic agricultural policy of the last four decades may be somewhat at fault. But, beyond that, more attention might have been paid to the indicators of a growing problem—the price trends in the problem commodities, and the rising foreign demand. The storm warnings were there to be read and heeded. If export controls had to be imposed, the controls could thus have been more orderly, and more equitable to all concerned, than the block-buster edicts that shook much more than the contractual commitments that had been negotiated. They also shook world confidence in our economic management and ultimately our currency. The impact on the credibility of our demands for freer access to foreign markets for our agricultural commodities may be considerable.

Lack of confidence in our ability to manage these things in an orderly fashion—as well as past experience with our propensity for trade controls as an answer to import impact problems—many have induced stepped-up orders for certain products in anticipation of export controls. If so, the supply problem was thus compounded. The Russian grain deal also had an effect on the supply problem, the sharp rise in prices, and foreign expectations about the way the United States might react. The recent government requirement that exporters of various agricultural commodities report weekly on new foreign orders is a useful step. Better planning would have required this much sooner. Too many horses have departed through too many barn doors.

Putting aside the question of whether a scrap shortage actually exists, it is reasonable to suppose that, if we had a coherent steel policy as the framework for whatever help the steel industry needed from government, the scrap situation would have been one of the many things kept under continuing review. Better decision-making by industry and government might have resulted. Now that we have added controls over exports of scrap to controls on imports of steel, we ought to proceed with a coherent steel policy addressed constructively to the real needs of the steel industry and to phasing-out these trade controls, indeed doing our best to avoid future recourse to such restrictions.

Regarding the agricultural commodities, we should adopt coherent policies addressed, not only to the fairest administration and quickest removal of the recent export controls, but to preventing recurrence of the supply crises that led to such restrictions. I am not aware that our intentions and preparedness in this direction have been made crystal clear to all who are intimately concerned with this issue at home and abroad.

These shortcomings in U.S. import and export policy play havoc with investments in trade promotion. They also aggravate a widely held suspicion around the world that the United States exports its problems. The world may no longer catch pneumonia when Uncle Sam sneezes, but it sure shudders at any symptom of American discomfort, and at American action harmful to their own interests. Present injury, and uncertainty over future policy, tend to generate resistance to U.S. overtures in trade and other policy areas. They may induce even more

protectionism as some of these countries decide to protect themselves against the unreliability of U.S. exports.

The time has come, it is long overdue, for an American initiative aimed, not only at greatly needed reforms in the world trade and monetary system, but at a grand strategy to program the dismantling of all trade barriers by the economically advanced countries and to eradicate hunger and poverty everywhere. The role of American agriculture needs no elaboration here. The American government should call upon the American economy to gear for this objective, and should facilitate the necessary adjustments. We should plan for abundance. The demands on sound policy management by government will be just as exciting as those on sound management by American industry and agriculture.

We have no such over-arching objective today. We are not ready for the effort. Nor are we preparing for it. Trade controls and other economic distortions will continue, and more will germinate, in this climate of uncertainty over goals to be sought and how fast to seek them.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

An agricultural emergency has now been added to a Southeast Asia crisis, a trade policy crisis, an international monetary crisis and other emergencies for American policy. For the United States to perform well in handling these emergencies, our system of government will have to work well. This means, among other things, adequate Executive accountability to Congress, meaning adequate Congressional surveillance of Executive performance in these policy areas. Adequate Executive accountability and Congressional oversight require something more than sporadic Administration appearances before Congressional committees. Certainly while an emergency lasts, the Agriculture committees of both houses should require the appearance of top echelon Agriculture department officials before these committees to report on progress being made in removing the export controls and in ensuring adequate supplies of these commodities for both the U.S. and foreign markets beyond the present crisis. (An appropriate committee in each house should require similar testimony from the Department of Commerce with respect to export controls on scrap iron and steel.) Although legislative responsibility for export control rests with another committee in each house, the Agriculture committees have a unique responsibility to concern themselves in a systematic way with the administration of agricultural export controls and with policy planning aimed, not only at the quickest removal of these restrictions, but at preventing such crises in the future.

The Agriculture committees with respect to agriculture, and other committees with respect to manufacturing, mining, fishing and labor, also have a special role to play in Congressional oversight regarding the forthcoming trade negotiations and the adjustment problems that may arise in the wake of dismantling tariff and nontariff barriers. The need for an adequate adjustment strategy to backstop the progress that must be made toward an increasingly open world economy is an issue for which the United States is not well prepared and with which the Congress has not adequately concerned itself.

OUR FLAG SPEAKS

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently there has come to my attention a most

impressive sermon which was delivered by Dr. Wilton E. Bergstrand in James-town, N.Y., to his congregation.

Because I feel this is a very timely and worthwhile message deserving the attention of all Members of Congress, I am submitting it for the RECORD:

OUR FLAG SPEAKS

(By Pastor Wilton E. Bergstrand)

I am the flag of the United States of America. On June 14, 1973, I celebrated my 196th birthday.

I was conceived in dreams of liberty.

I wave proudly over a nation of two hundred and ten million diverse people—over a nation of nations.

There are some who still say that the sewing basket of Betsy Ross was my cradle; that with the help of a Lutheran Ladies' Aid Circle in Philadelphia I took shape according to the specifications of General George Washington.

I float in majestic silence from sea to shining sea—from California to New York Island—from the Gulf Stream waters to the 3,000-mile Canadian border where not a single hostile gun or bit of barbed wire is found.

I flutter over a favored land, furled with mighty rivers and dotted with inland seas, an empire of thundering mountain ranges and deep-shadowed forests and rolling prairies and fruitful farmlands and surging, throbbing cities—whose endless ribbons of concrete carry a hundred million trucks and campers and busses and cars.

I am the flag of a young nation which has become the richest and strongest nation in history.

I am the flowering of five thousand years of man's deepest yearnings and bloody struggles to be free.

I am the century plant of human hope in full bloom.

I am hated with a bitter pathological hatred by all who could enslave the human spirit.

I represent the only new thing in history—government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I am unfurled over a land which has to a degree hitherto unknown in the story of man opened her heart and her doors to the distressed and persecuted of the world—"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

I ripple in the breeze over a land which has in a measure utterly unheard of elsewhere in the chronicles of the human race given billions to nations shattered by war and tattered by earthquake and battered by hurricane.

There is woven into my fabric the blood, and the sweat, and the tears—and the prayers—of forty-million immigrants—young people and young at heart, who ventured over stormy seas in plague-infested and scurvy-ridden schooners and braved countless dangers and endured incredible hardships in mankind's greatest mass migration; turning their backs on age-old patterns of special privilege and repression, driven relentlessly forward by a dream of new beginnings—the glow of adventure in their eyes, the glory of hope in their hearts.

I climb skyward at camp in the early morning propelled briskly by the eager hands of hungry boys and girls—to the sometimes uncertain toot of the bugler playing "Reveille".

I am lowered at camp before sunset, guided respectfully by the hands of those same boys and girls now weary from happy hours on playground and trail.

I am carried in procession to the right of other flags.

I am draped over the casket at military funerals—but never buried.

I am folded as tenderly and as carefully as a grandmother folds a precious heirloom from her wedding day.

I was fashioned from the sky: the stars sparkling like diamonds in the azure robe of night, the white clouds streaked with the crimson of sunrise.

In my upper left-hand corner—my canton—I capture the blue of the heavens—blue, which is the color of loyalty, of reverence for God, of sincerity, of justice, and of truth.

In my canton I also cradle a shower of white stars whose number has multiplied from 13 to 50—and these bright stars symbolize high and noble aspiration—as well as unity, dominion, and sovereignty.

My red stripes represent Love and Sacrifice—the valor, courage, zeal, and fervency of a million Americans who have poured out a libation of their heart's blood and of other tens of millions who have lived sacrificially to make and to keep men free.

My white ribbons represent Purity—the noblest in our dreams as a nation, cleanliness in life, and rectitude in conduct.

I am Francis Scott Key writing "O Say Can You See by the Dawn's Early Light?" I am a hundred other patriotic songs from "Yankee Doodle" and "God Bless America" and "This Land Is My Land" to "My Country 'Tis of Thee" and "Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory" and "America the Beautiful."

I am a thousand history books.

I am tens of thousands of Memorial Day and Flag and Fourth of July and Veterans' Day orations.

I am a hundred thousand heroes and heroines such as Jane Addams and Patrick Henry.

I remind boys and girls of their forefathers who did noble deeds and deserve praise—or who sometimes fell far short of their dreams and need God and man's forgiveness.

I have been raised on many a battlefield: at the Battle of the Bulge, at Chateau Thierry and the Argonne, at Ft. McHenry.

I am immortalized in bronze along with the six Marines who hoisted me on lava-strewn Mt. Suribachi on Iwo Jima.

I wintered with Washington at Valley Forge.

I rode westward with Daniel Boone and Davey Crockett.

I journeyed to Gettysburg with Abraham Lincoln. I was there when Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation saying: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under a just God, cannot long retain it."

I am heartache and heartbreak, adventure and ecstasy.

I point boys and girls to the land they love—a land that has many and great faults to be sure, but which is still the best country in the world.

I wave over a land of hope—a land that still worries about her sores and her problems and lets the light of searching publicity and intelligence and moral earnestness play upon them—a land that airs her problems in press and radio and T.V. for all the world to see—a land that instead of hiding my blots and stains behind an Iron or a Bamboo Curtain lets all the world scrutinize them through a huge picture window.

Am I unraveling? It is high time to check my stitches: to check the loose stitches of racism and to work for 100% brotherhood; to check the faulty stitches of injustice; to check the snarled stitches of a moral permissiveness that is leading millions to new slaveries; to check the air in which I fly that it remain breathable; to check the water beneath my feet that it remain drinkable.

I call upon youth to fulfill, and not destroy the American dream.

I fly over a land that though she is often wrong about many things, has been right on target when it really counts for the preservation of freedom in our world.

I embody the rule of the majority and the rights of minorities.

I stand for the right of honest dissent—but I repudiate disloyal subversion.

My peril is citizens who decide they have a right to do what they please. My strength is people who are pleased to do what is right.

Those who would make this the land of the spree and the home of the knave would destroy me; those who would make me the land of the free and the home of the brave will plant me on even greater heights.

I stand for the responsibility of privilege. In my hunting the twin strands of privilege and responsibility are forever interwoven.

I spark the lips of myriad millions of boys and girls to pledge earnestly as they stand at attention, "liberty and justice for all."

I epitomize liberty in law—for only as each American respects the rights of others can he have freedom for himself.

I offer each generation the possibility of freedom: freedom of speech, freedom of the ballot, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion. Yes, only the possibility—for each generation must prove itself worthy. Freedom is never free. It is the costliest thing in the world. New installments come due in each generation. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

I represent a free arena where each person can boldly speak his convictions without fear of reprisal, in the calm assurance that ultimately truth will prevail.

I stand firmly for law and order—but always, always coupled with justice and mercy. Then law and order are not code words for repression—they are code words for social survival.

Woe to him who seeks to drape me around his unbridled greed or his arrogant bigotry or his cruel mistreatment of his brother!

Woe also to him who in pathological hatred insults me, tramples upon me, spits upon me, desecrates me, burns me, tears me from my standard and unfurls thereon an alien and hostile banner!

Thrice woe to him who diabolically seeks to make me an instrument of division, of discord, of distrust!

Floating tirelessly day and night on the breezes that blow on the hilltop—winter and summer—spring and fall—on the front lawn at Holy Trinity—alongside the Wayside Cross—I have become a Holy Trinity and a Jamestown landmark.

I fly proudly in the blackest night atop a thirty-five-foot flagpole, on whose summit is perched a golden eagle—all a memorial to a good man who loved his country and his God and his home.

I fly all night as a reassuring reminder that I am there in difficult times, in times of thick gloom and stygian inky darkness—proclaiming that there is hope for the morrow—that surely the brightness of dawn will come again.

I fly as a reminder to every passerby to pray for our country—to pray a prayer of thanksgiving—to pray that the God who governs the affairs of men will give our leaders wisdom, courage, strength—and that since they, too, are mortal men tempted and tested sorely, capable of making great mistakes—so prone to fall into the trap that "the end justifies the means"—and since we ought to avoid the trap of the pot calling the kettle black—let us earnestly pray that they may be recipients of Christ's forgiving grace.

I fly in the brightness of the spotlights as a symbol that in a democracy every dark and hidden thing will sooner or later be revealed.

I ripple in the night breezes as a reminder that I have survived turncoats like Benedict Arnold, the rending of a Civil War in which brother fought brother, the lurid flames of riot and incendiary bomb, the oil spots of Teapot Dome, the bullets of assassins—and that I will continue to fly long, long, long after the splashing and bug spots from Watergate have been laundered out by the churning washing machine and the hot iron

of a free people and have become only a sobering—and, I trust, useful—memory.

I am the sum of the dreams of millions of boys and girls who on T.V. saw me planted on the moon on July 20, 1969, at 4:18 p.m. E.D.T. by two Eagle Scouts and a First Class Scout now astronauts. (Neil Armstrong is an Eagle Scout; Buzz Aldrin, a Life Scout; Michael Collins, the back-up man, an Eagle.)

I call the youth of America not merely to a life of affluence and gadgets, not only to feature comforts and power—I call them to work in their generation ceaselessly, tirelessly for the liberation of the human spirit, for the release of human potential, for the enhancement of the dignity of every person.

My motto is not merely "Live and Let Live"; it is "Live and Help Live".

I am a symbol of revolution—not a revolution of violence and hate, but a revolution of compassion and love.

I represent a way of effecting change without violence.

I stand for one nation indivisible—not black, nor white; not rich, nor poor; not north, nor south; not educated, nor uneducated; not young, nor old; not male, nor female; not unanimous, but united.

I have given the youth of America so much. Were they content with the failures or even with the partial successes of previous generations, I would be disappointed.

I rejoice in the discontent that impels youth to seek to reduce the gap between the American dream and the American reality. I call them to a lover's quarrel with America.

I have been in the days of yore a symbol of encouragement to downtrodden people in all lands yearning to breathe free.

I can be respected around the world only as each generation of Americans earns that respect.

I have no other character than that which the American people give me in each new generation.

Wise and good young people mean more to the insuring of my future than riches or arms without character.

Though I symbolize yesterday's achievements, I speak supremely of America's tomorrow—of the future.

At the top of my standard you will often find the bald eagle—the bird that flies higher than any other living thing—from the dawn of history a symbol of freedom, of strength, of courage, of contact with God.

I am known as "The Stars and Stripes"—"The Red, White, and Blue"—"The Star-Spangled Banner." I am "Old Glory."

The vision of me dancing in the wind often brings a lump in the throat and mist in the eyes and a hard-to-define feeling deep down inside.

George Washington in his Farewell Address said that three things would be needed if I were to continue to wave: Education, Religion, and Public Good Faith—a people possessing virtue and intelligence and trust in one another—a people knowing what is right and then wanting to do what is right in a partnership of equals, together.

When laws are made wholly wise and obedience is wholly complete—only then are men wholly free.

Only two flags are permitted to fly higher: One is the U.N. Flag over the United Nations Building—for above all nations is humanity.

Then the Christian Flag in a service at sea floats above me—for Jesus Christ is the King of Creation, the Lord of the nations.

Every church proclaiming the gospel is a lighthouse standing guard over me.

Yes, my base is anchored in faith in God—for freedom is a spiritual quality. Only men free in spirit set themselves free.

A nation cannot long have the fruits of freedom without the roots of freedom—faith in God.

The rights of man perish unless they are rooted deep in the righteousness of God.

"Ill fares that land, to hastening ills a prey; Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

True liberty is freedom to do the will of God.

The ageless truths still stand: "Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people."

And—"If my people, which are called by my name will humble themselves and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and I will forgive their sin and I will heal their land."

A country that interprets freedom of worship as freedom from worship instead of freedom to worship is on its way to losing its freedoms.

My white stripes remind the Christian of the spotless life of the Son of God. His sinless life was lived for sinful men.

My red stripes remind the Christian of the sacrificial death of the Son of God. His death was died for sinful men.

My blue field reminds the Christian of the eternal life Christ gives to his followers—the living hope of heaven.

If I am to endure, I must be grounded on other stars and other stripes—the stars and stripes of the Son of God, by whose stars we are illumined and by whose stripes we are healed.

What a land! To glimpse the future of an America redeemed is to share a mission with the stars; to control her destiny is to stand within the grip of the right hand of the omnipotent God—

What then to occupy this land for Christ!—not fitfully as the wind sweeps over the prairie, not fragmentarily as the field has won upon the forest—but searchingly, engulfingly, as the waters cover the sea!

Then—illumined by freedom's holy light long shall I wave over one nation, under God—the land of the free and the home of the brave.

And then shall this heaven-rescued land reverberate with praise to the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation!

BILL FOR FIREFIGHTERS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which I have introduced in past sessions, and which I sincerely hope will be successfully considered in this Congress. This bill is for a special group. Special because they work for others—for all of us. Because of them we all feel a lot safer and much more secure. They work in every State and city throughout the country and they deserve at least the same protection as they in their jobs provide for others.

I am speaking of our firefighters and law-enforcement officers. They need and deserve more than words of praise from both Congress and the public. They need a written mandate to insure their safety during the performance of their duties. These men are not machines. When an officer of the law or a firefighter is injured or killed by a felonious assault, it must not simply be written off as "part of the job." He is entitled to the same protection under the law as is every citizen. As it is a Federal offense for someone to murder me, so it should be a Federal

offense for someone to take the life of a law enforcement officer or firefighter while he is in the performance of his duty. How ironic that he should be stripped of this protection which is afforded every citizen while he is essentially serving and protecting them. He too needs this protection to deter attacks on his own person. My bill guarantees him this protection.

I urge Congress to remember that these public servants are men and women. Men and women with families and homes similar to our own. They have chosen to unselfishly serve their communities and they deserve all the help and consideration for their personal beings as is possible.

It is my opinion that this measure should not even have been necessary—that our firefighters and officers should always have had personal protection from felonious assaults, but, that this is not the case, I sincerely hope that this Congress will expediently grant them this legislation which they so desperately need and deserve.

OPPOSE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to explain to my fellow colleagues why I am opposed to the foreign aid program.

For over 25 years, we have managed to somehow lavish worldwide give-away programs of which we have achieved little results. In fact, some of the programs have achieved the very opposite of what was intended.

For over a quarter of a century, the United States, with the help of Congress, has poured billions of dollars into the European Community of Nations. Yet, in the past 2 years, we have had to devalue our dollar twice. So I ask the question, "Has our foreign aid brought international monetary stability?" Clearly, the answer is "No."

Has this outpouring of our taxpayers' money strengthened our home economy? Has our generosity to our wordly friends helped our trading position overseas? Has 25 years and billions of dollars spent to protect our friendly nations been met with the same commitment on their behalf? Very simply, Mr. Speaker, the answer is "No."

Almost 5 million Americans are out of work here at home—yes, we continue to give foreign aid.

Since 1949, our international payments have been running in the red—yet, we continue to give foreign aid.

Our gold reserves have foreign claims against them approximately five times their amount—yet, we continue to give foreign aid.

Our Federal budget is still soaring; \$246 billion in fiscal year 1973 to \$260 billion for fiscal year 1974—yet, we continue to give foreign aid.

Our deferral debt, which is approach-

ing the half-trillion-dollar mark, is costing us \$1 out of every \$10 that the Government spends—yet, we continue to give foreign aid.

We have aided countries that have turned around and have nationalized American companies and interests—yet, we continue to give foreign aid.

Over the years, Americans have given of their money over \$140 billion in foreign aid. Two-thirds of our entire foreign aid programs were lavished upon countries that have repeatedly voted against our position in the United Nations. In 1972, a total of 58 nations, receiving American aid, voted against the United States in the matter of seating the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the foreign aid program in its present form is not helping this country and I urge a resounding "no" vote on this legislation.

KILLER SMOG IS NOT GOING AWAY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the critical air pollution emergency that is now occurring in the Los Angeles air basin. Here in Washington, where an alert is called when oxidant readings hit the 0.10 parts per million level, we really cannot appreciate just how bad it is in southern California. I suspect that we would close down all operations here in Congress and declare an emergency if the smog level in Washington ever approached the level which exists right now in my district and other parts of southern California. Back there we have an oxidant level higher than 0.10 almost half of the year; it is considered a nearly smogless day when the level does not exceed 0.10. The oxidant ozone level yesterday was 0.49 in Los Angeles County—not the highest we have had so far this year, but still nearly 5 times the smog alert level in the District of Columbia.

I would like to insert in the RECORD an article from this morning's Los Angeles Times which describes the situation in more detail, Mr. Speaker. The article follows:

SMOG EMERGENCY TO CLOSE U.S. AGENCIES HERE TODAY—AUTO TRAVEL WILL BE CURBED, MOST STAFFS REDUCED

(By Dick Main)

Federal agencies in five Southern California counties were asked to close their offices or curb activities today because of extremely high daytime smog levels expected at many inland cities.

It was the first time the recently formulated federal Emergency Air Episode Plan is to be put into effect.

Gordon Elliott, chairman of the Federal Executive Board at Los Angeles, said the action was taken Wednesday at the request of the regional office of the Environmental Protection Agency in San Francisco.

The plan actually calls only for curbing all unnecessary automobile travel, use of skeleton office forces, and urges essential personnel to use public transportation or

car pools instead of their own vehicles to commute from home to work.

But its practical effect meant most federal offices will be closed today.

Elliott said there are more than 100,000 federal employees in the South Coast Air Basin which includes Los Angeles, Ventura, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino counties.

NUMBER AFFECTED UNKNOWN

Elliott said he could not estimate how many federal employees would remain at home, explaining that office staffing requirements for today were left to the discretion of agency heads.

Many agencies subsequently announced offices would be closed today.

The Internal Revenue Service said all its offices in four counties—Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside and Orange—will be closed today. Other IRS offices in Southern California will remain open.

Joseph Finnell, Social Security area director at Los Angeles, said all Social Security offices in the Los Angeles Basin will be closed.

Los Angeles city and county offices will remain open, however, spokesmen for those entities said.

State offices also will be open. However, in Sacramento, Gov. Reagan ordered an immediate halt to use of state vehicles except for emergencies in the smog-plagued parts of Southern California.

The governor's order covers downtown Los Angeles, eastern Los Angeles County and Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

DRIVING CUTBACK URGED

Herb Campbell, director of the state Office of Emergency Services, also urged motorists in the Southland to cut back on nonessential driving.

The federal air episode order was issued on the second day of the worst smog siege of the year.

In Los Angeles County, the ozone count soared to .49 parts per million, just short of the .50 level for a first stage alert.

The .49 reading was recorded as the Air Pollution Control District's East San Gabriel Valley station.

It was the second highest ozone reading in Los Angeles County so far this year. The peak ozone count so far was .57 ppm recorded in Central Los Angeles on June 21.

Launche said extensive use should be made of car pools and rapid transit vehicles for essential trips.

"The desire for reduction in motor vehicle travel is especially important during the 6 to 9 o'clock morning rush hour," he said, "since it is during that period when motor vehicles, the major source of photochemical smog, contribute most of the smog problem experienced in the later afternoon."

OBJECTIVE TOLD

Elliott, who is regional director of the Veterans Administration at Los Angeles, said the Federal Executive Board, is comprised of representatives of all federal agencies in the area.

He said the decision to issue the Emergency Air Episode Plan for the entire coastal basin was made by the EPA because emissions from automobiles in areas where there is only minimal amounts of smog could drift farther inland, aggravating conditions where smog levels are much higher.

The order's purpose is aimed at reducing pollutant emissions from automobiles of both federal employees and persons planning business trips to federal agencies, he said.

He said the EPA hoped that similar plans would be established by other governmental bodies as well as private industry.

SECOND ADVISORY

Meanwhile, the National Weather Service issued its second air stagnation advisory within two days, but said a high-pressure ridge aloft which is creating the low tem-

perature inversion is shifting northward. This may permit an onshore flow of sea air and lift the inversion slightly, the service said.

I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that Federal Government agencies will not be worsening the smog situation in Los Angeles today, even though the administration and many of our colleagues have thus far not seen fit to support strong measures to improve the situation. I would particularly like to commend those individuals within the Environmental Protection Agency who are fighting against all manners of special interests to clean up our air.

If I may take just another moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from an article which appeared in the San Bernardino Sun on July 11, which describes the smog levels recently in my own district. Smog is even worse there than it is in the city of Los Angeles, you will note:

FONTANA AND RIVERSIDE ARE SMOGGIEST IN AREA

(By Mary Ann Galante)

First stage smog alerts were called yesterday in the Central Valley and Riverside, as skies remained sunny and temperatures warmer.

A first stage smog alert was called at 2:40 p.m. in the Central Valley as the oxidant levels in Fontana reached a peak of .55 parts per million. Yesterday's smog alert, canceled at 4:20 p.m., was the second in two days for the Central Valley area.

The Central Valley smog alert was only the third since the smog alert criteria was established in 1970 by the San Bernardino County Air Pollution Control District. The first one was on June 6 of this year.

A first stage smog alert is called in San Bernardino County when the oxidant surpasses .50 parts per million for more than 15 minutes.

A first stage smog alert was called in Riverside at 1:35 p.m. yesterday when oxidant levels hit a peak of .32 parts per million. First stage alerts are called in Riverside when the oxidant reaches .27 parts per million for more than 15 minutes.

The APCD has predicted moderate smog tomorrow in the Central Valley.

Of course, "moderate smog" in the Central Valley refers to a level of air pollution that we would consider deadly were it to appear suddenly here in Washington. And we would be right. It is deadly.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of this situation many times before. And I will continue to speak about it, until such time as this body decides to ignore the pressure from special interest groups and consider the basic right to breathe clean air which is being denied my constituents.

S. L. A. MARSHALL: DOUBTS ABOUT THE VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I have had reservations from the beginning about the wisdom of an all-volunteer force. These reservations continue.

A probing and challenging analysis of the weaknesses of an all-volunteer force recently appeared in the *Norfolk Virginian Pilot*, written by a respected military analyst, Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall (retired).

Under leave to extend my remarks, the article follows:

[From the *Norfolk Virginian Pilot*,
July 15, 1973]

COLD PROOF OF VOLUNTEER ARMY NEEDED
(By Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall (retired))

The 91-0 confirmation vote by the Senate reflects an extraordinary confidence in the abilities of James R. Schlesinger to head the Department of Defense. He will merit it if he avoids the trap into which research scientists frequently fall—that of failing to distinguish between minor concerns and the all-important values.

The extent to which the game of make-believe enters into the preparation and presentation of military policy is hardly a value but rather a present and pressing danger. The hard realities get brushed aside out of the will to be pleasing and to put the best possible face on things. Not how things are but how they can be made to seem becomes the guideline.

There is no example of this practice that is more illuminating than the handling of the all-volunteer force undertaking over the past five years. All along the selling job, meaning the effort to persuade the Congress and the public that the program is both desirable and feasible, has been as expansive and possibly high as costly in dollars, as the recruiting drive, which is unprecedented.

This campaign got under way when President Nixon concluded, soon after his first election, that under the stresses of the Vietnam War the nation had wearied of selective service and therefore the alternative had to be proposed and studied. Little resistance to this departure was to be noted in the Congress, the draft being almost as obnoxious to the politician as is foreign aid.

So the Gates committee went to work and labored long before publishing a favorable report more noteworthy for its wishful thinking than for its common sense. It implied, not more clearly than mistakenly, that it would be as easy to recruit for the Army as for the Navy and Air Force, and for the combat arms as for the supporting services. It concluded that if pay could be made competitive with what civilian life offered, American youth would respond in the desired numbers and quality.

None of this squared with the lessons of our national experience. Moreover, a collateral study made by the Army, and done more realistically than the Gates survey, had reached quite opposite conclusions. It said the final 15 percent or so could not be procured whatever the monetary inducement.

Yet once the decision was made everyone in the military had to join step in full support of the program, professing or pretending that the aim was sound, that it would bring about a heightened professionalism and that the program was certain to go over, despite the manifest obstacles. When the recruiters' periodic reports did not support the cheerleading act, some reason was found to discount them, and the cheering went on.

Ironically, the military as a body was never polled on the issue, though service people do have a very special interest in what is best for the national defense. It is therefore simply a speculation that had there been such a referendum, it would have revealed that in the overwhelming majority, people in uniform believed that:

1. Ending the draft is a major blunder.
2. The all-voluntary force will fall short in numbers and quality.
3. The reform would impose a new barrier between the services and the people though their love affair already is chilled enough.

So where are we now? Some days ago at a symposium of researchers and military types. I heard a scientist describe the all-volunteer idea as a "national disaster," and though that was doubtless an exaggeration, no one arose to give him an argument. What seems clear enough is that the Pentagon's program managers radically underestimated the costs of the reform, including the extravagant bonuses, and that some of the force reductions, closings and other derailments now taking place are consequent to that miscalculation.

What seems still more clear is that the force levels, as set by the Congress, will not be forthcoming, and that the critical short fall will be in the Army. Even where the numbers are sufficient, many of them will be substandard in quality. The recruiters are caught between the devil and the sea. The all-American boy type that personnel policy demands isn't queuing up to enlist. If the recruiter doesn't get the numbers, he is washed out. If he cheats to get the numbers, he is investigated and may be charged.

Nothing more is suggested here than that it's time for Defense to take stock, look reality in the eye and cease duping itself and kidding the people. Either the positive proof should be present that the all-volunteer force is assured or there is no reason to believe that it will ever succeed.

PAUL WANZO PERSONIFIES PATRIOTISM

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal pride and pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress, the record of a man whom I feel personifies love of country and devotion to service.

Though I am confident that my fellow Members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate could also readily cite records of men and women residing in their respective congressional district and States who, likewise, have devoted their energies to keeping America strong, I would like nevertheless to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to Sgt. Maj. Paul E. Wanzo, retired, of Marietta, Ohio.

Though I have been aware of Paul's many community activities for some time now, it was not until we were recently contacted by the members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 5108, of Marietta, and Washington County Veterans Service Office, Fred Phelps, that I first learned the full extent of Paul's contributions to the city and his recent designation as a "Super Citizen" of Marietta.

Formally recognizing him as such, Marietta Mayor James F. Schweikert recently presented Paul with a Public Service Certificate of Appreciation which I feel summarizes my reasons for honoring Paul Wanzo here today. I would like to quote from that award:

Whereas Mr. Paul E. Wanzo, during many years has contributed greatly to the spirit of patriotism by participating in Veterans affairs such as 1,817 flag raising, 205 Veterans' parades and 389 Veterans' funerals in the county; and served his City, State, and Nation with distinction as a member of the United States Army during World War II,

thereby setting an example for all patriotic citizens of this Country.

Now therefore, be it resolved that it be known into all men that by issuance of this Certificate of Appreciation we acknowledge this outstanding man and his many accomplishments in bringing recognition and attention to our area and do further express to him our sincere thanks for a job well done.

At the State level, State Senator Robert Secrest offered a resolution of praise and recognition which was subsequently approved by the full Ohio Senate appropriately on the eve of this Nation's 197th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, all too often in this day and age the patriotic people who reflect the admirable characteristics of our forefathers are not given due notice for their service by the news media or the government. I want to see that Paul Wanzo—and the millions of other Americans who exemplify the spirit of America—be afforded the recognition which they never request, but certainly deserve.

In so keeping, I have recently written the President, asking that an appropriate letter or certificate be given Paul Wanzo to underscore our gratitude for his service. Paul Wanzo was born at Jackson, Ohio, August 25, 1903. At the age of 3 his family moved to Marietta where he was raised and received his education. He is the father of six children of which four have followed in their father's military service footsteps. He also had three grandsons who served with honor in Southeast Asia. Paul served in the Army during World War II and was discharged on August 23, 1945. Upon his return to Marietta, he became very active in local veterans' groups. He is the past commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Post 52, past post commander of the American Legion, Post 714, and honorary commander of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 5108.

In 1949, he joined the Ohio Defense Guard where after 23 years of exemplary service he retired a sergeant major.

I commend all the local officials and Paul's many Washington County friends who have honored their fellow resident as they have and I hope that his example will serve to encourage others to serve America as honorably and adequately.

CREDIT CARD VICTIMS

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that many credit card users may have unsuspectingly been victimized by speculative practices of the major credit card firms.

By speculating on the weakening American currency these firms can increase the price their cardholders must pay for items purchased in foreign countries. The method used by these firms to overcharge their customers is slightly camouflaged but rather simple. For example, a tourist makes a purchase before the devaluation using his credit card in a foreign country. If the purchase is made

in the middle of January for 100 marks, he calculates it at the existing exchange rate to be 31 U.S. dollars. But the credit card company may not bill the purchaser until long after the devaluation. Since the credit card firm does not set the exchange rate until it processes these foreign purchases, it can hold charges by its cardholders for months while the dollar continues to slip. Then, at the billing date the purchaser still owes 100 marks but calculated under the new exchange rate he is billed 43 U.S. dollars.

The delay in billing may be caused by two different factors. The foreign merchants may be holding the charge slips to take advantage of a rise in value of their currency versus the U.S. dollar. The other factor might be a delay in billing by the credit card firms.

If the credit card firm has promptly paid the foreign merchant the amount charge, the increased price because of the delay in billing comes right out of the pocket of the customer and into the coffers of the credit card firms. This increased cost can be quite astounding. If one had budgeted \$1,000 to spend on a European vacation in Germany during January he would spend approximately 3,210 marks. But when his bill comes in July his purchases will cost \$1,380, based on the exchange rate in that month, an increase in cost of 38 percent.

I have asked the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission to investigate this matter and would advise anyone who has been to Europe in the last 8 months to check their statement to see if they have been overcharged.

HENRY KLOSS—THE LAST OF HIS KIND

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an old friend, and a dedicated public servant, Henry Kloss, county supervisor from Sacramento County.

For more than 35 years I have known Henry and worked with him on matters relating specifically to the development of our water resources in the State of California and the Nation, and in other matters relative to local and State government.

Henry is an outstanding example of what our Nation needs in government at all levels—local, State, and Federal. I am proud to have known him and worked with him over the years.

The other day his leadership and service to his people was recognized in an article published in the Sunday, July 15 edition of the Sacramento Union. Staff writer Jim Lewis does an excellent job in capturing the spirit of Henry Kloss and his dedication to his people, his district, his county, and his Nation. At this point I insert in the Record the article entitled "Kloss the Last of His Kind," by Jim Lewis:

HENRY KLOSS—THE LAST OF HIS KIND

Henry Kloss is perhaps the last of the Sacramento County supervisors who can visit his district with his boots on, step in something and not worry about it.

Once, all county politicians looked a little like Henry Kloss, probably because most of them were in the same kind of business—farming or ranching.

But in this neck of the woods, Kloss is the last of his kind—a true country supervisor. He is in his late 50s, about 6 feet 2 and 220 pounds. When he shakes your hand you think you've latched onto the small end of a big ham.

Kloss can milk cows and swap crop stories with the best of 'em, but he also can use his pocket knife to cut through some of the maze of bureaucratic red tape for his constituents.

He displayed some of these talents during a recent trip through the south county half of his sprawling district that goes to the east county line and all the way to the Delta past Isleton.

"My district has a thousand miles of roads in it," he said. "I average hundreds of miles a month just covering it on county business."

Starting one morning last week and concentrating on the southern portion of the 5th Supervisorial District, Kloss went to the old Brown Cemetery north of Elk Grove where weeds are being cut, fences built and the 120-year-old graveyard restored to respectability.

"It took me six years, but we finally got the county to take this over," Kloss said as he looked at a stone which told of the demise of a settler in 1855.

"It won't take long for this to look good again. This cemetery is one of the last in my district that the county hasn't gotten into good shape yet. I had the whole history of it and gave it to the cemetery district secretary," Kloss said.

Kloss's family came to the Sacramento area about the time the cemetery got its first occupants. One of his grandfathers didn't make it to any California cemetery—Indians killed him on the way from Missouri.

We got into the car and drove to Galt, where Bill Spaans, the Galt Man of the Year, greeted Kloss in front of his cookie factory.

They talked about the wholesale cookie business and then the talk drifted to days when Spaans and his father followed the threshing crews in Michigan with their version of today's sandwich wagon.

Then over past the Eucalyptus groves jealously protected by the area residents, and on the county's newly greening park and lake near the Rancho Seco nuclear power plant.

Kloss got out of the car, his walk a combination of John Wayne and a guy walking behind a fast mule. "This Acacia tree's gonna live," he observed.

We looked at all the little fish in the new lake and Kloss told a story about bigger fish in one of the lakes near the Sacramento River, and his frequent talks with Ray Arnett, chief of the State Department of Fish and Game.

A reporter observed that Kloss also is on talking terms with a good number of state and federal officials, especially those who have anything to do with water.

"I'm on a first-name basis with every one of 'em. If you expect to get anything done, you have to know who to go to," Kloss replied.

Kloss's district is bearing a number of major issues in the county these days—the Rancho Seco plant is becoming more controversial, the possibility of a Hood-Clay connector for greater American River water flow is a continual concern, the expansion of the Central Sewage Treatment Plant raises tempers and discussions.

What do people in the south part of the county want from county government more

than anything? a reporter asked Kloss. "They want to be left alone," Kloss answered.

Back across the rolling brown grasslands around Rancho Seco to the safflower fields on the east side of the Sacramento River and down to the pear orchards above Locke.

"Hello there, you ol' cow juicer, you," said one of Kloss's neighbors in Locke. He referred to the fact that Kloss oversees the milking of 70-odd cows a day.

There also were conversations with a creamery truck driver, a restaurant owner and a dozen tomato pickers assembled to have a bite or two of peanut butter and one of the steaks at Al's Place, better known as Al the Wop's.

Kloss told of being persuaded to run for supervisor in 1964 and of his practice of not carrying money from one campaign over to another.

"If you can't make it from one to the other without that, then the hell with it."

Back up to a pear orchard with Jack Molino, owner of several fair-sized chunks of property in that area. "Looks like it's gonna be a good crop, Jack," Kloss said.

Molino noted how the pears were in clusters of four, five and six this year—a good sign for orchard owners.

At Isleton, Kloss talked with John Golden, who works in the county agricultural commissioner's new office there.

On around the bend, across the river near the Spendrift Marina where the levee crumbled last year and flooded Isleton and Brannan-Andrus islands.

Kloss noted the need to import solid material to shore up the spongy levees and said he had discussed the problem with Corps of Engineers representatives.

It's mid-afternoon now and Kloss points to two marinas with several hundred thousand dollars worth of yachts, cabin cruisers and assorted fancy boats tied up.

County Assessor William Lynch noted that the boats added considerably to the valuation on the unsecured property tax roll this year.

Elk Grove Park is one of Kloss's best showcases. He pointed out that next year a national softball tournament will be held there on a newly lighted diamond.

"This is one of the facilities where people can actually see what their tax dollars went for," Kloss said. But he grumbled at rising costs of construction.

Back into downtown Elk Grove. Tired. "Just remember, this was only half of my district. One of these days we'll go to the other half."

The day of the next board meeting, Kloss was dressed in a blue suit, just like any other city slicker. He even talked like one a little bit, as sophisticated issues came before the board.

But he's never able to hide those hands or his sunburned bald head or to keep from getting enthused when someone talks about preserving the farms in Sacramento County.

RATS-DESERTING-THE-SINKING SHIP DEPARTMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been impossible to avoid noticing in recent months the steady stream of departing White House aides and advisors. As the evidence increasingly points toward direct involvement by the man in the oval office, and as Mr. Nixon shows himself unwilling—or unable—

to clear himself, people who used to lace their cocktail party conversations with references to their White House connections now talk about how they were really for Senator McGovern all along last year. And even distinguished Republican Members of the Congress who supported the President's positions, no matter how illogical or foolish, on any issue that came to the floor over the last 4 years—even a few of these loyalists are now exhibiting a certain degree of independence.

In spite of these signs, however, I must admit that it took me by surprise when I read recently that evangelist Billy Graham is now telling people that he has not been in close contact with President Nixon for 18 months, and that his relationship with the President has been exaggerated. Mr. Graham, who recently made headlines with his Christian suggestion that rapists be castrated, was interviewed by the Minneapolis Tribune during a crusade in St. Paul, Minn. The resulting article, published on July 15, quotes the Reverend as saying:

I don't see the President as often as people think I do. I haven't seen President Nixon to have a talk with him privately in 18 months. But there are a lot of people who would get the idea that I'm there every week or two.

He went on to explain that he felt it was a "very good thing" for a President to turn to a pastor for occasional advice and counsel, and he said that such relationships are not unusual. Then he added:

I think in my case it has been greatly overplayed. I was fairly close friends with President Nixon until the time of the election. But after that the President becomes so busy and so occupied with other things that you're no longer in the circle at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming perfectly clear just what "other things" Mr. Nixon was occupied with during the election. I would not be surprised to see his circle of friends grow even smaller before we get to the bottom of the Watergate affair.

ST. AUGUSTINE HISTORICAL RESTORATION AND PRESERVATION

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1973, an article appeared in the Washington Post that was highly critical of the historical restoration and preservation activities in St. Augustine, Fla. While the author makes criticisms of "vague claims and half-truths," perhaps these same adjectives would be best applied to the insinuations made by the author, H. P. Koenig.

The people of St. Augustine have worked long and hard to restore and reconstruct the city to recreate a time in our history that should be of interest to every American.

According to John W. Griffin, director of the Historic St. Augustine Preservation Board, Division of Cultural Affairs for the Florida Department of State:

There are over 30 historic houses, dating from colonial times which have survived in St. Augustine. Eleven of these, approximately one-third, are located on St. George street. Seven were standing in George Washington's lifetime and the other four were built very soon thereafter.

Yet the author would have us believe that most of the buildings on St. George street "go no further back than the White House Days of Lyndon B. Johnson."

Mr. Griffin further describes how carefully the historic St. Augustine preservation distinguishes between restored and reconstructed buildings:

Restored buildings are original buildings from which later additions and modifications have been removed and the building placed as nearly back into its original condition as possible. Reconstructed buildings are those which have disappeared through time but on which considerable information from old maps and other accounts and the location of the original foundations by means of archeological research have provided the basis for rebuilding a building on its original site. There are only a few buildings which do not fall into either one of these categories. These might be called replica buildings or re-created buildings which are done in the style of an earlier period but are not positively located on an original site. Reconstruction is justified in returning an area to the appearance and atmosphere of an earlier time. This is widely done and is not done to "stretch the truth" or mislead the public.

The news story further states that a night spot "emerged" as a Spanish hospital and a neighborhood bar was "converted" into the Florida Heritage House. This is in error. The buildings housing the night spot and the neighborhood bar were removed and the Spanish hospital and Heritage House were reconstructed in their place.

The St. Augustine Preservation Board clearly points out that the government house stands on the site of earlier official buildings and that the site has been used over the centuries for governmental purpose—that while several old walls exist in the east wing, there is no attempt to deny the fact that the present building is basically new construction of the 1936-37 period in which the architect attempted to capture some of the feeling of the 1764 building.

Mr. Speaker, St. Augustine is a beautiful old city. It is a monument—not only to our heritage—but to the many fine citizens who work so tirelessly to preserve and re-create the atmosphere of the city during its early years. They are builders in the finest sense. We will leave to others, such as Mr. Koenig, the legacy of trying to tear down their work.

THE FARM LABOR RESEARCH COMMITTEE AND THE FARM LABOR PROBLEM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to learn of the recent formation of the Farm Labor Research Committee. This organization is designed to research

and analyze farm labor-management relations with major emphasis on proposed legislation in this field.

Of particular concern to the FLRC are six bills before the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor dealing with the farm labor problems. These bills either extend current labor law—the National Labor Relations Act—to cover farm workers and farm employees, or establish a new regulatory system which would incorporate parts of the NLRA and the Railway Labor Act under a national farm labor relations board arrangement.

The FLRC contends that each of the bills would grant new powers and privileges to union organizers with which they could conceivably control production on America's farms and repeat the history of strikes, strife, and makework practices that have plagued other sectors of the Nation's economy since the enactment of the NLRA.

According to FLRC spokesman Dr. Sylvester Petro, a professor of law at Wake Forest University:

All the bills now proposed will in fact bring big, specially privileged, monopolistic and coercive unionization to agriculture . . . they all endorse compulsory unionism, and they all grant special organizing and bargaining privileges to unions at the expense of the basic, natural, contract and property rights of employers and nonunion employees.

Dr. Petro advocates the following three principles in handling the farm labor problem:

First. Local, State, and Federal Government must do whatever is necessary to maintain the peace, protect property, and safeguard the person of all involved in organizing campaigns and collective-bargaining disputes.

Second. The right of unions to peacefully extend their organizations, and of employees to join unions if they wish, without fear of legal penalty, must be declared and enforced against any attempt to suppress them by violent means, by intimidation, by vandalism, or any other such unlawful method.

Third. In agriculture, unions should be confined to bargaining only on behalf of those employees who voluntarily authorize them to do so, and no agricultural union should be authorized to request, insist upon, or participate in any variety of agreement requiring either membership in or payments of any kind to the union as a condition of employment.

I strongly support the FLRC position on voluntary unionism in the field of agriculture. Compulsory unionism should be categorically opposed. Every agricultural worker should be free to accept or reject union membership in accordance with his freedom of choice and individual judgment.

NATIONAL LAND USE

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, our

former colleague, the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, recently spoke in Hot Springs, Ark., on the very important and timely subject of National Land Use Policy and Planning. His message is, I believe, a worthwhile one for all of us, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS BY HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, HOT SPRINGS,
ARK., JULY 18, 1973

I am pleased to be here this morning with you. I am impressed that you have assembled to consider the elements of what I consider to be a most far-reaching piece of legislation: the National Land Use Policy and Planning Assistance Act.

As the bill moves through Congress, it is imperative that we begin to consider creating the land use planning program which is envisioned by the legislation.

Having served in Congress, I know the crucial role and special problems of the legislative process. And I know that it is well that you should be grappling with these elements now—for it will be your shoulders upon which a large measure of the success of this program will rest.

This morning, I would like to share with you my perspective on this legislation, and what I believe needs to be done if we are to accomplish its goals and purposes.

Just a few weeks ago, President Nixon announced a series of far-reaching proposals in the energy field. One of the keystones of his program is the creation of a Department of Energy and Natural Resources. An important new thrust of this particular proposal is the addition of new energy functions, in response to the so-called "energy crisis" which we are facing.

I would like to point out that this "crisis" might have been averted—if various governmental levels had engaged in more deliberate long-range planning for the use of our resources—specifically land resources—because that is where the basic problem lies.

Let me explain what I mean. We aren't short of SOURCES of energy. We have billions of tons of coal reserves; we have billions of barrels of oil. What we are short of are certain "instruments" to convert resources into work. I am talking about power plants, refineries, and the means to transport raw resources—pipelines and super-ports.

The reason we have been caught short in all these areas is that public agencies have not been able to reconcile conflicts in locating these facilities. They have only become aware of these conflicts after the fact—when public outcry demands their attention. They are then forced to respond by reacting. We have simply lacked the means to identify conflicting interests beforehand.

When a problem crops up, all too often it is viewed in a negative way—and then there is no rational forum to resolve issues.

I submit that the focal point for identifying and resolving these concerns is the use of our land. And the long-distance perspective we need can come about when the states face up to the realities of the problem.

The energy issue, which is only one example, is certainly the most timely one. However, we could just as well be talking about housing or mass transportation or—and very important to the American spirit—open space.

We can't afford to live from crisis to crisis. We must address the broader problem—how can we combine our technical resources and political process into an effective planning and decision-making mechanism?

There are a number of bills before Congress right now which address certain critical problems of a regional nature—power plant siting, mined area protection, and others.

But there is only one piece of proposed legislation which will tie all these others to-

gether—the land use legislation. It will provide an incentive to the states to get about the job of land use planning. It will give them the political courage with federal backing to face the hard decisions.

This is not meant to degrade or brush over specific problems and solutions in the environment—they each deal with their own areas of concern. But the location of energy facilities, reclamation of mined land, siting of super-ports, transmission lines, highways or parks—all concern the use of our land. That use determines all the rest.

This is why the national land use legislation is so crucial to our future well-being. It is the key to achieving a quality environment. Until now, we've gone about it a little backwards—with the crisis/reaction syndrome. We discovered that our air was foul, so we clamped controls on air quality; our water was polluted, and we put controls on water quality.

But stop-gap solutions are no longer good enough.

We must seize the initiative. We must identify present and future conflicting demands on the use of our land resources. We must provide a forum for open public discussion of the pros and cons of various alternatives.

Most importantly, we must follow through on our decisions. I think you are aware of the importance of this requirement. Planning without legislative backing only produces a collection of pretty-colored brochures.

I don't claim that the answers lie in the federal administration. But I do claim that, working together, we can find them. And that is why we are here today.

This isn't a crash program I am talking about. We are dealing with a complexity of problems—division of labor, administrative machinery for regulatory authority, and strong emotions of taxpaying property-owners.

We at the Federal level and you at the State level are going to have to join forces. It simply is no longer productive to say "It's a Federal problem" or a "State problem" or a "local problem." Clear responsibility in the area of land use has become terribly muddled.

I must agree wholeheartedly with the observation of State Senator Bill Goodman of Prince George's County, Maryland, who I understand is here today.

Bill Goodman recently suggested that "Federal grant programs have inflamed the very abuses they were supposed to correct."

Some others have blamed the States for not having the machinery to make land-use decisions. The States, back in the 20's, passed the buck to local governments, with the zoning enabling acts, which are familiar to you.

Then, within the States, we have the urban-rural dichotomy. The urban legislators can't deal with the problem because their hands are tied by rural legislators. The rural legislators say it's an urban problem—and so on.

And yet our predicament is not entirely the fault of local governments, either. They do not possess the technical resources or the administrative machinery to deal effectively with the situation they are facing.

I would say, surveying the scene, it's a national problem—one that cuts across traditional boundaries. In rural areas, our agricultural land and our forests are threatened by housing developments and mass recreation facilities.

In urban areas, we expend huge sums of money, considerable mental anguish and human resources—and have only patchwork solutions to show for it.

If we don't come to grips with the problem now, land use, too, will become a problem of "crisis" proportions.

Mistakes in land use take generations to correct. We seldom get a second chance.

That's why the land use legislation is a

powerful mandate for the States to manage those areas which are of more than local concern.

It specifically mandates that State legislatures create agencies to determine needs for land for various uses, and that they identify, plan and manage land areas of regional and statewide concern.

By providing the financial and technical resources of the Federal government, the act encourages States to inventory land resources, develop policies toward its use, and to designate and manage four primary areas of land use.

Number one deals with critical environmental areas. These include shorelands and coastal areas, historical sites, prime agricultural areas and scenic areas. These are unique and irreplaceable resources of regional, statewide and national significance.

Second is in areas surrounding facilities such as airports, highway interchanges and other public facilities which induce growth into communities. Often such areas do not have local governmental machinery to ensure that the facilities solve problems instead of creating new ones.

The third area deals with developments of regional benefit—such as location of energy facilities, waste disposal sites, or in urban areas especially, insuring that an adequate supply of housing exists in all price ranges, and that local governments do not exclude such developments.

Finally, there are areas of large-scale development including major housing subdivisions, and new communities. States must have broad discretion in defining the extent of these areas.

The critical problem of the legislation in my view, is that Federal projects and planning must be consistent with the State's planning program. No longer will the Federal agencies plan and execute their projects in a vacuum.

In order to accomplish this, we are going to have to conduct our business in an entirely different way, establishing new communication and coordination. There is important authority in the legislation to assist with this task. During the course of your discussions today, you will be considering these coordinating mechanisms more thoroughly.

I also want to mention to you some things the national land-use legislation will not do.

First—it will in no way impose federal planning or zoning on the States.

There is no provision for my approving or disapproving a specific decision on the use of land, or on the substance of any State or local plan—except when that use degrades or damages neighboring Federal lands, such as parks and wilderness areas.

Second—this legislation does not mandate State zoning. It does require that the State manage the use of land in the four general areas I mentioned earlier. They can do this either through local jurisdictions with State administrative review, or direct State implementation.

The national legislation specifies that the rights of individual property owners as provided by the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of a State is not diminished. It does not provide for land acquisition or compensation for state or local use of private lands. Compensatory arrangements—and other devices that do not infringe on individual property owners rights—must be determined by each state—and perhaps eventually by the courts.

This is just a sketch of what you will explore in the workshops today. I stress that this legislation not only permits innovation, it demands it. The magnitude and complexity of the problem requires our most creative efforts.

Our roles are interdependent. In Washington, the Department of Interior has acted

as a resource to Congress, so that we can design the most flexible, yet challenging program that is possible.

Those same resources are available to the States, and I pledge a spirit of cooperation as you seek help or assistance.

But we won't be trying to tell you the sort of procedures you must use to meet the requirements of this legislation. Instead, we will tell you about successful examples, and point out milestones.

You must similarly join forces with your executive agencies. In this work, they will be a resource to you, pointing out new legislation which may be required.

But first, there must be a common base of understanding. Executive policies need the support of legislative initiative. And as one of my good friends in the Senate has pointed out, process without policy provides "no relief from bad decisions which are the product of good procedure."

And while we really can't legislate competence or cooperation, these are the key-stones to achieving the goals of this legislation.

Cooperation is embodied in a statement made not too long ago by Gerald Horton, State Representative from Georgia, who said at the recent ASPO conference that he'd never been taken out for a drink by a planner. If that is the case, then the time has come for legislators to take the initiative.

Executive agencies and legislators are going to have to build some mutual trust and understanding. You need each other to build a successful program.

As you well know, legislators are in the business of selling. If you succeed in selling your package to the legislature, and haven't garnered public support, then you are politically liable.

In planning, perhaps the most massive failure has been the public relations aspect. Planners haven't bothered to sell the public on their planning. I think one of our toughest jobs is going to be gaining broad public acceptance and support for a strong planning program.

You can't legislate public acceptance, but you can formulate new public education programs. We have a tremendous education job ahead.

These are just some of the areas in which you have a major role, and a valuable contribution to make.

I have traveled this country widely. And I believe that this country, when it puts its mind to it, can do anything. I have great faith in the ability of Americans to cooperate when there is a need and that need is well understood.

I believe, here in the Southern states, you have a unique opportunity. Your land is under pressure for development—but the megalopolis has not yet become your symbol. Your landscape has not been irrevocably scarred.

Here in Arkansas, I understand that the Governor's Advisory Committee on Land Use is developing an approach to planning that will maintain the state's environmental quality, as well as permit expansion of its economy.

Your opportunity is now—before pressures turn to crises. If you take advantage of the powerful incentives of the national land use legislation, you will not only enhance our "quality of life"—but will leave a great legacy to our children. The way our generation uses the land can expand or restrict the choices and living styles of our children for decades.

So I urge that legislators, executive agencies and members of the public sit down and plan together for using our most valuable gift—the good earth. We shall all benefit.

OIL PIPELINE OWNERSHIP AND COMPETITION IN THE OIL INDUSTRY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill, along with my colleague from Washington (Mr. ADAMS), my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), and 18 additional cosponsors, which would amend the Interstate Commerce Act to separate the business of transporting oil and oil products through pipelines, from the business of producing, refining, and marketing this commodity. The bill would make it unlawful for an oil pipeline company to ship its own oil or that of an affiliated company.

Pipelines have long been recognized as a major trouble spot in oil industry competition. Of all the major industries only this one has its own transportation system devoted exclusively to hauling its bulk commodities.

In 1906, Senator Lodge of Massachusetts, proposed the same measure we are proposing today. In that year Congress broke up the railroads' monopoly over the coalfields of Pennsylvania and West Virginia by enacting the railroad commodities clause of the Interstate Commerce Act. This clause bars railroads from dealing in the commodities they carry. The Lodge amendment, which attempted to extend the same provision to oil pipelines, was narrowly defeated. Congress contented itself with declaring that pipelines were common carriers, to which, theoretically, all shippers should have equal access.

Without the commodities clause, the common carrier provision has proved ineffective. Misuse of pipelines was one of the major restraint-of-trade charges leveled at the Standard Oil trust in 1911. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been powerless to prevent anticompetitive practices by pipeline owners. Nor have efforts to handle pipeline problems under the antitrust laws been successful.

The small oil producer or distributor is at the mercy of the big companies. He must bring his oil to the shipping point established by the pipeline owner and hope that a connection will be available if he pays for it. And, of course, even if a connection is offered, there is no assurance that it will be continued.

In a report last year on the "Anticompetitive Impact of Oil Company Ownership of Petroleum Products Pipelines," the House Subcommittee on Special Small Business Problems found that owners generally operate pipelines "so as to dry up the surplus or spot market at the destination point." The evidence of Mr. Beverly Moore before the subcommittee is illuminating on this point:

The critical competitive leverage in the oil industry is wielded by the independent refiners, terminal operators and retail dealers. The so-called private brand dealers are able to undercut the nationally advertised gasolines by 2 cents to 5 cents per gallon, primarily through more efficient operations and the avoidance of advertising and premiums. If consumers were aware that gasoline is a

fungible product, with little difference in quality among competing brands, and if informed consumer demand forced the majors to switch to private brand type operations at 3 cents less per gallon, the annual consumer savings could exceed \$2 billion. That figure is indicative of the potentially grave consequences to consumers of joint venture pipeline operations which dry up the source of supply for independent marketers.

Moreover, the inflexible commitments generally required of pipeline shippers—in throughput guarantees, investment in facilities and minimum tender requirements—may foreclose their use of competing transport modes such as tankers and barges.

This month, in a preliminary review of competitive problems in the petroleum industry, the Federal Trade Commission has found that poorly conceived Government policies, imposed at the instance of the oil industry, along with the "cooperative" behavior of the major oil companies, have aggravated the current fuel crisis. These policies, namely the oil depletion allowance, the oil import quota system, and the State pro-rationing system, have contributed to a lack of refining capacity in this country. The report also found that ownership of oil pipelines by the major companies has effectively inhibited free competition in the industry.

Although demand for petroleum products has been growing spectacularly in the last 20 years, there have been virtually no new entries in the refining business. Because of tax benefits, crude is priced high and products are priced low. The low-profit margin at the refining level works to the advantage of the vertically integrated companies and means that there is little incentive to enter the refining field.

It is not necessary to subscribe to a conspiracy theory to agree that the tight control that the oil companies exercise over the production, refining, distribution, and marketing of oil has contributed substantially to the current shortage and at the same time has enabled that shortage to be manipulated to the advantage of the industry, at the expense of the consumer.

Corrective legislation is needed. The bill we are reintroducing today provides a simple and direct way of encouraging more competition in an industry that is, quite naturally, using the current energy crisis to further its own economic self-interests.

Listed below are those Members sponsoring the bill I am introducing today along with my colleague from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) and my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE):

Herman Badillo, of New York.
George E. Brown, Jr., of California.
John Conyers, Jr., of Michigan.
James C. Corman, of California.
Ronald V. Dellums, of California.
Don Edwards, of California.
Gilbert Gude, of Maryland.
Michael Harrington, of Massachusetts.
Henry Helstoski, of New Jersey.
Elizabeth Holtzman, of New York.
Robert W. Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin.
Patsy T. Mink, of Hawaii.
Parren J. Mitchell, of Maryland.
John Moakley, of Massachusetts.
John E. Moss, of California.
Bertram L. Podell, of New York.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, of New York.
John F. Seiberling, of Ohio.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8975

A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that no pipeline company engaged in the transportation of oil may transport oil through its pipelines if that company has an interest in such oil.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (8) of section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1(8)) is amended—

(1) by adding "(a)" immediately after "(8)" in such paragraph; and

(2) by adding at the end of such paragraph the following subparagraph to read as follows:

"(b)(1) It shall be unlawful for any pipeline company subject to the provisions of this chapter to transport to, from, or within any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, any crude oil, or any oil product manufactured from crude oil, which is produced or manufactured by such pipeline company or by any affiliate thereof.

"(2) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'affiliate' includes—

"(A) any person or corporation owned or controlled by such pipeline company;

"(B) any person or corporation which owns a substantial interest in or controls such pipeline company by—

"(i) stock interest,

"(ii) representation on a board of directors or similar body,

"(iii) contract or agreement with other stockholders, or

"(iv) otherwise; or

"(C) any person or corporation which is under common ownership or control with such pipeline company."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the thirty-month period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

A. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR.

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague and good friend, A. Sydney Herlong, Jr., has just retired from the Securities and Exchange Commission, terminating almost 40 years of public service.

Syd Herlong served in this House with distinction for 20 years, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Agriculture Committee and, for the last seven terms of his congressional career, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Even before coming to Congress in 1949, he had earned a well-deserved reputation in his home town of Leesburg, Fla., as well as throughout the State of Florida, for his devotion to his constituency.

He has been president of the University of Florida Alumni Association, and following his love of all sports, president of the Florida State Baseball League.

He also served for a short time as postmaster of the Leesburg, Fla., post office. Just prior to his election to Congress in 1948, he had served with distinction as Lake County judge for 11 years, and was president of the Florida County Judges Association.

Following his retirement from Congress, President Nixon called upon him

CXIX—1665—Part 20

once again to serve his country and appointed him to the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1969, to fill an unexpired term. He was reappointed for a full term in 1971.

In accepting Mr. Herlong's resignation from the SEC as of June 30, 1973, the President said:

You have had a long and distinguished career in public service. As a member of the bar and the judiciary, as a distinguished member of the Congress, and finally, as Commissioner, you have worked for your country and your fellow citizens in the finest traditions of national service.

I join the President and my colleagues, as well as Syd's legion of other friends in saluting him for his outstanding record of public service and wishing him health and happiness in his retirement years.

FAMINE IN WEST AFRICAN SAHEL

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, a mighty war is raging in the West African Sahel. Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Chad, Upper Volta, Senegal, and Nigeria, supported by most of the nations of the developed world, stand arrayed on one side; on the other stands man's ancient and indomitable enemy, famine.

The West African Sahel is the region of plains and grasslands just below the Sahara. It is a land of nomads, herdsman, and farmers, all of whom depend on rainfall to keep away the encroaching desert. The rainfall in this region has been below normal for at least 4 and possibly as long as 7 years. The drought's effect on the Sahel is catastrophic.

Hunger and disease are everywhere. Meningitis, cholera, and measles prey upon the hunger-weakened, carrying away at first the more vulnerable members of the society, the old and the very young. Later, the stronger will have their turn; some estimate that 6 million people will die before October.

The tragedy goes beyond the terrible human cost of the casualties. The whole economy of the region is ruined; its society is being torn apart. Range, pasture, and watering places have disappeared. The drought is decimating livestock; in some areas losses reach 90 percent. Herds built up over generations are wiped out, and with them goes an entire way of life. Ruined herdsman and farmers flock to the cities, and there form a new lower class, jobless and poverty stricken. For example, the city of Agadez in Niger has a population in normal times of 7,000, but now the town has swollen to 15,000. This influx has overloaded facilities and raised social tension to the breaking point.

The developed world has rushed to the aid of the beleaguered Sahelian countries, but it remains to be seen if this aid will be enough to stem the tide of disaster; \$410,555 tons of grain have been pledged to the relief effort, with the United States giving 156,000 tons. The nonfood relief effort has been prodigious,

also, as the United States, the European Economic Community, the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organizations, and several other nations and organizations have contributed approximately \$29,739,000. In addition Belgium, France, Germany, Canada, Zaire, the U.S.S.R., and the United States have contributed aircraft and other means of transportation for distributing the aid.

This is primarily emergency aid. Even if we are successful in alleviating the effects of the drought, the tragedy is liable to be a recurring one unless we embark on a long range development assistance program which will rebuild the Sahel's shattered economy. It is up to the United States to join with the rest of the developed world to provide irrigation and dry farming techniques and the assistance, knowledge, and technology necessary to allow the people of the Sahel to return to their homelands and prosper there. I urge my colleagues to support efforts to relieve the plight of the Sahel.

THE FARM BILL FIGHT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of our recent prolonged and often confused consideration of the farm bill, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following editorial which appeared in Wednesday's Wall Street Journal:

THE FARM BILL FIGHT

The federal farm program long has been a prime example of government by subsidy, and this year seemed an opportune time to begin dismantling the costly and outmoded farm doles.

Economic conditions and public sentiment favored such a course. But the farm lobbies have managed to push four-year farm bills through both houses of Congress that not only preserve subsidies but actually increase the potential exposure of the federal Treasury to large outlays to farmers. Since it is unlikely that a Senate-House conference committee will reduce that exposure, the only hope of avoiding it would appear to be a presidential veto. We hope that the President's threat of doing exactly that is not an idle one.

The bills provide for direct subsidies to growers of wheat, feed grains and cotton when prices fall below specified target levels. The administration has particularly objected to an escalator clause which raises these targets as farm costs rise. In the administration view, the new subsidies could cost some \$12 billion over the four-year period. But despite this objection it was only late in the bill's passage through the House, under the shepherding of Agriculture Committee Chairman Poage (D., Texas) that it began to encounter serious resistance.

Up until then, it was almost as if Congress was oblivious to the country's rebellious mood about farm subsidies. A Senate bill with even higher "target" levels than the House version had passed with surprising ease. Moreover, the Senate had refused to plug up a loophole that has thwarted attempts to impose an effective ceiling on how much subsidy money can be handed out to big farmers on any one crop.

But subsidy foes gradually chipped away at the House bill. Congressmen Paul Findley (R., Ill.) and Silvio Conte (R., Mass.) pushed through an amendment cutting the maximum subsidy payment to any farmer

for any crop to \$20,000 from \$55,000. More importantly, they closed the loophole that allowed farmers to evade the ceilings by splitting up their acreage among members of their families or by leasing land. This was a particular blow to large cotton farmers, who were reluctant to see the bill pass in that form. Then, another blow was delivered to the cotton growers by an amendment to cut off a \$10 million federal subsidy to Cotton Inc., which is supposed to promote cotton sales and technology but seems to spend a lot of its money on fancy office quarters and high-salaried executives.

Further erosion of the subsidy lobby's position came when Rep. Robert H. Michel (R., Ill.) got surprising support for an unsuccessful amendment that would have given the administration much of what it wanted, namely a three-year phase-out of direct income subsidies altogether.

The bill finally passed the House, but only by a 226 to 182 vote, which suggests that a presidential veto could be sustained. In that case, assuming no compromise by the President, the farm act of 1949, as amended in 1958, would come back into play when the present farm act expires at the end of this year. That wouldn't end subsidies in principle but administration experts feel the Treasury would be considerably less exposed to subsidy drains.

The administration has been emboldened to tackle the support lobby this year because of a combination of factors. Rising world demand has boosted farm prices and income and reduced farmer interest in federal support. Consumers are increasingly resentful of the combination of high food prices and continued farm subsidies. There is greater understanding in Congress of the inflationary effect of budget deficits. The \$4 billion to \$5 billion that goes to farmers offers a place to cut.

The complaints from consumers about food prices have overridden everything else, but also led to an attempt to control food costs, which has been highly damaging to farm productivity. The freeze, now lifted on all products except beef, ran counter to the administration's basic agricultural policy, which is aimed at improving production and efficiency. That basic policy would remove subsidies that tend to limit farmers' incentives to seek the most profitable ways of putting their land to work. The 1970 farm bill moved in that direction by permitting greater decision-making freedom. Some Southern farmers, for example, have switched from supported crops to soybeans, which are in heavy world demand. This sort of thing should be further encouraged.

It is indeed possible that continued heavy world demand will keep farm prices above the proposed target levels that would trigger direct subsidies. But that is by no means a certainty and the prospect of a \$12 billion Treasury drain, even spread over four years, is not encouraging at a time when it is imperative for the administration to bring the federal budget back into balance to curb inflation. For that reason we hope the administration remains firm in its resolve when the farm bill finally lands on its doorstep.

KEMP URGES APPROVAL OF VETERANS PENSION LEGISLATION, PRAISES ENACTMENT OF GI HOME LOAN BILL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, our country and its citizens, including all of us in

Congress, have an immediate obligation to our veterans of Vietnam and other wars.

Continuing inflation, in such forms as higher prices and higher interest rates, is having a devastating effect on many of those who have served and sacrificed for our Nation.

Most adversely affected are those veterans and their wives, or their widows, who are dependent upon marginal incomes and monthly pension checks. They, who are most in need, are caught in a vise of low, annual income and the shrinking buying power of the dollars available to them.

With a deep awareness of this predicament, I urge all my colleagues to lend the strongest, bipartisan support to passage of H.R. 9474 when it comes to this body for consideration next week.

This critically required measure, which I have the privilege of cosponsoring with my colleague, Mr. DORN, the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, would provide a 10-percent increase in the monthly, non-service-connected disability checks of veterans and veterans' widows.

By law, the amounts of the monthly disability checks, upon which they depend, go down when a veteran's or his wife's annual income goes up. The 20-percent social security increase which became effective at the first of this year resulted in an average reduction of \$7 a month in veterans' pensions.

The additional 5.6-percent social security increase which will become effective in June 1974, will further reduce these checks unless we approve this very modest, requested 10 percent increase in pension benefits.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans did not hesitate to serve our Nation when duty called. I believe our duty, in connection with the proposed increase of pensions, is a call which demands our unqualified and wholehearted approval.

It is fitting that we demonstrate our gratitude and concern for our veterans and their widows in the wake of today's signing by the President of the bill we passed which authorizes the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to adjust the maximum interest rate on GI home loans.

I have had hundreds of telephone calls and have received a considerable volume of mail from my constituents in New York's 38th Congressional District complaining of the inability to obtain GI loans because of the statutory requirement of a maximum, 6 percent interest rate.

Because of that inflexible requirement, lifted today by the President's signing and enactment of amending legislation, the GI home loan program has come to a virtual halt.

Market conditions have made such a low yield unrealistic across the country.

The going interest rate of 8½ percent here in the Washington area is not untypical. And it is frequently higher.

The amending legislation will not only have the overdue effect of making urgently required housing available to veterans but it is the harbinger of an immediate and continuing expansion of America's housing industry and greater

job and wage opportunities for those workers in the construction trades.

ST. ALBANS HOSPITAL IS NEEDED

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to note that the Veterans' Administration realizes the pressing need of our New York veterans. In the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974 (H.R. 8825) \$5.1 million has been appropriated for the first stage of reconstruction of the outmoded veterans' hospital in the Bronx.

However, I am even more gratified to note that in the report accompanying H.R. 8825, the Appropriations Committee directs that the Veterans' Administration carefully reexamine the possibility and feasibility of utilizing the St. Albans Naval Hospital as a veterans' medical facility.

This hospital is presently under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Navy and has recently been scheduled to close.

In these times of spiralling inflation, it certainly seems more prudent to invest our resources toward improving what we already have, rather than tearing down and building anew.

It is anticipated that replacing the Bronx VA Hospital would cost an estimated \$86 million. However, an on-the-spot study already made by the Veterans' Administration has revealed that even if complete renovation were considered, the cost would be considerably less than the projected \$86 million needed to build a new hospital.

Utilizing St. Albans Hospital as part of the VA medical program would certainly benefit the more than 2.6 million New York veterans at little or no additional capital investment of taxpayers dollars. It could provide some of the services planned for the Bronx unit, perhaps reducing the cost for renovation of that facility. St. Albans could also be utilized as a VA extended care nursing home facility. Next year, the New York metropolitan area will be 450 nursing home beds short of VA's actual need. St. Albans could wipe out this terrible deficit.

As you know, the VA medical system is one of the finest and largest in the world, encompassing 168 hospitals, 201 outpatient clinics, 18 domiciliaries, and 77 nursing home care units. The volume of patients has risen significantly—to over 944,000 in fiscal year 1972.

This is not new, however. The United States has a long history of extending medical benefits to our veterans. From 1755, when the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts ordered a hospital to be established in a camp near Boston for the treatment of soldiers stricken with smallpox, until 1973, when the volume of patients treated rose to record-breaking levels, Congress has continued its mission to provide the quality medical care that our veterans so justly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I strongly urge the Veterans' Administration to consider making St. Al-

bans Hospital part of the VA medical system. Our budget will benefit, the VA will benefit, and New York veterans will benefit. Thank you.

GRANT ASSISTANCE TO THAILAND

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, within a day or two, the

foreign aid authorization bill is scheduled for floor action. Included in the bill is the sum of \$73 million in grant aid for Thailand. I think that it is important for my colleagues to recall that 4½ years ago, the United States found it necessary to borrow \$100 million from Thailand. It is especially interesting to note that while the United States was borrowing the \$100 million from Thailand with one hand, it was using the other hand to give Thailand an additional \$100 million in the form of a fiscal year 1969 military assistance service-funded grant. Repayment of the \$100

million loan from Thailand was made on July 9, 1973, together with \$29 million in interest.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Agency for International Development's Congressional Presentation, Thailand now has gold and foreign exchange reserves of over a billion dollars. To date, we have given Thailand more than \$1.6 billion in grant aid. We have also provided direct military protection of Thailand for many years. Is it not time to reconsider the need for further grant aid to Thailand?

Aid to Thailand is reflected in the following table:

THAILAND

[U.S. fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

Program	U.S. overseas loans and grants, obligations and loan authorizations																
	Post-war relief period 1946-48	Marshall plan period 1949-52	Mutual security act period 1953-61	Foreign assistance act period									Total FAA period 1962-72	Total loans and grants 1946-72	Repayments and interest 1946-72	Total less repayments and interest	
				1962-65	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972						
ECONOMIC PROGRAMS																	
A. Official development assistance																	
AID and predecessor agencies, total		16.1	253.2	106.9	43.4	53.3	46.7	35.5	26.5	22.4	17.5	352.3	1563.5	31.3	532.2		
Loans			45.6	31.6		3.5						35.1	56.3	31.3	25.0		
Grants		16.1	207.6	75.3	43.4	49.8	46.7	35.5	26.5	22.4	17.5	317.2	507.2		507.2		
Supporting Assistance	(-----)	(14.3)	(190.9)	(44.8)	(30.0)	(36.3)	(36.0)	(25.0)	(18.9)	(17.0)	(14.8)	(222.8)	(403.6)				
Food for peace, total		(²)	4.0	.4	.2	.3	.9	.6	1.2	.3	14.8	18.7	22.7	2.0	20.7		
Title I, total			3.6								14.0	14.0	17.6	2.0	15.6		
Repayable in U.S. dollars—loans											14.0	14.0	14.0		14.0		
Payable in foreign currency—Planned for country use			3.6										3.6	2.0	1.6		
Total sales agreements, including U.S. uses	(-----)	(-----)	(4.3)	(-----)	(-----)	(-----)	(-----)	(-----)	(-----)	(-----)	(-----)	(-----)	(4.3)	(-----)	(4.3)		
Title II total			.4	.4	.2	.3	.9	.6	1.2	.3	.8	4.7	5.1		5.1		
Emergency relief economic development and world food																	
Voluntary relief agencies			.4	(²)	.4	.2	.3	.9	.6	1.2	.3	.8	4.7	(²)	5.1		(²)
Other official development assistance	6.2			5.6	3.1	2.3	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.7	18.5	24.7	7.1	17.6		
Peace Corps				5.6	3.1	2.3	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.7	18.5	18.5		18.5		
Other	6.2												6.2	7.1	.9		
Total	6.2	16.1	257.2	112.9	46.7	55.9	49.3	37.4	29.0	24.3	34.0	389.5	610.9	40.4	570.5		
Loans	6.2		49.2	31.6		3.5					14.0	49.1	80.1	40.4	39.7		
Grants		16.1	208.0	81.3	46.7	52.4	49.3	37.4	29.0	24.3	20.0	340.4	530.8		530.8		
B. Other official economic programs																	
Export-Import Bank loans		1.0	15.3	17.9	15.0	3.4	1.0	3.2	3.2		2.2	45.9	62.2	48.8	13.4		
Other loans									.2	.5		.7	.7	.3	.4		
Total other official loans		1.0	15.3	17.9	15.0	3.4	1.0	3.2	3.4	.5	2.2	46.6	62.9	49.1	13.8		
Total economic programs	6.2	17.1	272.5	130.8	61.7	59.3	50.3	40.6	32.4	24.8	36.2	436.1	673.8	89.5	584.3		
Loans	6.2	1.0	64.5	49.5	15.0	6.9	1.0	3.2	3.4	.5	16.2	95.7	143.0	89.5	53.5		
Grants		16.1	208.0	81.3	46.7	52.4	49.3	37.4	29.0	24.3	20.0	340.4	530.8		530.8		
MILITARY PROGRAMS																	
Military assistance—(Charged to FAA appropriation) ³		16.4	286.9	233.4	30.2	21.0	(⁴)					284.6	588.1		588.1		
Credit sales (FMS)																	
Grants		16.4	286.9	233.4	30.2	21.0						284.6	588.1		588.1		
Military assistance service-funded grants						11.0	56.3	167.1	95.5	72.0	43.4	445.3	445.3		445.3		
Transfers from excess stocks		.6	8.9	11.5	1.2	.2						12.9	22.5		22.5		
Other grants			3.6	(²)	.9				1.3		11.6	13.8	17.4		17.4		
Export-Import Bank military loans																	
Total military programs		17.0	299.4	244.9	31.4	33.1	56.3	167.1	96.8	72.0	55.0	756.6	1,073.3		1,073.3		
Total economic and military programs	6.2	34.1	571.9	375.7	93.1	92.3	106.6	207.7	129.2	96.8	91.2	1,192.7	1,747.1	89.5	1,657.6		
Loans	6.2	1.0	64.5	49.5	15.0	6.9	1.0	3.2	3.4	.5	16.2	95.7	143.0	89.5	53.5		
Grants		33.1	507.4	326.2	78.1	85.5	105.6	204.5	125.8	96.3	75.0	1,097.0	1,604.1		1,604.1		

¹ The cumulative total reflects deobligations; annual data represent total new obligations in that year.

² Less than \$50,000.

³ Annual data through fiscal year 1963 are deliveries; subsequent years are annual program data. Totals for the entire period are cumulative program figures.

⁴ Military assistance under the FAA was transferred to DOD service funding.

ASSISTANCE FROM INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES—
COMMITMENTS

	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972	Fiscal year 1946-72
Total.....	30.0	67.2	525.4
IBRD, World Bank.....	12.5	42.4	404.1
International Finance Corp.....	.2	22.8
Asian Dev. Bank.....	15.8	18.0	48.8
UNDP, SF.....	.5	3.8	23.6
UNDP, TA (CY).....	.5	.6	13.1
Other UN (CY).....	.5	2.4	13.0

D.A.C. COUNTRIES (EXCLUDING UNITED STATES)

Donor	Official bilateral gross expenditures		
	Calendar year 1970	Calendar year 1971	Calendar year 1960-71
Total.....	97.4	76.8	374.2
Japan.....	77.9	61.4	230.3
Germany.....	6.4	4.9	80.8
Other.....	13.1	10.3	63.1

ASSISTANCE FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES (LOANS AND
GRANTS EXTENDED)

1971 (calendar year).....
1972 (calendar year).....
Cumulative through 1972.....

RUPPE PROPOSAL TO MEET THE
ENERGY CRISIS

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, energy research and development programs are presently spread across many agencies, departments, and offices of the Federal Government. There has been a total lack of coordination among the various research efforts; and there has been an obvious failure to formulate a rational plan to meet our present and future energy needs. Today, as a result of poor planning, we are experiencing critical shortages of environmentally acceptable forms of energy.

I have introduced a bill this week, H.R. 9535, that would establish within the Federal Government a National Energy Research and Development Board charged with the responsibility of coordinating and financially supplementing the Federal research effort in energy technologies and energy conservation. The Board's first order of business would be to conduct a thorough review and assessment of the current status of energy science. The Board's mandate would be to formulate an aggressive research and development strategy designed to provide the Nation with the capability of being domestically self-sufficient in environmentally clean energy.

The Board proposed in my bill could be implemented quickly without a major reorganization of the Federal energy agencies. The Board would be sufficiently independent to objectively assess, coordinate, and direct a national program of energy research and development.

H.R. 9535 would authorize the appro-

priation of \$4 billion over a 5-year period beginning with \$250 million in fiscal year 1974.

This bill does not purport to be the final answer to the Nation's energy problems. It does, however, propose a workable structure that could begin bringing our scientific and financial resources to bear upon a problem that is essential to the well-being of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following table and the full text of H.R. 9535, "The National Energy Research and Development Act of 1973," in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

PROJECTED FEDERAL ENERGY R. & D. FUNDING UNDER
H.R. 9535—5-YEAR PROGRAM

(In millions of dollars)

	Ongoing programs	Energy Board	Total
Year:			
1974.....	771	250	1,021
1975.....	925	500	1,425
1976.....	1,110	750	1,860
1977.....	1,340	1,000	2,340
1978.....	1,600	1,500	3,100
Total.....	5,746	4,000	9,746

Note: Increases in ongoing programs based on growth rate of funding levels over the past 5 years. Ongoing programs include current energy research and development activities conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of the Interior, the National Science Foundation, NASA, the Department of Transportation, EPA, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Commerce.

H.R. 9535

A bill to establish a national program for research, development and demonstration in energy technologies and energy conservation and for the coordination and financial supplementation of federal energy research and development; to conduct a thorough review and assessment of the current status of research and development in energy technologies and energy conservation in both the public and the private sector; to increase efficiencies of energy production and utilization, reduce environmental impacts, develop new sources of clean energy, demonstrate specific technologies and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Energy Research and Development Act of 1973".

TITLE I—NATIONAL ENERGY RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

SECTION 101. The Congress hereby finds that—

(a) The Nation is currently suffering a critical shortage of environmentally acceptable forms of energy.

(b) A major reason for this energy shortage is our past and present failure to formulate an aggressive research and development strategy designed to promote the wise management and conservation of energy sources, and the development of environmentally sound sources of energy.

(c) The responsibilities of the Federal government for conducting and assisting energy research, development and demonstration projects are fragmented among many agencies and departments of government and not being planned and managed in a rational and coordinated manner.

(d) Present inadequate organization arrangements and levels of funding for energy research, development, and demonstration have limited the Nation's current and future options for dealing with energy problems.

(e) The Nation's energy needs can be met

if a national commitment is made now to dedicate the necessary financial resources, to enlist our scientific and technological capabilities, and to accord the proper priority to developing new options and new management systems to serve national needs, conserve vital resources and protect the environment.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 102. In order to provide an adequate energy base to support the Nation's existing and future social goals and aspirations, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to establish and maintain a national program of research and development in energy technologies and energy conservation adequate to meet the following objectives—

(a) encourage the conservation of limited energy resources and maximize the efficiency of energy development, production, conversion, and use;

(b) insure adequate, reliable, economical, and environmentally acceptable energy systems to support the essential needs of modern society including the established social objectives of Federal, State and local government;

(c) discover the most desirable short-term solutions to those immediate energy problems which are having serious impacts upon society;

(d) develop the technology and information base necessary to support development of the widest possible range of options available for future energy policy decisions by aggressively pursuing research and development programs in a wide range of energy technologies;

(e) provide the option and the capability for self-sufficiency for the United States through the development of socially and environmentally acceptable methods of utilization of domestic energy sources;

(f) establish within the Federal Government central responsibility and institutional capability for maintaining continuing assessment, overview, and direction of the energy research and development activities of the Federal Government, private industry, and nonprofit organizations;

(g) supplement ongoing energy research and development programs.

NATIONAL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
BOARD

SEC. 103. (a) There is hereby established the National Energy Research and Development Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of five members appointed by the President, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be so appointed as Chairman of the Board. The members first appointed under this section, as amended, shall continue in office for terms of one, two, three, four and five years, respectively, from the date this section, as amended, takes effect, the term of each to be designated by the President at the time of nomination. Their successors shall be appointed each for a term of five years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed and until his successor is appointed and has qualified, except that he shall not so continue to serve beyond the expiration of the next session of Congress subsequent to the expiration of said fixed term of office. In the event that a person is appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, he shall be appointed only for the unexpired term. Not more than three of the members shall be appointed from the same political party.

(b) Each individual, upon selection to serve on the Board, shall cease affiliation with and relinquish any pecuniary interest in any person, firm, association, or corporation primarily engaged in the production, generation, transmission, distribution, or sale of energy.

Members of the Board shall be selected from among those individuals who have experience and competence regarding energy research and development, the environment and its protection and the conservation of natural resources.

(c) Said member shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment during his term of office.

(d) No vacancy in the Board shall impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board. Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the Board shall have an official seal of which judicial notice shall be taken. The Board shall annually elect a Vice Chairman to act in case of the absence or disability of the Chairman or in case of a vacancy in the office of Chairman.

DUTIES

SEC. 104. The Board shall—

(a) review the full range of Federal activities in and financial support for energy technologies and energy conservation, giving consideration to research and development being conducted by industry and other non-Federal entities, to determine the capability of ongoing research efforts to carry out the policies established by this Act and other relevant Federal policies, particularly the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852);

(b) formulate a comprehensive energy research and development strategy for the Federal government which will expeditiously advance the policies established by this Act, and insure that full consideration and adequate support is given to:

(1) improving the efficiency, conservation, and environmental effects of the conventional sources of energy including discovery, production, conversion, transportation, use and waste product disposal;

(2) advancing energy research, development and demonstration of unconventional energy sources and technologies including but not limited to—solar energy, geothermal energy, magnetohydrodynamics, fusion processes, fuel cells, low head hydroelectric power, use of agricultural products for energy, tidal power, ocean current and thermal gradient power, wind power, automated mining methods, in situ conversion of fuels, cryogenic transmission of electric power, electrical energy storage methods, alternatives to internal combustion engines, solvent refined coal, shale oil, utilization of waste products for fuel, direct conversion methods; and

(3) improving management techniques and the effectiveness of management of existing energy systems through quality control, application of systems analysis, communications, and computer techniques; and public information to improve the reliability and efficiency of energy supplies and encourage the conservation of energy resources.

(c) utilize the funds authorized by Section 110(b) of this Act to advance the energy research and development strategy by—

(1) supplementing by fund transfers the ongoing energy research and development programs of Federal agencies;

(2) initiating and maintaining, by fund transfers or grants, new energy research and development programs or activities utilizing the facilities, capabilities, expertise and experience of Federal agencies, national laboratories, universities, non-profit organizations, and industrial entities which are appropriate to each type of research and development;

(3) conducting through its own employees and facilities appropriate research and development; and

(4) establishing, in coordination with industry, demonstration projects in new energy technologies.

(d) in the exercise of its duties and responsibilities under this title, establish pro-

cedures for periodic consultation with representatives of science, industry, environmental organizations, and such other groups who have special expertise in the areas of energy research, development, conservation, technology, and environmental protection relating to the production, transportation, and use of energy.

(e) make an annual report to the Congress on the activities of the previous calendar year, the expenditure of funds, the new projects initiated, the projects which have been terminated, and new contractual relationships entered into, and the progress the Board has made during that year toward attaining the capability of domestic self-sufficiency for the United States. In each instance where delays in schedule accomplishments are reported, the reasons for the delays shall be set forth along with recommendations for actions, including specific estimates of additional funding, or requirements for such new legislative authority as the Board deems necessary to carry out the goals of this title.

(f) study the social, economic, and environmental impacts of existing and proposed energy and energy-related technologies.

DETERMINATION OF NEED FOR AND PRIORITIES OF FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 105. In evaluating proposed opportunities for particular research and development undertakings pursuant to this title, the Board shall assign priority to those undertakings in which—

(1) the urgency of public need for the potential results of the research, development, or demonstration effort is high, and there is little likelihood that similar results would be achieved in a timely manner in the absence of Federal assistance;

(2) the potential opportunities for non-Federal interests to recapture the investment in the undertaking through the normal commercial exploitation of proprietary knowledge appear inadequate to encourage timely results;

(3) the extent of the problems treated and the objectives sought by the undertaking are national or regional in scope as opposed to being of importance to localities or individual industries;

(4) there are limited opportunities for regulatory actions and incentives other than direct Federal financial assistance, including, but not limited to, end-use controls, tax and price incentives, and public education, to induce non-Federal support of the undertaking;

(5) the degree of risk of loss of investment inherent in the research is high, and the availability of risk capital to the non-Federal entities which might otherwise engage in the field of the research is limited;

(6) the magnitude of the investment appears to exceed the financial capabilities of potential non-Federal participants in the research to support effective efforts;

(7) effective use and conservation of energy are promoted;

(8) domestic renewable energy resources are utilized; or

(9) adverse social and environmental impacts are minimized.

PROPRIETARY INFORMATION AND PATENTS

SEC. 106. (a) All research contracted for, sponsored, or co-sponsored by the Board pursuant to this title shall require as a condition of Federal participation that all information, processes, or patents resulting from federally assisted research will be available to the general public.

(b) Where a participant in an energy research and development project holds background patents, trade secrets, or proprietary information which will be employed in and are requisite to the proposed research and development project, the Board shall enter

into an agreement which will provide equitable protection to the participants' rights: *Provided*, That any such agreement must provide that when the energy research and development project reaches the stage of commercial application all previously developed patents, trade secrets, or proprietary information necessary to commercial application of the energy process or system developed under this title will be made available to any qualified applicant on reasonable license terms which shall take into account that the commercial viability of the total energy process or system was achieved with the assistance of public funds: *And provided further*, That where a commercial energy process or technology has been developed through the use of supplemental funds made available under subsection 104(c) of this Act to other Federal agencies, the provisions of law applicable to those agencies on patent rights or the disclosure of trade secrets or proprietary information shall govern. Where an agency using such supplemental funds does not have a specific legislative policy on patent rights or the disclosure of trade secrets or proprietary rights, the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall control.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 107. (a) The Chairman of the Board shall be compensated at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule Pay Rates (5 U.S.C. 5313).

(b) The remaining members of the Board shall be compensated at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule Pay Rates (5 U.S.C. 5314).

POWERS

SEC. 108. (a) The Board may employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Board under this title and may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants as may be necessary, in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code (but without regard to the last sentence thereof);

(b) The Board may—

(1) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary;

(2) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other agencies of the United States;

(3) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles;

(4) enter into contracts or agreements for studies and surveys with non-Federal public and private organizations and transfer funds to Federal agencies to carry out aspects of the Board's duties; and

(5) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this title.

(c) The Chairman shall have the authority and be responsible for—

(1) the supervision of personnel;

(2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among personnel; and

(3) the use and expenditure of funds.

COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 109. Upon request of the Chairman, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized and directed—

(1) to furnish the Board within the limits of available funds such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions; and

(2) to detail to temporary duty with the Board on a reimbursable basis such personnel as it may require for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 110. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 annually for the administrative expenses of the Board including such amounts as may be expended for con-

sulting services in connection with the duties of the Board and including funds transferred to other Federal agencies in compensation for personal services in assisting the Board with the administration of this title.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and, subject to annual congressional authorizations, \$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$750,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, \$1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, \$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978, and thereafter amounts such as Congress shall determine to carry out the provisions of subsection 104(c) of this title.

TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 111. Nothing in this Act is to be construed to prevent the transfer of the responsibilities for some or all of the ongoing Federal energy research and development programs conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of the Interior, the National Science Foundation, and other Federal agencies to the Board.

NEW ENGLAND VETERINARY COLLEGE

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to an impending national shortage of veterinarians, a deficiency reaching critical proportions in New England, and an emergency demanding prompt congressional action.

Roughly half of the Nation's households call upon the veterinarian to treat companion animals. Beyond pet treatment, though, veterinarians contribute to the medical sciences by investigating the animal model that can be found for almost every human disease. Veterinarians prevent and control the 175 known animal diseases communicable to man. They maintain the health of our livestock and poultry. They supervise meat inspection and food regulation services. They insure humane treatment of laboratory animals. And they participate in research efforts in such vital fields as ecology, aerospace, pharmacology, and the marine sciences. Further, the responsibilities and opportunities of the veterinary profession in each of these fields are expected to increase greatly in the coming years. There can be little doubt, then, of the importance of the veterinary profession as a national resource and of the need to insure an adequate supply of well-trained veterinarians in the coming decade.

Unless Congress takes prompt remedial action, however, the United States will suffer by 1980 from a projected shortage of 6,000 veterinarians, a deficiency of 15 percent from the anticipated need for 41,000 veterinarians. With existing classrooms filled to capacity, our 18 colleges of veterinary medicine matriculate less than 1,600 students annually.

Plans for expanding existing facilities are only modest, and limitations in State and Federal funding place their realiza-

tion in doubt. Proposals for new veterinary colleges in several States appear to be postponed indefinitely, and the only veterinary school under development will enroll just 32 students when it opens next year. An early symptom of this developing national problem is the average of five job offerings awaiting each graduate of veterinary college.

New England faces an even greater shortage of veterinarians than does the rest of the Nation. If the New England States are to obtain the recommended national proportion of veterinarians to population, they must double their present supply of 1,500 veterinarians within the next 7 years. While every State with a population over 8 million possesses its own veterinary college, the New England States, with a combined population approaching 12 million, possess no such school. Unlike virtually all States without their own veterinary college, none of the States of New England have entered into contractual agreements with veterinary schools to assure higher admission priorities for their residents. Such agreements are now difficult to secure since veterinary schools must already turn away five qualified applicants for every one they accept.

While entering such contract agreements might provide short-term relief for New England residents, this method of interstate sharing of existing facilities contributes nothing toward the expansion of facilities necessary to avoid the impending national shortage of veterinarians. Without the advantages of a veterinary college in New England, or a special arrangement with colleges in other areas, only about 35 New England residents secure admission to veterinary schools each year. Hundreds of eager and qualified applicants from New England are rejected and hundreds more are discouraged from even applying to veterinary colleges—a ridiculous waste of talent.

William E. Brock, dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine at Oklahoma State University, cites this all-too-common testimony to the plight of New England students with veterinary aspirations in the recently published report of the New England Board of Higher Education:

A much greater capacity to educating veterinarians is needed in the eastern part of the United States. We receive hundreds of inquiries concerning application to the veterinary school each year from residents of eastern seaboard states. Our admissions policies at the present time prevent our consideration for admission of these students.

As Dr. Jack J. Stockton, dean of the School of Veterinary Science and Medicine at Purdue University, is quoted in the same report:

Each year we get many applications from what appear to be exceptionally fine students in the New England area. It's rather heart-breaking to have to turn down many of our out-of-state applicants and surely on the basis of need, the desire on the part of students, and the number of well trained and well qualified applicants available it should be perfectly obvious to those in positions making decisions that a school in the New England area would more than repay this investment.

Solving New England's severe shortage of trained veterinarians by recruitment from other areas will become increasingly difficult in view of the national deficiency of veterinarians, and again, this approach could only be a stopgap measure for the New England States since it ignores the clear need to increase the total number of veterinarians in all the United States.

The rational solution to New England's predicament, as well as a means of helping fill the entire Nation's growing need for veterinarians, lies in the establishment of a new regional college of veterinary medicine in New England. Deans of veterinary medicine schools throughout the country have recognized the wisdom and recommended the creation of such a school in New England. The internationally recognized medical and scientific community of New England could provide the interdisciplinary links necessary for a truly modern college of veterinary medicine. The sharing of construction and operating costs by the six New England States and the Federal Government would keep the financial burden on each to a minimum.

Finally, a local veterinary school would provide many essential services beyond professional training that are currently denied New England residents. These include continuing education programs, referral and consultative services, and specialized facilities for the practicing veterinarian as well as extension activities for the dissemination of information on new developments in animal health care to the public.

In conclusion, Congress has the opportunity to prevent a national crisis, to avoid emergency measures later, and to realize considerable financial savings if we face squarely America's impending shortage of veterinarians, and if we act promptly to aid that region of the country with the greatest need for a regional college of veterinary medicine: New England.

Our first step must be to extend efforts by the House Appropriations Committee to counter administration obstruction of veterinary school construction. The administration withheld all of the \$100 million appropriated last fiscal year for construction grants to schools in all the health professions, and it requested no such money for the upcoming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee has recommended the expenditure of the previously appropriated funds and the appropriation of another \$100 million for fiscal year 1974.

Even if all of this \$200 million is expended, however, and even if veterinary schools receive their usual portion of roughly 5 percent of this amount, then three schools would still be left with almost \$14 million less than what they need to complete projects already begun, and progress on a new veterinary school would not even reach the planning stage.

We cannot allow this to happen. We must appropriate the \$23.9 million needed for completion of present projects, as well as allocate sufficient funds for the planning and construction of a new veterinary school for New England.

And we must insure that these funds are released by the administration if we are to avoid a critical, costly, and unnecessary shortage of veterinarians in all the United States and particularly in New England.

THE ONLY CURE FOR INFLATION

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, with the Nation in continuing debate over inflation, unemployment, wage-price controls, the international monetary situation, and all the attendant issues in our very volatile economy, it might serve us well to learn of the intensity of debate over these very issues in other parts of the Western World. Great Britain, in particular, is experiencing similar economic woes. The debate is equally intense. The economic correspondent for the English weekly, the Guardian, Frances Cairncross, recently interviewed Member of Parliament Enoch Powell on the issue of inflation. The interview might contribute to the economic debate in this country. The interview follows:

THE ONLY CURE FOR INFLATION
(By Enoch Powell)

FC: Inflation is on everyone's mind at the moment. Do you think that our Government's prices and incomes policy has been much of a success so far?

EP: I'm driven back to the old self-quote: "All prices and incomes policy is nonsense, silly nonsense, and what is more and worse, dangerous nonsense."

FC: Why do you call it "dangerous" nonsense?

EP: Policies which are inherently futile are not necessarily harmless. A drug which does not cure the disease may nevertheless kill the patient. Besides its obvious evils—besides involving direct intervention in prices and a vast bureaucratic structure—prices and incomes policy has a deeper, psychological effect. It conveys the message that prices and wages and relativities and all the other economic values are things which should be decided by compulsion. The differential between a dustman and a shorthand-typist, which without a prices and incomes policy neither the dustman nor the shorthand-typist would think particularly remarkable, is suddenly rendered unintelligible, objectionable, and a subject if not for agitation then at any rate for political action, through the underlying presumption of a wages and prices policy that values can be fixed by government.

Well, outside a slave camp, value can't be fixed by government.

FC: But I'm sure you'd agree that wages over the last few months have risen much more slowly than before we had an incomes policy.

EP: I've never disputed that for a short time you can have a freeze, but a freeze is not a prices and incomes policy. That's why a freeze is always represented as something that you do while you are looking for a prices and incomes policy. That's been the persistent refrain. The Conservative Government in 1961 had a pay pause while we were thinking out a prices and incomes policy. But when we had a White Paper in 1962, "Prices and Incomes: the next step," we discovered there

was no next step. That's what we're going to discover with Stage Three. Then the Labour Party imposed a freeze while they were discovering the Eldorado of which George Brown had gone in search like so many others "whose bones lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold." A freeze is not a prices and incomes policy. Nobody denies, if people obey the law—and they're mostly prone not merely to obey the law but to obey what isn't the law but what they are brainwashed into thinking so—that you can hold things for a very short time.

FC: The Government's own argument, I imagine, would be that one of the main difficulties with making the freeze and Phase Two watertight has been the fact that food prices and the prices of raw materials have been rising very rapidly.

EP: They are only saying that there are some prices which even for a short time you cannot freeze, I don't dispute that.

FC: Is there anything at all that you can see that one could do about the problem of rising food prices?

EP: To concern yourself with one particular price, or set of prices, is to participate in the inherent fallacy of a prices and incomes policy. You should deal with the cause of all inflation, which is the excessive rate of growth of money compared with that of the contents of the opposite pan of the scale.

FC: Would you say the rate of growth of the money supply is the most important thing to deal with if one wants to slow inflation down?

EP: It's the only thing to deal with.

FC: There's no other way?

EP: There's no other way. Inflation in the present sense, that is to say, on-going inflation by 5% or 10% per annum, cannot happen unless there is a prior and conditioning increase in money.

FC: So if you want to slow inflation down at the moment, the only way to go about it is to take steps which will slow down the rate at which the money supply grows?

EP: No human being could slow down inflation "at the moment," because no return to fiscal policies which would prevent or limit the growth of the money supply would take instantaneous effect. And indeed, the rate at which they would take effect is not within precise limits predictable. So don't report me as offering an instant cure, I'm not a quack.

FC: How long would your cure take to work?

EP: Anything from six months to two years. But when we say "work," what do we mean? Start to work? Or work right through? My six months to two years is a rough stab, subject to what I've previously said, at those two extreme limits.

FC: If one were at this moment to try to slow down very drastically the rate at which the money supply is likely to expand, one would then presumably risk returning to a period of rather high unemployment. Would you agree with that?

EP: That's not because of restricting the rate of growth of the money supply. That's because of achieving the cure that everybody pretends to want to achieve, but few really do. It is not the way in which inflation is slowed down or ended but the fact that it is slowed down or ended which causes transitional unemployment. If it were ended by magic or prayer or lighting candles, it would still produce whatever transitional unemployment was specific to the previous rate of inflation and the sharpness with which that rate turned downwards. It is as logical as throwing a stone at one's opponent to say that his proposal for dealing with inflation will cause unemployment. All slowing down of inflation causes unemployment.

FC: Do you think people in this country are really prepared to accept the consequences of slowing down inflation?

EP: I do, but the Government doesn't. The Government ran away.

FC: But you think individual people would be prepared to accept another bout of severe unemployment?

EP: I do not believe that unemployment in contemporary terms has anything like the same political, psychological, social importance that the politicians, whose rules of thumb are generally about a generation out of date, suppose. I don't think there was any justification for the Government to panic when the turn-down in the rate of inflation from 10% to 5% was accompanied by what it is bound to be accompanied by. Instead, they broke ranks and deliberately speeded inflation up again. They called it "reflating." But when you have inflation, at 5% and reflate, that means you're going to inflate still faster. And sure enough they did. I've never seen a thing which worked so beautifully; I've never seen such a classic example of a Government adopting the correct methods for creating inflation, or rather creating more of it, and achieving its purpose. It worked beautifully. This of course is what we wanted; this is what we are determined to have; but it mustn't be understood that we are doing it. Otherwise we shall be blamed for something which people dislike more than they dislike unemployment. So they adopted a prices and incomes policy.

FC: Why do you think inflation matters? Don't you think we could learn to live with it?

EP: If by inflation you meant a constant annual depreciation of the value of money, which everybody assumed would be constant, then my answer to your question would be yes. But in fact we mean accelerating inflation. Indeed the results for which Governments cause inflation, for example, to produce and maintain a continuous full employment of labour are only obtainable by a constantly accelerating inflation.

FC: And you really feel that an accelerating rate of inflation is something that would cause political stresses and social distress which people would not be prepared to accept?

EP: The Germans worked this one out. God bless the Germans! If no one else would, they would always carry the chess game to the point where you take the king off the board . . . and they tried it out. They attempted to inflate ad infinitum. Trees don't grow to heaven. Just because we discover that we manage with 10% inflation when in 1957 we thought 3% was the end of the world, it doesn't prove we can manage with 20%.

FC: If one looks back we've had 3% and 5% and now 8 to 10%. If one draws the curve onwards it presents a pretty hair-raising spectacle.

All trends can go on; but they may not; and we know they won't forever. Life, the great game of politics itself, would be impossible if we could just draw exponentials.

FC: What do you think is going to happen next? We've got Stage Three coming up on the cards.

EP: Stage Three doesn't exist. There are two possibilities. One is that you drop the whole thing, with an infinite variety of pretenses and forms of humbug to cover the fact up. The other is to continue Stage Two, in other words, go on with the freeze. But, of course, in that case the contradiction between a freeze and real life becomes more apparent all the time. Those are the two broad directions in which you can go when confronted with the fact that there ain't no Phase Three, by which I mean there is no method whereby individual prices and wages can be so fixed that after the event they are found to have added up together to a certain rate of inflation. There is no such thing known to man.

FC: What about the American Stage Three?

EP: The Americans have made, on this

point, an interesting discovery, I mean an experience. (Isn't it a wonderful thing that in English unlike French you can distinguish between experience and experiment, though I must say in political practice we often mistake the one for the other?) At any rate the Americans have made an experience. When they had their bonfire of controls, they left the machinery. The result is two-fold. First of all the temptation is to resort to the same machinery when any pressures arise again. After all, if it is there, how can you possibly not use it again? You used it before, didn't you? Meanwhile everyone seeing "the grim two-handed engine at the door," says "We aren't in a free economy, are we? We'd better take our decisions, not as we would otherwise, but in the light of our calculation of the chance that those controls will be reimposed." Thus you get a tremendous distortion simply because the machinery is left in existence.

FC: Every major industrial country in the world is now suffering from inflation at a more rapid rate than they were in the late 50s and early 60s. Your view is that inflation in Britain is essentially the result of a too-rapid expansion of the money supply, and you'd presumably extend that to be true of the United States. . . .

EP: Obviously. Certainly.

FC: . . . and for the other major industrial countries?

EP: Here there is a rider. The increase in money demand, which Governments cause in order to satisfy their own spending requirements, has a special case. That is where the expenditure in which they wish to engage is that of buying other people's money. When a currency has a fixed parity which is too low, that parity can only be kept down by the country spending its own currency in order to buy such junk as other people's money, or gold. So you can sit on the sidelines and enjoy the spectacle of the Germans choking themselves with inflation by printing marks in order to buy dollars they don't want. Over and over again even the Germans, inclined as they are to carry a thing beyond its logical stopping-point, have done this. Our own huge balance of payments surplus in 1970 and 1971 was probably the main reason for the acceleration of our inflation in the early 70s.

FC: Isn't the way out of this going to be for a number of large industrial countries to embark on policies which involve them simultaneously in clamping down?

EP: Not necessarily. You can do it yourself. Sin is a worldwide phenomenon; but you wouldn't take that as an excuse, nor would you accept—confronted with the sinner—that it was really all part of a worldwide phenomenon and therefore if they had it in Brazil, you really couldn't complain. Of course they have it in Brazil, both sin and inflation; and no doubt they have it for the same reasons—in the case of sin, because that is how men were created by an all-wise Providence, and in the case of inflation, because that's what democratic governments are like in an age when money is fiat money. But this doesn't enable us to sit back and treat it as a meteorological phenomenon. It is not like rain against which we have to raise an umbrella. It is like temptation which we have to resist, even though the Brazilians are being similarly tempted.

FC: But what if we all resisted at the same time?

EP: That's all right.

FC: Don't you end up with a situation where you have a number of countries at the same time introducing policies which are going to lead to recession?

EP: I'm prepared to take the extraordinarily remote risk of Brazil, Germany, Switzerland, the United States, and Britain, managing to have at exactly the same time the transitional consequences of regaining some degree of honesty about their money.

FC: Can we turn now to the international

monetary system? What future do you think it has?

EP: System? Don't make me laugh. I said in the House of Commons that the international monetary system is an institutionalised idiosyncrasy. I've been laughing for the last two years. To pretend that governments can either fix supply and demand between their own currency and other currencies, or can foresee how that supply and demand is changing, or can foresee to what extent the changes are temporary or lasting—I don't think idiosyncrasy is too severe a description for that, do you?

FC: We have now a situation in which there's no system whatsoever!

EP: There's just as good a system as there is on the Stock Exchange. The only possible system is that of the market. The market is the best system there is for comparing and discovering the truth about value so far as it can be expressed in terms of money. So with a floating currency we have in fact put ourselves in the best system. When people talk about a system they seem to want a tyrant. A tyrant is the worst system, a free market is the best.

FC: And we have now got one which can last?

EP: Of course. The market can last forever.

FC: What about gold? What do you want to do about that?

EP: Let people buy it if they want to, let people sell it. . . .

FC: And government?

EP: Well, there's not much good in a Government owning gold. That's terribly primitive. There are circumstances in which if you are going to be buying things from savages, it's not a bad idea to have a supply of beads. That is why before 1939 the British Government, very wisely, stored up the equivalent of beads to sell to savages—because if a war came we might need to get hold of some raw materials. But I can't really see any reason for any more storage of gold in this country. I think we're entitled to something a bit nearer to our heart's desire in return for our efforts.

WALLOWING IN WATERGATE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon emerged recently from a brief bout in the hospital in a fighting mood. Before he even reentered the White House, he declared: "Let others wallow in Watergate"—while he attends to the important business of governing the Nation.

We find the Chief Executive's aggressive attitude ominous, and we resent his aloofness. Nobody wants to wallow in Watergate; but the whole country has been plunged unwillingly into the muck. The "plumbers" and their tools were not concocted on Capitol Hill; the whole smelly scandal originated at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Republicans in Congress did not hire those two-bit kindergarten politicians, Haldeman and Ehrlichman, but we have to live with the consequences of their stupidity. As head of his party, the President should be more sympathetic to the problems his former staffers created. Far from showing concern, however, Mr. Nixon has not even completely cleaned house. Ziegler still reigns in the press room, and many of Haldeman and Ehrlichman's old

cronies are salted away in key positions in the executive branch.

It is not only unfair, it is impossible, for the President to dissociate himself from Watergate. It is we who are suffering from his folly, and it is he who has abandoned us—not the other way around. Many of my colleagues may be dragged down to defeat because of their association with the GOP. One need only look at the Republican National Committee's finances to see how badly this fiasco is hurting the party.

Instead of ignoring the advice of Melvin Laird and John Connally, the President should consult more closely with politicians experienced in elective office. Too many people are impressed by tea and crumpets at the White House to speak plainly—and those who do are consigned to the category of undesirables. A distinguished journalist informed me that my name appeared on the enemies list because of my independence. If so, I wear my membership like a badge of honor. The President could not have better allies than those who tell the truth, and he needs them "now more than ever."

ALASKA PIPELINE QUESTIONS ANSWERED

HON. JOHN MELCHER

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, placed a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 18, pages 24717-24718, in which he and nine other Members raised a series of points about the trans-Alaska pipeline legislation.

I have responded to these questions in a letter to all 10 cosponsors dated July 20 which, for the information of my House colleagues, I am including at the conclusion of my remarks.

Since this letter was written, Mr. Speaker, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has approved H.R. 9130 which is designed to authorize construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline.

However, in view of the fact that the House soon may be considering this important legislation I felt that this response should be available to all of the Members.

The letter follows:

JULY 20, 1973.

HON. JOHN DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Thanks for your July 16 letter concerning the pending legislation on the trans-Alaska pipeline. These comments on the points you raised are made as the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee now considers H.R. 9130 as amended by the Subcommittee on Public Lands. Your letter has been made a part of the Subcommittee hearing record.

The statement that H.R. 9130 is not limited to the Alaska pipeline is correct. The reason for this is as follows:

While the Court ruling applied directly only to the Alaska pipeline, its implications were much broader. That decision could, in fact, apply to all oil and gas pipeline applications issued under Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act now under construction in the

lower 48 states as well as to many hundreds of lines that previously have been constructed under this authority where special land use permits have been issued by the various federal agencies that have gone beyond the Court announced width limitations. It appears that there are at least nine lines under construction that could be subject to injunctive action due to excessive widths granted by the agencies. While it is true that there is not a 48-inch line now under construction in the western United States, as is proposed in Alaska, there is no question that there are many pipelines under construction in the West that would be subject to the Court ruling. For this reason, it was the Subcommittee's conclusion that there was an urgency in taking care of not only the Alaska pipeline problem, but that which also existed in the lower 48 states.

The Administration had proposed a grandfather clause to bring in these lines but, in drafting the legislation for introduction, this approach was rejected because it was felt not to be justified. It was felt that the Secretary should examine these lines carefully if they are challenged and then reissue the permits under the provisions of the revised Section 28.

The statement is additionally made that Title I gives the Secretary of the Interior authority in Alaska and elsewhere in the United States to grant wide swaths of rights-of-way without meaningful guidelines. This is incorrect.

Section 1 of H.R. 9130 does not give the Secretary of the Interior the right to exceed the now existing rights-of-way width which consists of 25 feet on each side of the pipeline except in limited areas and upon a showing of need. The change that was made by the Subcommittee merely permits the pipeline to be placed at any location within a 50-foot right-of-way and except for the above indicated provision for wider rights-of-way in limited areas, it does not expand the statutory width of the right-of-way. It is true that the Secretary is given authority to include rights-of-way for related facilities and that is carefully outlined in the bill. In addition, the Secretary is given authority to issue temporary permits for the use of public lands during construction, operation and maintenance of the pipeline.

Numerous restrictions have been placed upon the Secretary's authority that were not previously present in the existing statute. These are the right of the Secretary to make the right-of-way and permits subject to such terms and conditions as he sees fit, and to give consideration to the National Environmental Policy Act.

The terms of the permits will be limited to the shortest practical time. The rights-of-way are non-exclusive and reserve to the Secretary the right to issue additional rights-of-way for compatible uses within the existing pipeline rights-of-way if he so desires. This should substantially reduce the acreage of public lands committed to all rights-of-way.

For the first time, the statute will require an applicant to pay for all administrative costs for processing and will require a grantee to reimburse the United States for the costs of monitoring construction and operation as well as the payment of the fair market rental value of the right-of-way.

In addition, the Secretary must now notify the House and Senate Interior Committees of any application for a right-of-way for an oil or gas pipeline exceeding 24 inches in diameter.

Another point raised in your letter concerns construction of pipelines under Section 28 across reserved public lands such as national forests, wildlife refuges, and game ranges. There is no change in the existing statute and H.R. 9130 neither expands nor restricts whatever rights now may exist for pipelines to cross reserved public lands.

Your letter also makes the point that the

approved right-of-way may be supplemented by temporary permits for the use of public lands in the vicinity of the pipeline. This already has been touched upon above and the only additional comment to be made is that the Subcommittee expects that the acreage involved in temporary permits will be held to the minimum feasible for the construction of the pipeline and for the protection of the environment in the vicinity. It also should be pointed out that the temporary use of public lands is needed for construction of pipelines in the lower 48 states to the same extent that it is needed in Alaska.

Your letter notes that the Secretary shall consider the environmental impact of a pipeline application as required by NEPA but feels that this requirement may not be extended to the so-called related facilities or to "temporary rights-of-way" or "additional rights-of-way." It is certainly the Subcommittee's intention that the Secretary shall consider the environmental impact not only of the pipeline itself but also of the related facilities, all temporary rights-of-way, and any permit issued for the temporary use of public lands in the vicinity.

Another issue raised by your letter is that the notification of the House and the Senate Committees regarding pipeline applications of more than 24 inches in diameter does not cover related facilities. It certainly is the intention of the Subcommittee that any related facilities constructed in connection with the pipeline of more than 24 inches in diameter will be covered.

While it is recognized that this provision does not give the committees any veto authority, it does give them a 60-day period in which to review the application and express their opinion. Certainly if both Committees agreed that the application was not in order, further legislative action could be taken.

In commenting in general upon Title I of H.R. 9130, I am firmly of the opinion that it introduces many improvements in existing law and places numerous restrictions upon the Secretary's present broad authority to grant pipeline rights-of-way under Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act.

Regarding Title II and Section 203 and the use of the word "mitigate" rather than "prevent," this appears to be a matter of word choice and I would note that in Section 1(c) on Line 8 of the Committee print, the word "prevent" has been used in somewhat similar circumstances.

Another point you make regards the prohibition of exporting oil from Alaska's pipeline. The Subcommittee amendment now provides that the President would have to make a finding that it was in the national interest and permit Congress to review this action for 60 days with the exports to cease upon passage of a concurrent resolution of disapproval.

As we also are engaged in trading and exchanging oil with both Canada and Mexico, any outright prohibition on exportation could well invite retaliation from these neighboring countries. This we cannot afford.

Best regards,

Sincerely,

JOHN MELCHER,
Chairman,
Subcommittee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENT TO RESTRICT THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, when the military procurement authorization bill, H.R. 9286, comes before us for amend-

ment on Tuesday, I shall offer the following amendment:

Page 8, after line 15, insert the following and renumber subsequent sections accordingly:

SEC. 603. None of the funds authorized for appropriation pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended by the Central Intelligence Agency for purposes other than the collection, evaluation, correlation, and dissemination of information pertinent to the internal security of the United States.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 18, the House Committee on Armed Services released its report on H.R. 9286, the military procurement authorization bill for fiscal year 1974. I would like to compliment my colleague from Colorado, the Honorable PATRICIA SCHROEDER on her additional views which accompanied the committee report and to lend my support to them.

Ms. SCHROEDER demonstrated by her comments a clear insight of committee procedures. She presents valuable criticism of those procedures and suggests possible reforms. Certainly her concern can only improve the currently inadequate method of conducting hearings.

One of the most severe inadequacies which I have experienced and which Ms. SCHROEDER also described is the amount of advance time available to read written testimony. On many occasions I have received written testimony only 24 hours before the hearing—the minimum time committee procedure requires testimony be made available to Members. This gives too little time to fully read and analyze many of the proposals and arguments presented. I believe Ms. SCHROEDER's suggestion to require written testimony at least 3 days in advance would help to provide the time needed.

Analysis of our national defense program is virtually impossible without the assistance of the committee staff. The staff, while small in comparison to the Pentagon, often provides assistance to Members generally favorable to the military. Those of us who have been critical of our defense program have found that the committee staff has often failed to provide necessary assistance to our office staffs. Criticism of our current defense program is not a disservice to the country. The failure to meet the responsibility to review programs thoroughly is a disservice.

Ms. SCHROEDER's criticisms of the actual hearing process, I believe, are extremely important. Questioning of witnesses should be sharp and debate should be open. It is obvious, though, that much of the responsibility for the lack of such sharp questioning and open debate lies with us, the Members. Instead of acquiescing to the military preoccupation with "more," "bigger," and "faster," the Members should begin to reassert their oversight responsibilities.

The committee's preoccupation with

technology, with "bigger" and "better," obscures the committee objective of legislating defense policy. As Ms. SCHROEDER states, the Armed Services Committee seems now to be not much more than the Pentagon's "lobby-on-the-Hill."

I urge my colleagues to read Ms. SCHROEDER's comments which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HONORABLE PATRICIA SCHROEDER, DEMOCRAT OF COLORADO

It was with extreme reluctance that I joined the majority of my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee in voting out the Military Procurement Authorization bill for fiscal year 1974.

My primary objection, aside from specific weapons systems noted in my minority report, centers around what I believe was the deficient manner in which this legislation was prepared. Our national defense program requires more analysis than other aspects of the overall budget, not only because it consumes about 40 percent of our taxes, but because it is presented to our committee by military men rigidly disciplined in what opinions they are permitted to express. This kind of discipline is invaluable on the battlefield, but when it comes to determining national defense priorities and strategies, it can frustrate the work of the committee.

The situation is not helped by the fact that the relatively small staff of the House Armed Services Committee, no matter how good its intentions, cannot adequately cope with a multi-billion dollar weapons procurement program that, I understand, is prepared by some 30,000 Defense Department employees with a huge computer system at their command. Nevertheless, the committee made no effort to supplement its staff, to hire outside authorities or to seek its own computer services. Rarely during the long process of hearings which I attended did the committee, or the staff, make the kind of comprehensive effort to master the separate parts of the program, or even to challenge it as a whole (or in part), that I believe should have been made.

Unfortunately, the committee seemed to prefer spending its time in a cursory review of individual weapons systems—a "once over lightly" approach—simply deleting a bit here and adding a bit there. Some members gave the impression that doing the hard and tedious work of analysis and criticism of our complicated military program is somehow unseemingly, unmilitary—indeed, unpatriotic.

Rarely during all the hearings I attended were the basic assumptions behind many weapons systems ever questioned. Nor was there adequate discussion of basic national security questions which would allow committee members an opportunity to evaluate a particular weapons systems with any sense of perspective. The committee often seemed preoccupied with the technology of a particular weapons system—asking whether a weapon was "bigger" or "faster" than the previous model—rather than with the larger long-range perspective of whether or not the weapon was needed in the first place. We are all subject to this fixation with technology but must not let it become our sole area of inquiry.

To me this preoccupation with "more" and "bigger" and "faster" is dangerous thinking. Those with such a limited vision of our military requirements end up, I believe, doing more harm than good to this country. They are like those French politicians who thought a bigger Maginot Line would provide more defense. They are like our own nuclear strategists who argue that killing an enemy 15 times over makes us more secure than if we can kill him only five times over. They remind me, to use a non-military example, of those people who believe we would honor George Washington more if we increased the height of his monument.

The committee seemed annoyed, even frightened, of vigorous and open debate. The inordinate use of secrecy is a major weapon to suppress debate. In my brief tenure on the committee it became clear to me that the excessive use of executive sessions, from which the public is barred, and the Pentagon's heavy-handed use of classification stamps, is designed more to keep information from the American public than from any of the country's enemies.

Two examples come to mind of the trepidation with which the committee views the prospect of full and vigorous debate. First, the number of witnesses favorable to the Pentagon's point of view who came before the Seapower Subcommittee, for instance, numbered at least 30, while those critical of the program numbered only two. Generally, the 30 witnesses were seldom pressed and their judgment was rarely questioned. The two critical witnesses, on the other hand, were treated in an indifferent manner and their arguments dismissed by many committee members.

The other example concerns the showing during an open Seapower Subcommittee hearing of the NBC-TV documentary film on the CVN-70 nuclear carrier. Some members of the full committee, not just members of the Seapower Subcommittee, felt sufficient concern over the showing of this film that they put in an appearance to criticize it. By all measures it was a balanced presentation, but senior members castigated it as, and I quote, "a diatribe," "unfair," "snide," "destructive," "damnable" and "poisonous." These are strong words for men who should look at all sides of a question before they decide.

None of this is conducive to opening up the legislative process so that the committee can examine the proposals in a thorough and competent manner. As a freshman member of this committee, clearly I cannot presume to have mastered the intricacies of such a complicated multibillion dollar bill as this one. But I have observed the process and procedures of the committee sufficiently to believe that they should—indeed, must—be improved.

The committee must welcome open and vigorous debate. Such openness would soon result, I believe, in reestablishing the committee's independence of action and judgment over legislation for which it has responsibility. As it stands now, the committee is not much more than the Pentagon's lobby-on-the-hill.

The refusal to open up committee proceedings is, in fact, a serious mistake because it promotes many unhealthy trends. Some members, for instance, have all but abdicated their critical faculties to the so-called Pentagon "experts"; the vision of many committee members is obscured by the shine of military brass; and there are far too many others who take any criticism at all as a personal affront.

After attending all the hearings I could, after asking questions, listening intently and seeking answers, I confess that I am still somewhat in the dark regarding the weapons systems themselves, their costs, and the role they are and/or should (or should not) be playing in our national defense program. Part of the blame obviously lies with me, for in retrospect I could probably have dug even a little deeper, worked even longer hours, asked even more questions and demanded even more answers. But the bulk of the blame, in my opinion, lies with a hearing process and procedures that restrict debate, stifle criticism and leave unanswered important questions.

The result is a piece of legislation whose implications and true costs no one on the committee, I fear, fully understands.

It is not my purpose here to criticize the integrity and sincerity of individual members. Many spent long hours listening and reviewing the testimony that was presented. There are other members of the committee,

both senior and junior, whose experience and judgment I respect and cherish. My criticism is directed solely to the procedures and practices of the committee, and the debilitating side effects, which I am convinced deter the committee from doing its job properly.

The ideal situation, in my opinion, would be one in which all hearings were adversary in nature. As I see it, the military should present its case, and the committee should receive it with considerable skepticism. The questioning should be sharp and the debate free and open. It should be permitted for written questions to be submitted for the military to answer. It would be healthy for the committee to hear differing opinions within the military establishment itself, as we witnessed briefly (and no doubt by accident) when factions within the Navy clashed openly in hearings on the 8th and 12th of June over a request for two additional DLGN's. Indeed, it should be the policy of the Pentagon to encourage open and public debate within its own ranks. Having its program accepted each year should be a trial by fire for the Pentagon rather than the cakewalk which it is today.

The ideal would include requiring all written testimony at least three days in advance so that our time is not wasted having the witness read it to us. Perhaps more hearings should be held so that we could spend more time understanding and examining the proposals. We would also benefit from the use of more staff, outside consultants and the use of computers. Instead of acquiescing to the military, the House Armed Services Committee should take the lead, as it did in the case of the nuclear Navy.

Reasonable men—and women—should be able to differ not only philosophically but on the means we seek to achieve a common goal. I believe that opening up the procedures and letting in the cleansing light of criticism and debate will not only enhance the committee's stature but even produce superior legislation. Indeed, the development and maintenance of a strong, flexible and healthy military defense program require that this be so.

MCPL REPORT ON CVN-70

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the excellent report prepared by Congressman BINGHAM for Members of Congress for Peace Through Law on the proposed nuclear carrier CVN-70. I will be offering an amendment to delete the \$657 million authorization for this carrier when the House considers H.R. 9286 next week. The report follows:

RESEARCH REPORT ON THE NUCLEAR-POWERED AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN-70)

SUMMARY CONCLUSION

At a cost conservatively estimated at one billion dollars, CVN-70 adds only a small fraction to the U.S. capacity for air power at sea. The U.S. capacity already dominates all the other navies of the world combined, and will continue to do so, even without new construction, into the 1980s.

When the cost of the nuclear-powered ships which are required to provide CVN-70 with a protective escort of comparable endurance and sea-keeping capability are included, and when the cost of CVN-70's air group is added to the total, the total initial cost of this program will reach about three billion dollars. This figure does not include the staggering cost of operation and maintenance and peri-

odic replacement of aircraft. The marginal addition to national security provided by such a nuclear task force is incommensurate with its cost, especially in view of the existing and projected lead held by the U.S. in this type of military power.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the CVN-70 project be cancelled and that the \$657 million dollars requested in the FY 1974 Department of Defense budget request be deleted. The Navy should make every effort to find alternative uses for the items already on order as long lead-time items.

Description of CVN-70

If built, CVN-70 would be the Navy's fourth nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier. It would be the third Nimitz class carrier, the first two of which are still under construction. Current Navy planning calls for an Initial Operating Capability (IOC) date of 1981.

The specifications for CVN-70 are as follows:

Displacement: 94,400 tons;
Length: 1,092 feet;
Estimated Speed: 36 knots;
Crew (approximate): 5,000.

This new nuclear attack carrier is expected to support an air group of some 100 aircraft. This air group would consist of a number of different aircraft types: fighters (for combat air patrol [CAP] or protection of the carrier and its escorts against air attack); anti-submarine warfare aircraft (to protect the carrier task force against enemy submarines); fighter-bombers (for projecting air power inland from the seas); support aircraft (such as the carrier on-board delivery [COD] aircraft); rescue aircraft (principally helicopters); and reconnaissance aircraft for photographic or electronic surveillance missions.

The Development of Modern Attack Carriers

Originally designed to provide air cover for major battle fleets and to operate against the major surface forces of enemy powers, the attack carrier as it is known today developed during the naval war in the Pacific between 1941 and 1945. The first major use of carrier air power against land targets was the devastating Japanese attack on the U.S. naval complex at Pearl Harbor.

Subsequently, the United States employed its carrier fleet against the Japanese Navy and in assaults on Japanese-held islands. The carrier eclipsed the battleship as the capital ship of the Navy, functioning both as a strategic weapons system for the projection of power over great distance and as a tactical means of protecting the U.S. fleet.

After World War II, the carrier served briefly as the launching platform for America's nuclear deterrent, carrying medium-range bombers armed with atom bombs until long-range land-based bombers capable of reaching the Soviet Union entered the U.S. arsenal.

Early in the Korean War, aircraft carriers provided air power against enemy land targets when no airbases were available within flying range. Carriers were deployed during numerous East-West confrontations during the Cold War and figured prominently in the U.S. landing in Lebanon in 1958.

During the Vietnam War and in subsequent air operations over Laos and Cambodia, the U.S. attack carrier force was used to bomb land targets while operating in the Gulf of Tonkin. In this role, the carrier supplemented land-based fighter-bomber aircraft (which could be refueled in mid-air) and strategic bombers capable of flying thousands of miles and returning to base without refueling.

During this same period, the attack carrier was utilized by the U.S. to "show the flag" off foreign shores and to apply pressure on short notice in sensitive areas of the world. Deployment of the U.S.S. *Enterprise* in the Bay of Bengal during the Indo-Pakistani War in 1971 was an example of this.

With the passage of time, the carrier's func-

tion of providing fleet air cover has diminished as combat at sea between major surface forces has become less and less likely and the carrier's air defense capacity has been realigned to provide protection for the carrier itself, for escorts in its task force, and, less often, for amphibious assault operations.

Since the end of World War II, U.S. attack carriers have never operated against a nation which had any semblance of a navy. U.S. carriers have been able to launch tactical air power inland unopposed by any retaliatory air power or submarine threat.

Technology and time have overcome the primary roles which carriers once had. The strategic role of delivering fire power inland is now reserved for ICBMs, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and land-based long-range bombers. The range and destructive power possessed by any one of these systems far surpass anything that the CVN-70 can offer, although certain fighter-bombers aboard existing attack carriers are armed with nuclear weapons for use in "theatre nuclear wars" which could develop in Europe or the Mid-East.

A trend is increasingly clear. Attack aircraft carriers are no longer intended primarily for use against the most-often-assumed opponents of the U.S.—the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Republic of China.

The attack aircraft carrier today is largely a potential instrument of intervention against non-naval powers, especially in the "Third World." In effect, it is a weapons system for projecting U.S. military power against militarily inferior countries, not for defending the territory of the U.S. or its ships at sea.

THE MISSION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED ATTACK CARRIERS

The Navy has assigned three basic missions to attack carriers:

1. "Sea Control." This mission implies action against enemy surface forces and merchant shipping in a manner reminiscent of World War II. It reveals a new U.S. strategy of "control" of the seelanes rather than the traditional U.S. strategy of protecting the international right of freedom of the seas. It is basically an updated version of historic "warfare at sea" concepts, and it suggests a refigiting of the naval engagements of World War II and of the nineteenth century. Such a strategy assumes that a foreign navy will challenge the U.S. at sea, attempting to sink U.S. shipping by air, surface, or submarine attack. No navy possesses the capability of carrying out such an attack on U.S. naval forces, but, even if this were otherwise, such sea warfare is an improbable scenario in the modern era of ballistic missiles for a very simple reason: a power launching such a naval attack would have to assume that the conflict would escalate quickly to a catastrophic nuclear level.

2. "Projection of Power Ashore." This mission signifies the ability to bomb land targets. It can be accomplished with relative impunity wherever the U.S. is unopposed by naval or air retaliatory forces, as in Korea and Vietnam. Wherever the U.S. might encounter meaningful opposition from enemy fighter-bombers, surface vessels (such as cruise missile patrol craft), or submarines, attack carriers themselves become prime targets. Committing a carrier to contested waters to cover amphibious or other land operations is a high risk venture, for the loss or incapacitation of a carrier due to enemy attack is a huge loss of both firepower and capital investment.

3. "Peacetime Presence." Under friendly conditions, this mission involves "showing the flag." Under hostile conditions, it means "gunboat diplomacy." Peacetime presence is one of the main roles of the attack carrier task force in the Mediterranean, but the U.S. Navy has begun to wear its welcome a bit thin, even with allied powers on the Mediterranean. As a result, port calls in recent years have been increasingly difficult

to schedule with the same duration and frequency as in the past. Many citizens of foreign countries find U.S. warships in their harbors an affront or a challenge to their national sovereignty. Even the most tolerant local authorities have difficulty in coping with the influx of sailors, despite the rewards in U.S. dollars for local economies, devalued dollars which now are becoming less of an incentive. In short, there can be too much of a good thing with Peacetime Presence; it may frustrate the friendly international relations which it seeks to promote.

As to the more ominous role of influencing regional politico-military events, the counterproductive deployment of a nuclear task force in the Bay of Bengal during the 1971 Indo-Pakistani War should provide an object lesson in the futility of strong arm diplomacy in today's world.

The Threat

CVN-70 is being built, in part, to meet the supposed challenge of a growing and changing Soviet navy. While the Soviet navy has indeed been in the process of a decade-long expansion and modernization program, it requires a certain distortion of the facts to perceive a threat to the U.S. from the Soviet fleet.

The Soviet development of a limited naval infantry and amphibious assault capability, the building of a series of anti-submarine warfare helicopter cruisers (of the *Moskva* type), and the more recent construction of a light aircraft carrier for fleet air cover do not constitute a credible offensive force or a serious challenge to U.S. naval supremacy. It is significant that the Soviets, along with their Eastern European allies, have concentrated on building various types of missile-carrying patrol craft for the purpose of inexpensive defense of home waters against capital ships such as the aircraft carrier.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union, unlike the U.S., is severely limited in its naval operations by restricted access to the open ocean and by an almost total lack of overseas logistics support bases, despite several years of attempting to establish a few regular port facilities for its modest forces. The forward bases which would be vital for offensive deployment of Soviet naval elements (which remain predominantly non-nuclear-powered) do not exist.

The Soviet navy's strategy, deployments, training, and fleet exercises continue to reflect a defensive orientation and posture aimed primarily against superior Western naval forces which have the capacity to attack Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Soviet naval surface forces do not have a similar capacity to launch meaningful attacks against the West.

This Soviet defensive alignment emphasizes nuclear submarines and nuclear-tipped weapons well equipped to counteract attack carrier forces in restricted waters where attack carrier task forces are especially vulnerable.

The Soviets could never assume that an attack on the forward-deployed U.S. fleet would not escalate quickly to a full scale nuclear confrontation involving domestic land targets. Naval blockade and attack on the warships of another nation have long been recognized as highly provocative military gestures. It is for this reason, in part, that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. negotiated in 1972 the "Incidents at Sea Agreement" so as to avoid any confrontation arising out of a misunderstanding at sea.

In any confrontation following an actual attack on naval vessels, aircraft carriers (and CVN-70, if built, among them) would be irrelevant to the world wide outcome. In all probability, if they were not already sunk carriers would be withdrawn from the area of the immediate naval confrontation because of their vulnerability and high cost. Even during the Six-Day War of 1967, both

U.S. carriers in the Near East were ordered to withdraw to the Western Mediterranean. Despite numerous attempts by the U.S. Navy to hypothesize the conditions leading to continued conventional "warfare at sea" with another major power, which might rationalize construction of CVN-70, there is no credible justification for expending \$3-billion for adding to an outmoded naval weapons system in a thermonuclear era.

Economics of CVN-70

The planned spending for CVN-70 is:

(In millions)

Appropriated in FY 1973.....	\$299
Requested for FY 1974.....	657
Anticipated outfitting costs.....	16
	<hr/> 972

Although the bulk of the funds for building CVN-70 have been requested for fiscal years 1973 and 1974, the expenditures would be made during the entire seven-year period required for its construction. Of the \$299-million appropriated in FY 1973, only nine million dollars had actually been expended as of May, 1973.

These figures do not make full allowance for the inflation and cost-growth which can be anticipated for CVN-70. All Navy ship construction programs in recent years have experienced extensive cost overruns. During the period 1970-1972, the three *Nimitz*-class carriers have experienced cost increases. The *Nimitz* and the *Eisenhower* together showed a cost rise of \$271-million, and the projected cost of CVN-70 alone rose by \$300-million. By conservative estimate, the final cost of CVN-70 will be at least one billion dollars when the ship is ready for sea in 1981.

Cancellation of the CVN-70 program now would result in some financial penalties to the government for contract rescissions, but such losses would be minimal as compared with the total one billion dollar cost of the ship alone.

The costs cited thus far are only for the ship. Aircraft and escort vessels entail large expenses as well. About 100 sophisticated aircraft for attack, antisubmarine warfare, and other missions will be required for CVN-70. Using a cost factor of \$10-million per aircraft (less than the cost of the Navy's new F-14 but more than the cost of other aircraft types) and allowing for the seven-year impact of inflation, the initial carrier air group for CVN-70 will cost between 800 million and a billion dollars, and these aircraft will have to be replaced approximately every five years.

Aircraft carriers also require escort vessels. Since CVN-70 would theoretically possess unlimited range as a result of its nuclear propulsion system, it should be provided with four nuclear-powered escorts. If its operational advantage of range and speed is not to be diminished by conventional escorts. The price for these four nuclear-powered escorts would be at least one billion dollars.

Thus, if all the necessary basic hardware is purchased, a CVN-70 Task Force would cost about three billion dollars. Other costs, such as crews, training, operations and maintenance, and aircraft replacement will raise this total far higher over the projected thirty-year life of the ship. The Center for Defense Information estimates the total 30-year cost at \$9-billion.

Critique

For an initial \$3-billion, the U.S. would obtain one floating airfield with about 90 to 100 aircraft, many of which will be required to protect the carrier itself from air, submarine, or surface-to-surface missile attack. CVN-70's maximum effectiveness as an instrument of military power will thus be largely dependent on its ability to operate in uncontested waters. When operating in defended areas, the carrier's air group will be oriented to ship defense, and only about 37 per cent of the aircraft will be available for attack missions. The remainder would

provide support (refueling, reconnaissance, rescue, electronic jamming, etc.) and a protective air umbrella for the carrier task force.

The main advantage which the Navy claims for the nuclear-powered CVN-70 is its unlimited range and high-speed endurance. Although an attack aircraft carrier cannot safely travel alone in combat, it now appears doubtful that CVN-70 will have escorts to match its vaunted range and speed, for the Navy has no plans to build the expensive, vital nuclear-powered escorts which would maximize the carrier's effectiveness. (A nuclear-powered escort costs nearly as much as a conventionally-powered aircraft carrier.) The Navy hopes that four nuclear-powered attack carriers will be in the fleet in 1981, but only two will have nuclear-powered escorts. Without these protective nuclear escorts of like range and endurance, the principal advantage of a nuclear carrier will be nullified.

CVN-70, if completed, will be only one ship in the 12-ship attack carrier force planned by the Navy for the early 1980's. It will represent an incremental addition to U.S. sea-based striking power of only one-twelfth at a cost ranging into the billions. There is no rational justification for the expenditure of such enormous sums for so small an addition to U.S. offensive power.

If CVN-70 is not built, the U.S. will continue to possess an eleven-ship attack carrier force in the early 1980's and, at projected retirement rates, a nine-carrier force level in 1987, three of which will be nuclear-powered. These carriers will be supplemented by the anti-submarine warfare carriers (CVSs) now in the fleet and any light carriers (Sea Control Ships) which may be built in the meantime.

A decision not to build CVN-70 will not affect meaningfully the Navy's carrier deployment plans which are based on technologically conservative and economically extravagant planning factors requiring a total of three attack carriers in the fleet for every carrier deployed at sea. CVN-70 only represents an addition to the excess capacity which the Navy claims is "required" to keep a force of four carriers deployed.

If CVN-70 is not built, the Navy could still maintain four carriers continually deployed with a back-up of only seven carriers instead of eight undergoing yard repairs, replenishment, or refresher training. Of the four carriers deployed for "quick reaction" (two in the Western Pacific and two in the Mediterranean), only three would be nuclear-powered. However, if the Navy carries out its plan not to provide adequate nuclear-powered escorts for two of the nuclear carriers, then cancellation of CVN-70 would be no disadvantage, for nuclear-powered carriers would be limited in range and speed by the inferior capabilities of conventional escorts.

At a level of nine or eleven carriers, the U.S. attack carrier force will still outweigh any challenger for the foreseeable future. In view of the decreasing utility of the attack carrier in all forms of modern warfare except unopposed intervention, any program to build more of these ships will be an investment in obsolescence.

Other Options

Basically a warship whose time has passed, CVN-70 is not the only "air capable" ship contemplated by the Navy. One alternative, a more austere platform for employing air power at sea, is the Sea Control Ship. Essentially, a light aircraft carrier with V/STOL (vertical/short takeoff and landing) aircraft and helicopters, this type of ship would be an economical protective ship. The Navy is now seeking funding for eight such ships at a total cost of about \$800-million, substantially less than the cost of one CVN-70.

A second proposal, now in the research and development state, is the Surface Effect Ship. It would travel on an air bubble, skimming

over the ocean surfaces at speeds up to 80 knots. It would be used primarily for anti-submarine warfare and would carry modern aircraft. Acceptance of this ship by the Navy would represent the beginning of the "100 Knot" Navy of the future, instead of the Navy of the past represented by CVN-70.

Conclusions

1. CVN-70, at a cost of one billion dollars for the ship alone, would add only a small incremental fraction to an already substantial U.S. capacity for airpower at sea that will continue to exist into the 1980's. If its construction is authorized, it will entail a subsequent purchase of about 100 aircraft at an initial cost of one billion dollars. For CVN-70 to operate with maximum effect, four new nuclear-powered escort vessels at an additional cost of a billion dollars would have to be built.

2. CVN-70 embodies obsolete "warfare at sea" concepts and is so vulnerable and costly that it can be employed effectively only in uncontested waters.

3. CVN-70 does not represent a valid reaction to the changing capabilities of a defense oriented Soviet navy.

4. In a confrontation with the Soviet Union, attack carriers would be vulnerable to nuclear weapons launched from surface vessels or submarines. It is likely that an attack involving a major warship such as a carrier would quickly escalate to an intercontinental nuclear level, at which carriers would be of negligible value.

5. Forward deployment of attack carriers for political reasons is a risky venture with dubious political payoffs.

6. Similarly, the use of fast carrier task forces for intervention in the so-called "third world" is a high-risk tactic of dubious value.

7. Whatever legitimate purposes attack carriers may have can readily be achieved with the eleven-carrier force the U.S. will possess in the 1980's even if CVN-70 is not built.

UP THE LADDER, BUT HOW FAST?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in "Commentary magazine" by Richard Scammon and Ben Wattenberg contended that blacks were moving in relatively large numbers into the middle class. This contention was surprising to those of us who represent black communities and who are unable to perceive the dramatic gains claimed by the authors.

It was also an alarming contention, coming as it did at a time when the administration was seeking to cut back or eliminate the social programs initiated during the "Great Society" to provide an escape from poverty for those in this Nation suffering under its bondage. Many of us viewed the "Commentary" article as providing a convenient excuse for the disruption of programs still very much needed by poor and minority communities throughout the Nation.

Many distinguished black scholars have responded to the Scammon and Wattenberg article and although these responses have not received the publicity of the original article itself, they have effectively refuted the conclusions reached by Scammon and Wattenberg from their analysis of the census data.

Dr. Herrington J. Bryce, the research director for the Joint Center for Political Studies, recently published an anal-

ysis of Census Bureau data which shows that rather than improvement, there has been a significant downturn or leveling off of what black economic gains were made during the 1960's. His analysis deserves the attention of my colleagues. A summary was presented by columnist Tom Wicker of the New York Times in his column which appeared on Sunday, July 22. I submit the column for your careful attention.

The column follows:

UP THE LADDER, BUT HOW FAST?

(By Tom Wicker)

In 1972, the median income of American families rose to \$11,120—an increase of 8.1 per cent over 1971. In the same year, the median income of black families was \$6,860, a substantial increase over the 1971 black median of \$6,440.

But the black median in 1972 as in 1971 was about 59 per cent of the median income of white families, which in 1972 was \$11,550. Relatively, therefore, black family income did not rise as against white family income. Moreover, the number of black poor increased from about 7.4 million to about 7.7 million in 1972, if being poor is defined as an income under \$4,275 for a nonfarm family of four. Thirty-three per cent of all blacks could be so designated in 1972, as against 9 per cent of whites. And all of the 1.1 million who climbed past that poverty standard during the year were white.

The statistics are from the June, 1973, consumer income report of the U.S. Census Bureau. They by no means tell the whole economic story of 1972, and statistics have a way of proving what someone wants them to prove. But Dr. Herrington J. Bryce, the research director for the Joint Center for Political Studies in Washington, has pointed out that, also in 1972, the black/white unemployment ratio returned to its historic two-to-one spread, after having briefly improved, and remains at two to one in 1973.

All this raises the question whether there has been a significant downturn or a leveling off of what had been substantial black economic gains throughout the sixties. No one disputes that there were such gains, and their prime chroniclers, Richard Scammon and Ben Wattenberg, have called them "nothing short of revolutionary."

In a recent article in *Commentary*, they argued that available statistics showed black gains so impressive that "a slender majority, but a majority nevertheless" of blacks could be said to have reached the middle class. They defined this as "to have enough to eat, to have adequate, if not necessarily expensive clothes to wear, and to be able to afford housing that is safe and sanitary"; and they said blacks in this slender majority also were beginning "to make headway" toward traditional middle-class goals—good neighborhoods, schools and jobs.

One of the major Scammon-Wattenberg points, for example, was that black families with a male head under 35 years of age, living outside the South, had achieved income parity with comparable white families. When the wife was working, such black families even earned a bit more than similar white families.

Dr. Bryce, in arguing that Mr. Scammon and Mr. Wattenberg were overemphasizing such black gains, wrote that "black husband-wife families outside the South in which the male is under 35 years of age account for only 16 per cent of black husband-wife families in the country. It is only 10 per cent of all black families. The other 90 per cent of black families continues to be unequal."

Thus, it is not so much the facts that seem to be in question as what the facts mean. The Scammon-Wattenberg article is convincing enough that blacks really are marching "across the invisible line into the lower-middle and middle classes." Yet, Dr. Bryce is

able to point out that the rate of high school completion is 50 per cent higher among white males than among black; and the rate of college completion among males under 35 is four times higher among whites than blacks. Moreover, he noted:

Unemployment among black teenagers is over 35 per cent. The percentage of housing with inadequate plumbing occupied by blacks remained at about 30 per cent during the sixties, despite economic gains. Black life expectancy (at age 25) is six years less than white; the black infant mortality rate far exceeds the white.

Given these exceptions, and the Census Bureau statistics on 1972 black income, blacks like Dr. Bryce may have reason to question whether black economic gains really have been "nothing short of revolutionary." Surely no one can deny his conclusion that "we also have tangible evidence that the task before us remains immense."

It was the purpose of the Scammon-Wattenberg article, however, to argue, as they put it succinctly in a recent letter to *The New York Times*: "Only if it is acknowledged that substantial progress [for blacks] has been made can we hope to convince America that we ought to continue our national efforts to make progress [for blacks]."

That makes political sense, but only as long as the gains are not exaggerated or the strength of the progressive trend overestimated. Blacks still get the short end of the economic stick in this country, which is the cardinal point on which Scammon-Wattenberg and Bryce agree.

TAKING A CLOSE LOOK AT THE ADMINISTRATION'S HEALTH POLICIES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the administration recently held a 2-day health seminar for medical writers, at which it claimed to have fashioned "a total health strategy." As two writers point out, however, there is a world of difference between what the administration has said it would do by way of health initiatives, and what it actually has done. The result is justifiable suspicion that any such health strategy exists, or, if it does, that it will last longer than a day or so.

At this point, I include the columns by Judith Randal from yesterday's *Washington Star-News* and by Stuart Auerbach from today's *Washington Post*. The columns follow:

THE ADMINISTRATION: GOING SLOW ON HEALTH CARE

(By Stuart Auerbach)

"The main thing I would like as sincerely as I possibly can convey is our absolute and total commitment to assure that health care is constantly improved . . . and that it will not be denied to anyone by the irrelevant factor of their not having sufficient income." —HEW Secretary, Caspar W. Weinberger.

"The administration's health program has been a great big bust. The words and goals are shared by all of us. But the action has been a complete and unadulterated failure." —Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.).

For two days early this month the Nixon administration bombarded medical writers who came from around the country with the story of its health initiatives.

In glittering generalities, administration big guns such as HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger and chief presidential domestic

adviser Melvin Laird described the high priority that health has among the inner-circle at the White House.

"Its priority is so high, inherently so high, that proponents of sound health programs should have great confidence as to their ability to secure adequate funding," Weinberger told the health seminar for medical writers.

He said that for the first time the Nixon administration has fashioned "a total health strategy."

Yet a look at the administration's record on health programs over the past 4½ years shows something different. The Nixon administration in 1973 is not even matching the goals set by President Nixon in his health messages of 1971 and 1972.

The national health insurance plan that President Nixon announced in 1971 "to ensure that no American family will be prevented from obtaining basic medical care by ability to pay" has been scrapped and HEW planners are now drafting a new proposal. Not since 1971 has the President mentioned the national health "crisis." The 1972 drive to increase the number of doctors, dentists and paramedics has foundered in a budget that cuts federal aid to medical and dental schools. Even with increases for cancer and heart research, the National Institutes of Health budget is down \$34 million.

Although it appears that the 1974 HEW health budget is greater than 1973's (\$26.3 billion versus \$20.3 billion), the difference dwindles to \$71 million after one subtracts medicare and medicaid money for future years along with programs that have been transferred from other government agencies. The increase that remains is not enough to cover inflation.

The clearest example of the administration's failure to pursue its goals is in the area of health maintenance organizations (HMOs), those pre-paid group practice plans which appeared in 1971 to be a cornerstone of administration efforts to reform American medicine.

"Some 7 million Americans are now enrolled in HMOs and the number is growing," said President Nixon in his 1971 health message. "Studies show they are receiving high quality care at a significantly lower cost. Patients and practitioners are enthusiastic about this organization concept. So is this administration."

A year later, Mr. Nixon called HMOs "a central feature of my national health strategy." And then-Secretary Elliot L. Richardson, now serving as attorney general, talked about spreading the HMO concept across the country so that 90 percent of all Americans could be treated in an HMO by 1980.

Now, this has all changed. Instead of viewing HMOs as a proven method of delivering medical care—as President Nixon and Secretary Richardson did two years ago—Weinberger says they need further testing. Instead of moving HEW forward in a full program of encouraging prepaid group practice, he talks of them as an "experiment." And yet he denies that the administration has pulled back from its commitment to HMOs. "The attachment we have to the health maintenance organization experiment has not changed, has not weakened," he says.

The facts do not support that statement. The administration clearly has bought the go-slow line of the American Medical Association, which has consistently called HMOs an experiment. Indeed, the AMA's new president-elect, Dr. Malcolm Todd, a campaigner for President Nixon and head of the Physicians Committee for the Re-Election of the President, said in an interview last fall, with *National Journal*:

"We used all the force we could bring to bear against this (HMOs). As a result, there is no question that there has been some backtracking on the part of the White House. The White House has directed the (HEW) Secretary (Richardson) to slow down on this thing . . . The Secretary has called off the aggressiveness, and this is good."

Dr. Gordon M. MacLeod, who was brought in from Yale University to run the HMO program in HEW, said in a speech last week that, "The administration now has reversed its previous position. For the subordination of HMO activity from a national program of 100 persons to a desk function of 5 or 6 people is not consistent with the priority formerly given to HMOs by the administration," he said.

MacLeod quit his job over the downgrading of the HMO operation, but Weinberger dismissed his concern as merely having to do with "his status within the organization."

Other health programs, including the highly vaunted administration initiatives in cancer and heart disease, also can be examined to show where the reality fails to match the promise.

The administration failed to spend \$50 million for cancer that was available in the 1973 fiscal year. And although the National Heart Institute received \$18 million more in the 1974 budget, it was directed to start entirely new programs in lung diseases that will eat up the entire increase without allowing it to focus more resources on heart diseases—the nation's biggest killer.

In explaining the administration's total health strategy, Weinberger said existing health programs are put under a microscope to make sure they are not squandering the "finite" share of the national resources that can go for health.

That's the truth of it; only so much of the federal pie has been allotted to health. And contrary to Weinberger's prose, its priority is not that high. So why pretend? Why insist the administration's commitment to health in general and HMOs in particular hasn't changed when clearly it has?

CONSERVATIZING HEW'S "H" (By Judith Randal)

Despite repeated impoundment of funds that Congress appropriated for health programs and the administration's determination to end many of them anyway, there always has been a degree of civility between legislators and the executive where these issues were concerned. But now—owing in part to Watergate, and even more to a change of leadership at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—it is disappearing fast.

Never was this more apparent than when HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger assembled some 200 medical writers at a two-day seminar here earlier this month.

Weinberger, whose informal alias of "The Knife" has followed him from his previous job as director of the federal Office of Management and Budget, portrayed congressional advocates of health programs as bleeding hearts who would bankrupt the Treasury, and those who have quit posts in his own department in disagreement over his policies as malcontents motivated only by "personal pique."

Not surprisingly, there were prompt rejoinders from the Hill. Remembering that the President in his first term made the "health crisis" the topic of a much-publicized address, for instance, Massachusetts Democrat Edward M. Kennedy, who as chairman of the Senate Health subcommittee keeps track of such rhetoric, described it as "overblown" and the administration's professed efforts to deal with the problem as "a great big bust."

A major source of the bitterness is that Congress has found that the administration changes its health stance with each new secretary for HEW, as if somehow each man were working for a different president than the man before. For example, Elliot L. Richardson, while at HEW, was deeply committed—as Nixon himself said he was then—to health maintenance organizations. And when Congress duly authorized a three-year \$800 million program to establish HMOs in many parts of the country, it looked as if the movement might take hold.

But now Weinberger says that HMOs—which provide comprehensive health benefits on a targeted per capita expenditure basis rather than on the traditional piecework or fee-for-service basis—must be further studied because those in operation have catered only to the solvent middle class.

The argument is in itself specious, as several well-established HMOs have enrolled substantial numbers of the poor and near-poor without going broke. But it is Weinberger's combative manner in insistently overlooking this, to say nothing of the shift in policy, that has angered legislators. Indeed, where Congress once laid the blame for the administration's indifference to health issues on the religious beliefs of Christian Scientists John D. Ehrlichman and H. R. Haldeman at the White House, it is now Weinberger's weasel-wording and arrogance at the Cabinet level that they find insufferable.

Another irritant is that very little that HEW says it will do gets done on time. National health insurance is a case in point. The administration did, to be sure, offer an insurance proposal during Nixon's first term. But that proposal died with the 92nd Congress, and an alternate prepared after Richardson had replaced Robert H. Finch as HEW secretary was junked by Weinberger when he took office in February.

Meanwhile, although Weinberger promised Congress that still a third version would be ready, first in April and then in May, the completion date has now been deferred until September, with the distinct possibility that it may slip further still. It has not escaped notice that Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., chairman of this session of Congress, very likely won't do so because of the delay.

Other examples: documents promised Congress have a tendency to become long overdue. Although the Conquest of Cancer Act, for example, was passed in 1971, the plan to implement it is still in limbo. And the counterpart plan for the Heart and Lung Act which, was supposed to reach legislators by May 20 wasn't delivered until yesterday, although it was ready and printed on time.

In short, whereas the farmer, theoretically at least, can count on the Agriculture Department to represent his interests, the businessman on Commerce and the workingman (occasionally) on Labor, the only constituency now being served by the "H" in HEW would seem to be conservatively minded members of the American Medical Association. And they went on record at their annual June meeting as saying that some HEW policies are too conservative even for them.

SELECTED VOTES IN THE BOBBY BAKER INVESTIGATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in making the following observation, I want to make it crystal clear that I in no way condone any illegal or unethical act connected with Watergate.

Further, I do not subscribe to the principle that in politics two wrongs make a right. In other words, if one administration uses illegal means in its political and governmental activities it does not justify a subsequent administration using the same means on grounds that "everybody does it." Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to state that the American people have been subjected to a great deal of moralizing by certain

members of the Senate Watergate Committee in connection with their television show. Now, mind you, moralizing has its place. However, selective indignation has no place in the pulpit.

It is for that reason I am placing in the Record for the benefit of my colleagues on both sides of the Capitol, a study of the voting records of U.S. Senators presently serving in the Senate who were also serving in 1964 when the Bobby Baker investigation was in progress. Seven times Senators were given the opportunity to get to the bottom of that scandal, which, without a doubt more directly involved the then President of the United States, than apparently Watergate involves the present occupant of the White House.

The record is clear and speaks for itself. Several Senators who now sit as judge and jury on the Watergate panel had the opportunity to exercise their moral outrage once before and the results were very telling.

The study follows:

SELECTED VOTES IN THE BOBBY BAKER INVESTIGATION MAY 14, 1964

1. S. Res. 330, a resolution to authorize the Senate Rules and Administrative Committee through September 1, 1964, to investigate Senators and all Senate employees with respect to "any financial or business interests or activities, including activities involving the giving or receiving of campaign funds under questionable circumstances," in order to uncover any conflict of interest or impropriety. (This was an extension and broadening of Williams' 1963 resolution that initiated the Rules Committee investigation of the activities of former Secretary to the Majority Robert G. Baker.) Curtis amendment to allow any three members of the Committee to call witnesses.

Total Vote: 36 to 33 (p. S10928).

Republican Vote: 24 to 0.

Democratic Vote: 12 to 33.

2. S. Res. 330, Mansfield motion to table (kill) the resolution. May 14, 1964.

Total Vote: 42 to 33 (p. S10931).

Republican Vote: 0 to 24.

Democratic Vote: 42 to 9.

SEPTEMBER 10, 1964

3. S. Res. 367. Authorize Senate Rules and Administration Committee to reopen its investigation into the financial or business interests of any officer, employee or former employee of the Senate, with emphasis on allegations raised in connection with construction of the D.C. Stadium. Substitute (S. Res. 368) directing the Senate Government Operations Committee to conduct the investigation and broadening it to include present or former Senators or officers or employees of the Government.

Total Vote: 37 to 50 (p. S21915).

Republican Vote: 32 to 0.

Democratic Vote: 5 to 50.

4. S. Res. 367. Amendment to turn the investigation over to the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Total Vote: 38 to 45 (p. S21925).

Republican Vote: 31 to 0.

Democratic Vote: 7 to 45.

5. S. Res. 367. Curtis amendment to empower any three members of the Rules Committee to call witnesses.

Total Vote: 39 to 45 (p. S21926).

Republican Vote: 30 to 0.

Democratic Vote: 9 to 45.

6. S. Res. 367. Amendment to extend the investigation to matters relating to the construction of any Government building.

Total Vote: 38 to 48 (p. S21928).

Republican Vote: 31 to 0.

Democratic Vote: 7 to 48.

7. S. Res. 367. Amendment to direct the

Rules Committee to call as witnesses in public session all persons mentioned in the allegations concerning overpayment on the D.C. Stadium construction contract.

Total Vote: 31 to 47 (p. S21938).

Republican Vote: 26 to 3.

Democratic Vote: 5 to 44.

8. S. Res. 367. Adoption of the resolution.

Total Vote: 75 to 3 (p. S21939).

Republican Vote: 27 to 2.

Democratic Vote: 48 to 1.

VOTE BREAKDOWN¹

[Symbol denote: Y=yea; N=nay; + =announced for; — =announced against; AB=absent, did not announce]

Senator	Vote No.						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Aiken.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bayh.....	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Bennett.....	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Bible.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Burdick.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Byrd, Robert.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Cannon.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Case.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Church.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Cotton.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Curtis.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dominick.....	+	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Eastland.....	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	AB
Ervin.....	—	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Fong.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fulbright.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	—
Goldwater.....	Y	N	AB	AB	AB	AB	AB
Hart.....	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Hartke.....	N	Y	N	AB	N	N	N
Hruska.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Humphrey.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Inouye.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Jackson.....	+	—	—	+	+	+	+
Javits.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Kennedy.....	N	Y	—	—	—	—	—
Long.....	N	Y	N	—	—	—	—
McClellan.....	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
McGovern.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
McGee.....	N	Y	—	—	—	—	—
McIntyre.....	AB	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Magnuson.....	AB	+	N	N	N	N	N
Mansfield.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Metcalf.....	—	+	N	N	N	N	N
Moss.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Muskie.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Nelson.....	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Pastore.....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Pearson.....	+	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pell.....	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Proxmire.....	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Randolph.....	—	Y	N	—	—	—	—
Ribicoff.....	AB	AB	N	—	—	—	—
Scott, Hugh.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sparkman.....	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Stennis.....	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Symington.....	+	—	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Talmadge.....	—	+	—	N	N	N	N
Thurmond.....	AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tower.....	+	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Williams.....	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Young.....	+	—	Y	Y	+	Y	N

¹ If a Senator was in favor of extending the Bobby Baker Investigation, he would have voted as follows: Vote No. 1, yea; vote No. 2, nay; vote No. 3, yea; vote No. 4, yea; vote No. 5, yea; vote No. 6, yea; vote No. 7, yea.

WORLD FOOD SECURITY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of concern has been expressed by private and international agencies over the disastrous effects of the drought in the Sahelian area of West Africa.

I am deeply concerned that adequate immediate relief to the area is made available from private, bilateral, and multilateral sources. But, I also view the Sahelian disaster as one more piece of evidence of the need for an effective international arrangement to assure reliable supplies of food stocks. Flexible

productive capacity of major exporters of food stuffs and adequate access to supplies for importers are necessary conditions for avoiding extreme supply and demand fluctuations. Without an international stock policy, supply uncertainties will continue to produce price instability in vital commodities and inhibit international response to disasters like the Sahel.

I have scheduled hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements for July 31. Future world food shortages and the capability of international organizations to deal with future increases in demand for basic food stocks will be reviewed by representatives from government and private agencies.

In the past, the United States has contributed substantial sums and a high level of technical expertise to the efforts of the FAO/World Food program, the U.N. Disaster Relief Organization, and the UNDP. The United States has also been party to various international commodity stabilization arrangements since 1946. However, the rapid succession of disaster situations in various parts of the world together with recent projections of an impending world food crisis should demonstrate the importance of developing a conscious international stock policy to meet world demand for vital food commodities.

In a statement before the U.N. Economic and Social Council, the Assistant Director-General for Economic and Social Policy of the FAO, Mr. E. M. Ojala, discussed present national stock policies:

Many countries hold food stocks, for a variety of purposes. But current national stock policies were not designed to cope with the situation that has emerged in 1973. At present, there is no means of ensuring that national stock policies are consistent with each other, from the viewpoint of overall world security; there is no international machinery for keeping stock levels under review; and there are no orderly arrangements for taking action when supplies are in danger of being depleted below safe levels.

The issue of world food management has taken on new dimensions in this period of international inflation and scarcity. Improved productive capacity of developing countries, access to traditional sources of supplies, and financing to assure more stable prices can no longer be looked at in isolation. Product specialization among nations has led to increased interdependence of national economies. Tariff restrictions that lower international levels of vital food commodities are a concern of importing as well as exporting nations.

Future food shortage problems will not be the sole concern of developing economies. Rising affluence in moderately advanced nations has created additional demand for food imports. In addition, crop failures in several large foodgrowing areas has created a massive increase in trade in 1972 and 1973. Unless some degree of coordination of agricultural stocking and trade policies is reached among producers and consumers, shortages and rising prices may become a pervasive problem in more developed economies as well.

As a leading exporter of agricultural

products, the United States will play a significant role in any international effort to cope with what is now being called "the politics of global scarcity." Increased world demand for grain and protein food resources has highlighted the importance of the United States as a reliable source of food supply.

As a major exporter, U.S. agricultural production, stocking, and trade policies must begin to take into account their effects upon the international distribution of food resources. In a State Department report to the Congress released in April, the world food situation and American assistance were discussed with particular emphasis on the impact of shortages on LDC's:

Long term projections by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization and the US Department of Agriculture suggest that food production in the LDCs will gradually improve over the 1970's. However, cereal production in many developing countries will still not be adequate to feed their population, and emergency shortfalls caused by unfavorable weather will undoubtedly occur again.

Food assistance is a significant part of US development aid. Until more developing countries have achieved a balance between population growth and food production, our food aid will be vital to their continued progress and is needed to meet short-term emergency requirements. In view of these continued demands, an overall review of US food production policy in relation to its effect on our assistance to the LDCs would appear desirable.

Food supply problems of developing countries have been approached in the past through programs to: First, transform their economies from subsistence to modernized, commercial agriculture; second, support agronomic research for the improvement of agricultural plant varieties in quality and yield; and third, provide low-interest, long-term credit arrangements between LDC's and major producing countries to cover production shortfalls and emergency relief.

All of these approaches depend upon the capacity and willingness of a few countries to provide the necessary capital, financial or commodity resources to meet the development requirements of the LDC's. But, in order to maximize the use of these resources, the structural capacity of the LDC's must also be developed. We see now in the Sahel that the delivery of vital supplies is hampered by the lack of adequate transport, storage, and communication facilities.

Congressional concern has been registered over the political as well as the economic impact of recent administration export policies on vital food commodities. Unilateral action by the United States to control exports of grain and protein commodities has weakened U.S. credibility in Japan and set back the process of agricultural trade liberalization with the EEC. The unprecedented size of the Soviet wheat sale may adversely affect our ability to respond fully to future emergency situations such as the Sahel. It is increasingly apparent, furthermore, that these export policies will not substantially contribute to the long-term solution of U.S. domestic food prices and supplies. Retaliatory action on the part of those hurt by recent U.S. actions may, in fact, work to offset any

July 27, 1973

internal assurance of food supplies. We are, indeed, a major producer of food products, but we are by no means self-sufficient in other products.

At the 60th session of FAO in June of this year, the Director General, Dr. A. H. Boerma offered a proposal for international action to assure adequate basic food stocks. Dr. Boerma noted that the world is currently just one bad harvest

away from widespread famine and critical shortages of foodstuffs. The Director General believes that a minimum level of world food security could be achieved through a limited degree of coordination of national stock policies. The three basic elements of his proposal include: First, the need for a consensus on the concept of minimum world food security; second, intergovernmental cooperation and con-

sultation on national stock levels; and third, international assistance to developing countries in establishing basic food stocks.

I hope that our efforts to stimulate discussion on this important issue will lead to specific congressional and administrative action to assure adequate food resources through a system based on international cooperation.