

10, United States Code, sections 2106, 2183, 3264, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Ball, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hull, Larry H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Herschel L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaniecki, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ramirez, Arthur L., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following-named scholarship students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Allen, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Amadeo, Dana S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bay, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Edwards, Robert B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McNab, James F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Montgomery, Patrick R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Powell, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx

Rethman, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schlomer, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following-named cadet, graduating class 1973, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284 through 4353:

Hagopian, Joachim, xxx-xx-xxxx

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Navy enlisted scientific education program) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Burney, Carl L., Jr.	Lane, Richard K.
Doyle, James V.	Moses, Mark S.
Fox, Martin.	Newmyer, John D.
Haskins, Dennis E.	Weigle, Walter W.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 5, 1973:

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, the following named person for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency:

Alfred P. Love, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1973.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL ECONOMY ACT

#### HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to alleviate the growing energy crisis by requiring the manufacture of more efficient motor vehicles. The bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to establish fuel economy standards to achieve a 10-percent increase in fuel economy of the aggregate of all 1976 model motor vehicles, 20 percent in 1978 models, and 30 percent in 1980 models.

A serious shortage of refined petroleum products is developing in this country. One need only talk to the parents of children whose schools were closed down last winter for a lack of fuel oil or to employees of factories that could not be heated to their normal temperatures to understand the problem. Or one could talk to people who could not travel freely this summer because of the scattered shortage of gasoline or to one of the more than 1,500 independent gas dealers who are now looking for new jobs because the shortages forced them out of business.

The problem will not go away; in fact, it will intensify in the years to come. The failure of the Federal Government to provide leadership to encourage alternative sources of energy—combined with the long leadtimes involved in developing new energy sources—means that it is beyond our power at this point to substantially alter the energy picture for the remainder of the decade.

Since the U.S. output of oil and natural gas has levelled off in recent years, while consumer demand has continued to soar, this will mean greater reliance on oil imports; by 1980, we could reach as much as 50 percent dependency on foreign oil alone, with most of the increase coming from the Middle East. While the imports will help meet our short-term needs, the foreign policy and economic implications of overdependence on imported oil are very disturbing and a long-range solution which decreases dependence on oil imports is needed.

Central to our demand for oil is the automobile. It accounts for approximately 40 percent of the oil consumed in this country and it is well documented that the overall efficiency of the automobile as a user of energy is very low; estimates range between 10 and 15 percent. Moreover, the efficiency of automobiles has been steadily declining. Between 1960 and 1968, before air pollution standards came into being, the efficiency of operation dropped 3 percent. In a study completed in November 1972, the Environmental Protection Agency concluded that the average fuel economy loss due to emission control for all controlled vehicles—1968 to 1973—is 7.7 percent. To provide an appropriate perspective, one must relate that data to other fuel economy penalties being experienced in today's cars. EPA laboratory tests, for example, show a 9 percent loss for operating air conditioning in a full-sized car and this penalty can go as high as 20 percent for continuous use on a hot day in urban traffic. The fuel economy penalty associated with the use of automatic transmissions is 5 to 6 percent.

The EPA study revealed that the fuel economy loss associated with emission controls is significantly less than that many vehicle operators claim they are experiencing. One major reason for this is that much of the decreased fuel economy observed is in fact attributable to the phenomenon of nameplate weight growth. When a nameplate—Chevrolet Impala, for example—is first introduced, it identifies a vehicle weighing a certain amount. Over the years, however, vehicles with the same nameplates have typically become heavier, a trend often unnoticed by the driver. These weight gains play a major role in decreased fuel economy, because weight is the single most important vehicle design parameter affecting fuel: A 5,000-pound vehicle demonstrates 50 percent lower fuel economy than a 2,500-pound vehicle.

Selecting fuel economy as the parameter rather than weight or horsepower will give the manufacturers more flexibility to introduce new technology to meet the required 30-percent increase in fuel economy by 1980. Thus, the auto manufacturers would be free to simply reduce vehicle weight or they could work

to develop and perfect new technology. For example, the stratified charge engine presently exhibits 12 percent better fuel economy than the average 1973 vehicle of the same weight and the diesel engine achieves almost 75 percent better gas mileage over the average 1973 vehicle of the same weight equipped with a conventional engine and has already met the emission levels required by the 1975 EPA standards.

The bill would also allow a brief exemption—not to exceed 3 years—from the standards for new technology which the Secretary of Transportation certifies may reasonably be expected to achieve significant improvements in fuel economy. The time permitted would be long enough to allow a full examination of the potentialities of new technology without being so long as to have a major adverse effect on the consumption of gasoline. Thus, the legislation would give auto manufacturers ample time and opportunity to develop the best possible technology from every standpoint and so avoid repetition of a partial solution such as the catalytic converter, which will help automobiles meet the air pollution standards but which are the most uneconomical solution possible in terms of the loss of fuel economy and cost to the consumer.

Finally, the bill would require manufacturers to provide fuel economy information in all advertisements. This would be an effective consumer education measure and would also stimulate the manufacturers to increase fuel economy beyond the required standards.

While it is not possible to precisely predict the effect of this legislation, it is worth noting that a recent Department of Transportation study determined that a 30-percent reduction in fuel consumption in 50-percent of highway vehicles would result in a 12-percent savings in transportation energy needs.

Another way of assessing the possible effects of this bill is that if the average weight of automobiles in this country were reduced to 2,500 pounds, 17 billion gallons of gasoline would have been saved in 1972. This compares to a projected 92 billion gallons of crude oil to be imported from the Middle East in 1980. Since about 50 percent of crude oil is converted to gasoline, this single con-

servation measure would allow for a 37-percent reduction in dependence on Middle East oil.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's lack of energy planning has resulted in many inefficient uses of energy, the foremost example of which is the automobile. If we are to protect our freedom to travel and limit our dependency on foreign nations for oil, we will have to demand greater efficiency from our cars. The Motor Vehicle Fuel Economy Act would do that and so I urge the House Commerce Committee to take swift action to help avert a catastrophic energy crisis.

#### CLIFF BLUE'S EDITORIAL

### HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial by Clifton Blue, editor and publisher of *The Sandhill Citizen* in Aberdeen, N.C. It is headed, "Other Issues Beside Watergate."

Cliff Blue is one of North Carolina's most remarkable citizens. He is widely respected by citizens of all political persuasions. He is a successful newspaperman because he can be trusted always to report things as he sees them, without fear or favor.

Mr. President, Cliff Blue's contributions to his and my State, and our Nation, are countless. He has served many years as a member of North Carolina's General Assembly. He has served as Speaker of the North Carolina House of Representatives. And when it comes to lending a dedicated hand to worthwhile causes of every description, Cliff Blue has no equal.

The editorial by Mr. Blue which I have just mentioned was published in the August 9 issue of *The Sandhill Citizen*. It contains some very wise counsel, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

#### OTHER ISSUES BESIDE WATERGATE

For months Watergate has been the big issue in Congress.

The sordid activities in the executive branch of the federal government being aired in the Senate Committee hearings certainly attest to the value of these hearings.

However, there are other vital issues which the congressmen and the Senators not serving on the Ervin Committee need to give their best thinking to.

1. We have shortages which have come on us almost like thieves in the night. Fuel shortages, meat shortages, paper shortages, to mention but a few.

2. A continuation of the spiraling inflation about which nobody seems to be doing anything except talk.

3. Deficit spending by the Federal government.

We may not have the solutions, but we have some suggestions:

1. A thorough and speedy investigation needs to be conducted into the shortages. Instead of paying farmers not to grow certain crops, if necessary the government

might add a subsidy to crops where there is a shortage, and to meat. Prices then might get back in line.

2. From the best information we have been able to ferret out, a reduction in government spending would probably do more to curtail inflation than anything else.

3. If the congressional and executive personnel salaries were reduced each fiscal year, percentagewise, by the percentage that spending exceeded the income, we believe that a balanced budget would take shape about as fast as the shortages have crept upon us.

#### CLEAN ELECTIONS ACT OF 1973

### HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, today I cosponsored the Clean Elections Act of 1973, originally introduced by my colleagues, Mr. JOHN ANDERSON, of Illinois, and Mr. MORRIS UDALL, of Arizona. Though I do not believe this legislation to be perfect, it does contain many provisions which recommend it. More importantly, I believe, the Clean Elections Act of 1973 provides our best chance of getting meaningful reform of many of the antiquated and inadequate laws governing our electoral processes. I hope that by the very substantial support for this measure, with over 100 cosponsors, we will be able to move ahead quickly with committee action and eventually look toward floor action before the country faces another national election.

The most despicable and regrettable features of the Watergate affair bring home the point more strongly than ever before that we need to have drastic changes in our present laws. We cannot continue to permit money and what money can buy to come even close to dominating any portion of our electoral process.

There can be little question that the rapidly mounting costs of political campaigns threaten to do great injury to the integrity of the electoral process and to narrow the pursuit of public office principally to those who either possess independent means or have supporters willing to contribute substantial sums of money to cover campaign expenses. It is in this context that the medium of television has taken on an importance far beyond the imagination of anyone just 20 short years ago. Television has become in many ways a monster—a monster we must tame before it completely dominates our election process by its use in political campaigns. The costs of campaigning in general and television campaigning in particular pose a real threat to the integrity of a good many office holders and those who seek official positions via election.

When we do impose limits on campaign spending, however, we must recognize that such limits will inevitably favor incumbents. Certainly there will always be imbalances of one sort or another between candidates, but we should give careful consideration to doing what we can to make sure that all candidates have

an opportunity to wage a competitive campaign. I have become convinced that the only way we can reach this goal is to provide at least some minimum direct subsidies to candidates in their use of the various forms of media available to reach potential and actual voters.

May I repeat at this time what I have stated on a number of occasions before committees and on the floor of the House. I own a minority stock interest in a corporation which is engaged in broadcasting, being the licensee of a television station and three radio stations. I hope that what I say on this point is not distorted by this fact, and in truth I do not believe it is. But as a believer in and advocate of full disclosure, in fairness I disclose once again the fact of this ownership.

The Clean Elections Act of 1973 provides for the establishment of a Federal Elections Commission. The Commission's responsibility will be to enforce the provisions of this act and all other laws regulating the electoral process. At present, the enforcement of these laws is left with the Clerk of the House, the Secretary of the Senate and the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office. Such enforcement should, in my opinion, be completely separate and apart from the Congress or its branches like the GAO.

Without question, the enforcement of election laws cannot and should not be left up to people who are controlled by the people they are to monitor. We need to have the objectivity and the ensured action that only can be had with an independent body such as a Federal Elections Committee. Objectivity of the committee can be insured with its composition of six members to be chosen, two by the Speaker of the House, two by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and two by the President of the United States. Members' term would be for 6 years and not more than three of the members could be of one political party. Also, I strongly believe that the Commission, to be truly effective, needs the powers to subpoena witnesses and compel evidence and to initiate court actions against violators as provided for in the act.

The Clean Elections Act of 1973 also provides meaningful campaign contribution limitations. The legislation would limit contributions by any person or political committee during any calendar year to \$1,000 in the case of candidates for the House or Senate and \$2,500 in the case of candidates for the Presidency. I feel it particularly meaningful to regulate, as this legislation would do, contributions to any candidate and all of his authorized campaign committees and provide that no committee could receive contributions in behalf of a candidate without the candidate's prior authorization. Though such a provision will be considered by some as placing an undue burden on the candidate, especially in Presidential elections, I believe that only through holding the candidate directly liable are we going to have real accountability.

The legislation also provides, and rightly so I believe, that contributions to any political action committee such as BI-PAC or COPE would be limited to

\$2,500 per year from any single source. This limitation would also apply to contributions given to national party committees.

Disbursements by national committees or congressional and Senate campaign committees of each party would be exempted in this legislation from the limitation on contributions to candidates. And while I support this exemption, I believe provisions should be added to the legislation to insure that this exemption does not encourage the so-called washing of contributions. By this I mean that we need to prohibit campaign contributions to be earmarked through national, congressional, senatorial, or party committees as a way to avoid identifying all campaign contributions to a particular candidate.

The Clean Elections Act of 1973 establishes provisions to provide for partial financing of a candidate's campaign expenses and at the same time encourage small contributions. I am strongly supportive of efforts to encourage more small contributors for I believe this is the best way to insure that campaigns are not controlled by a few large contributors and, even more importantly, it brings more people actively into the political process.

The provisions of the legislation provide that the current tax credit for political contributions would be increased from \$12.50 to \$50 per taxpayer—\$100 in the case of a joint return—and that each Federal candidate in both primary and general elections would be eligible for payments on his or her behalf from the "Federal Matching Payment Entitlement Fund." The congressional and senatorial campaign committees and national committees of each party would also be able to receive funds. To not overly burden the American taxpayer with expenses for campaigns, an upper limit has been placed on such payments and minor or frivolous candidates could not benefit from such payments unless they showed a minimum campaign contribution eligible for such matching Federal funds.

I certainly agree with the concept that we should move toward providing more Federal assistance to candidates to ensure that, even after we have effective spending limits, running for public office is not confined to people of wealth or those who have access to it. I do, however, have a deep concern that giving out Federal dollars by itself certainly does not solve the problems involved with our electoral process. Rather, to attempt to create a panacea by simply moving to eliminate or reduce the influence of campaign contributions ignores the equally important issue of how candidates spend their campaign funds once they are raised. As I indicated in my opening comments, I favor limited subsidies, not of a cash nature as here suggested, but in the form of underwriting certain costs for all candidates. This, I believe, is a more effective way to equalize candidates' opportunities which at the same time provides some incentive for the candidate to en-

gage in those activities which are less slick advertising and more informational. Also, such an approach tends to provide the challenger in an election a chance to utilize certain campaign tools which are too often available only to the incumbent.

The Clean Elections Act of 1973 does provide for the public subsidy of a certain amount of TV time. I would hope that this same subsidization could apply to radio, newspaper, mailings and the like. I would also hope that this increased subsidization could take the place of the matching fund payment provided for in this legislation.

It is the purpose of this legislation to insure that, where the Federal Government is involved in financing political candidates' media time, the public be given the best opportunity to study the candidate in depth. I am sure we can all agree that the so-called spot commercial may easily produce name identification, but does not offer much opportunity for the viewing public to study the candidates' character, political philosophy, or much of anything substantive on which to base a decision on how to vote. To require that the federally subsidized television time be in blocks is one of the ways we can better insure that the voting public has a view of the candidate himself rather than a manufactured image of a seeker after political office.

The bill also provides for minimum time periods during which no more than one of these blocks of air time may appear. We are all aware of the evils of the so-called blitz just before election days. The practice of completely saturating the viewing public with a barrage of political advertisements must be repugnant to all of us who hold dear the goal of electoral democracy. The requirement to space these blocks of air time also provides a means of giving a longer period for the prospective voter to learn about and evaluate the candidates and thereby be enabled to cast his vote on a more solid base of knowledge.

I would also like to make special note of two provisions of this proposed legislation which I believe deserve mention because they close two large loopholes in our present law: First, direct mail is added to the items—radio and TV, newspapers and magazines, billboards, and telephone banks—covered by the 10 cents per eligible voter expenditure limitation in current law; and, second, it is proposed that each candidate establish a central campaign committee which would collect reports of all other campaign committees of the candidate and file them with the Federal Elections Commission to eliminate the confusion caused by each campaign committee reporting separately.

I commend my colleagues Messrs. ANDERSON and UDALL for the introduction of this important legislation. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill. I believe its thrust is in a direction in which the Congress has in the past been much too reluctant to move. I trust that too great deliberation will not kill this piece of legislation.

## RESPONSIBILITY AND "LEAKS"

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the name of David S. Broder is well known and respected in journalism today. I first met Mr. Broder a number of years ago when he was on the staff of the Bloomington, Ill., *Pantagraph*, a newspaper in my former 17th District in Illinois. I have followed his writing with special interest since and have generally admired his keen insight and sense of balance in news reporting and analysis.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Broder's excellent column which appeared in the *Washington Post* on Sunday, August 26, 1973, entitled "Responsibility and Leaks." I hope all of my colleagues will take the time to read it.

Mr. Broder reminds us of something many are in danger of forgetting; namely, that when accused, a citizen—any citizen—is innocent unless proven guilty. Such an individual, as Mr. Broder points out, "shares with you and me the blessing of citizenship in a country which, thank God, decided 200 years ago that the burden of proving any one of us guilty falls entirely on the state, through a deliberately laborious process of indictment, prosecution and conviction at public trial in a court of law." To interfere with this process, or pass judgment in any other way, imperils the most important fundamental right of everyone.

Mr. Broder's column follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, Aug. 26, 1973]

### RESPONSIBILITY AND LEAKS

(By David S. Broder)

A couple weeks ago, in commenting on the President's last formal speech on Watergate, The *Washington Post* editorially criticized "the curiously detached status—almost that of bemused spectator—which Mr. Nixon assumed for himself." It was "this studied sense of remoteness," the editorial said, that stripped all conviction from his statements deploring the transgressions committed by those in his employ.

Somehow, that editorial came to mind this week when looking at the way leading newspapers handled Vice President Agnew's complaint that there was an effort "to indict me in the press" through calculated Justice Department leaks of kickback allegations, now being investigated by a Federal prosecutor and grand jury in Baltimore.

Talk about curious detachment and a studied sense of remoteness! My favorite editorialists acted as if they had no kinship to the newspapers where these leaks had appeared.

The *Post*, which on Aug. 15, reported that "informed sources" said several Maryland contractors had told the prosecutors of personal cash payments to Agnew, editorialized rather grandly that "... the Vice President is well within his rights to be powerfully annoyed..."

The *Washington Star-News*, which on Aug. 13 cited "reliable sources" as the basis for a similar story, now said editorially: "The Vice President is entirely correct in insisting that the Justice Department . . . find and stop the many sources of leaked information . . ."

And the New York Times, which on Aug. 16 named "sources close to the investigation" as buttressing its version of the pay-off allegations, editorialized: "Vice President Agnew has every right to complain that his constitutional rights are being violated by leaks attributed to 'Justice Department sources'..."

There hasn't been such a suspiciously conspicuous display of civic virtue since a San Francisco madam led her string of girls to the Red Cross blood bank during World War II.

All three papers washed their hands of responsibility for publishing the "leaks" by quoting Mr. Agnew's own statement that "the blame must rest with those who give this information to the press."

But that rationalization works only if those of us in journalism are going to set ourselves a low standard of conduct.

There are many reasons why the press ought to be wary of information leaked from criminal investigations. For one thing, the great lesson we supposedly learned from the McCarthy era was that responsible journalism requires that accusations against individuals not be delivered naked to the reader but be presented with due regard to the motives and credibility of the accuser.

The "sources close to the investigation" evasion makes this impossible. If the sources are, as Agnew suspects, on the government side, one has to wonder why a prosecutor with a genuinely strong case would risk it by premature publicity that could easily get him thrown out of court.

If, on the other hand, as the No. 2 man in the Justice Department says, the sources are "close to the investigation," because they are the very contractors who are under investigation, or their lawyers, then the reader should be told the mudballs hitting Agnew are coming from that direction.

Those who relay leaked information forget that we as journalists have just as much stake in the probity of the criminal justice system as any other citizen. A while back, several hundred American newspapers published Jack Anderson's columns containing verbatim excerpts of Watergate grand jury testimony. The rationalization one heard from editors was that "somebody's going to publish it, whether I do or not."

Not a single editor I know argued that the grand jury system could survive repeated disclosure of confidential testimony. Not a single editor contended that the rights of accused persons can be protected if accusations made in that non-adversary forum are publicized. Nonetheless, the leaked testimony was published—and to hell with the consequences.

Now Time magazine, with its vast circulation, has told its readers that unnamed "Justice Department officials" believe Agnew's indictment is "inevitable," despite the fact that the prosecutor says not one scintilla of evidence has yet been given to the grand jury which alone can determine that question. What does that imply about our system of justice? It implies that some journals, at least, think it is a farce and a fraud.

In this climate, when part of the press behaves as if any prominent politician accused of wrongdoing must be presumed guilty, what we need from our leading newspapers is not an attitude of lofty detachment, but the reassertion of some fundamental truths.

One truth is that Spiro Agnew is innocent. He is innocent (and not just presumed innocent) because he shares with you and me the blessing of citizenship in a country which, thank God, decided 200 years ago that the burden of proving any one of us guilty falls entirely on the state, through a deliberately laborious process of indictment, prosecution and conviction at public trial in a court of law.

And that is a process in which the press interferes, not only at its own peril, but at hazard to the most important of everyone's fundamental rights.

### CONGRESSMAN MIZELL REPORTS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

#### HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am now in the process of sending to every home in North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District a copy of my latest Report from Congress.

This report discusses many of the major achievements of the Congress thus far in this session, and the role which I have played in some of these efforts. The report also deals with some of the serious problems facing the Nation today.

It is my hope that my colleagues will find this report interesting, and for their information and consideration I am inserting it in the RECORD at this time.

WILMER D. MIZELL REPORTS TO THE FIFTH DISTRICT, NORTH CAROLINA FROM CONGRESS

#### WATERGATE

As I have said on several occasions in the past, I deplore the illegal and unethical actions that have come to be identified by the term "Watergate." There is no legitimate place in politics or government for those kinds of actions, and I have stated repeatedly my belief that the people guilty of criminal activity should be brought to justice.

While Watergate has troubled the nation, it has also been responsible for some new efforts to improve the electoral process in America. The Senate has already passed a new campaign reform bill, and the House will hold hearings on similar legislation this fall. I hope this legislation will help to encourage honest political activity from the precinct to the national level.

I am anxious, as I know many of you are, for the Watergate case to be finally resolved, so that the nation and its elected representatives can get back to work full-time on the many other matters of importance that face America and the world today.

#### THE COST OF LIVING

I have received a number of letters from residents of the fifth district expressing their concern about the current cost of living.

For some time, as most of you know, I have been trying to get the federal government to live within its means, so that the American people could better live within theirs.

I am continuing this effort through every avenue available to me, including keeping close watch over the appropriations process and voting for reasonable and effective control guidelines.

Congress must act decisively to halt runaway government spending, or we will continue to face the problem of inflation and the possibility of a tax increase.

#### BUSING

The spectre of massive—and expensive—court-ordered busing for racial balance still

hovers over hundreds of school districts in America, including the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County school system.

I have re-introduced in the 93rd Congress the same Constitutional amendment I authored and introduced in April, 1971, shortly after the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its decision in the Charlotte case approving the use of massive busing as a desegregation tool.

That amendment states that "no public school student shall, on the basis of race, creed or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school."

It was this amendment that last year won the endorsement of more than 160 Members of Congress, who share with me the belief that forced busing is a wasteful, unfair and artificial device that takes desperately-needed money from such educational needs as better teachers' salaries, better schools, better educational equipment of all kinds.

I emphasized this point, and the overwhelming opposition to forced busing demonstrated in the Fifth District and across the country, in testimony I presented to the Senate Judiciary earlier this year during that committee's hearings on a number of anti-busing proposals.

In addition, I called together a meeting of several Members of Congress this summer to discuss the busing problem and develop a strategy for passing legislation to prohibit forced busing once and for all. This group of Congressmen, representing both political parties and every region of the country, established a committee to oversee this effort, and I am hopeful that some kind of anti-busing legislation will pass the House this year.

It continues to be my policy that we shouldn't be spending money we don't have, to buy buses we don't need, to send children to schools they shouldn't have to attend.

#### BLUE RIDGE POWER PROJECT

What began eleven years ago as a generally acceptable plan to increase electric power production has been transformed into a threatening menace that looms over a way of life and a land of beauty in Ashe and Alleghany counties.

The Blue Ridge power project, conceived in the early 1960's as a moderate-sized hydroelectric power facility, has been modified to the point that it would now require the ruination of 40,000 acres of beautiful and fertile land and the disruption of hundreds of lives in the Blue Ridge region—all for the sake of a project that will be reserved for "emergency" situations that may or may not arise between now and 1990.

I have opposed this project ever since coming to Congress in 1969, and I am still opposed to it. In 1971, I was able to get the Environmental Protection Agency to represent itself independently in this case, and EPA subsequently found the same environmental horrors that others had previously foreseen. In 1972, I was the author of a section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act which prohibited the Federal Power Commission from approving the use of water storage for "pollution-dilution"—a major component of the Blue Ridge project—unless EPA recommended such use. EPA refused to make that recommendation for the Blue Ridge project.

In 1973, the FPC's Blue Ridge application proceeding was reopened, partly in response to my anti-pollution-dilution section and partly in response to a New York court case requiring an independent agency review of the environmental impact of major federal projects.

The FPC staff's draft and final environmental impact statements on Blue Ridge were met with severe criticism from many

sources. My own comments on the statements' shortcomings were among the most critical. When the FPC held cross-examination hearings on the final statement, I directed a member of my staff to ask the FPC experts why the project was doubled—in cost and capacity—in the space of three years. The answer, as expected, was not a definitive one. The Environmental Protection Agency failed to participate in these cross-examinations, and I subsequently wrote the agency's administrator requesting the reasons for this failure. I am still awaiting a reply.

Briefs of exception on this cross-examination hearing will be filed in September, after which the Administrative Law Judge who has presided over this proceeding for several years—and twice recommended granting the project license—will make his third recommendation. The full Commission will probably make a determination next spring.

In the meantime, I have introduced legislation to block completely any development whatsoever on the New River from its headwaters to Fries, Va., thus effectively prohibiting construction of the Blue Ridge project. I am presently awaiting the scheduling of hearings on this legislation in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

#### VOLUNTARY PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

The nation recently observed a rather unhappy anniversary—the tenth anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision banning prayer in public schools. I made a speech in the House of Representatives on the day of that anniversary, calling for action on a Constitutional amendment I have proposed restoring the right of voluntary prayer in schools and other public places.

I also testified recently in hearings on this subject being conducted by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. My testimony centered on the series of court decisions in which state and federal courts have denied or restricted the right of school children to pray on school grounds, even if done before school begins.

I believe these court decisions have seriously undermined the guarantee of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which provides that no law shall be made prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

To reassert that Constitutional guarantee, I have proposed a Constitutional amendment which states that "nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building, which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in voluntary prayer."

#### AGRICULTURE BILL PASSES CONGRESS

The House and Senate have both passed, and sent to the White House for President Nixon's signature, a comprehensive new agriculture bill aimed at increasing production of food and fiber and stabilizing prices.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I took an active part in drafting this legislation and in the floor debate on the bill.

The new agriculture bill is the product of many weeks of intensive investigation and painstaking work within the Agriculture Committee, and there are several provisions of the bill with which I am particularly pleased.

Among the most important of these is the new provision for "target prices." Under the new target price approach, the Congress establishes fair unit prices for producers of the three major commodities—wheat, feed grains and cotton. Such income protection would be available to all farmers who agree to cooperate with the government in supply adjustment programs.

If farmers could not obtain target prices in the open market, such as when there is an oversupply, the Government would pay farmers the difference between what they actually received and the target prices. If farmers

receive target prices or higher in the marketplace, the cost to the Government would be virtually nothing.

This is a historic departure from the agricultural philosophies which the Government has followed the last forty years. It brings the farmer much closer to the marketplace, where his opportunities for greater income are much improved, and it effectively removes the federal government from the close control—and the discouragement of production—it has maintained over agriculture for so many years.

A second major provision amends the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to provide grants of up to 50 percent of the total costs to rural volunteer fire departments for fire-fighting equipment and for training firemen in the use of the equipment. These grants would be made available to towns or unincorporated areas with populations of 200 to 2,000 people.

The bill also broadens the scope of assistance available to rural communities for fire protection. By changing the program from "wildfire" protection to general fire protection, more rural communities can qualify for assistance to organize, train and equip local fire-fighting forces.

Third, the legislation terminates the wheat certificate program under which processors are now required to pay 75 cents to the Government for each bushel of wheat processed.

Fourth, the legislation establishes new rural environmental conservation programs, consolidating the best features of the old REAP program (discussed elsewhere in the Newsletter), the water bank program, and the Great Plains conservation program. The new program will embody many of the tested practices that have been found effective in dealing with environmental pollution and wildlife preservation. It also sets a new direction for obtaining a better environment by encouraging long-range direction and planning.

#### PROTECTION OF FARM WORKERS FROM PESTICIDE EXPOSURE

I sponsored a section of the original agriculture bill drafted in the Committee on Agriculture, transferring from the Department of Labor's Occupational Safety and Health Administration to the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility for protecting farm workers from hazards associated with exposure to pesticides.

My introduction of this provision came in response to the totally unrealistic and extremely cumbersome regulations established on an "emergency" basis last May by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The senior agriculture specialist of the Library of Congress estimated that a \$50 million increase in production costs would result if these regulations were enforced—an increase that would soon be reflected in food prices.

The chairman of the panel of experts advising OSHA on pesticides resigned in protest against these regulations, stating that his committee had found no evidence that an emergency existed and that the proposed regulations were, in any event, unworkable, ambiguous, potentially disastrous, and would work unnecessary hardships on employer and employee. These initial regulations were subsequently withdrawn and modified, still without evidence that an emergency existed to justify the establishment of such regulations, and a federal court then ordered that these second regulations not be enforced pending further study.

I believe the safeguarding of farm workers from potential hazards of pesticide exposure is too important a task to be left to an organization so seemingly devoid of expertise and consistency and practicality.

I believe the Secretary of Agriculture is far more capable of establishing intelligent standards that will meet the crucial test of adequate protection and at the same time

allow for the continued economical production of food and fiber.

The full Agriculture Committee agreed to my proposal, by a vote of 20-5, but the House of Representatives struck my provision from the bill after a series of votes marked by confusion and discord.

#### RURAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Early in this session of the 93rd Congress, the House of Representatives considered legislation to reinstate the Rural Environmental Assistance Program (REAP) which had been suspended last December by the Department of Agriculture.

I offered a proposal to reinstate the program at a funding level of \$140 million, the amount which the Agriculture Department had planned to spend before the suspension order was given.

This motion was not approved, but it won a footnote in history all the same. The vote on my proposal was the first ever to be taken by electronic device in the House of Representatives. This electronic voting device was put into operation this year as part of the legislative reform effort initiated by Congress in 1972.

As for the REAP program itself, its best features have been incorporated in a new environmental protection program established in the 1973 Agricultural and Consumer Protection Act, discussed in greater detail elsewhere in this newsletter.

#### HIGHWAY BILL INCLUDES CORPORATION FREEWAY PROVISION

Just before going into its August recess, the House approved a comprehensive highway construction and safety bill.

This legislation contains some excellent provisions, including an expansion of the Interstate highway system, and the primary and secondary road system that supports it. This expansion will be particularly helpful to our rural areas in need of better transportation routes.

There is also an excellent and comprehensive highway safety program provided for in this legislation, as well as a provision I sponsored requiring new corridor hearings on the proposed Corporation Freeway in Winston-Salem. This section will insure that the voice of the people is heard and their concerns are fully considered.

One of the provisions of the bill which I did not support was the opening of the Highway Trust Fund to help finance urban mass transit systems. I have said repeatedly that highway funds should be used for highways, and that the way to provide for mass transit systems is to establish a separate fund for those needs.

Despite my opposition to this section, I found the legislation generally sound and effective, and I am confident it will prove beneficial to the fifth district, the state and the nation.

#### LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

The House this year considered legislation to establish a new Legal Services Corporation to replace the legal services program conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I strongly support the concept of providing adequate legal counsel to people who cannot afford to retain a lawyer for themselves, but I support just as strongly a system of safeguards that will insure that federal funds authorized for this program are not used to promote political or social "causes" not related to the specific defense of a legal service client.

One of those "causes" is forced busing, and I had documented evidence that the OEO legal service program had funded \$1.5-million for prosecution of at least eight busing cases, including the Detroit case which calls for the busing of 780,000 children across 52 school district lines.

I sponsored an amendment prohibiting funds from being spent to finance cases involving forced busing, and another prohibi-

ing funds from being used to push racial quota plans in colleges and universities. Other safeguards in the bill included a prohibition against these funds being used in "lobbying" efforts for passage of legislative measures.

#### 1973 QUESTIONNAIRE PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Several weeks ago, I mailed to each home in the fifth district my 1973 legislative questionnaire, seeking your views on many of the most important issues facing the nation today. While all the questionnaires have not yet been tabulated, I have compiled an interim report based on the early responses. I will make a full report on the questionnaire later, but I thought you might be interested in some of the early trends.

1. Do you favor granting amnesty to those who evaded the draft to avoid service in the Vietnam War? Yes: 18%, No: 82%.

2. Do you approve in general of President Nixon's efforts to hold down the level of federal spending? Yes: 77%, No: 23%.

3. Do you favor reinstating the death penalty for certain specified crimes? Yes: 89%, No: 11%.

4. Would you favor making federal Election Day a national holiday? Yes: 63%, No: 37%.

5. Do you favor the legalization of marijuana? Yes: 13%, No: 87%.

6. Are you satisfied with President Nixon's overall performance? Yes: 53%, No: 47%.

7. Do you favor federal registration and licensing of firearms? Yes: 45%, No: 55%.

8. Should Congress give the President the power to raise or lower tariffs as a bargaining tool in trade negotiations with other countries? Yes: 52%, No: 48%.

9. Do you favor allowing abortion on demand through the third month of pregnancy, as provided in the recent Supreme Court decision? Yes: 47%, No: 53%.

10. Should the United States provide economic assistance for the rebuilding of North Vietnam? Yes: 11%, No: 89%.

11. Do you approve of a tax credit for parents whose children attend private or parochial schools? Yes: 36%, No: 64%.

12. What do you consider the most important issues facing the nation today? Inflation and prices, Watergate, crime, drug abuse, environment, busing, energy crisis, welfare reform (in order of frequency).

#### STILL TO COME IN CONGRESS

This has already proven to be an active and productive session of Congress, with 10 of 13 government appropriations bills already passed and several other major pieces of legislation enacted as well. But there are several important measures still awaiting congressional action.

Among these are bills dealing with trade reform, tax reform and private pension reform; appropriations bills for defense, military construction and foreign operations; a new elementary and secondary education act (hopefully with new anti-busing language); and a proposal reinstating capital punishment.

In addition, hearings are scheduled on campaign reform legislation and proposed Constitutional amendments to reinstate voluntary prayer in public schools and other public places.

**SENATOR SCOTT OF VIRGINIA ASSURES PEOPLE OF TAIPEI THEY ARE NOT ALONE IN SEEKING FREEDOM, LIBERTY**

### HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator

from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), delivered a most eloquent address on August 21 before the Asian People's Anti-Communist League Conference assembled at Taipei, Republic of China.

In this fine address, Senator SCOTT shared some obvious and practical truths which deserve to be considered by every Member of this body, indeed every citizen of the United States.

I commend BILL SCOTT's counsel to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the address by Senator SCOTT was ordered to be printed in the Extension of Remarks, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAM L. SCOTT (VIRGINIA) BEFORE THE ASIAN PEOPLE'S ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE CONFERENCE, TAIPEI, REPUBLIC OF CHINA, AUGUST 21, 1973

Mr. Chairman, Prime Minister Chiang, distinguished delegates and guests: Let me first thank Dr. Ku and the Asian People's Anti-Communist League for your kindness in inviting me to participate in your conference. It is a pleasure to visit Taiwan and personally observe its progress. My remarks may concentrate on the Republic of China. Yet, I hope they have application to the various countries represented here, and to the entire free world. Of course, you realize that the thoughts I share with you are those of an individual citizen of the United States and they have not been cleared with our Department of State, or any government official. One of the benefits of a free society is freedom of expression. Perhaps I can speak with greater candor because I am not a diplomat and my views are my own.

Before one can serve in the United States Senate, however, he must first be elected. He must be a practical politician and be familiar with the views of citizens generally. Practical politics teaches you to concentrate on your friend's while, at the same time, not antagonizing anyone.

I believe this could well be applicable to international affairs. America and the Republic of China have been friends over the years. The vast majority of the people of America want this friendship to continue. We have much in common with free China. I understand that in Taiwan all religious beliefs are protected and encouraged. In America our Constitution prevents Congress from making any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

We share the right of free expression and free assembly. The Republic of China also believes in free enterprise as America does. The entire world can compare the flourishing capitalist democracy existing here on Taiwan with the Communist regime on the mainland. The same is true of Communist East Germany and the Capitalist West. Freedom to plan, to work out one's own problems and to achieve, makes life more meaningful. We in America rejoice in your accomplishments, a country of somewhat over 15 million, having more imports and exports than the 750 million people on the mainland under Communist control. We are also grateful for your trade missions and efforts to buy more American products and to improve our trade balance. Our trade center in Taipei next year may also help us maintain more balanced trade and be in our mutual interest.

Let me also compliment free China on your compulsory education system and on the many colleges and universities which thrive in your country. I am aware that many Americans primarily of Chinese extraction return to Taiwan to further their education and to absorb the culture of their

forebears. I am also aware that many Chinese Nationalists come to the United States to attend our various colleges and universities. Perhaps this mutual exchange of students helps to cement more firmly the friendships we have enjoyed over the years.

The whole world is aware of the success story of Taiwan over the past 20 years. Emerging from an agricultural society in the fifties, Free China today is identified as one of the most advanced industrial nations in Asia, with a standard of living higher than any country in the area except Japan. The Republic of China deserves extra credit because its achievements were made despite diplomatic setbacks in one of the world's most densely populated countries with only one-fourth of your territory arable. I understand that your gross national product last year was \$7.2 billion compared with only \$1 billion twenty years earlier. While foreign trade and investment was very important in Taiwan's economic development, the will to achieve in a free society, and perseverance in the face of adversity, also played a major role. It sets an example for other nations to follow.

One cannot speak before an anti-communist group without being conscious of the visit of our American President to Red China or the visit of the Russian Chief of State to the United States. Certainly we need open lines of communication to help reduce tensions and to eliminate the basic causes of conflict. But communication to be effective must be a dialogue: a two way operation. We must also look behind the smiling faces of the diplomats. Are there changes in the communist world? Does the communist goal of world revolution still exist? Are the people of mainland China smiling? Is complete sacrifice of intellectual freedom being made in the communist world in exchange for a full stomach? And is grain from the free world helping to sustain totalitarianism by filling those stomachs to the detriment of our own citizens? We, and our Governments must be able to distinguish between what is basically right and temporary expediency.

While it would be presumptuous for me to attempt to tell this conference about communism and its dangers, however, it does seem reasonable for us to think together about differing political principles and goals. We may desire one China and one world, but there is Nationalist China and Communist China. There is also a free world and a Communist world. We cannot close our eyes to differences that exist.

Your organization is to be commended for attempting to bring about a world organization to combat communism. The leadership of all nations of the free world need to be reminded from time to time of the dangers of communism, to be alert and to be prepared. One of our American presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, at the turn of the century in speaking of international affairs and preparedness, said "speak softly, but carry a big stick."

We must remember, however, that the United States is but one country within the family of nations. With only 6% of the population of the world, it cannot alone be the world's policeman and hope to prevail against every gangster nation. Our people are tired of the burden of American soldiers being stationed throughout the world for the past 30 years. The economic drain is becoming increasingly apparent at home. Yet the United States is a rich and a powerful Nation. We may reduce the number of our military personnel but you can be sure that our weaponry will continue to be updated and improved. We will spend whatever amount is necessary to have the quality and quantity of military equipment to meet any emergency that may develop. I am convinced that the people of America want to

be partners working with other nations within the free world who are willing to assume their fair share of the burden of assuring a peaceful world. Mutual assistance treaties between national states may be helpful, as regional alliances may be, but we need more. We need the free world to be brought together for united action, should it prove necessary, against a common enemy anywhere in the world.

You are familiar with the Shanghai joint communique last year between President Nixon and the Premier of Communist China. The President did affirm the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all United States forces and military installations from Taiwan. You should also be aware that in his annual report to the Congress on foreign policy this year the President indicated that while moving toward the goal of normal relations with Peking, the United States has maintained a policy of friendship with the people of Taiwan.

He referred to our diplomatic ties, Mutual Defense Treaty of 1954, and close economic contracts and added on the next page of his report, "first, the United States will keep all of its treaty commitments. We will adjust the manner of our support for our allies to new conditions, and we will base our actions on a realistic assessment of our interests. But as a matter of principle, and as a matter of preserving the stability of Asia, we made it clear that the United States would never repudiate its pledged word nor betray an ally." This is an assurance by the American President on May 3, 1973, in his message to Congress, of the position of the United States. As you know, America has kept its promises and honored its treaties in the past. Perhaps this is the best way to judge its behavior in the future. I cannot see my country standing idly by should any attempt be made by Red China to force its will upon Taiwan. Nor can I see the United States entering into any arrangement with Communist China which would jeopardize the freedom and independence of other Asian people. We also have defense treaties with Japan and the Philippines. One has only to look at a map to see the strategic importance of Taiwan to these countries and to the United States security interests in the western Pacific.

I am concerned about the United States exporting 1.2 million tons of foodgrains to Communist China during the marketing year ending June 30, 1973 and about 14 million tons, if we include corn, to Russia during the same period. This has contributed to inflated grain prices and shortages within the United States. But more important, if we accept the concept of concentrating on our friends and strengthening them where possible, it seems unwise to use our surpluses to strengthen potential enemies. I would hope that both the President and the Congress would re-evaluate our grain export program.

Members of this conference would enjoy and be encouraged by reading the Congressional Record of May 9, 1973. You understand that the Record is a verbatim report of the daily activities of both Houses of the Congress. At that time 43 members of the United States Congress followed one another in speaking in our House of Representatives and complimenting the Republic of China on its progress in recent years. They urged that our Government do nothing to compromise the freedom of the Republic of China and its people in the name of accommodation. One member brought out that the Peking Government had been treacherous and hostile in the past while the Republic of China was an old and trusted friend. He stated it was a sore spot for Red China to have a capitalist democracy flourishing within their shadow and outstripping their Communist regime in all save regimentation.

Another member indicated that the real difference between Taiwan and other people

who have not known similar progress is in the attitude of the people themselves. Having escaped tyranny he felt these good and peace loving people have dedicated themselves to individual freedom and the free enterprise system, whatever the cost. He said that like our own pioneers they have overcome adversity and hardship and have shown the world that freedom can and will prevail. This senior member of the Congress, elected by a different party from mine, continued that there was "little wonder that there exists such strong ties of friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Taiwan."

Still another member said, "It surely is no secret that both ideologically and economically, the Peking Government suffers from tremendous internal complications. It is also no secret, indeed it is very well known that the Government of Taipei has brought unparalleled prosperity and political stability to the peoples of Free China."

"What, one may ask, accounts for this striking contrast? We see it not only in China but in Berlin, Korea, and elsewhere. We should not be afraid to state the obvious. The political and economic contrast of these nations are a clear manifestation of the undeniable superiority of the philosophy of freedom over the philosophy of collectivism."

"Of course, we seek peace, of course we seek more amicable relations with those who would be our adversaries."

"But this does not mean that we should not invoke every opportunity to lend moral support to our friends, and particularly friends as dedicated to the principles of freedom as are the citizens of the Republic of China."

"Free China today stands as a shining example to freedom loving people in all parts of the world."

Similar language was used by Congressman after Congressman, 43 in all. Let me add that Members of the House of Representatives of necessity speak for the people they represent. Since they must face the electorate every two years they are very close to the approximately 500,000 people each of them represents. And so my friends, you're not alone in your desire for peace and freedom. The vast majority of the people of the world share this desire. However, I hope that all the nations represented here will continue to work for a free society and not permit police state domination or totalitarianism to be imposed by conquest of neighboring nations. The United States seeks to be a good neighbor. We want to work with you in the development of self determination for all nations of the world.

#### DÉTENTE AT ANY COST? NEWS ANALYSIS CITES PATTERN OF SOVIET REPRESSION

### HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, while we gladly relegate the cold war to history's pages, I think the United States—its officials and its people—face a portentous dilemma in deciding how far we go to achieve detente with the Soviet Union.

All of us are familiar with the Soviet Government's repressive policies to discourage emigration and to punish those who dare ask for permission to leave the country. Prominent Soviet citizens have been placed in asylums for stating their

views on freedom, or the lack of it, in the Soviet Union. Economic penalties and harassment have formed part of the pattern of repression to prevent people from speaking out against abuses by the State.

Surely, we want meaningful detente with this great superpower. Yet, these excesses perpetrated by the Soviet Government, are repugnant to Americans whose own republic was born to free the people of unwarranted government actions that suppress the freedoms which we now take for granted.

It is not enough to say that we cannot interfere in or criticize the internal workings of another government. For what is at issue here are what we call the inalienable rights of people. To be silent in the face of tyranny is to betray the ideals on which this Nation was founded and to corrupt the moral leadership of this country that encourages true freedom for peoples throughout the world.

Détente, for the most part, means an expansion of trade with the Soviet Union. Obviously, this fosters goodwill, promotes peaceful relationships, and is important to our economic situation. Yet, I cannot believe that the national administration or the Congress is willing to settle for detente, that is, the mighty buck, at the abdication of moral leadership by the United States.

The perils of detente are every bit as real, while not so visible, as were those of the departed cold war. I believe we must utilize every approach and stratagem to impress upon the Soviets that they cannot, in effect, share the results of our society while stifling in their own land the very human rights that have enabled us to achieve our level of influence and affluence.

Along with many of my colleagues, I am sponsoring legislation to withhold most-favored-nation status and credits to those countries which restrict freedom of emigration. I acknowledge that this is not the most acceptable method of helping the oppressed in the Soviet Union and its satellites. But, we are indeed limited in what we can do. We cannot ignore the plight of people oppressed—the ramifications at home and abroad would erode all for which we have stood and for what we have strived in almost 200 years as a Nation.

I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this news analysis from the August 31, 1973 edition of the Washington Post which illustrates the latest events in the Soviet Government's drive against so-called dissidents. It is a timely reminder for us that we must pursue a careful, prudent and alert course in dealing with Moscow.

The news analysis follows:

#### DRIVE AGAINST DISSIDENTS VERSUS DÉTENTE (By Robert G. Kaiser)

Moscow, August 30.—For nearly two years, the Soviet Union's political police have been trying to stamp out the last remnants of active intellectual opposition to the regime. Much of their work proceeded quietly and efficiently.

But in the last few weeks a remarkable coincidence of events has put the Soviets' campaign against dissidence at the center of international attention, vividly revealing one of the weak links in the new system of detente that East and West are jointly building.

Just this month, the Soviet image has suffered these embarrassments:

Outbursts of apparently official anti-Semitism at the World University Games in Moscow.

Bitter denunciations of the Soviet system by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, probably the single best-known private citizen in the outside world.

Defiant public statements from Andrei Sakharov, principal developer of the Soviet hydrogen bomb and another nonconformist intellectual whose fame assures wide publicity for his statements.

International protests against the new three-year labor camp sentence for the writer Andrei Amalrik.

Unfavorable publicity associated with the sudden removal of Soviet citizenship from Zhores Medvedev, an internationally known biologist.

A political trial in Moscow this week, which the Soviets are deliberately publicizing, has also drawn international attention to the campaign against dissidence.

Each of these events is tied to the security forces' attempts to wipe out the active dissidents, a campaign the Soviets regard as an internal matter.

#### STATE'S RIGHT

"The state has the right to defend itself," one of the Soviet Union's senior law officers told Sakharov a fortnight ago, a message that Soviet officials repeat in private conversations with foreigners.

We have our own customs and traditions, and our own way of dealing with troublemakers, they say, and foreigners have no right to question us about them.

Yet foreigners do question them, and the Soviet authorities have recognized the connection between their domestic policies and international detente. The connection is acknowledged in Soviet replies to foreign critics.

For example, in response to numerous documented accusations that Soviet mental hospitals are used for the forcible treatment of dissidents, the government news agency Tass recently carried an interview with a Soviet professor of psychiatry. Disputing foreign criticisms, the professor said that "hired anti-Sovietists obligingly spread these lies to please the circle that are interested in poisoning the international atmosphere and in preventing further detente."

Such comments represent a recognition that detente can be hindered if foreigners object to real or imagined aspects of Soviet internal policy.

In recent days the Soviets have mounted a propaganda offensive to respond to their critics. The responses, like that of the professor of psychiatry, often consist primarily of attacks on the accusers.

Another common response is a blanket denial. For instance, Tass simply denied that there were any displays of anti-Semitism at the university games, though these outbursts were witnessed by numerous foreigners, and one act was photographed.

Another form of reply is to blame manifestations of domestic dissidence on foreigners. This line emerged from the political trial of Pyotr Yakir and Viktor Krassin this week.

The speed and strength of recent Soviet replies to foreign and domestic critics confirms that their criticism is taken seriously. The question remains how the Soviets will respond to it.

The current leadership has shown an unprecedented willingness to react constructively to some foreign pressure. The best example of this is the decision to allow thousands of Soviets to emigrate, a decision that would have been inconceivable without foreign pressure.

#### IDEOLOGICAL ORTHODOXY

Yet the same leadership has decided that relaxation of tensions with the West must be accompanied by the strictest ideological

orthodoxy at home, a decision that has led to the crackdown on dissidents.

There are hints of a dispute inside the leadership on ideological issues. Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the Communist Party, said in a speech this month that he welcomed a freer exchange of people and ideas with the West, because this would win "more supporters for the ideas of scientific Communism."

This confident approach to a sensitive subject has not appeared in any other official Soviet statement before or after Brezhnev's speech. A few days after he spoke, Pravda published an authoritative article ignoring Brezhnev's formulation and reiterating the familiar Soviet position that any exchanges of people and ideas must respect the laws and customs of all countries—meaning specifically, censorship in the Soviet Union.

Whether these two views represent a debate or two sides of the same coin is not known.

In any case, discussions about vague notions like the freer exchange of people and ideas can't cover the difficult, specific problems the Soviet leaders now face. The most obvious of these is what to do with two world famous Soviet citizens, Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov, whose statements command enormous attention.

Are they to be stamped out too? Or would the outcry abroad that would certainly follow any further repression of them jeopardize more important causes, like the detente policy? Is that policy already threatened by Western reaction to the suppression of nonconformists in the Soviet Union?

The Soviets may feel that they can, in the Washington phrase, tough it out. The Western countries may well decide that it is preferable to acquiesce to Soviet domestic policies and sacrifice the tiny handful of dissidents, if trying to defend them would jeopardize the new and favorable international atmosphere.

Moreover, even the most indignant Westerners can have trouble finding ways to pressure Moscow. One astute Westerner here asked, "What are they going to do, say we won't sell you our computers unless you release Andrei Amalrik?"

Nor, if the West is trying to nudge the Soviet Union out of its historic isolation, is it necessarily desirable to pressure the country's leaders to change their historic attitude toward nonconformists at the same time.

The Soviet word for dissidents translates literally as "those who think differently." Differently from what? That question hasn't been asked in Russia for years, neither under the czars nor under their successors.

### THE SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMIT IS TOO LOW

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the financial problems of our elderly citizens are reaching crisis proportions.

By limiting the amount of money a senior citizen may earn without losing social security benefits, we are discouraging senior citizens from continuing any kind of employment, although it is obvious that most of our elderly cannot live on social security benefits alone.

Back in April, I joined in introducing H.R. 7092 to eliminate the outside earnings limitation for recipients of social security benefits.

A recent editorial in the Miami Herald agrees and persuasively makes the case for removal of the earnings ceiling.

The editorial follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Aug. 3, 1973]

#### EARNINGS LIMIT IS STILL TOO LOW

The origin of Social Security is to blame for more than one of its built-in flaws. The system of compulsory government insurance first was mandated by Congress during the long depression of the 1930s. A major objective then was to induce the elderly to retire, vacating payroll slots for the millions of jobless persons.

That notion seems laughable today in cities like Greater Miami where employers are scraping the bottom of the barrel for help. Yet the effect of the old goal lingers in a rigid, low limit on the earnings of Social Security beneficiaries. The ceiling is \$2,100 now, rising to \$2,400 on Jan. 1. For each \$2 of additional earnings, a cut of \$1 is required in Social Security benefits.

The limit was assailed and defended afresh last month at hearings before the Senate Special Committee on Aging.

Wilbur J. Cohen, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, urged Congress "to go slow changing the retirement test until you have solved the inequities" of the 3.6 million elderly living below the poverty level.

Their number contrasts with the 1.5 million retirees who would be affected by liberalization.

The opposite side of the coin was presented by a spokesman for two organizations of retired persons. He argued for lifting the limit to \$3,600 at a cost of \$1.3 billion.

His reasoning is persuasive: a working retiree is cut off from Social Security and thus put on short rations while his non-working neighbor continues to draw his benefits plus unlimited income from securities or rental property.

"To the average American, this is discrimination in favor of the well-to-do and reward for idle living," the witness contended. "It is basically wrong to tell a person he can't work."

We cannot and would not gainsay that viewpoint. We have repeatedly advocated a lifting of the earnings ceiling, not just for the money involved but for the well-being of the elderly still able to work and the good of the national economy, which can use their skills.

It is not, of course, a one-sided issue. Resolving it fairly to all will be difficult, if not impossible.

### REHABILITATION OF HISTORIC HOMES

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in the July 1973 edition of the Preservation News published by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, there appeared an article concerning New Orleans. In early 1972 a group of young citizens there organized and began promoting the idea of rehabilitating homes in an historic section of the city. The Coliseum Square Association as it came to be called is in my judgment a shining example of the constructive role that preservationists play in the rebuilding of our urban centers. The text of that article follows:



URBAN PIONEERS—A STORY OF RESTORATION  
IN THE INNER CITY

(By Carleton Knight III)

NEW ORLEANS.—Visitors to this city always see the French Quarter and may often see the Garden District with its large residences. But, there is another area they ought to visit—one that until a year and a half ago was considered "no-man's land," but today shows the effect of private individuals accomplishing the objectives of urban renewal and especially the effect of young people interested in preservation.

Briefly, here is what has happened in the Lower Garden District: The first private renewal began in October 1971, less than six months later an activist preservation organization was formed. Since then the group, the Coliseum Square Association, has succeeded in having the area listed in the National Register; has stopped, for the time being at least, the governor of Louisiana from building a second Mississippi River bridge with ramps through the middle of the district; has stopped the city from proceeding with its plans to cover over an old street made of paving blocks; and has led action to get a city-wide bond issue approved by the voters that will restore the park that is at the core of the district. Thirty houses are now under restoration.

Not too many new organizations can boast such an effective record in so short a time.

The Lower Garden District lies between the downtown area and the Garden District. It was laid out from old cotton and indigo plantations in the early 1800's and by the 1850's was a thriving residential neighborhood. Many of the houses, which are mostly Greek Revival, had large gardens, but the area was a mix and included commercial structures, churches and small houses as well as mansions.

In the late 1800's the area began a slow decline. Part of the problem was the expansion of a railroad into the district and the resulting increase in industry near the river. Downtown warehouses expanded into the district and many of the once-beautiful, tree-lined streets became full-scale truck routes. A major assault came shortly before World War II when a larger housing project was built, but the final blow, in 1957, was the Mississippi River bridge and its ramps that cut up the area, destroyed houses and remain a visual intrusion on Coliseum Square. Later, in the 1960's, as if to heap insult upon injury, scattered-site housing was to take many more old houses.

BOOK BRINGS IMPROVEMENT

A change for the better came about in mid-1971 when the first volume of a five-part series, *New Orleans Architecture*, was published by the Friends of the Cabildo. The first book dealt entirely with the Lower Garden District (New Orleans most endangered area, said the Friends) and chronicled its architecture and steady deterioration. Even while the book was being written, demolition was going on—more than 300 houses were lost in that time alone.

Seeing the book and realizing what could be done with some of the houses, Duncan and Camille Strachan and Louis Costa each bought property in fall 1971. "It was the publication of the book that convinced us we could do something," says Costa.

It was that first step that encouraged the activity since then. In the intervening year and a half, more than 75 pieces of property changed hands—some owners have purchased more than one. Approximately 40 young couples and single people bought houses during this time and are restoring them. The work is slow and painstaking—done by the owners themselves.

The joint effort began in January 1972, when four individuals obtained a charter for a non-profit organization, the Coliseum Square Association, and issued a newspaper

invitation for residents and interested persons to meet in March. Several people who had stuck it out through the worst years came.

The first effort was National Register listing for the district, and this was achieved after the herculean volunteer efforts of a local architect, Henry W. Krotzer, Jr. The forms were processed and the area was listed October 1972.

GOVERNOR EDWARDS BRIDGE

As work began to have the Lower Garden District listed in the National Register, a major threat to the area was posed by Louisiana Gov. Edwin Edwards. He decided that it was time to build a second bridge across the Mississippi.

The new bridge was to be upstream from the first; thus ramps from it would cut the Lower Garden District in half. Protests against the bridge came from all areas of the city and the climax came in the form of a Coliseum Square Association parade. Association president Duncan G. Strachan collects old military vehicles and a number of association members piled into one of his half-tracks and were driven to a downtown hotel where a meeting of the bridge commission was underway. The scene—sign-carrying protestors in a vehicle from Field Marshal Edwin Rommel's African desert campaign—was well covered by the media and had its desired effect.

The governor delayed any further action and promised public hearings for any proposed design. The New Orleans City Council opposed the upstream site. A citizens committee was named to select a location, but there remains doubt whether it will ever be built.

Ralph Thayer, an area resident, points up an area of growing concern. "If the bridge is built and cars are dumped into the central business district, as they are now, there will be nowhere for them to go. This could mean a rebirth of plans for the Riverfront Expressway." (Preservationists will recall U.S. Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe's July 1969 decision to withhold federal funds from that highway, after a protracted dispute.)

WEEKEND IN NEW ORLEANS

The activities of a recent weekend will give some idea of the easy-going lifestyle, the spirit of friendliness and the activity that can be found throughout the Lower Garden District. On a bright and clear Saturday morning this reporter was taken on a walking tour of some architectural highlights of the area.

Magazine Street has many commercial buildings with fine architectural details covered by asbestos siding. Some of the buildings are now being restored. St. Mary's Assumption Church (1858-60) is closed but will soon be reopened. Although badly damaged in a 1965 hurricane, it was announced in June that restoration funds have been raised and that work will begin. The interior of the sanctuary is a huge space with much plaster ornamentation and stained glass.

After lunch at Roccaforte's (known to locals as the Antoine's of the Lower Garden District), it was time for a parade. Celebrations of that sort are frequent in the city and there were hundreds of costumed marchers as well as floats, bands and Dixie beer. Members of the Coliseum Square Association gathered on the back of an open truck and joined the rest of the parade in an old city tradition—throwing cabbages, potatoes and dubloons at the people lining the streets.

Dinner that evening at the Strachan's restored home was followed by a private performance of the New Leviathan Oriental Fox-trot Orchestra's master vocalist, George Schmidt (the band played at the National Trust New Orleans Gala in April). Later there was a 2 a.m. ride to an Art Deco laun-

dry "that you simply must see." Although it was dark, one could see the oddly angular cornice and the richly colored ceramic tile detailing. The building is for sale.

FEMALE GHOSTS AND CAMELBACKS

Sunday saw another walking tour, including a visit to a house straight out of Tennessee Williams and reputedly inhabited by a female ghost. A half-octagon side porch with a huge four-blade overhead fan sticks out into a jungle of a side yard. The dark interior is lighted by working gas chandeliers and the house appears frozen in time from the mid-1800's.

Lunch was served at the recently restored home of a young psychiatrist and his wife. Then off to see more houses under restoration. A young city planner and his wife, Ralph and Leah Thayer, are doing over a "double shotgun camelback"—the "shotgun" refers to the floor plan, known as Pullman in the East (the "double" indicates there are two, side-by-side), and the "camelback" refers to a second story that is only over the back part of the house. Louis Costa, another city planner, is redoing his own house and has purchased the one next door as a rental property.

URBAN PIONEERS

Duncan Strachan describes his fellow Coliseum Square residents as "urban pioneers," and says that they have shown it is "possible to carve out and reclaim sections of the urban wasteland." He fully expects that America's inner cities will soon be repopulated and that old neighborhoods will spring again to life.

"This is promised," he says, "not merely by the resolves of a few preservationists, but by the swing of a great historic pendulum that affects all cities. This swing dictates the passing of the long night of urban crises and the dawn of a new era in America."

With impassioned words such as those, and the hope and work of dedicated people like the residents of the Lower Garden District, there can be little doubt that his prophecy will come true. And when it does, the credit surely must go to the urban pioneers.

H.R. 8580

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, since the late 1960's there has been an alarming increase in the incidence of terrorism and violence at nonunion construction sites. The magnitude of this problem is evidenced by the Associated Building Contractors, Inc., documentation of over 170 acts of violence against their members, including fires, bombings, vandalism, and assaults. The estimated cost of these attacks exceeds \$5 million.

This problem was compounded by last February's Supreme Court ruling in the case of United States against Enmons. This decision effectively bars any Federal intervention in this area with its finding that the Hobbs Act as presently written does not apply to violence committed in an effort to obtain the legitimate ends of collective bargaining. Thus, the entire burden of investigating and preventing this spreading wave of terrorism rests with State and local law enforcement officers. In the past, these officials have demonstrated an inability or unwillingness to effectively deal with this problem.

The Hobbs Act Amendment of 1973, H.R. 8580, is designed to allow Federal investigation and prosecution of incidents of job site violence. If enacted, it would make violence, sabotage, and extortion committed during labor-management disputes resulting in more than \$2,000 in property damage, a Federal offense.

I think the need for this corrective legislation is quite clear and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

#### THE ONLY WATERGATE HERO

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, little recognition has been given to the man whose alertness and quick response led to the arrest of the Watergate burglars. This lack of attention, I regret to say, may result in part from the fact that Mr. Frank Wills, an \$85-a-week security guard, is black. But without Mr. Willis the Watergate scandal would not have come to light. It is time he was recognized by the Congress of the United States. In this respect I submit the following article by Robert A. Jordan, of the Boston Globe:

#### FORGOTTEN MAN OF WATERGATE

(By Robert A. Jordan)

The Watergate scandal has its "forgotten man," and he is not, as one magazine purports, Spiro T. Agnew.

He is Frank Wills, a black security guard whose alertness led to the arrests of those who broke into the National Democratic Committee's headquarters. As the world now knows, that criminal episode has mushroomed into the worst political scandal in the nation's history.

It was Wills who, on the night of June 17, discovered that a lock on the door of the Democratic office had been tampered with. Realizing that someone could still be inside, Wills called the local police, who arrested the Watergate burglars.

It is not every day that an \$80-a-week security guard can alter the course of U.S. history. Since that time, Wills changed jobs in order to add \$5 to his weekly paycheck, bringing it to \$85.

It is easy for the news media to generally ignore a black person holding a menial job. After all, he could hardly compare in importance to such men as H. R. Haldeman, John Ehrlichman, John Mitchell, John Dean and President Nixon. Nor could he be mentioned in the same breath as Sen. Sam Ervin Jr., chairman of the Watergate Committee, and the eight other members. He is considered too small, too unimportant.

Yet, if it were not for Wills, there may never have been a Watergate scandal. The fact is, Wills has not been given the credit he deserves. Even most blacks who are aware of Wills's role can't remember his name.

This reflects an unfortunate attitude in our society. His blackness and low-paying job may be among the reasons why he has not received proper recognition. Also, the news media in general still has its prejudices. But many of them merely reflect America's own shortcomings. In all likelihood, if Wills were white, he might have received more public attention.

However, the news media is not alone in the mistreating of Wills. The Democratic Party, which has more to gain from Watergate than any other organization, is also to blame. According to a news article, an

unidentified party spokesman said the Democrats "have talked" about doing something for him. Apparently, they have not gone beyond the talking stage.

To most blacks, as well as whites, the Watergate scandal has been a blessing. It has, at least temporarily, stopped the Nixon Administration from turning back the clock on the black movement toward equality.

More than a few blacks feel that Mr. Nixon should resign or be impeached. But then, there is Vice President Agnew, who is hardly considered by the nation's minorities as an improvement.

#### THE TRAGIC LOSS OF DR. GEORGE WILEY

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of us were deeply saddened and shocked over the tragic accident which claimed the life of Dr. George A. Wiley early last month. Not only have we lost a friend but this country will surely suffer from the absence of his counsel, his insight, his leadership and his dedication on behalf of those who are at the very bottom of the economic ladder and who are struggling to secure those rights and basic human dignity which has so long been denied to them.

Throughout his all-too-brief life George Wiley was at the forefront of the various efforts made to insure that all Americans, regardless of color, economic station or background were afforded those basic rights which are supposedly guaranteed to us. He could have chosen to pursue what would certainly have been a successful career as a university professor. However, it was not in George Wiley's character to ignore the plight of his fellow man. Even while serving as a young officer in the Army he involved himself in the growing civil rights movement and, while assigned at Fort Lee, Va., he organized a voter registration program in neighboring Petersburg. He became increasingly involved in the civil rights efforts and was eventually selected as the associate national director of CORE.

However, Dr. Wiley's most notable achievements occurred after he founded and headed the National Welfare Rights Organization—a meaningful and effective grassroots effort which fought for the legal rights of welfare recipients. Under his dynamic leadership the NWRO was successful in establishing a welfare recipient's right to privacy; it overturned residency requirements; and it secured administrative hearings for those recipients whose grants had been threatened.

It has been written that George Wiley had a rare ability to inspire people to efforts they had not thought themselves capable of making. Because of this unique talent the NWRO succeeded in making use of a small group of highly talented lawyers, organizers, and others who gave a great deal of their time and energy, frequently at much personal expense. However, it was hard, if not impossible, to avoid being caught up in George Wiley's enthusiasm and dedication of purpose.

Early this year Dr. Wiley felt he had new causes to pursue and left the NWRO to found the Movement for Economic Justice which he had hoped to organize into a coalition of the working poor, the unemployed, and underemployed, senior citizens, the lower middle class and various health, consumer, and housing organizations. He believed that welfare rights had to be linked with other groups on a common economic agenda in an effort to redirect our sorely distorted national priorities and to take affirmative action to narrow the increasingly broad chasm between the haves and have-nots in this Nation.

We are indeed all better for having had the privilege of knowing and, for some of us, of working with George Wiley, and his untimely death—particularly at this critical juncture in our national history—will be seriously felt. I believe, however, that we can gain a great deal of inspiration from his example and we have an obligation to carry on the important causes to which Dr. Wiley devoted his boundless energies and his life.

#### JOHN BUCHANAN RETIRES— ACTIVE UNIONIST

### Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, John Buchanan, who retired from active service as a trade unionist in July 1973, has been a local union officer in the movie-TV industry for 30 years.

First elected as the president of Service Employees Union Local 278, AFL-CIO—Service Employees International Union—he was elevated to the chief executive officer of his union as secretary-treasurer in the late 1950's, and has remained in the position until his retirement. Mr. Buchanan also served as the vice president of the California State Council of SEIU and as vice president of the southern California Joint Council of SEIU. He was appointed a member of the civil rights committee of the Service Employees International Union, and continues in this important office.

Throughout his tenure in the various offices of his union, "Buck" Buchanan devoted his time toward securing excellent wages, fringe benefits, job security, and many other gains necessary for the union membership who are employed in service positions—building maintenance—in this important industry.

NOTED EDITOR TAKES A LOOK AT  
THE PRESS—AND FINDS THE PICTURE  
DEPRESSING

### HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, in this era of hypocritical piety by so much of the country's major news media, I was

comforted to note a splendid address delivered August 5 by Mr. Eugene H. Methvin, senior editor of the Reader's Digest, Washington editorial office.

Mr. President, most of my own career has been spent in the news business. In recent years, I have found myself disgusted at the manner in which so many "noted" journalists and commentators have prostituted themselves and their profession. But, Mr. President, the boom has been lowered by Mr. Methvin. He has pinned the tail on a number of miserable journalistic donkeys.

Senators would do well to read Mr. Methvin's speech, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SPEECH BY EUGENE H. METHVIN

(Senior Editor, The Reader's Digest, Washington Editorial Office, before the Annual Award of Merit luncheon, Section of Bar Activities, American Bar Association convention, August 5, 1973, Washington, D.C.)

You gentlemen of the bar may be interested in how a lifelong journalist like me came to the formal study of law. When I had my first job on a daily newspaper, as a cub reporter at the tender age of 17 on the Atlanta Constitution, I was assigned to cover the police beat. Now my high school civics had taught me what the Fourth Amendment says—that a man shall be secure in his person, and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmation, and so on. And I remember how astonished I was as I looked over the police blotter and log in the Atlanta jail and kept seeing this or that prisoner committed—and the only explanation recorded was: "on suspicion," or "suspicion . . ." of this or that. And I asked the seasoned old police reporter who was my mentor what in tarnation this meant; and he said, as if no further explanation was needed, "Well, this is the way it's done." At that point I didn't challenge the practice further, because in the 1950's 17-year-olds had not yet started providing answers to all mankind's problems. But that thing bothered me; and I decided that there must be something I didn't know and should, and therefore I ought to go to law school if I was going to be a reporter so I could keep an eye on the lawyers—because if that was the way it was done, undoubtedly they'd bear watching.

And there was an old lawyer in my hometown whom I greatly admired. When I told him I'd decided to go to law school, his response gave me a portentous hint of the mysteries that were to be unfolded to me. He said "It's a shame—a shame to mess up a perfectly good mind with the study of law."

Well, I did a year in law school, figuring that would equip me to keep an eye on the lawyers, in behalf of the people I would represent in the Fourth Estate. And I learned to penetrate some of the mysteries, and drop phrases like "res ipsa loquitur" and whatnot. (You may have heard of the old Georgia sheriff sent to serve a bench warrant who came back and reported: "Judge, his lawyer says I can't see him because he has a writ of *hic in Gum Swampus non cum outibus*.) You know what Oliver Wendell Holmes said: A man doesn't need to know Latin to be a lawyer, but at least he should have forgotten it.

Well, at least I have forgotten a good deal of high school Latin—and a citation or two from my criminal law and legal method and evidence and such.

But I remember enough Latin and law to know that a *subpoena duces tecum* isn't an

invitation to come to the courthouse and have tea with the D.A. and the grand jurors.

Just a couple of months ago, it seemed as if every reporter in the nation was being chased by a sheriff with a subpoena. If you believed what you read in the newspapers and saw on the newscasts, it looked like the White House and Justice Department were about to abolish the First Amendment and put all the journalists in jail.

Now it looks like the journalists are about to abolish the Administration and put everybody in the White House and Justice Department in jail.

If things can change so fast, it just goes to show you shouldn't take the present mess too hard. In the space of three months, we are seeing some of the wackiest reversals in the history of circus acrobatics. Most journalists and newspapers were demanding "absolute privilege" for themselves last spring. Now they are denouncing the President for daring to claim "executive privilege" for himself and his White House tapes. Just listen to some of them.

"The Washington Post found that the President's assertion of executive privilege 'comes very close to an assertion that certain aspects of the presidency are apart from and above the rule of law.' (7-29-73)

"The New York Times declared, 'This new Nixon Doctrine virtually sets the person of the President above law and public ethics.' (7-24-73)

Yet both newspapers a few months ago were assuring us that the free press would be dead without absolute privilege. Typically, Walter Cronkite declared (5-2-73) that reporter's sources must be granted an absolute privilege or the free press is finished. "The only remedy is a law that states simply, and therefore eloquently, that the First Amendment means what it says and no reporter can be haled before any government body and forced to reveal confidential sources of information." Yet we are now assured that freedom will be equally dead if the President succeeds in maintaining confidentiality of the White House tapes.

It seems to me New Jersey's governor gave us a wiser guide in vetoing a bill to give newsmen a broad privilege. He said: "It is no more acceptable to have the press all powerful than to have the government all powerful."

I find it hard to see why a reporter should be allowed to refuse a subpoena while the President of the United States should be required to answer it. As Senator Sam would say, it seems to me either one could respond to orderly inquiry in proper cases, and the heavens wouldn't fall. What's the sauce for the gobbling geese of the Fourth Estate ought to be sauce for the great big gander in the White House.

Did anyone notice that the very session of the Ervin Committee that voted to subpoena the President was held in the secrecy of executive session? The senators wanted to cloak their deliberations in secrecy so individuals could speak their minds. That's the same reason reporters need a reasonable confidentiality for their sources. And it's the same reason the President wants to maintain the confidentiality of his White House conferences and papers. We can laugh at the contradiction in the Fourth Estate's stance. Otherwise, we'd be obliged to weep—because it means we've lost all sense of moderation, all ability to see other sides of an argument.

As a practicing shoe-leather reporter corrupted by the study of law, I'd like to say a few words on the ethics of burglary and cover-ups and the people's right to know. After all, what were those Watergate burglars going to do with any interesting documents they found, but leak them to Jack Anderson? Anderson's own top investigator was recently arrested and charged with possessing documents stolen from the Bureau of

Indian Affairs. A grand jury had the good sense to no-bill the case. Later Anderson's sidekick asserted he would indeed have put the documents to use for their column if there had been anything interesting in them—but it turned out to be only a law book, among other things. He wrote: "Such a 'use' of Government documents—stolen or not—has been protected by the Constitution." (NYT 2-8-73) Bet you didn't know we journalists have a Constitutional right to steal, or at least to receive stolen documents, did you? (President Nixon doesn't need a good lawyer. He needs a press card . . .)

I confess to being puzzled at the journalistic outrage over the Watergate break-in. Journalists ought to have considerable sympathy for the burglars. It was, after all, the New York Times and Washington Post that first made wholesale theft of documents in this town stylish by making much hoop-la over Jack Anderson's subordination of the burglary of Sen. Tom Dodd's office. They all used the stolen Dodd documents to stage one of the most celebrated mass media lynchings of recent times. Drowned out was the still, small murmur of those who doubted the propriety of such burglaries in pursuit of "the people's right to know."

Indeed, the Pulitzer Prize selection committee, composed of our most distinguished journalists, voted to honor Anderson for that cup. The Columbia trustees stopped them. But nobody went to jail for the theft. In fact the thieves were praised for patriotism and idealism—though they were actually motivated by the basest personal vengeance.

We had another celebrated case a few years back involving filching files and bugging the office of a State Department security officer. His sin was testifying truthfully under subpoena before a Senate committee. The bugging boss in that case gave false testimony and was rewarded with a cushy job in—of all places—the Federal Communications Commission. (He was a lawyer, incidentally, not a journalist) On that round there was no outcry from the Fourth Estate of "foul" or "cover-up".

So why should the Watergate burglars have thought they were engaging in any serious felony? If Jack Anderson deserves a Pulitzer, so do G. Gordon Liddy and E. Howard Hunt. They've all sought to liberate the secret files of Washington with equal zest and a common methodology. In fact, Anderson has reportedly known one of the Watergate burglars for years—Frank Sturgis—and got him out of jail after the break-in. Probably he was hoping for a few useful documents in gratitude; or maybe professional services at some future date.

I confess once again to being thoroughly confused. After all, I went to both journalism school and law school, and both teach you to ask mean questions. For example, is there really any difference between stealing Ellsberg's psychiatrist's files or a Democratic senator's files, and stealing the Democratic Party's files or Defense Department files, so that the public might learn the secrets hidden there? (And I shouldn't leave out those stolen FBI files from the Media, Pa. office). Would the fearless purveyors of the stolen Dodd papers and the stolen Pentagon papers and the stolen FBI papers have turned up their noses at any juicy scandal offered in some stolen Democratic National Committee papers? Is it okay if you don't actually execute the burglary yourself—if you only take the burglars' swag and ask no questions about where they got it?

Ah, me—you see it: a mind thoroughly messed up with the study of law. Somebody once said if you could teach a parrot to answer every question by repeating, "Supply and demand," you could make him a professor of economics at the Harvard Business School and nobody would ever notice the difference.

Well, likewise, I think if you could teach the parrot to say, "Checks and balances," you could make him a professor of constitutional law in the Harvard Law School and nobody would miss anything essential.

*Checks and balances.* The men who wrote the U. S. Constitution feared two extremes—tyranny and anarchy, an unchecked centralized authority, and a disintegration of authority into popular tumult. It seems to me we're now teetering between the two extremes, with each ogre chasing us toward the other. (Aristotle noted this natural tendency in popular governments two thousand years ago.) We see the Fourth Estate asserting that reporters must not even be summoned into a grand jury room. We see journalists claiming the right to publish anything they can glean or steal from government files during wartime, even if it jeopardizes the government's capacity to negotiate secretly through foreign governments to end the killing. All in the name of "the people's right to know". Don't the people have a right *not* to know a few things?

Here we have a disguise for lawlessness that is as dangerous as the spirit embodied in the Watergate scandal: That any action under cloak of a highminded cause is constitutional, lawful, laudable. The journalist's demand for an absolute privilege of secrecy for his sources violates a basic rule of checks and balances—that no man shall be a judge in his own cause. It is as arrogant in its way as was Attorney General John Mitchell's assertion of an absolute right to wiretap or bug any person he chooses in pursuit of domestic tranquility. It asserts that one should be above the law, that he will not trust our time-tested institution of due process adjudication.

For my part, as one journalist, I not only find such assertions abhorrent, I find them among the gravest threats to a free press in my memory. They represent First Amendment Ku Kluxery. And they must be opposed by thoughtful friends of the First Amendment. Only a fair press will remain a free press. And those listening closely to the grass roots can hear a strong counterpoint behind the noise and public outrage over Watergate. It is outrage at the news media's super righteousness and—in many instances—demonstrable carelessness with the truth and reputations of innocent individuals or with public welfare and tranquility. People are fed up with the attitude represented by Jack Anderson's ballet dance in the Eagleton affair—that it is more important to lynch a suspected scoundrel in the media than to check the facts first and be absolutely fair and accurate. And that attitude is all too widespread.

In fact, if anything can rationally explain the self-confessed conduct of John Mitchell, Jeb Magruder and John Dean in covering up behind the Watergate burglars, it is an exaggerated fear of exactly this kind of mass media extremism. And certain it is that extremism begets extremism.

Most journalists, it seems, have not read the Bill of Rights beyond the First Amendment—to the Sixth Amendment, for example, which gives a criminal defendant an unadulterated right to compulsory process—presumably against reporters, too. And it grants a right to confront witnesses, not faceless, anonymous "sources close to" somebody.

Few journalists have any concept of our time-tested constitutional and legal methods, or of the case-by-case definition of rights and balancing of conflicting rights through due process of law. Unfortunately, life itself does not grant any absolute certainties. So how can a Bill of Rights do so? As Justice Holmes once put it, a man's rights often depend upon his estimating correctly what a jury will later decide. And a good lawyer today would add: upon his estimating

correctly what five justices will later agree on. (You see how far we've come in the fifty years since Holmes spoke in transferring power from juries to judges.)

The fact remains: rights must be asserted and defended in specific cases and circumstances, and against other parties asserting conflicting rights and values. And juries and judges must decide these cases and controversies "in the totality of circumstances", to quote one pregnant legalism. And legislators know full well they can never write rules to cover every case. The Philadelphia Framers recognized the indistinct boundary when they deposited "the judicial power" and "the legislative power" into separate laps without any effort to define the limits of judicial review and legislative supremacy. But too few of our journalists have any comprehension of this historic tradition and process.

Journalistic partisanship in asserting our own rights results in large areas of public ignorance and confusion. The media are filled with ex parte self assertion and adulation. The dissenters are seldom heard. The job of filling the void necessarily must devolve upon the men of the bar, schooled in law and history. Frequently lawyers must tell clients about the limits on their legal rights. And lawyers will have to tell the journalists they can't have their way all the way, all the time, either. This means there will necessarily be perpetual static between the Press and the Bar. Lawyers are accustomed to winning some and losing some. In every case, some lawyers are losers. But journalists are accustomed to being always right. Remember that great scene from Bernard Shaw's *Major Barbara*? The billionaire cannon king asks his freshly-graduated son how he plans to make a living, since he repudiates the cannon business: "Is there anything you know or care for?"

Stephen answers: "I know the difference between right and wrong!"

This hugely tickles the cannon king: "What!" he cackles. "No capacity for business, no knowledge of law, no sympathy with art, no pretension to philosophy; only a simple knowledge of the secret that has puzzled all the philosophers, baffled all the lawyers, muddled all the men of business, and ruined most of the artists; the *secret of right and wrong*. At 24, too! Stephen, I've found your profession for you. You're a born journalist."

Needless to say, I believe in checks and balances. I think, when Chief Justice John Marshall asserted the right to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, some journalist should have asked instantly who would declare acts of the judiciary unconstitutional? And when journalists assert the right to refuse subpoenas, some lawyer must ask who will call them to account? And of course when the President asserts such a right, the same question must be raised and resolved.

So I would offer one small proposal to you gentlemen of the bar today, to advance the cause of the Law Society. I would suggest that you arrange with the law schools to swing the doors wide for journalists to enter as special students; to take such courses as legal method, practice and procedure, evidence, and constitutional law. Let's get more journalists into the law schools, and more lawyers into the press box and on camera. When we watch the performance of such reporter-lawyers as Fred Graham and Clark Mollenhoff, we cannot help but be inspired to hope for this trend to grow. (Incidentally, if Mollenhoff had not left the White House Office of Counsel to the President to return to reporting, nobody would ever have heard of John Dean. And probably Watergate would be as obscure as Rosie O'Grady's Boarding House. Mollenhoff says he's always maintained that good government is good

politics—only nobody has ever tried it. You can see his mind was not messed up with the study of law!)

Needless to say, it's an exciting time to be a lawyer, and an exciting time to be a journalist—and a superb time to have a little toehold in both camps. I cannot give you stone tablets telling you the difference between right and wrong. But I can pass along one certain observation by a great journalist, H. L. Mencken, "The American form of government is the most *entertaining* form of government ever devised by man."

And as such, certainly it will survive. Both human advancement and entertainment demand it. The show must go on.

JOHN COLEMAN, "THE WEATHERMAN"

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, Wednesday, September 5, 1973, is an excellent day to talk about the weather.

Here in Washington, we are having another day of hot, humid, and hazy weather. In Chicago, however, the weather is beautiful. The sun is shining, and the temperature is in the comfortable low 80° range. There is an old saying that:

Everyone talks about the weather and nobody does anything about it.

People around the United States rely more and more upon radio and television for their weather reports. The "weatherman" is a title that has taken on a new and added dimension. In particular, the television weatherman is a "professional" in every sense of the word.

Not so long ago, there was a group known as the "Weathermen," who received a good deal of adverse publicity in connection with their demonstrations and antiestablishment views. Their motto was:

You don't have to be a weatherman to tell which way the wind is blowing.

Fortunately, however, the term "weatherman" today is a term that is an appellation that is respected. The television weatherman, for example, must have a good knowledge of meteorology, the ability to interpret satellite pictures of the Earth, the talent to understand "high" and "low" pressure areas, and the perspicacity to review weather data and apply it to a particular region. In addition to having the technical knowledge mentioned, the television weatherman must also have the ability to explain the weather so that the viewing public will understand the weather phenomena.

John Coleman of Evanston, Ill., is one of these new "professionals" who has been an extremely popular and able weather prognosticator to the Chicago-land area. On behalf of the people of the 10th District of Illinois, I am proud to recognize his exceptional talents and abilities.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA LAW  
SCHOOL IMPOUNDMENT STUDY**HON. PAUL G. ROGERS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Florida Law School has recently released the preliminary findings of a 6-month study of Executive impoundment of funds appropriated by the Congress. This project was financed by a grant from the Joseph H. McIntosh Foundation and contains a number of interesting findings and recommendations. In light of the recent House action on impoundment legislation, I would like to insert a story from the July 8, 1973, New York Times concerning the report of the Florida study group. I think that my colleagues will find this article most enlightening. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 8, 1973]  
NO BENEFIT FOUND IN IMPOUNDMENT—STUDY  
REPORTS MORE IDLE BUT NO CUT IN INFLATION

(By James N. Naughton)

WASHINGTON, July 7.—A research team at the University of Florida has concluded that President Nixon's refusal to spend more than \$8-billion in Federal funds for domestic projects did not measurably reduce inflation but did contribute to unemployment.

The results of the nonpartisan, six-month study, made available here today in a preliminary report, posed a new and sharp challenge to the White House rationale for impounding, or refusing to release, money appropriated by Congress.

At the same time, however, the study suggested that the Democratic majority in Congress was more interested in making a political issue of impoundments than in resolving the underlying economic problems.

President Nixon has contended in a series of statements and his Administration has argued in several Federal court cases that it was proper to refuse to spend the Congressionally approved funds as a method of curtailing inflation.

But L. Harold Levinson, a professor of law, and Jon L. Mills, the director of the impoundment project, said in the initial report on the University of Florida study that their findings "raise a serious challenge to the President's asserted justifications."

## NOT REDUCING INFLATION

They said that economists participating in the study had projected the impact of the impoundments through the 1975 fiscal year and had determined "that the impoundments have not significantly prevented or reduced the inflation."

"One of the only measurable results of the impoundments," the report went on, "is an increase in unemployment."

It also criticized the White House for maintaining "secret files" on impoundment decisions, declared that the "potential political impact" of impoundments was a factor in the decisions, and said that "arbitrary discriminatory and irrational decisions" could go unchecked as a result of the Administration approach.

The University of Florida assessment was nearly as critical of Congress, which challenged the impoundments early this year and began consideration of reforms in the Congressional budget system but has lost interest in the issue amid the preoccupation with the Watergate scandal.

The report stated that both the executive and legislative branches "bear a share of the responsibility" for the impoundment is-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sue "and both seem content to let the existing system continue."

## FILES UNAVAILABLE

Furthermore, the report charged, the House Appropriations Committee "apparently maintains its own secret files, which are not readily available even to other members of Congress," and many legislators "have not been disturbed enough to change a situation in which ambiguity offers an opportunity for maneuvering and rhetoric."

The study, financed by the Joseph H. McIntosh Foundation, was carried out at the University of Florida College of Law. The participants, including professors and students of law and economics, obtained access to many junior and middle echelon officials of the Government.

A final report, scheduled to be completed next month, will flesh out the preliminary conclusions with a mass of details, Mr. Mills said.

In a telephone interview, Mr. Mills cited one example. As a result of the Administration's moratorium on Federal housing assistance, he said, 35,000 families in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut had been unable to find housing.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SELF-GOV-  
ERNMENT BILL ADOPTS RECOM-  
MENDATIONS OF NELSEN COM-  
MISSION**HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss H.R. 9682, the District of Columbia self-government and governmental reorganization bill, which will be considered by this House late in September. H.R. 9682, a comprehensive and commendable bill, includes the following major elements of governmental reform, most of which were recommended by the Little Hoover Commission under Congressman ANCHER NELSEN.

First. Consolidating under the Mayor and City Council the present independent agencies on manpower, housing, and urban renewal.

Second. Granting the Mayor authority for municipal planning.

Third. Selecting local judges by the Missouri Plan—not considered by the Nelsen Commission.

Fourth. Setting up a financial management system to give Congress and the public fuller information on borrowing, budgeting, long-term financial planning, and control of city revenues.

Fifth. Setting up a rational system for basing the Federal payment on costs and benefits of the Federal presence, and on comparable revenues in other large cities and surrounding jurisdictions.

Sixth. Appointing a city administrator to provide professional direction to the executive office of the Mayor.

Careful consideration of the provisions of H.R. 9682 will reveal many additional efforts by my colleagues, during the past 6 months, which are too numerous to list at this time. The members of the House District Committee devoted time and effort far above and beyond the call of duty, and I compliment my colleagues of the committee for their endeavors in this matter.

September 5, 1973

A MINORITY REPORT MAKES  
GOOD**HON. GERALD R. FORD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak the sentiments of all Members when I say how happy we are to see the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE) looking so fit and healthy after the August recess and his bout of illness in July. In that period, there came to my attention an article in the periodical *The Alternative*, published in Bloomington, Ind., which pays tribute to EARL LANDGREBE'S determination as a legislator and its effect on the other body, from which I insert excerpts in the RECORD for the information of the Congress without, of course, endorsing all the conclusions of its author except as to EARL'S courage to fight for his principles.

The article follows:

## A MINORITY REPORT MAKES GOOD

(By Edwin Feulner, Jr.)

Earl Landgrebe is a little known Republican congressman from the Second District of Indiana. He was first elected in 1968 to succeed Charlie Halleck, the former Minority Leader of the House.

As a small businessman who owned and operated his own truck line, Landgrebe came to the House without many of the silly misconceptions of so many new members of Congress. For example, Landgrebe is a "gut conservative" who believes that certain things are right and when they are right they are worth defending even if you are in a minority. This attitude gave him a number of problems back in Indiana, including a well-financed primary in 1972, where he almost became a political casualty to Indiana Republican feuding.

Nonetheless, he was re-elected by 54.7 percent of his constituents and was sworn in as a member of the Ninety-third Congress on January 3, 1973. He retained his committee assignments which included a ninth ranking out of sixteen among the Republicans on the House Education and Labor Committee. . . . (This committee has been responsible for) the Occupational Safety and Health Act which is driving hundreds of small businesses out of existence, the latest minimum wage proposal which has the primary effect of driving black teenagers out of productive employment and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which has done more to erode local autonomy and diversity in school systems than any other single piece of legislation. . . .

Needless to say, Landgrebe's role as a fundamental conservative on Education and Labor placed him in a minority. The sensible people among the thirty-seven members of the committee never totaled more than twelve and on many issues could be reduced to five or six. Nonetheless, Landgrebe believed in his principles and, therefore, when the committee voted and then filed a report on the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 he not only voted against it but he also had the audacity to file a minority view of one on it. His views were his own because even such other conservative stalwarts as Messrs. Ashbrook of Ohio, Huber of Michigan, and Kemp of New York did not join him, and also because he had the good sense to file a substitute bill. The substitute would have cut back the funding level, kept the focus on vocational rehabilitation rather than medical treatment, consolidated the bureaucracy, and was within the President's

budget limitations. Again, it should be noted that Landgrebe was the only member to offer an alternative bill at this point.

Then the battle of the budget began.

The President indicated that anything that came to him from the Congress that was over his budget would be subjected to a presidential veto. The Senate liberals, while usually preoccupied with grooming candidates for the next presidential election, nonetheless realized that if the battle of the budget were to be won, it would have to be won by an override of presidential vetoes and that this could most likely occur on politically popular and sensitive votes such as the Vocational Rehabilitation renewal.

Therefore, all the guns were pulled out when the President sent up his Vocational Rehabilitation veto message. Hubert Humphrey took to the floor on a frequent basis and with weeping and gnashing of teeth talking about how this program which had existed since 1920 was being eliminated and how thousands of people were going to be abandoned to a fate not readily determinable—since there were no fewer than five other competing Federal programs overlapping in the same areas and the Landgrebe alternative still provided for an increase in funding over the last fiscal year.

Lobbying pressure grew. The groups most directly affected had representatives in wheel chairs and wearing leg braces moving about the Capitol buttonholing legislators and engaging in a very intensive and emotional lobbying campaign.

The Landgrebe substitute was then noticed by a group of freshmen senators, when it became apparent that the Senate would be the testing ground of the President's veto. These young turks, led by Jesse Helms, (R.-North Carolina) introduced the Landgrebe substitute as their own bill on the Senate side and received wide backing for it. By taking key leadership roles, these members of the Senate were able to round up the necessary votes to sustain the President's veto in the Senate. The magnitude of this victory can be seen by the fact that when the President called Hugh Scott, the Senate Minority Leader, to congratulate him, the President is alleged to have admitted to Scott that the White House congressional liaison staff was so convinced that the veto would have to be upheld in the House rather than in the Senate that they had already written the congratulatory letters to the House members, and not to the senators.

The long-range implications of this vote and action by the Congress are truly remarkable. In the first place, the Senate, the body that unquestionably is more liberal with the taxpayers' money, upheld the first presidential veto of the current round of budget battles. From this the Nixon Administration has in fact begun a whole new direction in its domestic legislative programs. New, more rigorous criteria have been established for all of the programs. Furthermore, the liberal leadership in both the House and Senate found itself in total disarray and has to retrench, regroup, and rethink its position on the key question of budgetary priorities.

President Nixon, sometimes known for rhetoric, nonetheless has indicated that he intends to chart a new course in domestic policy which will require stricter evaluations and a generally leaner budget. That he is representative of the view of the vast majority of Americans cannot be questioned when one analyzes public opinion polls. And that he has won the first several battles is certainly clear from the words of even the Democratic leadership. Mike Mansfield, the Senate Majority Leader, for example, admitted after the key Senate vote that "the President's in the driver's seat."

The point to be remembered when the battle of the budget of the 1970s is recorded for future generations is that it was a lonely voice from Valparaiso, Indiana, Earl Land-

grebe, who had the courage to stand up for principle and to fight for what he believed in despite its apparent unpopularity. Landgrebe's action gave the United States Senate and the President himself the peg to hang their hat on in this opening round the 1973 battle of the budget.

#### NIX INTRODUCES UNIFORM RECIPROCAL PEACE BILL

### HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will, if enacted, bring us one step closer to the reality of world peace through law, one of mankind's most cherished, but elusive dreams.

The bill is entitled, "The Uniform Reciprocal Peace Act". Its aim is to encourage its adoption in other nations by making its provisions binding in our own.

Its provisions were drawn up by the Philadelphia Bar Association after 10 years work. It is nonpartisan and is sensible.

It merely provides that the waging of aggressive war would be a violation of domestic law, the law of the country on whose behalf aggressive war is waged.

Its effect would be that it would deter a nation's leaders from going to war casually on the assumption that such a war will be successful, thus freeing them from the prospect of war crimes trials. If a nation's leaders had to fear that at some time in the future their own nation might try them they would have to think twice before undertaking such a war. Such fear would be based on the certain knowledge that in the common experience of mankind, no administration and no party maintains its hold on public office forever.

Democratic nations, of course, depend on public support during wartime as well as peacetime. Dictatorial regimes do not to the same extent. The threat then of domestic sanctions at home at some point in time would tend to bind even a dictatorial society which adopts such a measure since strong man regimes could not depend on outlasting the effect of a self-imposed law.

The hope of inducing other nations to adopt of their own accord such legislation is based on the fact that no nation publicly maintains a position of supporting aggressive war. Making such legislation part of the law in an authoritarian regime has some value to such a regime's foreign policy. But, once part of its law, how can a regime in a crisis be sure that its people will obey its commands while ignoring the plain command of its own law.

An example of this has occurred in recent history. West German courts have been trying Nazis for war crimes since Second World War. Trials under domestic German law have been relentless with no possibility of still fugitive German war criminals gaining sympathy from the German public.

War by aggressors depends on a presumption of regularity which in turn is dependent on the response of people doing the fighting that they have the legal right to obey orders. Once a doubt is created as by legislation of this kind, the human energy at the aggressor's disposal is diminished.

I believe that we all agree that we must try any reasonable step to make world peace a reality. The world cannot survive indefinitely with advanced domestic legal systems and a medieval international law system where force is the master. At the same time, our experience after the Second World War has shown us that we cannot rely on any grand design to bring peace. World peace through law will only come the way of the Bill of Rights, with two steps forward for every backward step. This legislation is a forward step; one step at the beginning of a long journey. I believe we should take this step, and I hope that the House will enact this legislation.

I want to offer my congratulations to the Philadelphia Bar Association, under the leadership of its chancellor, Mr. Joseph Bongiovanni and former chancellor, Mr. Joseph R. McConnell. The legal profession has every right to be proud of them as well as the great progressive membership of that body who has lent new luster to the title "Philadelphia Lawyer", for drawing up this inspiring legislation.

#### STANDARD OIL POSITION ON MIDDLE EAST ASSAILED

### HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call my colleagues attention to a recent letter to stockholders of Standard Oil Co. of California, dated July 26, 1973, and signed by O. N. Miller, chairman of the board.

Mr. Miller writes that "there must be understanding on our part of the aspirations of the Arab people, and more positive support of their efforts toward peace in the Middle East." Miller builds his case on the argument that the Arab States—and Iran—"represent the only major source to which the United States can look for any substantial increase in its crude oil imports."

I have already written to Mr. Miller that his letter "reads as if it were dictated by some Arab 'Pasha' standing astride one of those oil sheikdoms."

I told him it is bad enough that the Standard Oil Co. of California is the recipient of special "privileges" in terms of our tax laws.

And I told him that it adds insult to injury to have the taxpayers pay for his self-serving and biased analysis of the problems confronting the peoples and the countries of the Middle East.

## TINY TAIWAN EXCEEDS OUTPUT OF MAINLAND

**HON. O. C. FISHER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in a July 18 news story, written by Geoffrey Godsell for the Christian Science Monitor News Service, is contained another confirmation of the remarkable economic progress that is taking place in Taiwan.

In his report Mr. Godsell states:

Taiwan, equivalent in area to the states of Massachusetts and Connecticut combined and with a population only 1-50th of mainland China, has forged ahead of the mainland in its total foreign trade (\$5.51 billion) last year.

This provides a shining example of what free enterprise and the exercise of individual freedom can achieve in the highly competitive world in which we live.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article written by Mr. Godsell. It follows:

### TINY TAIWAN EXCEEDS OUTPUT OF MAINLAND

(By Geoffrey Godsell)

KAOSHUNG, TAIWAN, July 18.—This fast-growing industrial port city in southern Taiwan and its immediate surroundings bespeak the commitment of the people of this island to hard work.

"Hard work," says Vice President Yen Chia-kan, "is our slogan. And after that, harder work"

The harbor is crammed with ships. The new industrial parks tick along with impressive efficiency—and with an ever-improving quality of output. The factory chimneys are giving Kaohsiung its first taste of smog. The oil refinery refines enough imported crude for the whole island with some refined products left over for export to Guam and elsewhere.

Local farmers are complaining about the pollution of canals and streams by industrial plants. But these same farmers used the breakdown lane of the new multilane highways linking the plants as a threshing floor for their early rice crops.

This hard work so much in evidence wherever one moves on Taiwan is one of many contributing factors behind the following statistics:

Taiwan, equivalent in area to the states of Massachusetts and Connecticut combined and with a population only 1-50th of mainland China, has forged ahead of the mainland in its total foreign trade (\$5.51 billion dollars last year).

Per capita income on Taiwan (approaching \$400 a year) is three or four times that on the mainland.

Over the past two years, Taiwan has had the highest rate of economic growth of any country in the world of any consequence. (The figure for 1973 may well be 12 per cent.)

Taiwan is inside the first 20 of all the trading nations of the world.

Statistics so far this year indicate that Taiwan will be in 1973 ninth in the list of United States trading partners. (Within four years, it will probably be sixth on the list, vying at the top with Canada, Japan the United Kingdom, France, West Germany and Italy.)

Taiwan had a favorable balance of trade in 1972 of \$483 million, 2.2 per cent up on the previous year.

As Japan is moving out of certain indus-

tries because of labor costs, Taiwan is picking up new lines. Most significant of these is electronics, in which field wages in Taiwan are about one-fifth of what they are in Japan and one-half of what they are in Hong Kong.

Such firms as Admiral, Bendix, Motorola, Philco, RCA and Zenith all have plants in Taiwan, and the island has now virtually captured the black-and-white TV-sets market from Japan.

So far, Taiwan has managed all this without social disruption. When the Chinese Nationalists came here from the mainland in 1949, they began with a land-reform program that has worked well.

Now 85 to 90 per cent of the island's farmers own the land they till either outright or in part, and although only one-third of the island's area is good farmland—the rest is mountainous—Taiwan is self-sufficient in food.

From better farming, Taiwan moved to food processing, then light consumer industries and now finally to labor-intensive and heavy industries.

With more and more people now leaving the land for industry, however, the first warning signs are beginning to appear. The rate of increase in farm output is slackening, and a gap threatens between farm incomes and industrial wages.

Of equal concern to the government is the imbalance within Taiwan's over-all very favorable trade pattern. Its two most important trading partners are the U.S. and Japan, but its favorable trade balance with the U.S. (about \$707 million last year) is offset by a roughly equivalent unfavorable balance with Japan.

In other words, its trade with each is dangerously one-way—exports (mainly textiles and electronics) to the U.S. and imports from Japan.

The government in Taipei has not yet found a way out of this dilemma—but at least it is desperately and keenly aware of it

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR H. S. "HUB" WALTERS OF TENNESSEE—A GREAT AMERICAN

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of the Congress, Tennesseans were shocked and saddened by the untimely passing of former Senator Herbert S. "Hub" Walters, a great American and an outstanding Democrat—often referred to as "Mr. Democrat" of Tennessee.

"Hub" Walters' life was dedicated to service—he was a successful contractor early in life and therefore had time and resources to devote to the Democratic Party, to many charitable enterprises, to the development of his beloved alma mater, the University of Tennessee; to the improvement of public facilities generally in the State and to the attraction of new industry to Tennessee.

He served in the U.S. Senate by appointment following the death of Senator Estes Kefauver and he represented Tennessee and the Nation faithfully and well. "Hub" Walters however, preferred to remain in the political background and his only other service in elective office was as a State representative.

As a political leader, Senators Walters

knew how to marshal his resources—he was the architect of many Democratic victories, including the election of a number of Governors of the State. He served several terms as chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee and was a member of the committee for 25 years.

He came from humble origins—his first job was hauling water to wheat harvest crews at 25 cents a day. In 1917, he bought a few mules and entered the contracting business and became one of the most successful contractors and businessmen in the State.

At the time of his death, he served on the boards of directors of eight leading Tennessee corporations and he was, of course, president of Walters & Prater, Inc., the general contracting firm he founded.

In later years, Senator Walters devoted much time to education. He served as a member of the board of trustees of the University of Tennessee for 11 years and vice chairman the past 5 years. Walters State Community College at Morristown—a community college which bears his name—was also the beneficiary of Senator Walters' keen interest and support. A large commemorative plaque at the school honored Senator Walters as a "statesman, a gentleman and a great Tennessean."

"Hub" Walters lived a full, useful, and productive life and his dedication and leadership meant much to the growth and progress of Tennessee during crucial years when the economy of the State was changing from agricultural to industrial.

Certainly he will be greatly missed because he has been a strong voice in Tennessee for many years—and I want to take this means of extending to his beloved wife, Sarah, and other members of his family this expression of my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy in their loss and bereavement. My wife Ann joins me in these sentiments.

## INEXCUSABLE NEGLECT CORRECTED

**HON. JOHN B. BREAUX**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government at long last has formally recognized the Coushatta Indians of Louisiana. It has been a recognition long deserved, and the fact that it now is a reality is a credit to many people, both in Louisiana and in Washington.

For the purpose of informing Members of Congress and the general public on the importance of what might seem to be a routine bureaucratic matter, permit me to provide for the RECORD an editorial which appeared Sunday, June 24, 1973, in the Lake Charles American Press, of Lake Charles, La., pertaining to this subject.

### COUSHATTA TRIBE GETS BREAK

Thirty years of inexcusable neglect of a legal and moral trust could end at any moment with the U.S. Bureau of Indian

Affairs formally acknowledging that the Coushatta Indians in Allen Parish between Elton and Kinder form a bonafide American Indian tribe.

Latest information David L. Garrison Jr., commissioner of Louisiana's Commission on Indian Affairs, has received is that bureau officials agree that the tribe should be recognized. He feels certain that recognition is imminent.

The Coushatta story is another in a long series of broken promises, duplicity, violation of a trust, mistreatment and neglect of the American Indians.

While the treatment of the Coushattas is not one of crude brutality, the cumulative effect of the neglect has in many ways contributed to conditions as cruel and inhumane as the banishment from their motherland in Alabama. The exodus and actual exile from their villages in Alabama rank with the worst, but that is not at issue here.

At issue is that in 1953 the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs administratively ended the federal services to which the Coushattas were entitled.

Matters had remained the same until May 30, 1972, when Gov. Edwin W. Edwards created the Louisiana Commission on Indian Affairs and named Garrison as commissioner.

The governor's choice was a fortunate one for the Coushattas. Garrison, a 27-year-old oil man from Lake Charles, plunged into the job and within a year had cleared legal clouds for a formal petition for reconsideration.

He set an example for anyone who wants to serve the public. His agency was not funded. His expenses for commission work came out of his pocket.

Garrison enlisted the help of two nonprofit organizations, in presenting the Coushattas' case. They drafted dossiers which are accurate enough for use in court.

The petition to the Bureau of Indian Affairs follows precedent set by the Micosaukee tribe in Florida which gained recognition in 1960.

Admission by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that the Indians are members of a bonafide tribe would open the way for far-reaching federal programs. An Indian tribe is equal to cities in obtaining aid.

An Indian tribe on a federal reservation has even more claims to federal services. Recognition would pave the way for aid and grants for welfare, health, recreation, education and other services.

Garrison said tribal leaders want to go even further. They want to acquire about 1,000 acres of land to establish a reservation.

This would make additional federal services available to the Coushattas. It would also enable intensive efforts to develop businesses and industries to create jobs for the Indians and open broad avenues for a tourism program.

Basis for the tribes' request for reconsideration dates back to early American history. The Coushatta tribe was recognized as a member of the Creek Nations Confederation. They signed treaties with four nations.

Through the years the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the United States never legally pronounced the tribe as no longer existent. Until 1953, the Coushattas were treated as a bonafide tribe.

Even when Congress by resolution moved to take federal protection from them, no formal action was taken to do so. Lawyers for the nonprofit organizations which took up for the Coushattas feel they have a strong case.

Success with the Coushattas could lead to further action with other tribes in Louisiana. Garrison thinks the Choctaw communities in Central and North Louisiana may also qualify for federal recognition.

Those tribal groups also have kept their language and customs alive. Their relatives in Mississippi are helped by the government.

Unfortunately, the Tunicas of Avoyelles Parish have no strong claim for recognition. However, they are in the courts for clearance of a land title which would have bearing on their case.

The Houma tribe of Terrebonne and Lafourche parish has 4,500 members. Nevertheless, they have little hope of recognition. They can't show that the tribe today is the same that was there some 200 years ago.

Regardless of the outcome, the Commission on Indian Affairs has shown a potentially profitable concern for a mute minority. That concern has produced results which could benefit both the state and a small group of long-suffering Indians.

If the help is not forthcoming from the federal government, the people of Louisiana now have the information needed to help their fellow citizens.

### YIELDING TO ARAB BLACKMAIL WILL NOT SOLVE OUR ENERGY SHORTAGE

#### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, a number of Arab governments have begun a new campaign to win through economic blackmail what they had failed to win in three successive wars—the destruction of the State of Israel.

At the heart of this sinister campaign is the theme that the United States must end its support for Israel if we expect to continue to receive Arab oil to meet our growing demand for energy.

The Arab propagandists and those sympathetic to their objectives including certain American oil companies would have us believe that only our policy toward Israel stands in the way of the free flow of Arab oil to meet our future energy needs.

This is simply not true.

IF ISRAEL DID NOT EXIST, THE FLOW OF OIL WOULD STILL BE THREATENED

Let us picture for a moment a Middle East without Israel. The area would still have a great number of problems which would threaten the flow of oil to the West.

There would still be countries such as Libya which are caught up in a wave of revolutionary nationalism which considers America as the "capitalist, imperialist enemy."

There would still be countries such as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait who would use their huge currency reserves to attack the American dollar on the world money markets.

There would still be countries such as Iraq where the constant threat of war with dissident minorities—the Kurds—and neighboring states—Iran and Kuwait—makes it a most unreliable oil supplier.

There would still be countries such as Syria which has become a pawn in the Russian drive to extend its influence southward into the Middle East. Indeed, where would the pro-American countries of Lebanon, Jordan, and Iran be today if Israel did not exist to check the extension of Soviet influence into the region?

If Israel did not exist, there would still be countries such as most of the oil-producing Arab States who are now taking advantage of the American energy crisis by doubling the price of oil and tripling the tax rate paid by Western oil companies. Are we so naive as to think these price and tax increases are not the result of simple human greed?

THE ARAB LEADERS SEEK TO DECEIVE THEIR OWN PEOPLE

The Arab world is an area unfamiliar to most Americans and far different from the Western World. Many of the oil-rich Arab States have not yet emerged from a feudal system with rich absentee landlords and poor tenant farmers.

Slavery was permitted in some countries up through the 1960's. Illiteracy is widespread. Women are allowed little schooling, few civil rights, and must spend much of their time working in the fields.

Political intrigue is the order of the day with constant assassinations, plots, and coups—Arab against Arab.

To mask government instability and to distract the people from their own poverty and inequality, Arab radios are filled with chants of war. Political rallies are designed to focus on Israel and to ignore their own wealthy Arab leaders who are the real cause of the continued suffering of most of the Arab people.

This latest Arab move to threaten the West with the curtailment of oil supplies is just another chapter in the long effort by Arab leaders to deceive their own people into ignoring the real problems in the Arab world.

The deception first began after World War I when Arab landowners, fearful of the example set by the prospering Jewish settlers in Palestine, fomented a long series of anti-Jewish riots rather than encouraging their tenant farmers to learn the successful farming methods of the Jews.

The deception continued after 1948 when the Arab leaders refused to resettle the Palestinian refugees while Israel was promptly resettling over half a million Jewish refugees from Arab lands. The Arab leaders had decided that the Palestinian refugees, their own "brothers," should remain as political pawns in refugee camps.

In recent years the deception was continued when the oil-rich Arab leaders amassed enough money to buy limousines and air-conditioned palaces and European vacations and still have enough left over to speculate against and weaken the American dollar. But they could find no money to help improve the lives of the millions of Arabs who live in poverty.

To play along with this latest attempt by the Arab leaders to deceive their own people will in no way help the Arab people. To give any encouragement to this latest Arab propaganda effort will only serve to continue the poverty and inequality which are prime causes of the chronic instability and turmoil in the Middle East—and it is this chronic instability, not the existence of Israel, which is the real threat to the flow of oil.

ISRAEL DESERVES OUR SUPPORT

Of course, there are many positive reasons why the United States should con-



tinue to give support to Israel which have little to do with oil. Israel is a free democracy of hard-working, proud people. Made up of refugees from all over the globe including the survivors of the Nazi holocaust, the Israelis have restored a barren land and have defended it repeatedly against enemies on every side. To support such a nation is to be consistent with our highest American ideals.

The new Arab campaign to tie oil to American support for Israel must be seen as the propaganda that it really is and not as a serious proposition to solve America's energy shortage. It is the nature of the Arab world and not the existence of Israel which governs the flow of oil from the Middle East. None of the real threats to the increased importation of Arab oil would be met if we reduced our support for Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD two very perceptive newspaper articles from the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post which propose a thoughtful American response to the recent Arab attempts to blackmail our country:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 21, 1973]

#### EYES ON THE FIGLEAF

With the voluminous talk of the "energy crisis" and the eternal tension in the Middle East, a great deal of attention has been focused on the possibility that the U.S. may have to back away from its support of Israel because of its need for Arab oil. We often wonder whether the West isn't more obsessed with Israel than the Arabs are.

Some Arab nations have long made rhetoric about oil and Israel, of course, and the current concern arises because Saudi Arabia has started to join in. Lobbying for a more pro-Arab U.S. policy by Mobil and Standard Oil of California, two of the partners in Saudi Arabia's main oil consortium, apparently results from something King Faisal said to their executives. But we wonder just what the king said, and what he meant by it. Similar well-publicized remarks by his oil minister, Sheik Ahmed Zaki Yamani, seemed on close examination to peter out into remarkably vague and mild statements. We wonder whether the whole issue is being kept in perspective.

Take, for example, the "energy crisis," which in fact is America's adjustment to becoming a larger-scale importer of oil like other industrial nations. Saudi Arabia, which sits on some 28% of the world's proven oil reserves, is of course a key factor in meeting future world demand. And the United States will need some Middle Eastern oil to meet its increasing demands. But even in 10 years from now about half of American needs will be met domestically, and nearly half of the rest from elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere. Some of the remaining 25% to 30% will come from non-Arab lands such as Iran. Up to now, for instance, our largest supplier from the Eastern Hemisphere has been Nigeria.

As far as the Arab world is concerned, a renewed war with Israel would indeed endanger the flow of Persian Gulf oil. But this possibility seems to have blinded American opinion to the even more serious Middle East trouble spots that border directly on the oil fields. As an immediate source of an oil crisis, Arab-Israeli conflict ranks somewhere below Kurdish nationalism, the Iraq-Kuwait confrontation over the islands of Babiyah and Warba, the Iraqi-Iranian dispute over the Shatt al Arab waterway, the Saudi tension with Abu Dhabi over the Buraimi Oasis, and the ethnic rebellion in the Dhofar province of Oman.

Arab politics might not even be as mono-

lithic on Israel as many in the West seem to think. In spite of King Faisal's fear of the Jews, the Saudis have not forgotten that the 1967 war forced Egypt to withdraw its expeditionary force from the Yemen, from which it occasionally dropped gas bombs on Saudi border villages.

Rhetoric about Israel in fact often seems to be a "figleaf," as one Middle East bureaucrat puts it, for more pressing economic objectives. Saudi reluctance to increase oil production has its real origin in problems of absorbing oil revenues in a near-feudal economy. Yet the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies says the answer favored by the Saudis and other Arabs is "a dream of transforming themselves from mere reservoirs into industrialized states, exploiting a combination of surplus capital and cheap energy in order to process oil and other goods for the world market." This dream needs cooperation from America, both as an outlet for investment money and for help creating a local petrochemical industry; the IISS remarks that industrialization depends on "assured export markets for oil products and other manufactures."

While Saudi Arabia may suffer pressure from more militant Arab lands, the militants themselves have their own economic interests. We hear reports that Iraq's oil boycott plan, for instance, would give Iraq an increased share of the market. Libya has nationalized American properties ostensibly over Israel, but it has nationalized British properties ostensibly over the Persian Gulf islands of Abu Musa, Greater Tunb and Lesser Tunb. It recently put production limits on Standard Oil of California despite California Standard's pro-Arab lobbying, suggesting that the real targets of the campaign are the oil companies that have not yet agreed to Libya's economic demands.

Egypt's President Anwar Sadat saluted one of Libya's nationalizations in a militant speech about beginning the battle against American interests in the Arab world. Two weeks before, he was inviting Exxon to explore for oil under a 30-year contract. Two weeks later, he was soliciting American bids for construction of a \$300 million Suez-Mediterranean pipeline.

The Arabs no doubt are tough customers to deal with, as are the Norwegians, the Ecuadorans, the Alaskans and almost anybody else who sits on oil. There may be serious troubles ahead if the Arabs decide to foresake their development plans and sit on the oil instead. But the idea that to crush Israel they would ignore their economic interests, or would turn charitable if Israel were sacrificed, strikes us as a view tinged with romanticism which has so often fogged the Western view of the Middle East.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 2, 1973]

#### ARAB OIL THREATS NEED CALM U.S. RESPONSE (By Hobart Rowen)

If the Nixon administration doesn't watch out, it will stumble needlessly into making Israel the scapegoat for the prospective shortage of oil in the years ahead.

Increasing American dependence on Middle East oil, and hopes that Saudi Arabian production can be stepped up from 9 million barrels a day to 20 million barrels a day, have clearly given the Arab states a powerful new weapon in bargaining with their oil customers.

But this government should not let Saudi Arabia blackmail the U.S. into a sudden change of posture on the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The fact is that there is no real connection between the energy crisis and the Middle East conflict between Arabs and Jews. As Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco observed, these "constitute in fact two separate sets of problems, each of which should be viewed primarily in its own context."

But the Arab countries, acting for themselves—and using the public relations power of their American oil company partners, are turning on the heat.

King Faisal of Saudi Arabia publicly responded to Sisco in a July 5 interview with Washington Post correspondent Jim Hoagland, in which he said that if American support of Israel continues as it is, the Saudis would find it "difficult" to cooperate with the United States.

Hoagland said Faisal's remarks were intended to underscore suggestions made by his petroleum minister, Sheik Yamani, that Saudi Arabia might be compelled to keep its oil in the ground because of rising Arab resentment over America's pro-Israel policy.

But how serious is such a threat? Nothing could be more confused or confusing than the complicated politics of the oil-rich Arabian Peninsula-Persian Gulf area. Thus, Prince Saud el Faisal of the Saudi oil ministry admitted to a Beirut editor last week that cutting off oil to the U.S. was unlikely to hurt America until the late 1970s.

But the King and the Prince, according to the Beirut report, are willing to use some of their huge oil revenues for a \$1.2 billion program to re-arm the Egyptian air force, with Kuwait, Abu Dhabi and Qatar putting up the rest.

The threat conveyed to Hoagland, thus, is that if the U.S. doesn't change its Israeli policy, it won't get all the oil it wants. The refinement suggested in Beirut is that money from oil sales to the U.S. would be devoted to strengthening Arab arms for the ultimate victory over Israel.

The problem is how best to react to threats of this kind, and many read into the designation of James E. Akins as the new U.S. ambassador to Saudi Arabia a shift in American political and military support for Israel. In "Foreign Affairs" for April, Akins said that because of U.S. "vulnerability," the Arabs' threat "to use oil as a political weapon must be taken seriously."

The first and proper response should be a massive effort to develop new energy sources—oil from shale, the use of abundant low-sulfur coal, atomic and solar energy.

Gov. John Love, the head of the new energy office, told a group of Washington Post editors recently: "I don't think there's any doubt that we'd be in a better bargaining position (with the Saudis) if we developed our own sources of energy."

Looking at the situation realistically, both Love and his oil expert, Charles DiBona, doubt that the U.S. will ever get as much oil as it might like to have out of Saudi Arabia.

"I find imports of \$25 to \$35 billion (projected for 1980) impossible to accept," Love said. "There are sound economic reasons for the Saudis to say oil is better in the ground, apart from what Faisal says about Zionism. . . . For many reasons, we have to take a closer look at what we can do to make it to their advantage (to export oil to us) and we need a greater sense of urgency in finding different sources."

It is clear to DiBona and other Middle East watchers that with or without Israel there would be a Middle East oil problem. And in fact, as DiBona points out, without Israel, it might be a much less stable area than it is.

The "sound economic reasons" for Saudi reluctance to increase oil production relate to the problems of what an economy still in a near-feudal state can do with all of its oil revenue. And like other big producing countries, the Saudis recognize that their reserves are not limitless.

As the Wall Street Journal observed in a perceptive editorial Aug. 21, "the idea that to crush Israel they (the Arab nations) would ignore their economic interests, or would turn charitable if Israel were sacrificed, strikes us as a view tinged with romanticism which has

so often fogged the Western view of the Middle East."

In all probability, much of the Saudi Arabian rhetoric is intended to satisfy radical and militant pressures internally and from other Arab states.

In the long run, as Prof. Oded Remba of the Staten Island Community Center pointed out in a letter to the New York Times, the Saudis will need the friendship of the United States if Soviet influence grows in neighboring lands.

So there is little reason for the U.S. to panic. Playing it cool would suggest that the U.S. try to help the Saudis to find ways of investing their cash other than the Egyptian air force. It suggests, as well, a big push behind research and development for alternate energy sources—and a willingness to follow Love's recommendations for serious curbs on energy usage here, especially by big cars.

And for those who complain that development of oil from shale, or energy from the atom or from the sun is too far off, one might recollect what France's Marshal Lyautey is supposed to have told his gardener, who argued against planting a new tree, because it wouldn't flower for 100 years.

"In that case," Marshal Lyautey said, "plant it this afternoon."

### THIRTY-ONE ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORT RHODESIAN SANCTIONS BILL

#### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess of Congress, the Washington Office on Africa announced that 28 national organizations have joined in endorsing a statement which asks Congress to restore this country to adherence to UN sanctions against the minority regime on Southern Rhodesia. Since the date of that announcement, the number of organizations has increased to 31 with the addition of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workers of North America, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and the National Council of Negro Women. This is another important example of the new awareness and concern on the part of the American people that its Government should leave the ranks of open international lawbreakers and undo the unwise work of the Rhodesian chrome amendment.

Bills to accomplish that objective are now pending in the House and Senate (H.R. 8005 and S. 1868) with the expressed support of the Administration. In the House there are 110 cosponsors and in the Senate there are 31. These bills deserve the active support of all our colleagues.

I ask that the full text of the announcement by the Washington Office on Africa be printed in the RECORD at this point.

#### NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS JOIN DRIVE TO RESTORE U.S. COMPLIANCE WITH UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS AGAINST RHODESIA

August 7, 1973.—The Washington Office on Africa announced today that 28 national organizations have now endorsed a statement calling on the Congress to restore United States compliance with United Nations sanc-

tions against Rhodesia. They thus join a growing list of members of Congress who have sponsored legislation for that purpose which will be voted on in early fall.

The text of the statement is as follows:

#### A CALL ON CONGRESS TO RESTORE SANCTIONS AGAINST RHODESIA

We call on Congress to restore U.S. sanctions against Rhodesia to renew our country's adherence to international law and our United Nations treaty obligations.

We call for the restoration of sanctions because of our support for majority rule in Rhodesia. Since 1971 imports from Rhodesia in violation of sanctions have given economic and political aid to an illegal regime which is based on the disenfranchisement of the 95 percent African majority and discriminatory social and economic laws parallel to apartheid in South Africa.

Advocates of imports from Rhodesia have argued that these contribute to national defense by lessening imports of chrome ore from the Soviet Union. But these Soviet imports have actually remained at the same level. And the U.S. stockpile of chrome ore is so much in excess of projected needs that the Administration has submitted legislation to sell off the unneeded reserves.

The breaking of sanctions against Rhodesia is threatening U.S. jobs. The U.S. Ferrochrome Association announced in May that 19 ferrochrome plants in the U.S. are endangered by the surge in imports from Rhodesia and South Africa, where production costs are cut because of conditions of forced labor and special subsidies.

For these reasons we support the bi-partisan group of 31 Senators and 109 Representatives co-sponsoring bills S. 1868 (Senate) and H.R. 8005 (House of Representatives) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to restore sanctions against Rhodesia.

Endorsers of the Call include:  
American Ethical Union.  
American Humanist Association.  
Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa.  
Friends Committee on National Legislation.

The Sisters Network.  
Unitarian Universalist Association.  
United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society, Women's Division, Board of Global Ministries.  
United Church of Christ, Council for Christian Social Action.  
United Presbyterian Church, Southern Africa Task Force.

African Liberation Support Committee.  
American Committee on Africa.  
Committee for a Free Mozambique.  
Gulf Boycott Coalition.  
Pan African Congress, USA.  
Southern Africa Committee.  
Washington Area Task Force on African Affairs.  
Black Political Convention, International Policy Committee.

Congress on Racial Equality.  
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.  
Americans for Democratic Action.  
National Student Lobby.  
World Federalists, USA.  
Action for World Community.  
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.  
American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO.

United Auto Workers.  
United Steelworkers of America.  
In addition to those organizations which have specifically endorsed this statement, other organizations have adopted individual policy statements resolutions which expressly call for United States compliance with the United Nations program of sanctions. A partial list of such organization includes:

AFL-CIO.

United Methodist Church, Board of Global Ministries.

United Church of Christ, General Synod of 1973.

Young Women's Christian Association.

### THE GRAND OLD PARTY'S GRAND OLD MAN

#### HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess I was pleased to read of the bestowal of the Herbert Hoover Award on one of the most prominent citizens of Dubuque, Harvey M. Lange. It is not often that an active Democrat would take notice of a Republican award given to a Republican stalwart, but in this instance it was a recognition of merit and service that easily transcends any partisan barrier. Harvey Lange is a patriarchal figure among Iowa Republicans. By his energy, enthusiasm, and sturdy adherence to principle he has throughout a long career helped to elevate the standards of politics in the State and has provided a continuing example of how service to party can be transformed into public service to all. Harvey Lange possesses qualities of mind and the kind of personal integrity which set standards for us all to emulate in both public and private life. Like Herbert Hoover, an Iowan in whose name the award was given, or Alfred E. Landon, still living in Kansas, Harvey Lange brings a quality of ripe wisdom and broad judgment for which we are all indebted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article in the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald be printed in the RECORD. I think that all my colleagues, even those who have the most profound skepticism about the conclusion reached by Mr. Lange in the last paragraph, will appreciate this fine vignette of an outstanding Iowan.

The article follows:

#### THE GRAND OLD PARTY'S GRAND OLD MAN (By Steve Walters)

1912: An 18-year-old Republican earned \$1 each afternoon by dropping Teddy Roosevelt-for-President handbills on Dubuque front porches and passing them out at the old Grand Opera House.

1920: The same young man had the audacity to ask the Dubuque County Republican convention, meeting in City Hall's council chambers, to endorse Gen. Leonard Wood for president. He had served under Wood during World War I; the convention buried his resolution in committee.

1930: The Depression had folded America's economic tent. Nobody wanted to talk politics, but that didn't stop the same Republican, who took the thankless job of Dubuque County Republican chairman. He held the post for 12 tough years—years with Democrats strongly in control.

1940: The GOP chairman introduced Republican presidential candidate Wendell Willkie from the rear of the candidate's whistle-stopping campaign express. About 7,000 attended the Dubuque rally, making the chairman believe Willkie was doing better than he was; Willkie was slaughtered by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

1944: Even nightfall couldn't cut the summer heat at the Republican National Convention in Chicago, where the Dubuquer sweltered with the Iowa delegation. He helped Iowa cast a first-ballot vote for its favorite son, Hanford McNider of Mason City, before joining the stampede to Thomas E. Dewey of New York.

1950: The Dubuquer gave up his seat—held since 1942—on the Republican State Central Committee. He then confined his political activity to running the campaigns of veteran congressman Henry Talle, Decorah Republican who served 20 years in Congress.

That Dubuquer, Harvey M. Lange, got a standing ovation last week—from all the Republicans too young to remember how lonely it was to be a Dubuque Republican 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

This new crop, led by youthful party chairman Tom Tauke, paid well deserved homage to the patriarch of Dubuque County Republicanism, giving him the Herbert Hoover award for outstanding service.

Born July 28, 1894, on Dubuque's Lake Street (later renamed in honor of President Garfield when he died), Harvey Lange grew up with Republican politics.

"Dad (Otto Lange) was always working for somebody in politics," he said during a three-hour interview last week at his home at 1888 St. Joseph St. "Dubuque and Dubuque County were mainly—decidedly—Democratic at that time."

So decidedly Democratic, in fact, that when Republicans wanted to oppose Democrats running in the city's wards—Dubuque went to precincts in 1920—they ran on a "citizens" ticket.

"They didn't want the Republican label on them," said Lange, chomping an ever-present cigar.

"Politics originally was an accident of birth, just like religion. If your parents were Catholic, you were Catholic."

Lange went to Audubon School and graduated from the old Dubuque High School on 15th Street in 1913. A year at Exeter Academy in New Hampshire prepared Lange for Harvard University, which gave him an economics degree in 1918. He taught small-arms fire during the war, married, and came home to Dubuque.

Lange joined his dad's insurance company (he's now president of Lange Insurance), and plugged back into the local political scene. His dad became the first Republican to represent Dubuque County in the Iowa Legislature, serving in the Senate until 1930, when he lost a primary race for governor.

The younger Lange was named county Republican chairman in 1930, and shortly after, as Lange describes it, "the stock market broke to hell."

"Those were 12 tough years," Lange said, mindful of the Democratic landslides of Franklin Roosevelt, American's economic troubles and the Democratic Party's lock on county politics.

He was asked many times to run for office himself, but told the questioner: "I don't want to hold public office. I've got a living to make."

Mrs. Geraldine Lange would have "not one thing" to do with politics, her husband said. The couple have two children, Barbara (Mrs. Ted Ellsworth, former local Republican party vice chairman) and Marjorie, who lives in Florida.

Through the Depression and America's entry into World War II, Lange stumped for the party. "You worked hard in all the elections, for the whole ticket." He remembers the few GOP victories well.

In 1942, he won northeast Iowa's seat on the 16-member Republican State Central Committee. It meant that he would have to worry about Republican votes not only in Dubuque, but in communities like Oelwein, Strawberry Point and Decorah as well.

He had the state job in 1948, when Dewey

ran again, this time against Democratic President Harry Truman.

"That was the year I thought Dewey would win," Lange said, "but the squirt, in his speeches he had nothing but platitudes—he was talking way over the heads of the people."

He gave up the central committee seat in 1950, saying "someone else should have a chance." He phased himself out of politics by running Talle's congressional campaigns until 1958.

Lange, who claims he is politically inactive now, said he's seen the following changes:

"Bossism doesn't exist today like it did years ago. . . . In the old days they'd say, 'So-and-so controls Linn County, and so-and-so controls Blackhawk County.' I don't think the controlling of the voters is as prevalent anymore."

But the voter has become more apathetic. "I hate to see the small turnouts that we have today—60 per cent for a presidential election. A lot of the voters just aren't interested; getting out the vote is a hard thing to do."

"The cost of campaigns have gone up considerably, eight to 10 times what they used to be. I don't think the money that is being spent for campaigns is practical, and a lot of it is wasted."

"I enjoyed the work and there was a lot of it," Lange said. "This country really grew under the Republicans; I really believe the country is in better hands under Republicans."

#### CRAIG HOSMER WRITES ABOUT THE NEW GEOPOLITICS

#### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. HOSMER) has won second honorable mention in the U.S. Naval Institute's 1973 prize essay contest writing on the subject of "The New Geopolitics." He entered the contest anonymously as did other entrants. His essay has been printed as an article in the Institute's August proceedings.

The article describe the evolution of the Nixon doctrine and the presently harmonious relationships between the United States and other key nations of the world. It also warns that even during relaxed periods of low international tension there is a level of defense effort below which no nation can linger for long without arousing the instincts of predators.

The article follows:

#### THE NEW GEOPOLITICS

(By Rear Adm. Craig Hosmer, U.S. Naval Reserve)

Elihu Root: "When foreign affairs were ruled by autocracies or oligarchies the danger of war was in sinister purpose. When foreign affairs are ruled by democracies the danger of war will be in mistaken beliefs."

With rare exceptions, American presidents have not assumed office as experts in the theory and practice of using their country's power to enhance its national security and attain its external goals. U.S. history is replete with instances of options neglected, of off-handed commitments supported by no more than one man's prejudices or intuition, and with questionable decisions of great consequence belatedly made on fragmentary data in atmospheres of crisis. Fortu-

nately, during recent years, reforms have occurred in the institution of the presidency, and in the civilian and military organizations supporting it, which have corrected many of the flaws and gaps in the national decision-making machinery. Today, the restructured National Security Council and its counterpart nonmilitary agencies are fully capable of laying before the President and his key advisors precise, up-to-the-minute assessments of the global geopolitical environment, together with the alternatives and options available for coping with any conceivable domestic or foreign emergency. They do so routinely.

In parallel with this institutional growth, government leaders and the public have developed a mature awareness and appreciation of those basic facts of international life without which viable decisions cannot be reached. Not only are the physical fundamentals of global power relationships—as defined long ago by Mahan and his successors—accepted as matters of course, but many more recent postulates governing the psychology of nations also are considered to be essential inputs to the decision-making processes. For example, it is now reasonably well accepted that:

Whereas it is difficult to perceive basic local, national, and international realities in or about open societies, their perception is infinitely more difficult in closed societies. No two nations view themselves, other nations, and the world in exactly the same light.

When dealing with those nations hewing to geopolitical misconceptions, one must either dispose of the fictions or accept them as realities for the purposes of the dealing.

Thus, in the years ahead, how well we fare in maintaining our national security and in attaining our international objectives will depend not only on how intelligently we exploit the geopolitical realities of the world, but also on how well we turn to our advantage the myths and fables other societies have been passing off as truth.

Such matters were understood only vaguely as the United States moved from isolation to international involvement and as the events of the two great wars first made it a world power and then, as hostilities ceased in 1945, thrust upon America the predominant role in the family of nations. At that moment, a combination of some naiveté, the heady promises of lasting peace made in the new United Nations Charter and the flush of victory blurred our own—and many other nations'—images of the world to come. Our rose-colored glasses were shattered by several gratuitous Soviet slaps and we saw that country's pugnacious posture in fuzzy, but no less ominous, outline. Camaraderie with the allies was quickly ended by Soviet paranoia over fraternization. Secrecy and haste to consolidate control over countries destined to become satellites offended Americans and menaced international harmony. At Yalta and Potsdam, Stalin repeatedly appeared to be inexplicably arrogant and unyielding. Some excused these and other enigmatic Soviet actions—how can one condemn the thrashings of a badly-wounded bear?—as being merely the natural reaction of a war-weakened nation which was seeking to position itself against potentially fickle friends who were likely to turn belligerent at any moment. Others thought that these were deliberately hostile actions which unmasked a malicious and treacherous society that seemed to be brazenly girding itself for the conquest of the world, as called for by Marxist-Leninist dogma.

Unable to solve the riddle of Soviet intentions, the United States for many years after World War II conceived the Communist world to be unified and monolithic in ideology, hostile and aggressive in purpose, and dedicated totally to obliterating or devouring all before it. We came to see the Free

World as a reverse image of the Communist one, with all the virtues of the former locked in mortal struggle with all the vices of the latter. This concept of opposing and opposite worlds dominated our foreign policy and shaped our defense posture for more than two decades. Faced with aggression, our logical response was to isolate this contagion and quarantine it within Communist borders. Promulgation of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan in 1947 were the initial major moves to implement this strategy. Many others followed as we began working and spending to bring order, stability, and economic opportunity to those allied and friendly nations whose freedom and safety appeared to be intertwined with our own. A threat to any was seen as a threat to all; it would be countered by "cold" means if possible, but by hot war if need be.

Within a short time the Berlin Crisis of 1948 simultaneously confirmed our belief in the correctness of this analysis of Communist intentions and verified our estimate of the necessity for a strategy of quick and positive responses to every appearance of aggression. Thus, in 1950, when the Republic of Korea was attacked by the Communist North, containment of the forces of total aggression, even to the point of open conflict, seemed essential and proper, not just to save that particular ally, but to prevent other free nations from thereafter falling—as one prominent American put it, "like dominoes."

In retrospect, the "Two Worlds in Conflict" concept and our strategies and initiatives to cope with its manifestations seem to have worked reasonably well throughout the 1950s. The ascendance to power of the People's Republic of China early in this era confirmed our suspicions of Communist malevolence, malfeasance, and perfidy. But history is not static and, by the early 1960s, signs began to appear that some things in the Communist world (as well as in our own) were not quite as we had thought them to be, or had changed, or were changing from what they had been. As time passed, the evidence of change mounted. Even so, revision of our concepts of an enemy, long tempered by years of Hot War and Cold War, did not come quickly. It is the way of men and nations alike to hold to old patterns until a significant event triggers movement, and then change comes swiftly.

The succession of President Richard M. Nixon in 1969, following bitter debate over the "hot," although undeclared, Vietnam war, was such an event. It focused the national awareness not just upon realities of the two Vietnams, but also upon broader aspects of relations within and outside the Communist bloc. Many of the nation's key leaders, including the President, became convinced that the Communist world was no longer unified and monolithic, and they believed that it ceased to project the intensity of hostility and aggression that it did in earlier years. Instead, they came to regard the Communist bloc as being under great stress from internal forces which seemed to be sapping both its appetite and its capacity for external adventures.

Recognizing these changed circumstances, the new Administration began a search for alternative strategies which it believed would prove more responsive to current U.S. national interests and opportunities than those of the Containment Doctrine. These took form as the Nixon Doctrine, the formulation of which began at Guam in 1969 and continue today. Its application already is manifesting distinguishable differences in power relationships in the 1970s from that which prevailed in the 1960s.

Viewed in the light of the Containment Doctrine, the escalation of aggression by North Vietnam, which began early in the 1960s, appeared then to be yet another cen-

trally-directed, Korean-like probe, tilting the dominoes, testing the climate for worldwide aggression and justifying commitment of more than half-a-million American ground troops to hurl back the aggressor and reseal the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. That may have been exactly the way it was then; but, today, taking into account the major changes which have since taken place within the Communist world, the continuation by North Vietnam of its military effort to conquer the South obviously is locally-inspired rather than externally-directed. Under such conditions, the tenets of the Nixon Doctrine devolve upon the victim the primary responsibility for its own defense and encourage others to assist reasonably with materials, but only sparingly, if at all, with men. Accordingly, American forces were repatriated from Asia at a pace, in a manner, and under arrangements calculated to avoid strewing politico-economic wreckage in the area which later could embroil the United States in renewed hostilities.

It is apparent that the Nixon Doctrine is basically an ongoing effort to accurately perceive the world not only as it now is, but also as it changes and evolves. Implicit therein is our exploitation of those fictions and myths which realism decrees should be treated as fact. Then, based upon these understandings, U.S. policies, doctrines, and strategies are conceived, modified, or discarded so that we can more quickly and efficiently respond to current realities, evolving challenges, and emerging opportunities. The Nixon Doctrine places heavy reliance on negotiation, partnership, and strength as techniques for forwarding U.S. national interests. It recognizes defense priorities in the following order of importance: *first*, continental defense; *second*, protection of lines of communications; *third*, maintenance of alliances; *fourth*, protection of U.S. overseas interests, and *fifth*, the capability to assist indirectly or directly in local conflicts, if, when, and where advisable.

Our earlier strategy called for an always ready response to every opposition initiative and therefore demanded full manning of all the Cold and Hot War ramparts. In contrast, current doctrine does not insist that every move by the other camp be treated with equal alarm. It thus permits assignment of increasingly limited resources according to carefully calculated orders of need.

From this perspective, our Southeast Asia troop withdrawal, Vietnamization of that war, and the vigorous campaign to end it by strong diplomatic and extended military pressures on Hanoi can be seen to fall squarely into the new fifth priority concept of limited partnership with allies engaged in local conflicts. And, whereas the older Containment Doctrine assigned top priority to multiple areas of defense, the Nixon Doctrine realistically highlights continental defense as America's first priority. To this end, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks were begun in 1969. They aimed first to freeze nuclear stockpiles at levels assuring mutual deterrence, and hereafter in the ongoing SALT II negotiations to reduce their size and cost. Knowledgeable observers believe the initial agreements negotiated in Moscow will extend for several years the time during which the continental United States will remain secure from nuclear attack. At the same time they do nothing to allay the growing unease with which members of the Sino-Soviet bloc have come to regard each other's nuclear capabilities.

As a sign of the times, it is interesting to note that the Soviet and U.S. strategic stockpiles now regulated by SALT may constitute the last remaining vestiges of our former all-pervasive bipolar concept of the world. Polycentrism in Communist and noncommunist countries alike has become the order of the day. Its ubiquitous influence has flooded the

international scene since the U.N. decision in mid-1971 to seat the Peoples' Republic of China and to give it Nationalist China's former permanent membership on the Security Council.

Those acts gave the lie to the fiction of a lurking conspiracy led by the United States to "unleash Chiang" Kal-shek upon mainland China. They undermined the foundations of the Peking regime's violent, longstanding anti-American propaganda campaign. They caused Mao's minions finally to focus their undivided attention upon the many conflicting ideological, geographic, and historical forces which serve to repel the Chinese and Russian societies from each other. Peking's leaders at last were forced by these events to acknowledge that their basic danger stems not from the United States and its allies, but from the pincers of Soviet power steadily encircling China from the north, from the west, and from the south. Top Chinese officials are lately reported to have but two reactions to Soviet Russia: "hatred and fear." The realignment of the two Chinas at the United Nations also has forced Moscow to see more clearly the collision course being set by Mainland China's need to expand into the same vast spaces of the Siberian heartland that the Soviet Union feels it must occupy if it is to fulfill its own destiny. That nation's regard for the P.R.C. is mutely expressed by the presence of 49 Red Army divisions along the disputed 7,000-mile-long Sino-Soviet frontier.

The leaders of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China have become increasingly aware of the costly implications of this diametric opposition of their basic future interests. In the Communist world, the fostering of continued fighting in Vietnam once seemed a cheap and easy means to nettle the United States while demonstrating fealty to the legend of Marxist solidarity. Then, as the Sino-Soviet rivalry came into sharp focus, continued support of Hanoi by the Soviet Union appeared counterproductive to its need for calm in the West during a time when prudence suggested that Soviet attention ought to be directed primarily toward the East.

Similarly, the P.R.C. came to see that its basic security interests were substantially disserved by keeping open channels for military aid to Hanoi which also functioned as conduits for further extension of Soviet influence at China's southern border. For these reasons, Washington could safely estimate that both countries had come to recognize that an end to the Vietnam war would be in their own self-interest and that the mining and closure of Haiphong Harbor by the United States to forward that end would be accepted with the equanimity that it actually was. President Nixon's later visits to their capitals constituted tacit admission, by both, of their self-interest in gradually normalizing relations with the United States. They also served as occasions to offer each party parallel presidential assurances of U.S. neutrality and evenhanded treatment during the indefinite duration of their Siberian contest.

In that conflict, both powers understand that permanent domination of the vast territory involved can be assured only by massive settlement, development, and industrialization. They know that unprecedented capital investments will be demanded and are preparing to make them. Recently, the Soviet Union exhibited unusual goodwill in settlement of the German issue, and its remarkable acquiescence to Egypt's abrupt demand for withdrawal of Soviet forces probably signaled the start of a new era of relaxation in the Mediterranean. Moscow's diplomats moved to dampen rather than to fan the flare-up of Arab-Israeli tensions which followed tragic events at the Munich Olympic games. They appear serious about achieving a mutual and balanced reduction of forces in Europe.

Such conciliatory moves seem to be in response to a perceived need for detente with the West while the problem in Asia is dealt with. From the Soviet standpoint, these are the kind of things which can contribute to the creation of a comparatively benign international climate conducive to buttressing their Asian ramparts from domestic resources, from profits growing out of expanded trade, and even from borrowed Western capital. The Chinese, on the other hand, move ever more inscrutably to clear their decks for economic battle, but P.R.C. placidity on the Taiwan issue and the rapidly evolving political and industrial rapprochement with Japan are two of many indicators that China, too, intends to flex growing economic muscle in the years ahead.

There is talk by these two countries of a formal renunciation of the use of force against each other, and there is hope that this conflict which finds the world's two largest armies facing each other can be resolved without warfare—but there is no assurance that it will be. Soviet strategists have pointedly discussed the doctrine of preemption in nuclear war, while the key political and industrial areas of Mainland China long have been protected by the most extensive underground defenses extant.

It does not follow that the United States and others may relax simply because the world's two most populous countries are in serious contention. In this lawless world, many separate forces of disharmony, in addition to those stemming from the struggle between Communism and Capitalism, abound between nations. Those underlying the Arab-Israeli war are but one example. Moreover, there is no assurance even that the two principal contenders will choose to devote all their capabilities to be worrisome exclusively to each other. Communism's dogmatic hostility to competing systems remains an underlying fact of international life which can swiftly surface above intramural disputations whenever pragmatism and the self-interests of Moscow and Peking fall into momentary coincidence. Nevertheless, the emergence and growth of Sino-Soviet tensions over the Eurasian land mass serve, while they continue, to moderate those between East and West. They provide this nation and others a respite to address unrelated concerns.

Of course, for many millions of individuals everywhere, Communists and non-Communists alike, the world will never lose its bipolar image, the intensity of Cold War will not diminish, and global Hot War will be forever imminent. And, it is possible that the nation's leaders have, indeed, been deliberately deceived by a clever enemy masking its solidarity behind a disguise of disunity. If that is the case, or if the unexpected occurs, or should dangers revive through the passage of time, then they must be faced. However, it becomes increasingly difficult for most individuals to interpret the significant events of these beginning years of the current decade except in terms of the consequences of growing Sino-Soviet alienation and disharmony. Therefore, it seems provident for the country to take advantage of the possibilities while they last for advancing U.S. domestic and overseas interests afforded by this probable condition of low international threat.

Already, national priorities have been reordered and defense spending has been pared to a level appropriate for a period of respite from serious external exigencies. This is obvious when the defense budget, adjusted for pay changes and exclusive of retired pay for Fiscal Year 1964, the year prior to the Vietnamese buildup, is compared with that for current Fiscal Year 1973. In constant 1973 dollars, the 1964 expenditure was \$78 billion, while that for 1973 will be less than \$73 billion, a cut \$5 billion below the previous peacetime level. For these comparison years,

the reduction is equivalent to a decline in defense outlays from 9.7% to 6.5% of the gross national product, from 44% to 31% of the Federal budget, and from 30 to 20% of public spending. It has been absorbed completely by domestic programs and tax cuts. Thus, the elimination and cutback of bases and the reorganization of command structure, now underway Servicewise should not be regarded as a response to the ending of the war in Southeast Asia, but instead as a reshuffling of available defense dollars in order to allocate them in closer accord with the revised order of defense priorities called for under the Nixon Doctrine.

There is a minimum level of defense effort below which no nation can fall for long without arousing the bloodlust of predators. Unless, in the first place, creating the U.S. nuclear deterrent capability was unnecessary and a foolish miscalculation, any subsequent failure to maintain it at the level needed for nuclear parity inescapably will force Soviet leaders to evaluate the wisdom of pre-emption. On the other hand, so long as mutual deterrence is maintained, it operates as a strategic umbrella beneath which crises involving conventional armaments probably can be orchestrated to fairly high intensities without undue risk of nuclear backlash. Thus, should the West's conventional defenses be sadly neglected, Moscow and Peking might realistically entertain a temporary moratorium on their own controversy in order to seize an opportunity to forward their still-common eventual goal of Marxist universality. In this context, the Soviet Union's conciliatory efforts for a detente with NATO are not inconsistent with the recent strengthening of its Red Army forces in Europe. This buildup has a dual purpose: first, to protect that country's Western flank while it is engaged in the East; and second, to preserve its military and political options to maneuver westward again if irresistibly easy opportunities are presented.

Given circumstances in which bluff or blackmail are likely to succeed, and should they fail, the cost of following through militarily seems reasonable, neither Soviet Russia nor Communist China can be expected to ignore opportunities to buy substantial advancements in objectives at bargain basement prices. In fact, the same can be said of almost all nations, and it means that even if Communist threats dissipate entirely there still will be other dangers presented by other countries. Over the long haul, a constant ebb and flow of international tensions is guaranteed indefinitely by the impending world energy, population, and food crises alone. The need to stay prepared for an inevitable flow after any ebb in tension will long remain.

The world's nuclear powers incur unique risks and heavy expense for their atomic arsenals, but, deterred except as a last resort from initiating the strategic use of these special weapons, their need to maintain suitable conventional forces is no less than that of the nonnuclear weapons states. With regard to conventional arms, no nation can hope to survive unless it maintains a defense base high enough to deter nonnuclear attack and wide enough, if deterrence fails, to support the fast expansion of its survival capability. For the United States this is not an inconsequential task. It regularly demands a burdensome share of the national budget. And, when danger is not imminent, it is difficult year after year to persuade the Congress to keep on providing substantial arms outlays to maintain it. It would be ironic if an increasingly niggardly defense budget someday weakens us to the point of inviting a conventional attack upon ourselves and key allies, as in Western Europe, against which attack the only viable alternative to surrender is an early resort to our outdated stockpile of crude and highly radioactive tactical nuclear weapons. It would be even more ironic if the adoption of new force postures

and tactical doctrines, clearly and cleanly capable of deterring that kind of attack before it ever begins, remains blocked by the persistence of an anti-nuclear psychosis that bars the introduction of a new generation of discrete, substantially fallout-free, tactical warheads based on newly emerging pure hydrogen fusion technologies.

In the future as in the past, the keystone of U.S. national security will always be a willingness by the American people to support a thoroughly modern military force capable of coping with any emergency, strategic or tactical, nuclear or conventional.

The clarity with which molders of the Nixon Doctrine and their successors analyze changes in the geopolitical climate, and the ingenuity of their suggested responses to such developments, will be meaningful only for as long as the military establishments capable of implementing them is maintained. Yet, military preparedness is not an American tradition. During the extended ebb in international tension experienced by the United States between the two World Wars, for example, defense was only marginally supported. The Selective Service Act of 1940 was enacted by but one vote, and early World War II GIs had to drill with wooden guns.

Two generations of war and danger have built up a momentum of public support for adequate defense budgets which has not yet run out, but the existence of antimilitary sentiment today is obvious and growing. The critical test of the Nixon Doctrine is still ahead. It will be necessary to devise effective means to maintain that momentum during another probable period of extended respite from imminent external threat.

#### ENERGY VERSUS ENVIRONMENT: A RATIONAL APPROACH

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent edition of the Wheeling News-Register, a prominent daily newspaper in my district, columnist Don Daniels offered some interesting observations about the need for a clean environment versus the continued demand for energy to keep our Nation operating smoothly. In his remarks, Mr. Daniels, who is well known to his paper's readership for turning witty but accurate phrases, also had some very flattering things to say about the position taken on this issue by one of our colleagues in the Senate, my friend the esteemed Majority Whip ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia.

In their call for a rational approach to reconciling our energy requirements with the need for a clean environment, I believe both Senator BYRD and Mr. Daniels have useful insights to offer. For that reason I believe Mr. Daniels' column, reprinted below, will be of interest to my colleagues:

#### ENERGY VERSUS ENVIRONMENT: A RATIONAL APPROACH

(By Don Daniels)

In what has become his almost trademarked fashion, West Virginia Senator Robert C. Byrd has sliced through the fog of rhetoric and diluted the anguished outcries of the doomsayers and gotten directly to the point.

The tough Democrat who quite frequently astounds his party colleagues by saying what

Byrd thinks and not what some loyalists want him to say, has come forth now to the effect that government clean air standards are not only unworkable, they are dangerous.

I'm sure the environmentalists will not breathe easier for that. But I am equally sure they will continue to cough up their particular brand of sanitary sputum.

In calling for a necessary re-evaluation of the ecologist credo, Senator Byrd said a relaxation of existing environmental rules is vital if the nation is to escape a national paralysis.

"The inescapable fact," Senator Byrd said, "is that if we are going to avoid a paralyzing stoppage in almost every phase of our national life we are just going to have to make accommodations."

The logic of that is inescapable and inarguable.

The United States is an industrial nation. It mines coal and makes steel and builds buildings and it exists on energy created by man. It drives cars and builds roads. And now it is faced with the frightening prospect of factories closing not because of any economic depression but because the idealists, the Harvard trained, broad based social evaluators claim everyone will die pretty soon unless the stacks quit spewing smoke.

Well, everyone will die pretty soon if they do quit spewing smoke, you can be sure of that.

According to Byrd, and this is one senator who does his homework, if the standards adopted by the Environmental Protection Agency for 1975 are adhered to, the consumption of 155 million tons of coal a year would be prohibited.

If this happens the nation will need to spend a billion and a half dollars to import oil for the lamps of Alliquippa and the carburetors of General Motors. It is not an enticing prospect.

Senator Byrd is not advocating abandonment of all the ecology efforts. He is simply asking that his sometimes easily panicked colleagues in the halls of Congress take a more realistic approach. The senator, in fact, lauds the aims of the back-to-nature bombasticators but he insists that unless Americans are ready to full change their lifestyles, we are going to have to make room for the industry necessary to provide the energy to run the mills . . . and it is the mills that pay for the bread we buy.

Mr. Byrd is sometimes unique along that often odd collection of elected sachems in the upper chamber of Congress. Not only does he often distress the party faithful he occasionally, if his conscience requires it, supports one measure or another which may require some sacrifice on his own part and that of his home state, if the measure appears to benefit the entire nation.

That is no small thing. But it is admirable. It has long been the contention of this meek observer that the Senate and its members are not beholden only to their own states, they are beholden to every citizen of the nation. The same applies to House members but perhaps to a lesser degree.

In his plea for a realistic approach to ecology . . . especially clean air, Senator Byrd does indeed cry loudly for his own State of West Virginia . . . but he is crying for all of the nation too.

Clean air, you understand, is a fairly recent issue. Before the ecologists got hold of the idea we all used to go around breathing and increasing our life spans in total ignorance of the dire danger we were in. Now we are warned by legions of nature lovers who cry havoc in the streets . . . and who expect total purity over night. It can't be done.

Coal companies, steel producers, the sweat and blood peddlers of the nation are working diligently to overcome the discomfort of polluted air. And I am quite certain that they will accomplish this without interference from additional government bureaus and

more essays from book trained theorists who apparently believe you can produce energy by waving a fig leaf.

Senator Byrd is correct, of course. And he will gain a few loudspoken adversaries for his dedication to honesty. Some of these will get on television to speak their piece. When they do I hope they will realize that the device they used to broadcast their views is the ultimate product of that smokestack they see when they look out the studio window. . . .

So is the auto they got there in.

#### A PRISONER'S FAITH

### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, many of us were privileged during the last several months to visit with some of our young men recently returned from prisoner of war camps in Vietnam. Their sacrifices, their love of their country and their God, their deep patriotism and loyalties, made even the most ardent member of the "hate America" crowd stop dead in their tracks for a brief pause in our Nation's history. Over and over again, I have been deeply conscious of the deep and abiding faith in God which sustained these brave young men throughout their personal encounter with the Godless tyranny of communism.

While all of us hope and pray that future generations of Americans will be spared the suffering endured by our returning prisoners, the realities of life in a hostile world cannot permit us to accept this hope as fact. One wonders what will sustain future generations of Americans in similar circumstances in view of the Supreme Court decision banning prayer in the public schools and the failure of Congress to overturn this decision. We must provide our young people with the moral and spiritual weapons to withstand whatever pressures the future may bring—we must pass legislation to return voluntary prayer to our public schools.

"In the Presence of Mine Enemies" by Navy Capt. Howard E. Rutledge recounts the experiences of a POW and his dependence and faith in a Supreme Being—it is reviewed here by Andrew Seamans, assistant editor of Human Events:

IN THE PRESENCE OF MINE ENEMIES

(By Howard and Phyllis Rutledge)

It was to be expected that once the POWs returned from the prison camps of Vietnam there would be a mad rush to get their experiences into books to hit the market as soon as possible.

Actually there has been an ex-POW's book on the market for two years, Green Beret Maj. James N. Rowe's *Five Years to Freedom* (Little, Brown, \$7.95), but quite mysteriously the publishers seem not to be promoting it despite the keen national interest in ex-POWs. While Nick Rowe's book recounts his half-decade in the clutches of the Vietcong and his narrow escape, publishers are looking now for material based on the experiences of those who landed at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines last February.

While two other books are already slated to hit the book stores, Fleming H. Revell Co.,

not one of the publishing giants, grabbed the edge with the first tome, and it's a good one.

*In the Presence of Mine Enemies* is a triple play of sorts. Not only does it recount the seven years of torment and physical torture of Navy Capt. Howard E. Rutledge in Hanoi, it also includes the mental anguish of his wife Phyllis who for five of those seven years knew only that her husband was "missing in action," and the added perspective of black and white illustrations of prison life by Navy Cmdr. Gerald Coffee, who was captured by the Vietnamese Communists two months before Rutledge's plane was downed.

*In the Presence of Mine Enemies* is not a long book, yet in its 124 pages it says an awful lot. Yes, it details the tortures recounted in the ex-POWs' press conferences, but it also tells how at least one of these American servicemen steeled himself to the ordeal by reclaiming his religious past. And it sadly tells also of at least one who did not make the trip back to "The World."

Air Force Capt. Ron Storz, affectionately nicknamed the "Hardheaded Kraut" by fellow prisoners in the maximum security prison known as "Alcatraz," was an inspiration to the other 10 men moved there from the Hanoi Hilton for being incorrigible.

Storz, using that unique tap code we've heard so much about which enabled POWs to communicate one with another, would sweep down the prison corridors, his broom heralding religious messages with its carefully measured beat on the stone floor. "Seek God here! This is where you'll find Him," was one of the captain's messages Rutledge remembers.

Then, Rutledge writes, Storz tapped out a foreboding plea to his Maker: "One day Ron swept a very different kind of message. With his broom he tapped, 'God, hear my cries.' We all knew Ron was very ill. He was getting weaker and his weight had dropped from around 175 pounds to just over 100. He was quite emaciated, and even the enemy was growing aware of his plight."

When the Reds tried to move Storz to larger quarters, isolated from his comrades, Storz didn't want to go. All he begged was to be left in a cell near those of his friends. Or better yet that he be allowed a cellmate. Someone to talk with. He had been kept in solitary and denied any letters from home. Later the other 10 POWs were returned to the Hanoi Hilton; Storz remained behind.

Rutledge laments: "That night we moved, one at a time, into a waiting truck, past Ron in his lonely cell. It was one of the hardest moments of my life as a POW. The worst part of being a prisoner is the helplessness to reach out and lift up another man in need. We couldn't even say good-bye. They had the burp guns. They had the power."

Concluding this tragic chapter, the Navy pilot writes: "We never stopped praying for Ron and for his family, but we knew we would probably never see him again until that day God chose to unite the Alcatraz Gang in another world free from such pain and sorrow."

Between the descriptions of torture, mistreatment and lack of even the most elemental medical care that was the norm in Hanoi's camps, there are some few touches of humor in Capt. Rutledge's saga.

One such involved the profuse resort by the POWs to four-letter words to hurl at their guards. Rutledge said they would take pleasure in cursing the keepers with a smile on their lips so the captors, knowing no English, would be ignorant of what names they were being called.

Amusingly, the increasingly more religious naval officer and his cellmate for a while—Air Force Capt. George McKnight—tried to reform their barracks language with "a pact."

"One day George and I made a pact," Rutledge recalls. "We would start on Sunday and go seven days; we would each keep track of the other's swear words, numbering them, and the person with the fewest slips would receive a precious banana at the end of the week. We may have had to steal the banana from a careless guard, but we weren't working on a cure for stealing that week!"

While Capt. Rutledge languished in Hanoi, Phyllis lived out her years in her own private hell. From the fateful day she learned from a Navy chaplain that Howard was missing in action to the wondrous night when she saw him walk off the C-141, her life was one crisis after another, in many ways typical of the plight of those brave women who waited so long and so courageously for their loved ones to return.

There was the pressure of suddenly being faced with the total responsibility of raising four children—the oldest 15. And the sick people who prey on those who are suffering, like the anonymous foreign tea bag received in the mail by Howard's mother and addressed to Howard's father who had died shortly before Rutledge was shot down.

After searching for hidden meanings in hope that it was some kind of message from her husband, Mrs. Rutledge sent it to the Navy only to find that other military families in similar straits had received these sick little gifts.

Yet, it seemed the fates were especially out to get Phyllis Rutledge. Two years after Howard was reported as an MIA, Phyllis lost her mother.

Then, on July 4, 1968, tragedy struck again. The family was spending the day at the beach—swimming and picnicking. Fifteen-year-old John Rutledge, the Rutledge's lone son, dove into the surf and struck his head on a submerged rock. Although dragged ashore by an unidentified black youth, the result was almost enough to drive Phyllis over the brink of despair. "Mrs. Rutledge," said the doctor, "your son is paralyzed from the neck down. He is alive but will probably never move again."

Mrs. Rutledge goes on to describe her life of doubt leading to the moment when, after all but giving up hope for Howard's safety and without warning, she received a seven-line letter from Hanoi written by her husband. She details how she had almost lost her faith, and how her friends, some of whom she had never known and others she will never know, helped pull her through.

And finally she shares with the readers her moments of anxiety—waiting by the television screen for a glimpse of Capt. Rutledge as he stepped down from the C-141 and of happiness when they embraced upon his return to San Diego.

There is a footnote to the story of Capt. and Mrs. Howard Rutledge. While in Hanoi, the pilot made several promises to himself. One of these was "I promised God that the first Sunday of my return to freedom I would take my family to their home church. At the close of the service I would walk to the front, confess my faith in Christ, and take my responsible place as a member there with my family. . . ."

On February 18, six days after his release, Capt. Rutledge kept his vow, joining the First Southern Baptist Church of Clairemont in California. According to the Rev. Charles W. Foley Jr., the pastor, five others in the audience that day, moved by the captain's testimonial, "were inspired to accept the Lord."

The warrior had come home to his country and to his God, and he brought something back to each.

## ENACTMENT OF THE "BRANNAN PLAN"

### HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 marks a new era in agricultural policy. It embodies new and forward-looking concepts that I believe will enhance domestic food production and simultaneously assure the American farmer a fair return on his investment. This landmark legislation may not represent all that we would like but it is a very significant step in the right direction.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the originator of the 1973 act. Nearly a quarter of a century ago Charles F. Brannan had the foresight and imagination to propose supports for farm incomes rather than farm prices. It is this basic concept that lies at the heart of what has evolved at last into our national farm and food policy.

It gives me great pleasure to insert into the RECORD at this time an article that originally appeared in the New York Times and was reprinted in the August issue of the Rocky Mountain Union Farmer which recognizes the contribution of a great Secretary of Agriculture and my good friend, Charles F. Brannan.

#### "BRANNAN PLAN" PLEASURES BRANNAN

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

It took nearly a quarter of a century, but Charles F. Brannan was a happy man today.

It was Mr. Brannan, as Secretary of Agriculture under President Truman who first proposed in 1949 the radically different method of supporting farm income that finally reached fruition in the farm bill signed today.

Mr. Brannan, now 69 years old, is general counsel to the National Farmers Union with offices in Denver. Asked in a telephone interview if he was pleased by the new bill, he replied, "I sure am."

"I've had a lot of fun watching it this year," he said. "Back then it was called the 'infamous Brannan plan.'"

As a member of the House of Representatives, Richard M. Nixon as President signed today's legislation voted with the majority of the House against a provision of the then-pending farm bill that contained a Brannan-plan experiment.

For 40 years the Government has supported farm prices, not farm incomes. It has done this by restricting acreage to avert oversupply, and by, in effect, buying up part of the crop when necessary to keep the price from dropping below the desired level. That is how the once-huge Government-owned surpluses were accumulated.

The Brannan approach supports farm incomes, not prices. A "target price" is established by law for the main crops—wheat, feed grains and cotton. The farmer sells his crops for whatever the market will bring. If his average prices fall below the legally established targets, the Government sends him a check for the difference, with a limit in the bill of \$20,000 per farmer.

The new plan has several advantages, in the view of its advocates, as follows:

If production is high and prices drop, consumers get the full benefit of the price de-

cline, though as taxpayers there can be a cost to them.

Farmers, with an assured income, can safely plant all their acres. This is crucial now when maximum production is needed to help bring down soaring food prices.

With prices high as at present—and many experts believe they will remain well above the new "target" prices at least through 1975—the new program is virtually costless to the government and the taxpayer.

The program is simple and does not require complicated mechanisms such as the present "bread tax" on wheat, payments to farmers for leaving acres idle, export subsidies and the like.

This bill, says Don Paarlberg, director of economics in the Agriculture Department, "gets rid of all the junk accumulated over the years."

"The bill," Mr. Paarlberg added with a smile the other day, "amounts to unintended euthanasia for the old farm programs."

How did it finally come about after all these years?

The Nixon Administration did not propose the change, though Mr. Paarlberg and his chief, Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, are among persons who are now enthusiastic about it.

Chief credit for the change apparently goes to a Republican Senator from North Dakota, Milton R. Young, who was a freshman in the Senate when Mr. Brannan first proposed the plan. At a closed session of the Senate Agriculture Committee in early May this year, Mr. Young suggested the new approach for wheat, and the committee quickly expanded his idea to include feed grains and cotton.

There was little opposition in the Senate and the House Agriculture Committee also quickly embraced the idea.

The basic explanation for this, however, was not sheer intellectual appeal but the sudden increase in prices of the crops involved. This meant that the Brannan type of approach would cost very little or nothing, and it became a better way than the old programs for inducing farmers to take the risk of planting to their full capacity.

Secretary Butz estimated today that the cost to the Government of programs for these basic crops, which was \$4-billion in the last fiscal year, would drop to less than \$500-million for next year's crops and perhaps would be "nothing."

What are the flaws?

There is essentially only one, but it troubles some government officials. It is the potentially huge, and open-ended, cost of the program if crop surpluses and sharply lower prices should reappear.

For example, Gary L. Seevers, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, noting that "our aim is the largest possible output," said he could foresee a time when supply and demand seemed to be coming into better balance, with some possibility of a drop in prices below the targets.

Mr. Seevers said that under strong pressure from the Office of Management and Budget, which is always worried about government spending, the Secretary of Agriculture might then exercise his right under the law to order a cutback in acreage and hence production—a cutback that is enforced by denying the cash payments to farmers that do not comply.

"We could be right back in shortages," Mr. Seevers said recently. Herbert Stein, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, once called the bill "terrible," though he commented at a time when the target prices in the law seemed likely to be much higher than those in the final version of the bill. It was only a reduction of the targets from the original Senate levels that averted a Presidential veto.

In any case, a wholly new type of farm

program for the main crops will begin next year, and it could remain well past the four-year life of the bill Mr. Nixon signed. Reminded of Mr. Brannan and his long-ago Democratic proposal, Mr. Paarlberg said, "He ought to be pleased, it's his program."

**U.S. NAVAL STRENGTH SHOULD  
BE MAINTAINED**

**HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues will recall, prior to the congressional recess the House passed the military procurement authorization bill leaving intact the full \$1.5 billion requested for the Trident submarine project in fiscal year 1974.

Our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol will shortly be debating this measure, and we are all aware of the move underway to slash \$885 million earmarked for the Trident submarine program from this legislation; a move which may prove to be penny wise but pound foolish.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House and in the Senate an editorial which recently appeared in the Annapolis Evening Capital, for I wholeheartedly agree that—

There is no room, and there can be no room, for the viewpoint of those who would weaken this country to the point at which major foreign adversaries, such as China and the Soviet Union, would be tempted to undertake the kinds of risky ventures that have placed the world close to disaster in the past and could do so again in the future.

If we are to emasculate our defense forces in the name of "economy" we should consider the total costs involved. While \$885 million is indeed a sizable figure, we must consider the cost—not merely in dollars but in human life and tragedy—of another war precipitated by unnecessary weakness on our part. It is trite yet poignantly true that in matters of defense an ounce of protection can be worth a pound of cure. It is a lesson of history that we should not forget—one which is effectively articulated in the editorial which I insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

**U.S. NAVAL STRENGTH SHOULD BE MAINTAINED**

The latest edition of Jane's Fighting Ships, the bible of international Naval strength, indicates that the Soviet Union's Navy may for the first time in history be number one.

That this could happen, that Jane's could even consider the possibility, is a shocking reflection on the extent to which United States armed forces, and especially the Navy, are getting the short end of the budgetary stick in Washington.

The problem of course is that same old bogey, the Vietnam War, a national catastrophe of such vast proportions that it staggers the mind. For it seems clear that the end result of Vietnam will have been not only to weaken this country morally and financially, but to weaken it physically as well.

The Congress, with good reason it must be admitted, is clearly determined that U.S.

forces will not again be put into battle for irrelevant or marginal political objectives. And Congress is also deeply disturbed by revelation after revelation of deceit and fabrication about military operations. That these deceptions have been perpetrated mainly by high ranking civilians is increasingly beside the point, the point being that to a large degree the military is going to take the brunt of the reaction.

This is unfortunate indeed for the world in years to come is not suddenly going to become a paradise. Earth is a dangerous place; most of the people who live on this planet are hungry and unhappy, and the chances for conflict continue to be great.

No one can fault President Nixon for opening new lines of communication to China and the Soviet Union. It is better by far to be talking to our adversaries than not talking to them. But it would be a great mistake for this country to develop the notion, as many on the radical left have done, that a line of communication is the same as a permanent friendship.

The fact is that the surest way to provide a future war is for either the Russians or the Chinese to get the idea that the United States is weak and can be had, or worse, can be bluffed successfully.

The unfortunate fact is that right now, in the wake of Vietnam, and in the light of an illegal and unconstitutional to say nothing of profoundly stupid action in Cambodia, the chances of the United States military and credibility being taken seriously in the near future are not too good. Unless, that is, the question is one of genuine and meaningful and direct national security, and not just an attempt to maintain influence or some similar unspecific objective.

This means that it is more important than ever for the United States to maintain sufficient military strength to provide the deterrent effect that has avoided a major world war for the last quarter century.

Such strength must begin with the Navy's submerged missile systems and be backed up with other expensive hardware. Yet at the moment it is the hardware that is being cut while skyrocketing personnel costs are eating up larger and larger percentages of the budget.

There is no simple answer to this problem. But one answer that we can not afford is simply an all out reduction of U.S. military capability. There is plenty of room to discuss methods of increasing efficiency, the reduction of overlapping strategic forces, and other technical and strategic matters of continuing importance.

But there is no room, and there can be no room, for the viewpoint of those who would weaken this country to the point at which major foreign adversaries, such as China and the Soviet Union, would be tempted to undertake the kinds of risky ventures that have placed the world close to disaster in the past and could do so again in the future.

The old advice about keeping powder dry and carrying a big stick is more applicable than ever in today's dangerous nuclear world.

**DEDICATION OF CHATFIELD DAM**

**HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, 1973, the Chatfield Dam was dedicated. This represented the culmination of many years of work on the part of a great number of Coloradans who recog-

nize the importance of protecting the metropolitan Denver area from the ravages of flash flooding.

Located at the confluence of Plum Creek and the South Platte River, the Chatfield Dam should go a long way toward eliminating the threats of devastating floods such as the one which caused over \$325 million worth of damage in the Denver area alone in 1965.

On the occasion of the dedication, Vice President AGNEW spoke to the need for flood control, environmental quality, and sound land use controls. I believe his timely remarks will be of interest to many of my colleagues, and I am, accordingly, inserting them in the RECORD at this point:

**ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

I always enjoy coming to Denver. Flying across the plains and seeing your modern city set against the backdrop of the snow-capped Rockies leads one to understand the enduring and powerful attraction of the West.

For those of you who have the good fortune to live in Colorado, the natural beauty of your State is a very real part of your everyday lives. It provides a constant source of enjoyment and inspiration and, because you live close to nature, your appreciation of its marvels is heightened. But also because you live close to nature, you possess a very realistic understanding of its often unexpected, inscrutable ways. You are profoundly aware that nature can cause devastation and human misery. And that is the reason we are here today.

The Platte River stretching before us can illustrate both the benign and the malevolent in nature. The South Platte was a well-traveled route to the West for the early settlers. It offers them a convenient road, as well as firewood, shade, protection, food and many other natural attractions. Communities such as Denver sprang up at its more favorable crossing points. Yet along with its advantages, the river also harbored many dangers. Its shifting quicksand made for a treacherous crossing, and the first settlers of Denver were warned by the Indians that they had chosen a hazardous site for their new community.

The South Platte had a history of flash flooding. Too often its deceptively placid waters had broken loose, leaving destruction and chaos in their wake. Yet never was this danger as great as on the night of June 16, 1965, when the rain-swollen Platte exploded with a fury that brought about the worst disaster in the history of Denver.

The flood caused over \$325 million worth of damage in the Denver area alone. Thousands of homes and businesses were lost, power and communications were disrupted, water and sewer systems endangered and the health and safety of more than a million citizens jeopardized.

Perhaps even more far-reaching were the costs inflicted in terms of human anguish and misery. It is a tribute to the resiliency of the human spirit that those stricken by the flood found courage within themselves to rebuild anew from the ruins of what, for many, represented the dreams and hard work of a lifetime.

But if one single factor kept them going, it was the hope that measures would be taken to prevent a future recurrence of the tragedy. As far back as 1950, Congress had authorized money for flood control in this area, but there was an apparent lack of public pressure to develop a workable project so the funds lay dormant until the tragedy of 1965 energized the people. Something had to be done to remove this threat if rebuilding efforts were to go forward. Mr. Jack Shapiro



and his group recognized that and they went to work.

The new dam before us today is proof that something was done. This dam came not from a mere governmental appropriation. It came from the hearts and minds of the people themselves. That is where the Chatfield story really began and that is where the initiative for all great endeavors in our society must develop. Unless citizens are willing to press their demands and share the responsibility for arriving at desired goals, then government cannot serve them well.

Unfortunately, many citizens today erroneously feel that there is little they can do to stimulate improvement. They automatically look to government to identify the problems and provide the solutions. But government cannot shoulder all the burdens. Government is limited in its resources and energies. Moreover, when government fails to meet the demands made of it, some citizens become frustrated, alienated. The surest antidote to alienation is involvement, and those of you who have participated in the realization of this project have seen the achievement that is possible when concerned citizens commit themselves and press their demands in a responsible manner.

I realize that it has been a long, hard struggle. But when you have the kind of responsive leadership in the private sector that Denver has, and the effective professionalism of public servants such as Senator Peter Dominick and Governor Love, Congressmen Brotzman and Gordon Allott, to mention a few, who worked on this project from its inception and, of course, the current leadership of Governor Vanderhoof, a good result is assured. That combination gained a momentum all its own, a momentum that moved the construction forward and got the job done. The local, State and Federal cooperation that completed this project exemplifies the spirit of the New Federalism which the Nixon Administration believes in. We commend all of you for proving that Federalism works and works well.

There is another concept we believe in that you have also applied effectively in the planning and building of the Chatfield Dam. I am referring to the need in our country today to strike a balance between necessary growth and environmental protection. You in Colorado have a special interest in preserving the natural beauty and resources with which your State has been so richly endowed. I am encouraged to see that you have found a proper balance in this project and that the cooperation of responsible environmental groups—many of whose representatives have been invited here today—have made it possible for important features protective of the environment to be incorporated into this project.

For example, I understand that trees were planted well in advance of completion to provide the Blue Heron that have traditionally nested here with a new home to move to once the area is flooded. Moreover, I understand that, along with its primary purpose of flood control, the Dam will also provide facilities for boating, fishing, camping, hiking and other recreational activities for the people it protects. Clearly you have shown that progress need not mean the destruction of nature but rather a better way of harnessing the destructive aspects of nature so that its advantages and beauties can be enjoyed even more.

The Chatfield Dam is a monument to American vision and diligence. It was the vision of a better tomorrow, ladies and gentlemen, that brought Americans West in earlier times. That vision sustained them and gave them the strength, determination and courage to overcome the obstacles they faced. That diligence enabled them to settle communities like Denver to provide a better life for themselves and their families.

As we dedicate this Dam and open the new

chapter it represents in the history of Denver's growth, we can be certain that the spirit of America, which played such a major role in the development of this great Nation, is alive and undiminished here along the Platte River.

#### H.R. 10003—RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks, Congress will act on a bill to reorganize the bankrupt Northeast railroad system. During this reorganization process, it is inevitable that railroad service will be terminated along a substantial number of branch lines, creating severe but unavoidable hardships for the businesses, individuals, and communities served.

As a means of softening this impact, I have introduced H.R. 10003, a bill to provide adjustment assistance to firms, workers, and communities adversely affected by the termination of railroad service. Under this program, funds would be available to assist firms changing production processes or using different modes of transportation in order to continue local operation and prevent the loss of jobs.

If firms are forced to close or move elsewhere, funds would be available to assist the affected employees and communities. This bill is consistent with the general philosophy of adjustment assistance—that the Government should, wherever possible, minimize the unintentional damage to firms and individuals resulting directly from Federal policy decisions.

The national railroad system is a regulated industry. Federal permission must be obtained for any changes in service including terminations, reductions in the number of stops per station, and changes in the time schedule. Federal policy decisions have forced individual railroad lines to continue necessary but unprofitable service to particular communities, and have directed mergers of bankrupt lines. In addition, discriminatory tax structures and Federal subsidies of the trucking and air freight industries through the construction of highways and airports have had a great deal to do with the decline of railroad service in the Northeast. The level of Federal involvement in the industry and the dependence on railroad service of many major Northeast firms and communities contribute to the compelling case for adjustment assistance.

H.R. 10003 will be reintroduced with technical corrections and cosponsors on September 13. Adoption of this bill would help insure that the secondary impact of branch line closings would be taken into account in the reorganization of the regional rail system. If the Federal Government is to fully consider the interests of the region, it must have the financial incentive to consider the secondary effects of the new railroad plan.

The impact of railroad reorganization in the Northeast is likely to be severe. In my district, the Sixth of Massachusetts, over 5,000 jobs would be affected if services were discontinued on the marginally solvent lines serving Amesbury, Gloucester, Topsfield, and Haverhill. The weakness of the Northeastern economy and the base closings in New England—which will cost Massachusetts 12,000 civilian jobs alone—point up the need to soften the impact of railroad reorganization and provide for long run options to speed the recovery process.

The bill I have introduced would establish within the Department of Labor, a Railroad Reorganization Adjustment Assistance Administration charged with coordinating assistance to firms, workers, and communities adversely affected by service terminations. The cost of the bill would depend on the number of shutdowns and would provide a sensitive mechanism to compensate the areas most heavily damaged. This is a program we can afford, and is a necessary and integral element in a final rail solution. I hope that it will receive the serious consideration of all those involved in the urgent business of railroad reorganization.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time a summary of the provisions of H.R. 10003 "The Railroad Reorganization Adjustment Assistance Act of 1973."

#### SUMMARY

Title I. Authority to implement adjustment assistance would be vested in the Secretary of Labor. The major focus of the bill is on employment and adjustment assistance to workers. Eligibility of firms and communities would be based on employment figures as well. Since the Department of Labor is primarily concerned with employment, and the program must be coordinated by one agency, to avoid duplication all authority should be vested in this department.

Title II, subtitle A, eligibility. An individual worker would be eligible for adjustment assistance if he becomes or is threatened with becoming unemployed or underemployed as a result of discontinuance or abandonment of any rail service. Firms shall be eligible under subtitle B if a significant number of its employees became or were threatened with becoming unemployed. A community would be eligible under subtitle 4 if the situation of a firm or the relocation of facilities would cause serious injury to the economic base of the community.

To speed the decisionmaking process, determinations by the Secretary of Labor would be made on the basis of a rebuttable presumption whereby workers and firms shall be deemed eligible unless the Secretary rules otherwise within 30 days of the petition for eligibility. For community applicants, the period will be 90 days.

Subtitle B, assistance to firms. A firm deemed eligible for adjustment assistance may, within 2 years, file an application. Within a reasonable time after filing the application, the firm shall present a proposal for its economic adjustment. Adjustment assistance under this

subtitle consists of interim assistance—section 212; assistance through existing agencies—section 213; technical assistance—section 214; and direct financial assistance—section 215.

Subtitle C, assistance to workers. Adjustment assistance under this subtitle consists of: Part II, readjustment allowances; part III, training; part IV, health insurances; part V, relocation allowances; and part VI, early retirement payments.

Any adversely affected worker with at least 26 weeks of employment within the past year with a firm may file an application with the Secretary for one or more forms of assistance under this subtitle. With respect to any week of unemployment, the total amount payable to an adversely affected worker as remuneration for services, unemployment insurance, as a training allowance, and as readjustment allowance would be equal to 100 percent of his prior average weekly wage. Payments of readjustment allowances would not be made for more than 52 weeks, unless the affected worker is 60 years old or is undergoing training. An adversely affected worker would not be entitled to any readjustment allowance unless he applied for training assistance and accepted, continued and made satisfactory progress in training provided.

Health insurance coverage would insure that the worker would be covered by a policy representative of the average range of benefits offered by manufacturing industries in the country.

Relocation allowances would be granted only if the worker could not be reasonably expected to find suitable employment in the immediate commuting area and had obtained a firm offer of employment elsewhere.

Adversely affected workers entitled to begin receiving retirement pay under a pension plan within 3 years would be eligible for early retirement payments. These payments would terminate when the worker became eligible for pension benefits.

Subtitle D, assistance to communities. Within 2 years after certification of eligibility, a community may file an application and present a proposal either separately or in conjunction with firms and/or groups of workers for technical or financial assistance. When applications from the same affected area are not made jointly, the Secretary would notify all parties involved and work out a coordinated adjustment assistance program.

#### H-F CHOIR MAKES MARK OVERSEAS

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**  
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to again direct to the attention of the Members the outstanding accomplishment of a choir from my district. The Homewood-Flossmoor Viking Choir has just completed a very successful tour

of the Netherlands, Germany, and France.

This very effective, and notable group of young people were properly commended by the Southwest Messenger Press which serves the communities in south suburban Cook County in Illinois. I am pleased to insert this article of August 16, into the RECORD.

The article follows:

#### H-F CHOIR MAKES MARK OVERSEAS

A midwest high school choir composed of 100 youthful singers has made a mark for itself in promoting understanding between nations. Three years ago, this notable singing group, representing the Homewood-Flossmoor High School made its first tour of Europe and the Soviet Union. Recently, the choir completed its second tour—this time to the Netherlands, Germany and France. Again this outstanding group of young Americans, known as the Viking Choir, has shown our friends overseas that America is a land in which culture and good will flourish, notwithstanding some of the sordid headlines that always seem to take precedence over the constructive works of mankind.

**SENATOR CHARLES PERCY AND  
CONGRESSMAN MORRIS UDALL  
DISCUSS CAMPAIGN REFORM ON  
CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS'  
"WASHINGTON INSIGHT" PRO-  
GRAM**

#### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, each month I moderate a television program called "Washington Insight" which is aired on station WSJV-TV in South Bend-Elkhart, Ind.

Yesterday, September 4, 1973, on this program, I had the privilege of discussing campaign reform legislation with two distinguished Members of Congress who are leaders in the effort to win passage of such a measure—Senators CHARLES PERCY, Republican of Illinois, and Congressman MORRIS UDALL, Democrat of Arizona.

Only today the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, in listing major legislation on which Congress should act this year, called attention to the need for a bill to reform campaign practices and campaign spending.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the timeliness and importance of this matter, I insert at this point in the RECORD a transcript of my discussion with Senator PERCY and Congressman UDALL:

WASHINGTON INSIGHT: JOHN BRADEMAS, MORRIS UDALL, AND CHARLES PERCY ON CAMPAIGN REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. BRADEMAS. Welcome to another edition of Washington Insight. Watergate and other dramatic events unfolding in Washington over the last several months have sharply increased the demand for campaign reform. Here in Congress, Senators and Congressmen have been proposing a variety of approaches on legislation affecting the way campaigns for public office are conducted and financed in this country. The Senate has already passed an important campaign reform bill, and some of us in the House of

Representatives hope that we can approve similar legislation during the next few months. With me today are two outstanding leaders in Congress, both of whom have been outspoken on the need for campaign reform.

Senator Charles Percy, Republican of Illinois, is serving his second term in the Senate, where he has involved himself in a wide range of concerns—from foreign affairs to the problems of nutrition, aging, and the operations of government. Senator Percy is often mentioned as a possible Republican Presidential candidate in 1976.

Morris K. Udall, Democratic Congressman from Arizona, has been one of the most vigorous champions in the House for campaign reform. Congressman Udall, one of the most popular Members of the House, is now serving his fifth term here; he's won wide respect on both sides of the aisle for his energy, his wit and his broad range of legislative interests. He has recently published a fascinating book, *The Job of A Congressman*.

Senator Percy, let's begin by asking you, sir, why there is so much interest in campaign reform right now. Is it Watergate?

Mr. PERCY. There isn't any question about it, John. We could never have passed the bill we did in the Senate to reform campaign financing with the speed that it was passed, with the overwhelming vote, without Watergate. This is at least the silver lining that is in that very dark cloud that hangs over us.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Do you agree with that, Mo?

Mr. UDALL. Yes. You know, Chuck, I've often thought that especially in politics you have to sometimes have a very bad situation occur before you can do some good. We desperately needed ethics committees in the House and Senate. We desperately needed some kind of disclosure. You and I and others were making voluntary disclosures. You know why we got these? We got these because of Adam Powell and Senator Thomas Dodd. Without those events giving the public attention to it and the impetus those events caused we would never have the ethics committees and the disclosure that we now have.

#### NEW SENATE BILL

Mr. BRADEMAS. Senator Percy, you alluded to the bill passed by the Senate in late July for campaign reforms. Could you tell us what some of those major provisions are?

Mr. PERCY. Very briefly, John, we sent a bill which can be perfected and improved, I presume, in the House. I hope it will not be weakened and I certainly know that, in this bipartisan forum, we're going to see no weakening on your part of that bill. I hope you can even strengthen it further.

We first of all eliminate the idea of multiple Committees, which are devices for purposes that we well know. One candidate, one committee, and that's the way it ought to be. No more of these big cash contributions.

We put a limit of \$50 on a cash contribution. I would like to have seen it reduced to \$10 and had a bill in to that effect, but certainly no suitcases filled with money should be given to candidates so far as the Senate now is concerned.

#### ELIMINATE THE FAT CATS

We also put a spending limit of 10¢ per candidate per eligible voter, that is, in the primary, and 15¢ in the general election. That would reduce this extravagant waste of money in campaigns. A \$3,000 limitation is set on individual or committee contribution that can be given to any single candidate and an overall family limit of \$25,000 for all contributions to Federal political campaigns in a single year. So, you eliminate the fat cats in a sense owning and controlling, as the implication is, a Member of the Congress of the United States.

#### REQUIRE FULL DISCLOSURE

We require that the name, address, occupation, place of business be put down on a card and clearly identify a contributor so we

can't have the possibility of overlapping of contributions. We do require, for the first time in the history of the Senate, and here we had an overwhelming vote, on an amendment I sponsored, full financial disclosure for the first time for all Members of Congress.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mo, what do you think of the Senate bill? You've got a bill in yourself called the Clean Elections Bill, I believe.

Mr. UDALL. We have over a hundred cosponsors. Chuck Percy's friend, John Anderson, who is one of the best and the brightest of the Republican Members of the House, and I have over a hundred cosponsors from both parties. Here again, as with Watergate, people ask, "What can we do?"

We say, "Get behind the Clean Elections Bill."

The Senate bill tracks pretty well with ours. We're out for the basic same goals as Senator Percy outlined although we don't deal with this last matter of disclosure. We already have a more far-reaching disclosure rule in the House than in the Senate.

#### THE 1971 CAMPAIGN REFORM BILL "INEFFECTIVE"

Mr. BRADEMAs. Now, let me ask you this, before we get into a discussion, gentlemen, of the major provisions that we have to pay attention to. Congress did pass in 1971 a campaign reform law and some say, had it not been for that law, we would not have uncovered the campaign abuses that are now being revealed. Why do we need a new law since we have that one on the books? Senator?

Mr. PERCY. It was totally ineffective as Watergate proved. The provisions that I have outlined that are in the Senate bill are not now in law. They should be in law and overwhelmingly the Senate has said they must be in law. And I hope that the House will concur.

Mr. UDALL. I don't think quite as harshly of the 1971 law. It has some deficiencies and they ought to be closed. The Senators' bill has loopholes which need closing and we want to, too. The present law was a great improvement over that monologue we had for 50 years, which never resulted in a prosecution of any kind. There were really two points, however, about the 1971 campaign reform act that I would like to make.

One, there was connivance in both parties to delay the effectiveness of that law until April 7 of our election year, and this is why you had people running around with suitcases in the middle of the night trying to beat the April 7 deadline. So the new law never had a complete test of a complete election cycle.

Second, the law was ineffective in terms of enforcement. That law put the enforcement in the hands, as far as Congress was concerned, of politicians or appointees of politicians. One, the Attorney General made the decision whether to enforce the law as regards to Presidential elections. And then officers of the House and Senate decided whether to enforce it with regard to the House and Senate candidates. We all agreed on one point: that enforcement of that law has got to be taken over by a bipartisan, non-partisan, independent Federal elections commission. They can supervise it, publicize the facts and take action as necessary.

Mr. PERCY. Incidentally, we've accepted your suggestion on that. That provision is in the bill that is now over in the House. This is a key reform.

Mr. BRADEMAs. How does that work, Senator, in the Senate bill?

#### AGREE ON OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Mr. PERCY. A seven man election commission that has absolute authority and responsibility to supervise the election. One member would be the Controller General, with the six additional members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. UDALL. In our bill, we have two appointed by the House, two appointed by the Senate, and two appointed by the President, and then, as I recall it, the Controller Gen-

eral as the seventh member of the commission.

You see, that's really vital. There were hundreds of plain violations of this 1971 law this last time. Where do you send them to determine prosecution? You send them to the Justice Department. And the head of the Justice Department is either going to be a Democrat or he's going to be a Republican, and he shouldn't be a political figure because you can't win. If the President's Attorney General prosecutes Republicans, they say, just a minute, you're one of us. If he prosecutes Democrats, the defendant says, oh, this is political prosecution. So you need to get the enforcement of law completely out of the political process.

Mr. PERCY. I think you will find, though, that the Senate method of appointing the commission is more consistent with what you have expressed.

#### SHOULD THE PUBLIC FINANCE CAMPAIGNS?

I'd like to ask both of you one question—a judgment factor of both of you if I could. In the Senate, the great debate was whether or not we should have public financing out of the United States Treasury of campaigns. Overwhelmingly, the Senate was not ready to move in this direction, particularly when we have an unbalanced budget. But the thought was expressed, and I expressed it as an amendment, to this bill where we would double the tax credit from the existing level, from \$12.50 to \$25.00 for individuals and double that for couples, and double the tax deductions from \$50 to \$100 for individuals and from \$100 to \$200 for a couple.

This would encourage smaller contributions; it would encourage them because regardless of the income of the person they can well afford to do it. As long as they are paying any tax, they would get a tax credit. If they are in low income levels, yet they would not lose control of which party they want to give it to or which individual, which to me is better really than public financing.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Now, maybe you could comment on the Senator's question and also talk about why the tax credit apparently hasn't worked as effectively as it should?

#### THE FINANCING TAX CREDIT UNDERUSED

Mr. UDALL. Well, I don't think it's been widely enough publicized yet, John, and there is an important underlying psychological principle here. Our tax laws say when you give to your church, that's good. It says people ought to give to churches. It says when you give to the Red Cross and educational institutions, we allow you to deduct that and that's good.

But political giving has always been considered kind of dirty and underhanded. It has a bad name. And I think a tax credit idea ought to be publicized, expanded the way the Senate has in its new bill, to say to the public that, under our laws, giving to political parties is good and wrap a mantle of righteousness about it and bring a lot of little people into it who have had a view that political giving isn't sound.

But I do think that we've got to move some way towards public financing and the tax credit idea is a beginning because it permits you to say, rather than sending to Uncle Sam \$50—for a husband and wife—in our taxes this year, we send this \$50 to the Republican Committee or to John Brademas' campaign in Indiana . . .

Mr. BRADEMAs. I like that idea.

Mr. UDALL. Or wherever we want to put it. But I do think that we have to begin to move towards public financing and we had a new idea here in the House that I think solves a lot of the old problems that have always been raised when you get into public financing.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Now exactly how did your public financing proposal work, Senator? You offered an amendment for public financing?

Mr. PERCY. Well, I offered an amendment

but as you well know, and I knew I would, I ran smack dab into a brick wall, a constitutional question. Senator Long, Chairman of the Finance Committee, rightfully raised the question. We can't put that amendment on this bill because that's a revenue amendment, and the Constitution provides that only the House can originate such a bill.

My purpose in doing so was public education, to emphasize the point, and germaneness really would say it ought to go onto a campaign bill, but it is a revenue matter affecting taxes.

So I agreed after a deliberate amount of debate that it would go as a separate amendment on the first revenue bill that we get from the House, and then it would go back to conference. And I hope that would double what we now have and we want to see that it gets more prominence, given public education, because this is a painless, low-cost way for everyone to finance candidates and parties of their own choice.

But the odd thing is—because this bill that we sent over, the Campaign Practice Bill, is not even scheduled for hearings in the House until September, and we'll have a revenue bill from you in September—the Percy Amendment will go on that bill and it will come over, and with your support and help it will be enacted into law long before the Campaign Bill.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I think we're being lobbied here, Mo, but I won't resist.

Mr. PERCY. We hope it's in the public interest.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mo, what does your Clean Elections Bill have to say with respect to this matter of public financing?

#### CHANGEOVER TO PUBLIC FINANCING WITH MATCHING PAYMENTS

Mr. UDALL. I think eventually this country will get toward the British system. And even Puerto Rico and a lot of free countries have the public, the treasury, the taxpayers, finance elections rather than the special interests that we have now.

And I think we'll get there, but I have never believed we are going to be able to just draw the line; today we have private financing, tomorrow we're going to switch to a complete system of public financing.

But we suggest a mix; we say, let's move toward it gradually, let's try it out and here's a way we can do it. We say, you, John Brademas, if you can raise a thousand dollars in \$50 or less chunks, if you can get 20 people to give you \$50, you must be a serious candidate with some broad base, and the Federal government will match that thousand dollars.

If you come back with another list of people who've given you a thousand, we'll match that thousand, so on up to \$25,000. You raise \$25,000; the government will match \$25,000. This will lessen your dependence on the big contributors and will enable you to have some measure of substantial public financing and yet will keep the incentive there for people to get involved with small amounts to help you, and we think this is a very innovative idea to begin to move toward public financing.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Senator Percy, let me turn to another subject here, and that is the matter of limitations on the amount of money people can contribute to a campaign committee or to a candidate. Now in the Senate, as I understand it, you limited the amount of individual contributions to \$3,000 for a primary and \$3,000 for a general election. I think Mr. Udall's bill is even tougher. Why do we need these limitations, in your judgment?

Mr. PERCY. I think we must do this to remove any implication that a Member of Congress is unduly dependent on someone simply who has the ability to contribute large sums. Now we know that the integrity level is very high in the Congress—of all of the types of organizations I have dealt with in my life, business, labor, education, I think

the integrity in the Congress is quite high—but there are exceptions and those exceptions have caused us to be concerned and the public to be concerned. So that to remove any chance that there could be the appearance of undue influence or that any citizen, no matter how humble his category, doesn't have the same clout, you might say, to come to their Congressman and Senators with an idea or grievance and have the same access to him, we are limiting it so that no one could imagine that \$3,000 could then be an overwhelming influence to an individual in Congress.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mo, your bill is even tougher in this respect. How does it work?

Mr. UDALL. A \$1,000 limitation that any one person could give any of us in a House or Senate campaign and \$2,500 in a Presidential campaign. And that's on the same principle that Chuck Percy is talking about here. No man, regardless of his motives, ought to have a million dollar clout on a Presidential election. There was one man in Chicago who gave President Nixon a million dollars—two million, Senator McGovern must have received a half a million from Stewart Mott, whose motives are pure, who believed in Senator McGovern, but no one should have that kind of clout in our political process.

I think I could throw out of my office someone who had given me \$1,000. I'm not sure I could conveniently throw someone out who had financed the whole campaign. There's a principle at stake here. Keep it small, keep everyone involved. I think we'll come out of this, the House and Senate this year with some kind of a reasonable small contributor limit.

#### SELLING AMBASSADORSHIPS: A CASE IN POINT

Mr. PERCY. I think one of the most ludicrous things that has been done under both Administrations, Democratic and Republican, is the outright sale of ambassadorships abroad. To think that the Ambassador to a given country, that that post, could be purchased for \$100,000, \$200,000! But the going rate became so high in 1972, it was up to around \$250,000 and in our Foreign Relations Committee, and I'm on that Committee, I went over to see the Secretary of State, and I said we simply are not going to accept anyone if they contribute over what we consider to be a modest contribution.

I've had to disappoint people who come in my office and have said well, they believed there was almost an implied commitment that they were going to get an ambassadorship. I said, first, that's illegal, and second, you'd better not embarrass yourself by coming forward. You just gave \$249,000, or whatever it was, too much, that was your trouble.

Mr. UDALL. You know, both parties have done this, but this—and we're all aware of this particular instance, I won't mention names, but this shows the extent to which this has deteriorated. The Committee to Reelect the President had reelected the President. It was December of 1972; a wonderful lady from New York gave the Committee—and they had four million dollars left over—gave them \$300,000, I think it was, and a couple of weeks later, was picked as Ambassador to Luxembourg.

Now you can stuff in the phone booth here all the people in Washington who think they went down the list to find the most qualified American to be Ambassador to Luxembourg. As I say, the Democrats didn't sell the embassies at quite those high prices, but it's happened all down the years and you ought to be congratulated, Senator, for putting a stop to it.

#### HOW DO WE STOP THE SUITCASES?

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me ask, speaking about contributions, about the limitations on the amount of cash that people can give to a candidate or committee. Senator, you put a limitation in your bill in the Senate on cash contributions, haven't you? How do we stop

this business of suitcases moving around the country full of hundred dollar bills?

Mr. PERCY. Well, just simply pass a law and make it a criminal offense for anyone to contribute or for anyone to accept over a given amount. Now the bill I put in calls for a ten dollar limitation. If someone's giving over ten dollars, I see no reason why they shouldn't make out a personal check. And I see no reason why every campaign ought not be required to pay—make every disbursement—by check, unless it's petty cash or postage stamps or a lunch or something like that. But the Senate raised the figure over my protest, to \$50, and I think that's a long way and a far cry from what we've been accepting. Up to this stage, there's been no limitation of any kind on cash contributions.

#### CAN WE DEAL WITH CORPORATIONS?

Mr. BRADEMAs. What about another question that's come into the headlines very dramatically this year and that's the question of the contributions given by major corporations in exchange apparently for the hope that they would be given favorable consideration with their problems with the Federal government? Most obviously, I believe, is American Airlines, which admitted that its head had given about \$100,000 to the Committee to Reelect the President. How can we cope with that kind of activity?

Mr. UDALL. Well, this poisons the whole political process. It's gone on during all the election years. The law has always said corporations can't give, and you never get a corporation check, but the President or someone in the corporation goes to all the executives and says, "Boys, we're having a little fund here, and your individual allocation is so much money.

And then it's all delivered in a package and they know that it came from the executives of "X" company and that company in effect is making the contribution.

The whole system we've got, if it's going to work, it's got to work on disclosure. We ought to have a system with this independent committee where, if 200 executives of "X" company give me money, the computer will show who they are. And that's why Senator Percy had in that provision the name and address, occupation and employer, and so forth, so the public will know that I'm getting my money from nineteen corporate companies or railroads or airlines or whatever and then they can judge my votes on issues affecting them.

#### LIMIT SPENDING AND LENGTH OF CAMPAIGNS

Mr. BRADEMAs. But, Senator Percy, this raises another question. We know, without mentioning names, that in States in the East and a couple not far from the States you and I live in, candidates, both Democratic and Republican, spent literally millions of dollars because they had access to them. And in some cases, public disclosure certainly didn't solve that problem. What about the question of imposing very rigorous limitations on the amount of money that can be expended in the campaign. What do you say to that?

Mr. PERCY. Well, I'm all for it, and of course, it's in the Senate bill. I think that in a general election, a 15¢ limitation per eligible voter will bring down the cost of elections, and of course, as you know, we also sent over to the House a bill which provided that in Presidential elections, the primaries not be held until the first of August so that we would shorten the period of time over which people campaign. I think we exhaust the American public with these long, long, highly expensive campaigns, and I think they're totally out of taste, they're out of keeping with the times, and this legislation will help control that.

Mr. UDALL. The British do a better job. They do it in six weeks or so, and that's about all you need. People can make up their minds in six weeks.

Mr. BRADEMAs. What about the charge, Mo, that we incumbents are greatly favored by

any system which imposes limitations on the amount of money—or time—that can be expended?

Mr. UDALL. They say that Senator Percy's well known. It would take a challenger a year to catch up with him. Why not have plenty of time? Well, I've heard all of these arguments, but I have found there's a balance here. I've found you never beat an incumbent in the ordinary situation unless there's a large anti-incumbent component in that vote. People have got to get mad at John Brademas or Chuck Percy before they'll throw them out. And they get mad at you because of your record, the things you've done, the things you haven't done. I think in any system you can devise, the incumbents are going to have a sort of advantage, but they have some burdens that challengers don't have—a voting record and mistakes that we've made right out in public.

Mr. PERCY. Just as I've sat here, I think there's a way that we can plug that loophole, and I think we have to be careful that these laws can't be called the Reelect the Incumbent Act instead of Election Campaign Reform Act. I think we do have to look at say, the free frank that we have as Members of Congress. We did in this bill put a limitation in that you should not and cannot use the franking privilege thirty days before an election. I might suggest to the two of you, why don't you put in a provision in the House bill for ninety days before the election? And in conference, this can be compromised to sixty, and that's twice as good as thirty.

Mr. UDALL. We're ahead of you. I had a bill for a sixty day cutoff. I was the sponsor of it. We took it to the House floor in a reform of the franking privilege law and my colleagues chopped it out of there. They didn't want to be restricted in that way and we had abuses. . . . I've known Members who on the Monday before the Tuesday election, at public expense, have dropped in every mail box in the Congressional district some greetings from your Congressman and a record of all of his accomplishments.

Mr. PERCY. Well, I voluntarily restrict before any campaign, and I have found that this got a more favorable response from people, particularly my opponent, who did feel it was totally unfair to use taxpayers money in postage to send out some sort of self-serving bulletin about yourself with a picture of the family and so forth in it, but that is the kind of activity that I think, today, in this atmosphere, is going to bounce back on any candidate.

Mr. UDALL. I agree with that.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me ask another question that also touches upon the situation of the incumbent, and that's the application of the so-called "equal time rule" with respect to television. Senator, can you tell us what the Senate bill did on that score, and maybe Mo would comment on how he sees that issue?

Mr. PERCY. Well, obviously this has been something we've had to do on a regular basis so far as the President . . .

Mr. BRADEMAs. Could you explain the "equal time rule"?

#### EQUAL TIME RULE BURDENS RESOURCES

Mr. PERCY. The "equal time rule" is that any candidate would have to be given equal time. That means that any network would be required, if there's a third, fourth or fifth candidate, to give equal time, which means that they really can't give any time, and I would think it's in the public interest, and the networks agree, I think, to provide free television time for those candidates who have a real chance as a public service is all for the good. That then removes the necessity for money, they have the time, they have a big listening audience and it serves the public interest. So we want to encourage that as much as possible.

Mr. UDALL. I have always favored repeal of the equal time rule and the reason is we have debates. You talk to political scientists and historians. The finest hour of politics in America was the Lincoln-Douglas de-

bates. And with the magic of television, we could bring debates into the living room of every home in America, or every home in the Congressional district, or in a state-wide senatorial race, and we don't use it. Instead we have jingles and thirty-second commercials and my ad man tries to dream up a more exciting thirty-second spot than your ad man. The relaxation of the equal time rule would permit candidates to debate, would encourage them to debate, and we would use television and radio up to their potential.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Senator Percy, President Nixon has said that before Congress does anything in respect to campaign reform, we ought to have a Commission to look into the whole subject and he'll veto any bill that we pass if we haven't set up a Commission. What do you think about that?

**A STUDY COMMISSION IS NOT NECESSARY**

Mr. PERCY. I don't think it's necessary at all. If there's any one subject that we know something about, this is it. And when I saw on the Senate floor as many as 75 and 80 Senators, almost the whole time during the debate on this issue, I didn't have to be convinced we need some outside Commission to study what ought to be done. We know what the abuses are and we want to clean them up.

Mr. UDALL. I don't think in the light of all that's gone on this year and the problems we have and the attentions which have been focused, I don't believe that President Nixon's really going to veto the kind of responsible bill the Senate's produced and I hope the House will produce.

**SUPPORT POST CARD VOTER REGISTRATION**

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me just ask you two other questions, gentlemen. One is the problem of voter registration. Only 55 percent in 1972 of the people who had the qualification to vote actually voted for the President. Now, what do you think about a proposal to provide that people can register by postcard to make it easier for them?

Mr. PERCY. I voted for it, I think it would broaden the base, bring more voters into the elections, and make it easier for them. If you can file your income tax return by signing a slip of paper, I think you can also do this. Now there is some concern that it is going to increase fraud. We'll have to be awfully certain that it doesn't, particularly in Cook County, I feel sensitive but on balance, I voted for it.

Mr. UDALL. I agree with this. It's long overdue and the government ought to take a role in encouraging people to register to vote. The philosophy is expressed by some that we're really better off if people who don't care enough to get down to the courthouse and register and vote stay out of the political process. I don't believe that. I think we ought to encourage them and this postcard registration idea does it.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Gentlemen, just a few seconds from each of you. What is your advice to the people whom you represent and to other people in the country who want to see Congress pass a campaign reform bill this year? Mo?

Mr. UDALL. Well, they've got to make their views known. There are people who don't want reform, who have a stake in the old system, and Congress ought to be deluged with letters and telegrams, when you see your Congressman this fall out home, you ought to ask him how he stands on these issues and force some action on the issue.

Mr. PERCY. I'd say don't write your Senator. We've already passed it. Write your Congressman, and I feel certain, John and Mo, no one will have to write you. I commend you for being in the forefront of one of the most important reforms that Congress can enact.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you very much, Senator Charles Percy, Republican of Illinois, and Congressman Morris Udall, Democrat of Arizona, for having joined in this discussion of campaign reform on this edition of Washington Insight.

DR. IRVING D. LITWACK

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 1973, the city of Long Beach, Calif. will lose a dedicated and invaluable public servant. After 37 years, Dr. Irving D. Litwack is retiring as Long Beach's City Health Officer.

Dr. Litwack's training and experience in public health and preventive medicine have made tremendous contributions to the welfare of the people he has served so well. But his commitment to the community went far beyond his job duties. His involvement with and support of nonprofit and voluntary agencies in the area of health and many other medically related organizations are numerous. I am sure he will remain actively concerned with their future.

During his tenure as city health officer, Dr. Litwack has demonstrated continuously his high concern for the well-being of all people and his dedication to solving their problems and serving their needs. I join with his colleagues and the citizens of Long Beach in thanking Dr. Litwack for his past efforts and wishing him well in the years ahead.

PETE ROZELLE AND TV BLACKOUTS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks, a great deal of debate has evolved over the issue of TV blackouts, particularly as they relate to the National Football League. Pete Rozelle, the commissioner of the NFL, has addressed himself to the issue on many occasions. A great number of misinterpretations abound on this issue and I think it would do each of us in this body well to seriously weigh what Pete Rozelle says:

**STATEMENT BY PETE ROZELLE**

Whenever I speak for the NFL member clubs on the issue of local telecasts of NFL home games, I feel like Scrooge in Disneyland. What is worse, I feel like Larry Brown running against all forty members of the Dallas Cowboys squad.

It is seemingly impossible to communicate to many people why the NFL member clubs believe that they are on sound ground in resisting the requirements that they telecast their home games locally. I think it is because there are a great many people, in Congress and out, who simply don't want to be influenced by such considerations.

Senator Pastore, for example, views the League's reasons for opposing such legislation as much ado about nothing.

"Much Ado About Nothing", as a Broadway play, ran for 116 performances in the Winter Garden Theater in New York. Then, one night, it was offered on free home television. One week later the play closed, after box-office receipts declined 60%.

The show was not offered to television without charge. The producers realized \$775,000 from the television rights. But once it had been offered to the public on free home television, the demand for theater tickets became practically non-existent.

Professional football will be headed in just this direction when NFL member clubs are required to telecast home games locally. As the public becomes accustomed to receiving without charge the same product which it is being asked to buy, there will inevitably be a steady erosion of ticket buying interest. Ultimately ticket buying habits and actual game attendance will be significantly affected—to nobody's benefit.

Substantially everyone with a close knowledge of professional sports, including, I am pleased to note, the overwhelming majority of American sports writers, are in basic agreement with the League's position on this.

The current issue has not been a pleasant one for the NFL, particularly with respect to the reaction within the Washington area. We have been called arrogant and unmindful of the public interest. But the local situation in Washington bears little resemblance to the conditions existing elsewhere in the League. And, unfortunately, Washington happens to be the home of some 535 legislators representing the entire population of the United States.

Those who have followed professional football in Washington have suffered through many lean years. Only recently have the Redskins established themselves as a winner. There are currently no other professional sports franchises within the Washington area. The Redskins also have one of the League's smaller stadiums. These conditions have combined to create unusual pressures for the telecasting of Redskins' home games at the time when they are being played.

The recent furor over the fact that only two Redskins' home games will be telecast from Baltimore stations during the 1973 season is an illustration of this. The fact is that until 1970 both Colts' games and Redskins' games were televised by the same network. This circumstance largely precluded Redskins' home games from being carried on Baltimore stations. There were no complaints about this situation, primarily because the Colts were then a winning team and the Redskins were an established loser.

In 1970, however, when the Colts were transferred to the American Football Conference, it became technically feasible for both Colts' games and Redskins' games to be telecast from Baltimore stations. There was one such telecast in 1970, three in 1971, two in 1972, and there will be two this season. The Redskins and their visiting opponents have never been under any obligation to allow such telecasts and these occasional games were permitted primarily because they were games which were nationally telecast and games of local interest to Baltimore fans.

Suddenly these home game telecasts from Baltimore (six in number over a three-year period) have become a vested right to 100% of the Redskins' home games during following seasons.

The situation simply proves the point that we continually try to make—once something has been given away, people come to expect it to be that way always.

Recently a member of my staff was quoted at length by the Washington media on this subject. Frankly, his use of terms was not the best and our position was termed arrogant.

But is the NFL arrogant when it: Televises every road game back to each team's home area, despite the fact that the economics of television make this an unproductive practice in many instances?

Offers approximately 74 NFL game telecasts annually in each home territory, which represents more than one-third of the entire NFL game schedule played in all cities?

Voluntarily permits multiple game telecasts of other NFL games in each home city when the home team is playing at home?

Are these liberal television policies followed by any other professional sport? The answer is a loud no. The NFL has always been recognized as having the most enlightened television practice in professional sports. In-

deed, if we had followed the practice of other professional sports and limited game telecasts to telecasts arranged for by the local teams and to occasional game-of-the-week telecasts carried nationally, most NFL away games would not be telecast locally at all.

It is the intelligent use of television that has helped our game grow and brought professional football to its present level of popularity. But the heart of professional football still rests with the fan in the stadium. We simply have no desire to follow the path of professional boxing—which gave its product away to the point where fan interest declined and actual attendance became a thing of the past.

Senator Pastore and other proponents of the current bills will tell you that they are only asking for legislation requiring home game telecasts when the games are sold out 48 hours in advance. They will say that such legislation will be in effect for only a year so that its impact can be measured. How, then, they say, can the game be hurt?

The answer lies in the fact that the current level of interest in professional football is not locked in—in Washington or anywhere else. Erosion is not an instant process which can be turned off and on at will. It took nearly 15 years for televised boxing to die, and boxing was not even aware that it was being eroded.

The Senator from Rhode Island will also tell you of the favor which Congress did the NFL in 1961 when it enacted a law permitting the NFL member clubs to sell their television rights jointly. But there has been little effort to put this "favor" in its proper perspective.

The 1961 statute was not the source of the NFL clubs' right not to telecast their home games locally. The statute was not even intended to deal with this question. That right had been consistently exercised by the member clubs for some dozen years prior to the enactment of the statute. Neither in 1961 nor during the earlier court review of NFL television practices did anyone ever question the practice which the member clubs now follow. It simply presents no antitrust issues.

Nor was the right granted to the NFL member clubs in 1961 an extraordinary concession in terms of antitrust principle. The American Football League, National Basketball Association, the National Hockey League and professional baseball had all dealt jointly in the sale of television rights prior to 1961 without antitrust questioning. The NCAA today, follows a like practice without the benefit of any antitrust statute. The NFL was then precluded from dealing as a league only because of a court decree directed at entirely different television issues.

In 1961, Congress was persuaded that it was in the public interest to permit the League to negotiate in a manner which would provide equal access to television facilities for each member club of the League. If the League's interests have been served by this statute, so also has the public interest—by the League's action in guaranteeing the fans in each home city of a telecast of each away game of their home team.

I believe that any realist making an objective review of this situation will conclude that the proposed legislation is unfair and unsound. But who wishes to be objective when self-interest is involved? As a writer in the New York Times recently commented with respect to the Pastore Bill, "To explain why this is bad, one must hack one's way through a thicket of pieties, disclaimers, qualms, and troths."

## OPEN SPACE PROGRAM

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1973, the House agreed to a conference report on H.R. 8825, the Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1974. The departmental appropriation, which totals about \$3.3 billion, must still be passed by the Senate before congressional action is completed. I urge that such action be taken by the Senate so that the programs supported by the Department can be carried out without interruption during fiscal year 1974.

More specifically, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of House Members to the appropriation for the Federal open space program. The open space program provides Government support to a variety of activities in the national interest, including the provision of parks and recreation areas in urban communities with dwindling amounts of undeveloped land.

The 11th Congressional District in Chicago, which I am privileged to represent, received some funding in 1972 for 11th District park sites under the open space program. However, through December 1972—fiscal year 1973—no new open space projects were approved for the 11th Congressional District, and in January 1973 the open space program was administratively terminated and there have been no new approvals since that time.

The open space appropriation of \$70 million originally included by the House in the fiscal year 1974 HUD appropriations bill indicated strong congressional support for the goals underlying this program, as it is presently constituted, and a realization that the public welfare is advanced by providing good, healthy environments in our cities. While the Senate deleted new appropriations for the program, the conference bill—which has already been adopted by this body—reinstated the open space appropriation in the amount of \$25 million.

The \$25 million appropriation for the open space program agreed to by the conference committee is urgently needed if this program is to continue during the current fiscal year.

The administration did not request an appropriation for the program because open space land acquisition was to be one of the activities to be funded from special revenue sharing for community development under the administration's proposed Better Communities Act. That bill, by itself, is not going anywhere, however, since the responsible committees both in the House and Senate are awaiting the development of housing legislation to go with it. By the time that a housing and community bill acceptable to the administration and the Congress can be enacted and implemented, most or all of fiscal year 1974 will be over.

Many communities which have made plans and proceeded toward acquisition

of open space land to relieve urban congestion will not be able to buy the land. In some cases the land will be developed for other purposes, aggravating the congestion. In other cases, the price of the land will increase.

It is urgent, therefore, that we provide at least the \$25 million recommended in the conference report, so that this vital program can be continued.

## BILL RYAN—THE MAN MOST RESPONSIBLE FOR LEGISLATION TO PREVENT LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as we consider H.R. 8920, a bill which I and many of my colleagues are cosponsoring to extend and improve the resources available for detecting and combating the effects of lead-based paint poisoning under the authority of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act of 1970, I ask us to pause and give recognition to the contribution made by the late William Fitts Ryan to our national recognition of this critical problem. Our former colleague, Bill Ryan, that innovative, courageous legislator who fought always for the underprivileged, was the first to focus national attention on a problem that had before been relegated to the ghettoized, ignored status of most of its victims.

In March 1969, Bill Ryan introduced the bill that became the law we are amending today. With his characteristic commitment and toughness in pursuing his legislative objectives, Bill Ryan became a persuasive expert on the problem of childhood lead poisoning. He persuaded us to end the shameful neglect of this problem and then fought to obtain adequate funding for programs to implement our legislative concern. As a veteran of battles with the Nixon Administration to win its support for programs to stop the lead poisoning of children, Bill Ryan would not be surprised were he here today, that H.R. 8920 comes to the floor without administration support. He would recall that after the passage of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act of 1970, it took persistent bipartisan pressure from the Congress to force the administration to request only \$2 million to start the programs authorized by the act, a sum which was less than 7 percent of the \$30 million authorized under the act by the Congress.

Now we have an opportunity to significantly strengthen the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act and continue the work which Bill Ryan began. In his memory, and for the hundreds of children who still suffer severe illness and death because of our failure to remove this peril from them, we must enact H.R. 8920 and commit ourselves, as Bill Ryan did, to the eradication of this terrible problem. Bill Ryan would expect no less from us.

## STAMP DEDICATION CEREMONY

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 27, in Austin, Tex., the U.S. Postal Service dedicated a commemorative stamp honoring the late President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Postmaster General Theodore Klassen presented to Mrs. Johnson, and her daughters, Lynda and Luci special souvenir albums of the Lyndon B. Johnson Stamp in the process of the ceremony. The Postmaster General's brief remarks contain a very meaningful commentary on the career of President Lyndon Johnson. Recognizing the great respect with which President Johnson was held by Members of Congress, I direct their attention to the official remarks of the Postmaster General:

REMARKS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL E. T. KLASSEN

Mrs. Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. Robb, Mr. and Mrs. Nugent, Mr. Watson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen.

Lyndon B. Johnson came to us as President at a time of great national tragedy.

In those first dark and uncertain days, his decisive leadership calmed a nation's fears and gave us renewed hope for the future.

No man was ever better prepared to assume the burden and the glory of the Presidency.

Lyndon B. Johnson was the complete politician in the finest and truest meaning of the word.

His accomplishments in the United States Senate established him as one of the most effective legislators this nation has ever known.

Lyndon Johnson had great dreams for America. His heart went out especially to the underprivileged.

"In a land of great wealth," he said "families must not live in hopeless poverty. In a land rich in harvest, children must not go hungry. In a land of healing miracles, neighbors must not suffer and die untended. In a land of learning and scholars, young people must be taught to read and write."

These are the words of a man who truly cared about people.

History will record that Lyndon B. Johnson did more for education than any other President.

He tried hard to eradicate poverty and want—the twin scourges that enslaved a fifth of the population in this land of abundance.

He secured the blessings of adequate, low-cost medical care for more than twenty million senior citizens.

He moved to rebuild our decaying cities . . . to beautify the countryside . . . and to clean up our neglected and polluted environment.

His accomplishments were many.

But, above all else, Lyndon B. Johnson will be remembered down through the ages for his profound dedication to human rights.

He worked with all that was in him to overcome "the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice" which pervaded our society. Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves—and won immortality as the Great Emancipator. The accolade was richly deserved.

But a hundred years were to pass before the sons and daughters of those slaves won the right to live as free Americans.

Speaking at Gettysburg in 1963, Lyndon

Johnson made the point that so many of us had closed our eyes to.

"Until justice is blind to color (he said), until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skin, emancipation will be a proclamation but emancipation will not be a fact."

Today, because of Lyndon Johnson, emancipation is closer to being a reality than ever before.

Every civil rights bill enacted in the 20th century bears the imprint of Lyndon Johnson. Not one of them would have become law had it not been for the legislative genius of the man from Texas.

Today, Black Americans can live where they want to live . . . they can freely exercise the right to vote . . . they can put up at any inn in the Nation . . . they can attend decent schools . . . and work in productive jobs.

Today, a Black American sits on the highest court in the land, and a Black American has served in the Federal Cabinet.

These monumental steps forward in human relations were all achieved through the leadership of Lyndon Johnson. We may still have a long way to go, but he brought us farther as a nation than we had come in more than 200 years.

Lyndon Johnson worked with breathtaking energy to make our nation and the world a better place—a place that was at peace with itself.

But it was his fate to serve as President during the most troubled period since the Civil War.

To his everlasting credit Lyndon B. Johnson never lost faith in his dreams for America.

And neither must we.

In the last speech he ever made, he was still speaking out for compassion and understanding—for justice and reconciliation. He still believed with all his heart that—"When the last chains of 20th Century totalitarianism have rusted away, our system will still stand unbowed, unbroken and unburred."

Our system will grow and prosper as long as we produce men like Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Today, on the 65th anniversary of his birth, we take deep pride in dedicating this commemorative stamp to the fond memory of our 36th President.

We can all be glad he came our way.

He served us well.

It is now my privilege to present souvenir albums of the Lyndon B. Johnson stamp.

By tradition, the first album is reserved for the President of the United States.

The next album is for Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson—the President's beloved Lady Bird. She stood by his side for nearly forty years. She was his most trusted adviser and most cherished companion. In every sense—in every way—she was our First Lady.

The next album is for Mr. and Mrs. Charles Robb—Lynda and Chuck.

I have an album for Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Nugent—Luci and Pat.

## THE OIL SHORTAGE AND INDEPENDENT DEALERS

**HON. RICHARD T. HANNA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on August 9 Governor Love made clear that the administration continued to be unconcerned about the impact oil shortages

were having upon independent gasoline marketers. Approximately 80 percent of all gasoline sold in the United States is controlled by 20 companies. What keeps the competition honest in this industry of high concentration is the existence of independent marketers who must be able to obtain sufficient supplies of gasoline to meet their needs and the needs of their customers.

Attached is a copy of a letter I recently received from Mr. Dean Walcutt of the Independent Marketers Council regarding this matter. I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Walcutt's letter.

The letter follows:

INDEPENDENT GASOLINE MARKETERS COUNCIL,

Washington, D.C., August 23, 1973.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANNA: On Thursday, August 9th, Governor Love announced that the Nixon Administration would continue to ignore the disastrous impact of oil shortages upon independent marketers.

It is, therefore, predictable that the major oil companies will be encouraged to take another step toward the elimination of the private-brand competitor, and thereby deny the American people the right to "buy independent."

Our national consumer policy seems to be based upon the proposition that the people can buy all the gasoline and heating oil they may want, so long as they buy it from the right companies.

National oil policy apparently supports the fully integrated, major oil companies as the "favored few."

There are only about twenty majors that are fully self-sufficient, but they alone have the assurance of in-house sources of supply, allowing them to market about 80 billion gallons of finished products each year.

The independent marketer should sell as much as 20 billion gallons through as many as one thousand companies, but, unfortunately, their sources of supply all depend upon the preservation of a "competitive market that is free of restraints."

It is in the marketplace that the adverse impact of Governor Love's policy will be felt because the favored few now control about 80 percent of all gasoline sold in the United States and will control more and more as the independent competitors disappear.

The vital 20 percent that flows through the independent, price competitive channels is recognized as that influence which "keeps the market honest."

On Thursday, August 9th, Governor Love announced that the Nixon Administration would not even listen until September 10th. Come that date, the Independent Gasoline Marketers Council sincerely hopes that the voice of Congress will be heard.

Until then, the independent price competitor will simply do his best to "cling to the cliff."

Sincerely,

DEAN WALCUTT.

## BURCKHOLTER GIVEN PRESTIGIOUS WEATHER SERVICE AWARD

**HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, having recently been advised by the National

Weather Service of the selection of Mr. Ray Burckholter as a recipient of the Weather Service's prestigious Thomas Jefferson Award, I would like to take this opportunity to personally offer my congratulations to Mr. Burckholter for his dedication and professionalism to the voluntary weather observation service.

Mr. Burckholter, a resident of Philo, Ohio, is one of five award winners announced in Washington by the National Weather Service.

Thomas Jefferson Awards were originated in 1959 by the National Weather Service to honor volunteer weather observers for unusual and outstanding achievements. It is the highest award the National Weather Service presents to volunteer observers. The award is named for Jefferson because the statesman-scientist made an almost unbroken series of weather observations from 1776 to 1816.

Mr. Burckholter was cited for recording over 25 years of accurate, complete, and legible weather observations which continue those compiled by his father and grandfather. These observations, taken since 1895, provide a total of 78 years of unbroken and dedicated family service to the community and country.

Mr. Burckholter is a retiree from the Ohio Power Co., and 33-degree Mason. He is also a 50-year Grange member and township trustee.

The National Weather Service has more than 13,000 volunteer observers who make and record daily weather observations in all parts of the United States. The valuable information they gather is processed and published by the Environmental Data Service, another major component of NOAA, and becomes a valuable part of the Nation's weather history.

On this occasion, I know that my colleagues in the U.S. Congress join me in this salute to a fine gentleman for a job well done. We wish him continued success and happiness.

**NIX POINTS OUT THE WHOLE WORLD IS WATCHING NORTH VIETNAM'S REGULARS IN CAMBODIA**

**HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I supported the legislation which ended American bombing in Cambodia on August 15 of this year.

I did so because I believed that constitutional questions involving the war powers of the President were decisive. That particular issue will be answered when the Congress enacts war powers legislation.

I had hoped, as many others did, that the North Vietnamese would take the ending of our bombing as the clearest kind of signal that they could take reciprocal action. They could withdraw their troops, the main cause of the war

ever since Sihanouk requested secret bombing of the North Vietnamese by the United States. If they did so the Cambodians could settle matters themselves.

But that is the problem. They do not wish even the most dedicated Cambodian Communist to come to terms with the Government of Cambodia. In fact their position was made very clear when they fought pitched battles with Cambodian Communist troops, they had themselves trained. These were disciplinary battles and as a result North Vietnamese discipline has been reimposed.

The whole world is watching the North Vietnamese Army.

World opinion has seen the end of American bombing.

World opinion knows that the truce agreement of last January applied to Cambodia and North Vietnam has ignored it.

Article 20(b) of the agreement ending the war and restoring peace in Vietnam, states:

(b) Foreign countries shall put an end to all military activities in Cambodia and Laos, totally withdraw from and refrain from reintroducing into these two countries troops, military advisers and military personnel, armaments, munitions and war material.

Article 20(c) states:

(c) The internal affairs of Cambodia and Laos shall be settled by the people of these countries without foreign interference.

The Congress cannot ignore what the whole world can see. On behalf of my constituents I condemn the continuing violations of the truce agreement in Cambodia by the North Vietnamese regime and I will never support the spending of one dime on reconstruction aid for North Vietnam as long as these violations continue.

## WAR, WATERGATE—AND WANT

**HON. BELLA S. ABZUG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, "two commodities that few shoppers ever wanted,"—war and Watergate—are responsible for the high food prices, according to Columnist Jack Anderson. "We are still paying for these national tragedies with every bite."

The complex interrelationship between these events and the soaring cost of living, especially eating, is clearly outlined in an article by Anderson in Parade for September 2, 1973. As an aid to understanding the current situation, I would like to insert the column in the RECORD.

### WHY FOOD PRICES ARE SO HIGH

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Across the nation, grocery shoppers are staring at the cash register totals in utter disbelief. When supermarkets run rare specials, early arriving housewives fill their shopping carts, leaving only the pickings for others. Pensioners sift through shelves of canned goods, looking for older stock with lower prices. A suburban

matron pockets a tomato, and store clerks turn their heads to avoid noticing.

The time may be upon us when a chicken in every pot can again be a tempting political promise to Americans who have two cars in their garages and little meat on their tables.

Two of the key burdens, adding weight to the price tag like a butcher's thumb on the meat scale, are commodities few shoppers ever wanted—war and Watergate. We are still paying for these national tragedies with every bite.

The billions thrown away on bombs, bullets and bribes in Southeast Asia have materially weakened the dollar. The wages of war have drained the U.S., and the greenbacks have been piling up like autumn leaves around the world. This has forced the devaluations of the dollar, which have made American farm produce far cheaper abroad.

### LOSS OF CONFIDENCE

The scandals, which have come to be lumped under the word Watergate, have also made the dollar worth less. Foreigners hurried to convert their dollars into more tangible assets.

"We have been told for years that the balance of payment deficits meant nothing, that devaluations meant nothing," Gordon Nelson, a broker for a leading commodities firm, told us. "That is 100 percent nonsense. The American people are being conned. What has happened is that foreigners, seeing our paper money worth less every day, have rushed to convert their currency into something real. Our commodities, because of inflation, have become cheaper for them, so they buy them up. And we don't get them."

The biggest deal, known ruefully inside government circles as The Great Grain Robbery, was the wheat sale to Russia—an adventure in capitalism that still has Kremlin leaders chuckling in their borscht.

Two winters ago, the crunch of winter destroyed huge quantities of Soviet grain. Smothered by the snows and hindered by a frigid spring, most of the Russian wheat crop was ruined. The Soviet leaders knew only one nation could solve their acute food shortage—the United States.

The Kremlin sent squads of bright young men to study the U.S. commodity market. They developed a remarkable understanding of how the market operates, and then they began making piecemeal purchases. Agriculture Department officials, eager for the business, agreed to charge the world rate of \$1.65 a bushel and to subsidize any price increases with U.S. money.

### TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE

By the time the Americans woke up to the bold dimensions of the Soviet purchase, it was too late. The Russians had gobbled up more than 400 million bushels of wheat—over a quarter of our total crop. They paid the subsidized price of \$1.65 while Americans were paying \$2.75 a bushel. This, plus shipping and storage subsidies and a three-year \$750 million loan made up more than \$950 million of the billion-dollar Soviet purchase. As a result, of course, wheat prices climbed higher.

This grain drain coincided with a seemingly unrelated event on the Peruvian coastline, which combined to put jet propellant into the price of food in the U.S. Tiny silver fish called anchovies vanished mysteriously from once-teeming Peruvian fishing beds.

Anchovies happen to be a prime feed enricher for hogs, cattle and poultry. As the Peruvian catastrophe reduced the world anchovy catch to a fifth its former size, farmers looked desperately for another meal replacement. They found it in soybeans, another protein-rich additive.

Soybean prices in the U.S. soared out of sight as farmers fought to keep up the qual-



ity of their feed. But inevitably, farmers were forced to reduce the protein they fed to hogs and cattle. A farmer who cut the protein additives in his hog meal by 3 percent could expect his sows to give birth to litters a sixth smaller. Result: fewer hogs on the market.

#### IN THE SQUEEZE

The cattlemen, for their part, were caught in a squeeze between high feed prices and frozen beef prices. The ranchers, therefore, simply turned their herds loose on the open range. Munching away on grass, the animals fatten more slowly, and less expensively. But the consumers will get stringier, less appetizing meat when the cattle come to market.

The weather also took its toll. More than a quarter million cattle died—a net loss of 120 million pounds of beef—during what the Cattlemen's Association called "the worst winter with the greatest impact in history." The retail worth of the lost meat amounted to over \$150 million. The bad weather also obliterated the onion crop and some fruit harvests.

#### FARM SUBSIDIES

Government policies and programs have also contributed to the present plight. For years, small farmers have been pushed off the land by the big-money operators who are able to turn the sod and a buck more efficiently. These big operators have influenced Congress to grant them handouts for what they don't plant.

This great concentration of economic power—the gentlemen farmers call it "agribusiness"—now has such clout it can virtually manipulate the market price at will.

One long-standing effect of agribusiness is the trek to the cities of the unskilled poor, no longer needed on the big, mechanized farms. These hapless citizens make up a large chunk of the welfare cases. Part of their dole, the food stamp program, which costs \$3 billion a year, has given many of the poor their first taste of decent food. This has increased the demand, and therefore the price, of better-grade foodstuffs.

The Food for Peace program, another laudable attempt to share the surplus of our groaning granaries with the hungry of the world, now adds to the pocketbook pressure at home. Almost 10 percent of last year's wheat harvest was bought by the government to distribute free or through easy-interest loans to needy foreign countries. The program will ship out 130 million bushels of wheat this year, at a cost to the taxpayers of \$800 million. This will increase the cost of bread and the price of fattening cattle.

#### "BEEFALO"

As food prices soar, enterprising businessmen have made some bizarre innovations. Sawdust manufacturers have begun to market their product for cattle feed. A West Coast rancher has perfected a new hybrid called the "Beefalo"—half cow, half buffalo—as a source of quality meat at cheap prices. In the prairie states, owners of growing bison herds are offering steaks made of pure buffalo.

And while consumers have yet to alter their eating habits, the President's National Commission on Productivity is pushing still another new entry to the nation's meat counters—bull steaks. Although the bull is assumed to be less appetizing than his cousin the steer, young bulls may soon offer low-cost protein to American diets.

#### THE FUTURE

The food industry is also at work on innovations to cut costs and speed up shopping. In the years ahead, say industry spokesmen, the present cash register system will be replaced by lightning-quick computers. Food products will be packaged in specially tagged wrappers that register prices instantly when passed by electronic sensors. This should end

the ungainly checkout lines and expensive personnel costs. Electronic wizardry promises huge savings in food storehouses, too. Once packers begin shipping produce in standardized containers, machinery will process what is now sorted clumsily by men.

But none of this is going to bring down the cost of groceries this week. And the worst is still ahead.

#### NEW GRAIN DEAL

For the sake of international relations, particularly the new warmth with Russia and China, the Nixon Administration plans in the next 12 months to sell an additional 400 million bushels of grain and soybeans to these two countries.

Normally, prices at the grocery counters offer Americans the world's best bargain. But the combination of bad weather, bad policies and world demand have joined to keep food prices soaring.

#### INTEREST RATE INCREASES FAIL TO SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE SAVINGS

### HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on July 20, I argued that the July 5 decision of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to raise the interest ceilings on savings deposits spelled bad news for home buyers. It was my feeling that the July 5 decision would have little impact on total savings and that its net effect would be to take funds out of savings and loan institutions and to increase mortgage rates.

That, in fact, is what has occurred. Before July 5, for example, savings and loans were reporting a net savings inflow; but the FHLBB now estimates that these same institutions experienced a net outflow of savings of more than \$300 million during the entire month of July. Moreover, mortgage interest rates have now been quoted at 9 percent plus 1 to 2 points—the highest prevailing mortgage rates ever recorded.

Finally, a survey taken in late July by the American Bankers Association shows that the July 5 decision has not resulted in any substantial increase in savings deposits in banks and that most of the increases which have been recorded reflect transfers within the industry. I commend the results of this survey to my colleagues' attention, as it is a further index of what has happened since the July 5 decision:

JULY 27, 1973.

#### REPORT OF A TELEGRAPHIC SURVEY OF INTEREST RATE CEILINGS

The American Bankers Association has just conducted a survey of 50 banks in various sections of the U.S. and representing all size classes to find out how the higher ceilings were affecting the flow of savings. We have now received responses from 42 banks. The new ceilings have been in effect for such a short period that it is difficult for commercial banks to make meaningful observations about the impact of the changes. However, our survey shows that 40 out of 42 commercial banks have raised the rates paid on some types of savings. Twenty-seven out of 41 respondents (1 did not answer the ques-

tion) have raised their passbook rates to 5% and time deposit rates have generally been advanced to ceiling levels. Thirty of the 42 responding banks indicated that they were offering four-year CDs. Twenty-one are paying 7%, three are paying 6½%, and six are paying more than 7%.

The banks were also asked to indicate how these changes had affected the dollar volume of various types of savings. Almost uniformly the banks indicated that the impact of the changes in rates had been slight. Although five banks did not supply the information, seven reported that they had had a gain in passbook savings, 14 showed a loss, and 16 showed no change. The trend of the dollar volume of certificates of deposits is equally interesting. Although four banks did not supply information, 17 indicated that there was a gain, 13 showed no change and 8 showed a loss. The gain in certificates of deposit was undoubtedly due in great part to the offering of the new instrument—the four-year CDs.

We also asked them to indicate the major sources of their funds. Twelve of the banks reporting gains indicated that one of the major sources of funds had been the transfer of deposits in its own bank. Several reported the receipt of funds from other commercial banks, but only two were able to identify funds as coming from a savings and loan. Banks reporting losses of funds from time and savings accounts were, for the most part, unable to indicate where the money went. Four, however, stated that funds flowed to money market instruments, especially Treasury Bills.

#### TRIBUTE OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. ROONEY TO HIS LATE AND RESPECTED FRIEND, CHARLES ROZMAREK

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have long known Charles Rozmarek over the long span of his public service, his recent passing has deprived us of a true and valued friend. This passing has been a severe loss to the Nation and more particularly to the officers and members of Polish American organizations throughout the land.

Most important of the many great contributions Charlie made to the Polonian societies was the founding of the Polish American Congress and his dynamic leadership demonstrated as president of the Polish National Alliance.

To know Charles Rozmarek was to admire him for his unwavering loyalty to the cause of fighting for the freedom of Poland and the other subjugated countries of Europe. Throughout his leadership in this struggle to regain the independence lost to the Nazi and Russian Communist superior might, he clearly distinguished the difference between the Polish people and Poland's Communist-dominated Government. He consistently refused to temporize with Communist doctrines or acts and he never maintained any contact with Warsaw representatives in this country; nor did this speaker. Yet he gave his enthusiastic support to every proposal which would benefit the Polish people economically, culturally, and politically.

I refer again to his keen interest in

the plight of the Polish displaced persons most of whom were the pitiful victims of Nazi and Soviet aggression. I recall vividly his tremendous zeal in obtaining maximum help for these sick and destitute people after he had returned from personal visits to European displaced persons' camps and had seen first-hand their plight. I know, too, of his personal help in getting thousands of these unfortunate homeless Poles resettled in the United States and other countries. There are literally thousands of American citizens, Polish-born and American-born, who today owe their coveted rights to U.S. citizenship to the dedicated work of Charles Rozmarek.

Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to come to know this great American personally and to work with him for the cause of freedom and justice. It was my privilege in 1964 in Chicago and again in 1968 in Cleveland, Ohio, to address the PAC conventions and there reassure my Polish-American friends along with Karol Rozmarek of America's recognition and appreciation of their great patriotic contributions for Free Poland and a better world.

America mourns the loss of one of her great citizens. It extends her deepest sympathy to the family who survive him and to the Polish-American organizations which he so loved and served. Karol Rozmarek is not dead—his deeds and the selfless manner in which he performed them shall inspire us to redouble our own efforts to achieve the ends to which he aspired and which because of his untimely death must still be accomplished. Requiescat in Pace.

#### MY FIRST PRAYER: THE LATE LAURIE TORGAN

### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 26, the life of Miss Laurie Torgan was tragically taken in an untimely automobile accident.

Her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Torgan of Spring Valley, N.Y., have very thoughtfully shared a prayer with me that their lovely daughter wrote.

In writing to Mr. and Mrs. Torgan, I noted:

Although the grief of such a tragedy is a heavy burden to any parent, I sincerely hope that you will find solace in the knowledge that during her short lifetime, she dedicated herself to others less fortunate so that the memory of her goodness will live with them.

Having been deeply moved by Laurie's sensitive and unselfish thoughts, I respectfully submit the text of her prayer at this point in the RECORD so that others may reflect upon her thoughtful message:

#### MY FIRST PRAYER

Please, oh dear lovely beautiful God—if ever you can forgive us our trespasses and can touch the wounded and heal them.

Oh, please let the children of Vietnam be the first to receive your power and strength.

CXIX—1804—Part 22

And if your love runs out for us, let it run through for Cambodia and Laos.

And, if your arms embrace, but have only so little room left—let them embrace all the little children of the ghettos, we have created, we white men and women.

Please help me flood this earth with love and kindness and make it easier for us to deal with conflict.

We dare not venture out alone—you are with us—you are in my brothers and sisters and that is why I believe in you.

I am not asking for you to do it all, you will not, for our sins—but oh please help me, my friends, my workers to do it all.

I am seeing shining eyes. They shine through the rain, the mud, the bomb-filled air, and the bullets—they do this so brave and lovingly—they are where, if I get my strength, I will get it.

#### PROPOSES MEDAL OF HONOR AWARD FOR NONMILITARY

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 10 of this year, I introduced a bill to provide for the awarding of a Medal of Honor each year to one policeman and one fireman from each State. I introduced this bill because I feel the acts of heroism performed by our police and firemen in the routine everyday performance of their duties are no less praiseworthy than those performed by the soldier on the battlefield, and this kind of public recognition is long overdue.

Since I introduced this bill, I have written to the law enforcement agencies in the State of Maryland requesting the names of officers who have been commended for their outstanding service. The response to this request has been heartwarming and I would like to include a partial list of those officers at this point:

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.,  
Rockville, Md., August 17, 1973.

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,  
Congress of the United States,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOGAN: This is in reply to your letters of August 6, 1973 to Lieutenant Colonel G. Warren Howes and me concerning legislation in the 93rd Congress to honor police officers and firemen who have performed their duties with a degree of excellence.

In order that their names may be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish you to know the following named officers were commended for various performances during fiscal year 1972-73.

Sincerely,

K. W. WATKINS,  
Superintendent.

COMMENDATIONS 7/1/72—8/30/73

Name, Date, and Assignment

Pfc. Chauncey J. Augustine, Jr., 6/11/73, Rock.  
Pvt. Thomas E. Coffman, 11/30/72, SS.  
Pvt. David A. Conner, 12/22/72, Beth.  
Pvt. Thomas N. Crichton, 7/20/72, SS.  
Pvt. Donald E. Deaton, 3/28/73, WG.  
Pfc. Donald E. Gabriel, 9/12/72, WG.  
Pvt. John E. Horwat, 5/3/73, Rock.  
Cpl. Owen J. Lennon, 9/13/72, Hom/W.

Pfc. Thomas E. Leonard, 10/24/72, SS.  
Cpl. John F. Lynch, Jr., 9/13/72, Hom/W.  
Sgt. Kenneth G. Magee, 9/13/72, Hom/W.  
Pfc. Frank W. McAtee, 10/24/72, SS.  
Pvt. Robert F. McKenna, 9/12/72, V&I/W.  
Cpl. James J. O'Connell, 10/17/72, SS.  
Pfc. Ronald W. Ryan, 10/26/72, Beth.  
Pvt. Raymond L. Simmons, 6/29/73, Rock.  
Pvt. Charles L. Simpson, Jr., 12/5/72, Rock.  
2nd Lt. Odus W. Sweat, Jr., 3/19/73, Hom/W.

MARYLAND STATE POLICE,  
Pikesville, Md., August 16, 1973.

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,  
Congress of the United States,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOGAN: I have your letter of August 6, concerning legislation which you have introduced in the 93rd Congress, and in connection therewith the following information is forwarded as requested.

The highest award given by this Agency is a Governor's Citation. This award is authorized in instances where the performance of a member has been identified as outstanding and above and beyond the call to duty. In every instance, a definite risk of life by the member must be involved.

During the past two years, the following members of this Agency have received Governor's Citations:

Tfc. D. D. Waltemeyer.  
Tpr. J. F. Kerchner.  
Tfc. J. L. Galyon.  
Tfc. E. D. Horner.  
Cpl. G. C. Royer.  
Tfc. G. H. Davis.  
Tfc. E. W. Hoffman.  
Tfc. E. F. Tarburton.  
Tpr. H. D. Robertson.  
Sgt. J. L. Forsythe.  
Tfc. J. W. Brown.  
Tfc. M. B. Storey.  
Cpl. R. W. Beaumont.  
Cpl. J. C. Turrall.  
Sgt. R. R. Morgan.  
Tpr. A. Hadaway.  
Tfc. G. W. White.  
Tfc. C. H. Wood.  
Tfc. H. J. Hagey.

We in the law enforcement profession appreciate this gesture on your part. Assuring you of our cooperation in any and all matters of mutual concern.

Sincerely,

T. S. SMITH,  
Superintendent.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,  
CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MD.,  
August 16, 1973.

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,  
Congress of the United States,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am in receipt of your correspondence dated August 6, 1973 relative to your pending legislation in the 93rd Congress.

I believe this would be a fitting reward to those officers who have performed their duties to the highest degree of excellence. They certainly deserve recognition. I have listed those officers in my command who have been cited for outstanding service while in the line of duty:

Lt. William W. Dalrymple.  
Det./Cpl. Gary L. Sherman.  
Sgt. Laurie N. Cofsky.  
Cpl. Werner P. Winkler.  
Cpl. R. Daniel Fuller.  
Pfc. Stephen W. Carter.  
Pfc. John C. Goetz.

If I can be of any further assistance, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Capt. ROBERT E. PORTER,  
Chief of Police.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,  
CITY OF GREENBELT, Md.,  
August 13, 1973.

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOGAN: Received your recent letter requesting names of officers who have been cited for outstanding service so that they may be included in the Congressional Record.

The following is a partial list of officers that have been cited for their service; a copy of their commendations are also enclosed:

Sgt. Herbert L. Faulconer.  
Sgt. Carl F. Goodwin.  
Sgt. Thomas E. Van Valkenburgh.  
Cpl. Ernest W. Brumley.  
Cpl. Paul I. Reamy.  
Cpl. John R. Salvatore.  
PFC Michael L. Janney.  
PFC William E. Vogel.  
PFC Alvin Hall, Jr.  
Patrolman Kenneth L. Stair.

I also noted that you have proposed legislation which would provide the awarding of a Medal of Honor for police and firemen who have performed their duties in the highest degree of excellence.

May I assure you that your efforts to give recognition to deserving officers is appreciated and will further inspire those receiving such recognition as well as other officers to even greater efforts of service to their communities.

Please be assured of our full cooperation.  
Respectfully,

WILLIAM T. LANE,  
Chief of Police.

SENIOR DEPUTY U.S. MARSHAL  
RETIRES

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 of this year, Mr. Robert C. McConaughey retired as the U.S. Deputy Marshal for the Northern District of West Virginia. "Mac," as he is called by all who know him, devoted more than 36 years of highly efficient and effective service to this country, more than 32 years as U.S. Deputy Marshal and nearly 4 years as an Air Force captain during World War II.

I had the privilege of working with Mac in the 1950's when I was the U.S. District Marshal for the Northern District, and I know he deserves the congratulations and thanks of every citizen for the outstanding manner in which he carried out his responsibilities.

Mac does not talk much and wastes few words. In fact, he was asked recently why he originally took a deputy marshal's position back in 1936. He replied simply: "I thought I might like the work." And that he did. He was responsible for 33 counties, but special assignments often took him around the country. When he retired, he was the Nation's senior ranking U.S. Deputy Marshal.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to wish Robert C. (Mac) McConaughey a most pleasant and rewarding retirement, which I hope he will enjoy as much as he did the job he performed so well for a third of a century.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE:  
THE GASOLINE SHORTAGE, AN  
INTERVIEW WITH RAYMOND R.  
WRIGHT, DIRECTOR OF MARKET-  
ING, AMERICAN PETROLEUM IN-  
STITUTE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted a television interview concerning the current situation of gasoline shortages facing this country. My guest was Mr. Raymond R. Wright, director of Marketing, American Petroleum Institute. I insert the text of that interview at this point:

RARICK. If you've pulled into a gasoline station recently to fill up, and found that the service station had closed early or was out of gas, you've experienced the gasoline shortage. Industry and government experts alike tell us that it is a matter of supply and demand. We are using more gasoline than we are able to refine and transport. In the time we have today, we are going to take a look at the energy shortage, where we are, how we got there and where we're headed, and how it affects you, the consumer-taxpayer.

American consumption of oil, gasoline and petroleum products has been rising rapidly in recent years. Production and refining capacity however, have not followed this dramatic U.S. increase in demand. Americans are now questioning why we are suddenly running out of petroleum, where does the fault lie, and what can be done to help solve the situation. To help us understand the problem and what is being done, I have as my guest today, the Director of Marketing of the American Petroleum Institute, Raymond Wright. Mr. Wright, thank you for joining us today.

The American Petroleum Institute is a major trade association for the entire petroleum industry, and acts as a clearing house of information on all phases of oil exploration, production, refining, transportation and marketing.

Mr. Wright, I think that most of our people have some knowledge of the fact that the United States faces a shortage of gasoline. Just how extensive the shortage is is not quite so clear in most people's minds. How serious is the gasoline shortage and what does the fuel situation look like for the remainder of the summer?

WRIGHT. Our inventories right now are about what they were at this time last year, and demand is up some; so that the way that I look at the figures would indicate that the shortage is real, but that it does not amount to any national calamity or catastrophe. It will result in inconvenience, mainly to motorists who are not going to be able to find the stations that they are used to seeing, open, and maybe not be able to buy all the gasoline at one filling that they are accustomed to buying. I do not see it as a national emergency this summer, at least.

RARICK. A rising demand for petroleum throughout the world is often pointed to as a contributing factor to the fuel lag in this country. How does the U.S. stack up in the world market?

WRIGHT. Well, I have a chart here which shows that we only have 6% of the people in the United States, but we're using 33% of the world's energy resources—oil, gas, nuclear, coal and the like. So we are tremendous consumers of energy per capita in the United States and it's a large contributor to our high standard of living and productivity.

RARICK. In a preliminary report by the

Federal Trade Commission released last week, "insufficient refining capacity" was pointed to as a major factor in the gas shortage this summer. Are our refineries operating at capacity and can refining capabilities be increased in the near future?

WRIGHT. The refineries are running flat out. They're running just as fast as they can and producing just as many products as they can. They set all-time records both last winter and this spring. The refineries can be expanded. It takes 1½ to 2 years to do some major refinery expansion.

Our problem has been that you build refineries in two places. You build them where the oil is or where the people are. And the lack of expansion of our crude oil production in the United States has discouraged refinery construction. As you know there are some delays in leasing in the Gulf, there are bans on drilling in California, and we haven't gotten the oil down from Alaska. So that refineries built on the basis of expansion of crude oil supply have not been built. The refineries on the East Coast, where the people are, have had difficulty getting sites.

People are concerned about the environmental damage refineries would have and this has delayed things there. We've had some economic reasons for not building, some crude oil reasons for not building and some reason that people have for not building.

RARICK. Mr. Wright, I'm sure that you're aware plans are now on the way to build the first new oil refinery in the United States in the last three years. We understand that it's to be located in Louisiana, in fact near Baton Rouge. My question is this, is there any reason why the industry has waited for so long to continue to expand refining facilities?

WRIGHT. Well, this is a new refinery in Louisiana although Baytown, Texas has recently announced a 250,000 barrel expansion in the Gulf area. I think that what we're seeing down there is the new leasing that has come in the Gulf area has uncovered new oil and gas resources to warrant refining expansion. This was the kind of refinery expansion that is due not to people but to expansion of crude oil supply. When you have it it makes sense to build enough refining capacity to take care of the crude from new fields.

RARICK. I know it takes time to gear-up for heavy demand. What is the time lag involved in the exploration and development of a new oil field? A refinery?

WRIGHT. It takes about three years to build a major refinery. And that is after you get the sites. There's a lot of negotiation that has to be done with local authorities. Town hearings to convince people that you can build one safely. Once you get all the permits, it takes about three years to build a major refinery. And the permit business, I don't know, it can take a year. It can take even longer depending upon how much resistance there would be in any area to a refinery, and sometimes they're just not built because of local resistance.

RARICK. Do we have existing domestic reserves of oil to satisfy our growing demands?

WRIGHT. We have adequate reserves, but crude oil that is still in the ground is not immediately available unless it has been drilled for. Our domestic reserves, unless we have expansion of domestic drilling, will not increase, and in fact, will be declining.

RARICK. What about the Alaskan oil situation?

WRIGHT. The Alaskan oil will certainly help. It would cut half of our foreign imports of crude oil if it were being brought down now. It's not the total answer, but increased drilling off California and increased crude oil production domestically from smaller pools and the hope of finding a large supply in the Gulf of Mexico and off the East Coast would ultimately help to close this gap. I

personally don't foresee a time when we'll never import one drop, but what we have to do is get our imports down to a level that our foreign exchange and earnings position can tolerate.

Unless we increase our production, our total demand will have to come from imports and that could get as high as 15 to 20 million barrels a day in a few years. The rule of thumb is that there's about a dollar loss of foreign exchange for every barrel imported. You'd have 15 or 20 billion dollars a year flowing out of this country. Right now we have a problem tolerating a 5 and 6 billion dollar a year trade deficit. How could we handle a 15 to 20 billion dollar deficit?

RARICK. Well, in addition to the deficit a loss of money for oil imports. I think many Americans are concerned about a growing dependence on foreign oil supplies and in relationship to our national security. How much of our fuel does the industry foresee the U.S. importing in the years ahead?

WRIGHT. Unless we do roll up our sleeves and increase the crude oil base in this country by 1985 many experts estimate that we could be importing as much as 51% of our total crude oil supply. And since Venezuela and Canada have announced to us that they're going to need most of their oil for themselves in the future, our crude oil supply is going to have to come from the Middle East and North Africa.

I think that we all know that that is not the most stable part of the globe. There's all kinds of problems over there. They've interrupted crude oil supply to Europe 14 times since World War II and to the extent that we're depending on them, we can anticipate that they would use our dependence as a club, you might say, to gain their own ends at our expense.

RARICK. Mr. Wright, many of the people back home haven't been to Washington, probably aren't aware that we shut out percentages of the lights in the halls, and the air conditioner is turned a little bit warmer than many people would like it. In our garages, many of them look almost like tunnels because of the efforts to impress upon the people that there is an energy shortage and to try to conserve electricity and therefore the fuel.

Earlier in this session of Congress, I introduced a bill to authorize the president to suspend the rigid pollution controls required for automobiles until the fuel crisis eases. I know that these pollution control devices have greatly increased the gasoline demand. Do you have any additional information about fuel demand and EPA pollution requirements?

WRIGHT. Well even now, owners of '72 and '73 cars realize that they're not as good performers as the pre-'72 cars. One reason for this is that the EPA and the automobile manufacturers have both agreed to lower compression ratios of engines. They don't require higher octane fuel. That alone would make them less efficient, plus the fact that EPA is correct. The cars are heavier. People are putting more options on them—air conditioners, automatic transmission, power windows and the like, which soak up the energy. The air pollution devices themselves create inefficiency and Phillips Petroleum Company has prepared a slide that shows if the full EPA requirements are put on cars and as more and more of these cars are so equipped, by 1980 the fuel penalty to the American people would be around 30%. Now if you go to slightly lower standards, more realistic standards in many people's minds, the fuel penalty would be only 15%. The 15% are the California type standards that have been pushed by the Chrysler Corporation as representing a reasonable compromise between the very extreme protection and cost and good protection at more moderate cost.

The fuel penalty, if we keep the current

standards all the way through '77, is around 10%. And if you were to go back to an earlier level of control, say '71 or '70 or '69, the percentage penalty is 5% less. The air is being cleaned up, but like anything else we do, there's a price to be paid and right now efficiency of automotive engines is one that we're paying. They're just not as efficient.

RARICK. What role have other environmental considerations played in oil production and refining?

WRIGHT. Delays in nuclear plant completions have been caused by environmental concerns. Nuclear plant sites and refinery sites are delayed or banned by environmental concerns. Coal mining is curtailed, and coal burning is, in effect, outlawed in many areas. Displacement of coal with oil has increased fuel oil demand by utilities nearly 42,000,000 gallons per day in five years. Electric power that is not being produced by nuclear plants as planned has to come from oil.

RARICK. The Justice Department is currently studying what has been referred to in the press as a monopolistic control of the oil industry by a cartel of the big corporations. Are the big companies trying to drive the smaller independent dealers out of business?

WRIGHT. The increased demand for petroleum products has caused nearly all customers to turn to firm supply contracts. Many independents bought surplus supplies through brokers on the basis of market conditions. Gasoline and other products are no longer in surplus and are not being offered under surplus marketing conditions. The way to best help independent markets is to develop more energy supplies of all kinds—oil, gas, coal, waterpower, nuclear, solar, and geothermal so that abundant supplies are again available.

RARICK. We have a problem. Now what's the solution? What can industry, government and the consumer do to correct the problem?

WRIGHT. For the short term we must tighten our belts and use energy more efficiently. Savings are possible in our homes, transportation, government and industry. We must start immediately on expansion of exploration and production of oil and gas. Build the Alaskan line. Permit construction of new refineries and nuclear plants. Allow coal to be used under controlled conditions.

RARICK. Well, I think that we all agree that we do have a problem and truthfully we have to work for a solution and we all look forward—industry, government, and the American people, the consumer—working together can correct the problem.

Mr. Wright, my guest on the program today is with the American Petroleum Institute. I'm sure my viewers have certainly enjoyed your comments and the additional data you have supplied and we're most happy to have you in the homes of our Louisiana viewers.

WRIGHT. My pleasure, sir, and my pleasure to be with you.

#### IDEAL WAY TO TOUR

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the city of Philadelphia is offering its residents and tourists a most ideal way to tour the city's famous cultural and historical landmarks.

Philadelphia's Cultural Loop Bus makes it possible for sightseers to visit these attractions at very low cost and also offers discount admission tickets to five sites.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a statement by the city of Philadelphia describing this unique bus service:

New York City is copying Philadelphia's Cultural Loop Bus, according to an article in the New York Times.

The service, which gets underway Saturday, Sept. 1, appears to be identical with Philadelphia's operation. It covers 22 participating institutions instead of 10, the price is \$1 instead of 50 cents, and the operator is the New York Transit Authority.

Philadelphia's Cultural Loop Bus is now in its second summer, and its patronage has been steadily increasing. Ridership this year has been 35,557 up to the end of last week, compared with 23,538 in the same period last year.

For 50 cents, residents and tourists can ride from Independence Hall through mid-city, wind through Fairmount Park and loop at America's first Zoological Garden, visiting 10 historical and cultural attractions. The one low fare entitles the rider to on-and-off privileges all day plus discount admissions to the five major attractions that charge.

The Cultural Loop Bus offers service every 30 minutes in either direction from Independence Hall or the Zoo between 9:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. in an air-conditioned SEPTA bus Sunday through Saturday.

The Bus is made possible through the efforts of the Parkway Cultural Promotion Council, the Convention and Tourist Bureau, Philadelphia Area Council on Tourism, Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, and the City of Philadelphia.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON H.R. 9175

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on the "Community Anticrime Assistance Act of 1973," H.R. 9175, a bill which I introduced together with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, HAMILTON FISH, JR., and H.R. 9809, a companion bill introduced by Mr. RODINO, chairman of the Judiciary Committee. This legislation provides Federal grants to assist cities, public agencies, and nonprofit, private organizations in efforts to increase the level of citizen involvement and cooperation with the various components of the criminal justice system.

The hearings will be held Thursday, September 13, and Thursday, September 20, 1973, at 10 a.m., in 2141 Rayburn House Office Building. On the first day of hearings, the subcommittee will hear testimony from the Honorable John V. Lindsay, mayor of the city of New York; and Mr. Lawrence P. Doss, president, New Detroit. On the second day of hearings, the subcommittee will hear testimony from the Honorable James H. Scheuer, president, National Alliance for Safer Cities.

The subcommittee will hold further hearings on this legislation in October. Those wishing to testify or submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

## LIFTING THE TV BLACKOUT OF NFL HOME GAMES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the "sport-View" column by Jack Craig in the August 25 issue of the Sporting News provides an informative assessment of the problem of home blackouts, along with a forecast that—

The heretofore untouchable television blackout of NFL home games will be lifted this season, by an act of Congress.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 9620—introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PARRIS)—to lift the blackout, I should like to include Craig's column in the RECORD at this time.

The column follows:

SPORTVIEW

(By Jack Craig)

HOME GAMES ON TV SOON?

BOSTON.—All you football fans languishing on waiting lists for season tickets to home games of your favorite NFL team can relax. Chances are you are going to see those games anyway, without spending a dime or battling a traffic jam.

Granted that politics have never been more unsettled in Washington, D.C., so predictions are more perilous than usual. But here's one. The heretofore untouchable television blackout of NFL home games will be lifted this season by an act of Congress.

The reasons for such a bold forecast are twofold. First, Congress is so anxious to lift the blackout provision that it will dodge the customarily slow-paced legislative process. Secondly, there is simply no political opposition left to lifting the blackout. Only the details remain an issue, and not very big, at that.

The few legal steps left include hearings for three days, beginning September 5, by the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power, after which the committee will propose a bill for the full House. After the latter adopts this bill, it will form a conference committee with members of the Senate, which will undoubtedly have its own bill by that time.

The final version then will be resolved and sent along for the signature of President Nixon, who already is on record for lifting the blackout.

All of this may be accomplished before the first Sunday of the season on September 16. But if not, a Congressional source insists it should be completed by the following Sunday.

The only real point of contention involves how much of an impact lifting of the blackout for pro football will have on pro baseball, basketball and hockey.

Under the Senate version, events sold out 48 hours in advance in each of those sports will have home blackouts lifted even on non-network telecasts, subject only to the wishes of the station that holds the home club's TV contract.

The legislation sought by the House Communications Subcommittee would restrict the impact on baseball, football and hockey to network telecasts. Its reasoning is that otherwise, while the over-whelming thrust of the blackout bill is toward pro football, it would have a much heavier impact on the other sports because they generally derive more money from local than network TV, unlike the NFL.

Also, there is a question whether such a law can be passed on local telecasts. The power to act on network TV rests in the

legal axiom of benefits conferred, in this instance through the antitrust exemption authorized in 1961 by Congress for pooled profits on network sports telecasts. That Congressional provision has led to bountiful profits for pro sports, notably the NFL, in the past 12 seasons, and now there is an assumed obligation for pro sports to reciprocate and at least experiment by lifting home area blackouts.

The alternative for Congress would be to lift the antitrust privilege, which would require each team to negotiate its own TV deal, meaning clubs in the largest markets would reap the higher profits which presumably would have an impact on the playing field.

But local telecasts for baseball, hockey and basketball have not benefited from any Congressional sanction in the past. So, does Congress have any power not to enforce regulations regarding them?

Leaders of the three sports apparently are ready to test the argument if Congress does adopt the blackout rule for local TV. This could lead to an injunction which could delay the blackout lifting on pro football.

The NFL and networks have been asked to present data by the time Congress returns after Labor Day in order to estimate the impact of home blackouts being lifted when sellouts are in force 48 hours before kickoff.

NFL Commissioner Pete Rozelle will testify on September 6 and is expected to project figures on loss of parking and concessions revenues resulting from empty seats caused when season ticket holders choose to stay home and watch the game on TV rather than visit the stadium.

Earlier this year, Rozelle said up to \$3,000,000 is involved in these areas. If that's the case, it seems a paltry figure. After all, the NFL is now negotiating a four-year contract with the three networks that calls for around \$214,000,000, an increase of \$30,000,000 alone over the one that will expire after the '73 season.

Rozelle also will undoubtedly point out the loss of jobs and the danger to existing contracts various clubs have with stadium groups.

But all of this has been heard in Washington before, without deterring Congress from seeking a change in the blackout rules.

A quiet bombshell in passage of the bill lifting home blackouts would be the impact on pay cable television, which the NFL is eyeing affectionately.

The present regulations of the Federal Communications Commission require a two-year ban from pay cable by a sport from the time it has been shown free on home television. As long as NFL games have been kept off TV screens in the home area, the league has been free to experiment with pay cable when it wishes.

But once the blackout rule is lifted, pay cable of home games will be dead. Pay cable is the ultimate dream of team owners. This will allow home games to be seen by paying a fee in each household, while retaining the network package for road games.

But this factor finds no sympathy in Congress. In fact, it creates a negative picture, one of greed by club owners. Rozelle not very long ago told Congressman Robert H. Macdonald, chairman of the House Communications Subcommittee, that he had no interest in cable. Yet that possibility is included, reportedly, as a non-negotiable item in the upcoming NFL deal with the networks. This does not sit well in Washington.

The key issue in lifting the NFL blackout rule is how many ticket buyers decide to stay home. Congress' argument to Rozelle is that the only way to find out is to try it. It sounds reasonable enough.

It even overrides for Congress Rozelle's basic contention that it is unfair to force a team to televise its product in the very area that it is selling tickets.

## FAMILIAR ARGUMENTS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a column by Lyn Daunoras, the well respected feature editor of the Brookfield, Ill., Times, came to my attention shortly after the commencement of the congressional recess. However, the column is still very pertinent, and therefore, I insert it into the RECORD today.

Her column, on August 1, is directed at the liberal press world and their attitude toward the recent Supreme Court decisions. Since the clarity of the article does not require further explanation, I insert it at this time.

The column follows:

FAMILIAR ARGUMENTS

(By Lyn Daunoras)

We're getting a super-charge out of our liberal colleagues who are bemoaning the ill fate that has befallen the country through that obscenity ruling by the Supreme Court (all our "troubles" should be so big!)

We're somewhat amused by the furor because they're coming up with all the points we used when the court was making some of those horrendous decisions that we protested, to no avail, for lo, these many years.

"It isn't fair," one late talk show emcee whined, "It's only a 5-4 decision, which shows that four people realize the potential danger in censorship."

Funny. When we used that argument on 5-4 decisions which gave a blanket protection to criminals and released cold-blooded killers on the streets to continue their predatory ways, the liberals laughed. Now they're feeling the pinch of the shoe and the laughing has turned to tears and frustration. Welcome to the club, seniors.

"How can nine men speak for all the people?" they demanded.

Ha. How could nine men ever speak for all the people? But that's the way our system was set up, and no one found fault until recently when the liberal fringe started demanding, and getting "rights" for everyone to read pornography and see movies that once were considered stag films to be shown surreptitiously in some basement.

What they are saying, in essence, is that if they approve of the decision it's all right for nine men to preside and for one more than half to set the stage, but if they disapprove, the nine men are inefficient, arrogant and unfeeling.

The argument that people should be able to censor their own material is well taken. There is absolutely no substitute for the boycott of a film. If it dies at the box office, so do the get-rich-quick producers.

However, if critics would stop reviewing every piece of smut as a work of art and hailing it as something all persons who wish to broaden their outlook must see to appreciate every aspect of life, perhaps there would be less patronage.

While curiosity may have killed the cat, there is no way to kill curiosity. Much of the box office success of so-called obscene films comes from those who "just want to see what it's all about." But even that human trait could be eliminated if the publicity, stressing shock value, was de-emphasized.

Critics consider themselves experts and expect the world to respond to their beck and call. But how is the world to know whether a "work of art" is not just the illusionary wonderment of a plain "dirty old man?"

We're not for outright censorship because

we don't feel that is the solution. We employ our own, based on what we read about books and movies. We simply have no desire to boggle the mind with sex scenes that belong in a private room, not on the screen with thousands of people gawking, squirming and tittering. That isn't even sex; it's just plain lewdity.

But if there are people who thrive on it, so be it. We don't think banning films or books means anything. Far worse than the movies themselves are the headlined comments and reviews that publicize them and lure the public. How many people would see "Last Tango in Paris" if not for the furor over it?

If critics would simply review a film or book with dignity and fact, and let the readers decide whether it sounds good enough to read or see, there would be no need for any obscenity ruling.

**DR. IRVING D. LITWACK RETIRES  
FROM A LIFETIME OF DEDICATED  
PUBLIC SERVICE**

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, immediately upon graduation from the School of Medicine of the University of Illinois in 1930, Irving D. Litwack, M.D., was commissioned a medical officer in the U.S. Navy, serving on active duty until 1936. From that date on he had served the people of California generally and the people of Long Beach specifically as city physician from 1936 to 1941, as assistant health officer in 1946 and as health officer from 1947 until his retirement which is to occur a few days hence on October 1. During 1941-46 he was on leave from his city post for World War II service in the U.S. Naval Medical Corps.

During all these years of his distinguished professional career, Dr. Litwack has earned in equal measures the highest respect and admiration of his professional colleagues and the last affection of the general public. Even earlier in his native Chicago, at the University of Illinois in Urbana where he earned his bachelor of science degree and at the University's Medical School in Chicago where he earned his M.D., Irving Litwack was universally regarded as a man destined to make major contributions to the welfare and to well-being of his fellowmen.

His wife of 40 years, Edith, has been constantly and lovingly at his side to help him make these contributions throughout the years. Their son Kenneth is also a physician, practicing his specialty of internal medicine at Corona del Mar.

A modest man, Dr. Litwack has not sought rewards or recognition, but inevitably many have come his way. For example:

The 1957 Good Government Award of the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce for outstanding service to the city;

The 1964 Jewish War Veterans Bernard and Milton Saul Post No. 593 man of the year award; and,

In 1968, during his term as president, the outstanding merit award of the

Southern California Public Health Association.

In every sense, Dr. Litwack has been the guiding spirit of most of the many voluntary health agencies which serve his city. In fact, either he or his inspiration is responsible for their founding. His involvement with and contribution to these specialized agencies and to many other humanitarian efforts of a broader nature as well as his professional associations and accomplishments are too numerous to list in full, but their scope and function is indicated by the following partial enumeration:

Member of staff of major hospitals of Long Beach.

Chief, Medical-Health Division, Long Beach Emergency Preparedness Council.

Member, Board of Directors, Long Beach Psychiatric Clinic for Children.

Member, Board of Directors, Long Beach Epilepsy Clinic.

Member, Board of Directors of Memorial, Pacific and Community Hospitals.

Member, Board of Directors, Meals on Wheels.

Member, Board of Directors, Visiting Nurses Association.

Member, Advisory Board, Long Beach Council of Parents and Teachers.

Member, Advisory Committee, Children's Dental Foundation, Long Beach.

Member, Advisory Board, Long Beach Tuberculosis and Health Association.

Member, Committee on Consumers' Affairs of St. Mary's Hospital.

Member, Regional Welfare Planning Council.

Diplomate of Specialty Board in Public Health and Preventive Medicine.

Consultant to California State Health Department on Public Health Administration.

Fellow of American Public Health Association (1951).

Fellow of American College of Preventive Medicine (1958).

Fellow of Pan-American Medical Association.

Fellow of Royal College of Public Health Physicians.

Diplomate of American Board of Preventive Medicine.

Member, American Medical Association, California Medical Association, Los Angeles County Medical Association, Long Beach Medical Association.

Member, American Association of Public Health Physicians—California Chapter, American Association on Mental Retardation, California Conference of Local Health Officers.

Former President, Southern California Public Health Association.

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to make note in this RECORD of these years of unselfish and dedicated service to fellowmen by Dr. Irvin D. Litwack and to express for myself and on behalf of my fellow citizens our deep and lasting appreciation for this good man's benevolent influences upon all our lives.

We wish him and his loved ones a long life of health, happiness, and continued service in their retirement years.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS**

**HON. DON EDWARDS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Civil

Rights and Constitutional Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary will commence a series of hearings on the Civil Rights Aspect of General Revenue Sharing on September 6 and 7, 1973, in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building. Mr. Graham Watt, Director of the Office of Revenue Sharing, will be the first witness. For subsequent hearings, the dates of which are to be announced, representatives from local community organizations, national civil rights organizations, and municipal and State governments will be called.

Persons interested in submitting statements for the record may address their inquiries to the House Committee on the Judiciary, 2137 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

**COLORADO SECOND DISTRICT 1973  
OPINION POLL RESULTS**

**HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recently concluded recess I made public the results of the annual Colorado Second District opinion poll. As I have done in the past, I am inserting the results of the questionnaire in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

Once again, the residents of the Second District revealed their interest in the important affairs of the Congress by responding in large numbers. More than 35,000 persons took the time to answer the poll which I had delivered to every mailing address in the Second District. In checking with other Members who have taken similar surveys, I believe the response of Second District residents may be the highest in the Nation.

In the past, the participants in the Second District opinion poll have rather accurately represented the attitudes of the Nation as a whole. Accordingly, I believe each of my colleagues will be most interested in the results. I know that having the thinking of so broad a cross-section of my district is most useful to me in my efforts to represent my constituency in the House.

In assessing the results, I note that there continues to be strong support for rapprochement with the Soviet Union and mainland China. Nearly 80 percent of the respondents favored these efforts.

The results show a marked upturn in the number of people who believe that Congress should limit the authority of the President to commit U.S. troops to combat without prior authorization. Last year, only 55 percent of the people favored legislation on this point, however this year an identical question received the endorsement of 71.6 percent.

On the economy, Second District residents expressed, by a preponderance of opinion, support for mandatory wage and price controls. However, this question elicited an unusually high number of "undecided" responses, 18.4 percent. There was no doubt, however, over the desire of the respondents to see Congress impose a strictly enforced limitation on

Federal spending each year. Nearly 72 percent favor this course of action.

Finally, in a departure from the "yes-no" format, I asked participants in the opinion poll to advise me of their views on the Watergate events. Over 5,000 took the time to send me notes on this subject, and their thoughts are extremely diverse and difficult to categorize. However, the biggest single grouping of respondents, 37 percent, said they were either tired of hearing about Watergate or wanted reform of politics; 29 percent specifically expressed opposition to the President, to one degree or another, while 9 percent took the occasion to reassert their support for the President—14 percent want to see the Senate hearings continued and 11 percent want to see them terminated.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of the Second District are to be congratulated on their overwhelming response to the opinion poll. I continue to have faith in this Nation's ability to solve her problems, and it is through an informed, intelligent, active electorate that we can best find solutions to these problems. I am again, most grateful to my constituents for letting me know their thinking on the issues which face us today.

Results of the poll follow:

**TABULATION OF COLORADO'S SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 1973 OPINION POLL**

1. Should Congress limit the asserted power of the President to commit U.S. troops to combat without prior authorization?

Yes	71.6
No	22.0
Undecided	4.4
No response	2.0

Should some form of amnesty be granted now to those young Americans who chose to avoid serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam?

Yes	29.4
No	62.9
Undecided	5.8
No response	2.0

3. Do you favor federal legislation to make health insurance for catastrophic illnesses available to all citizens?

Yes	65.1
No	20.7
Undecided	11.5
No response	2.8

4. Should the death penalty be imposed for serious federal crimes such as kidnapping, assassination, and airline hijacking?

Yes	69.9
No	20.9
Undecided	7.0
No response	2.3

5. Should Congress appropriate funds for the rebuilding of North Vietnam?

Yes	9.8
No	79.8
Undecided	8.0
No response	2.5

6. Should Congress adopt a strictly enforced limit on total federal spending each year?

Yes	71.7
No	14.6
Undecided	10.8
No response	2.9

7. Should mandatory wage and price controls be reimposed at this time?

Yes	46.8
No	30.9
Undecided	18.4
No response	4.0

8. Should accredited representatives of newspapers, magazines, radio and TV be protected by law from having to disclose their news sources?

Yes	57.7
No	31.1
Undecided	8.8
No response	2.4

9. Do you support current efforts to improve diplomatic and trade relations with the Soviet Union and mainland China?

Yes	78.9
No	12.0
Undecided	6.5
No response	2.5

(Figures shown above may not add to exactly 100 per cent due to rounding.)

**JEWISH SUPPORT AGAINST LIVE FETUS RESEARCH**

**HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, some persons have attempted to attack the amendment to the biomedical research bill which overwhelmingly passed the House last May, as well as separate legislation I have introduced on the subject of live human fetus research, on the grounds that it is a particularly Roman Catholic issue. During the recess, I received the following letter from the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America in support of my legislation.

The support of this respected organization, representing the thoughts of Orthodox Jews from all parts of this country, gives ample proof that this is not a partisan religious matter but rather a humanist and ethical issue transcending parochial bounds.

I once again renew my urgent call for swift enactment of H.R. 7724 as passed by the House and for early committee hearings on my bills to prevent all Federal agencies from conducting or supporting such research and to provide Federal criminal penalties for researchers who persist in misusing funds in this manner. Congress must act promptly to insure that no Federal support is given to those who would perform experiments on our babies who are living with a beating heart, separate from their mother.

The letter follows:

UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH  
CONGREGATIONS OF AMERICA.

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO,  
Member of Congress, Longworth Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RONCALLO: Our Commission on Communal Relations has studied your efforts to pass legislation in Congress, preventing the use of live fetuses for medical research, and we commend you for your sensitive concern for this matter.

Human life is the ultimate creation of the Almighty and whether it be a fetus or a grown person Jewish law and philosophy in-

vest this being with an inviolable essence and divine dignity. Indeed, Jewish law forbids abortion of pregnancy except where the mother's life is threatened by the fetus.

The growing mechanistic and manipulative concepts of life—evidenced by research such as that which your legislation would prevent—poses a potentially grave threat to the spiritual values which have underpinned American society.

We wish to be identified with efforts such as yours for the defense of the inviolability of human life.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD M. JACOBS,  
President.

**MARTHA WASHINGTON HOSPITAL  
TRIBUTE TO CLARA L. MAASS**

**HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the tribute paid to Clara L. Maass, the American nurse who sacrificed her life in the conquest of yellow fever, by the staff of Martha Washington Hospital, 4055 North Western Avenue, a fine medical institution located in the 11th Congressional District which I am proud to represent.

Clara Louise Maass is a symbol of the ideal American nurse and an example of sacrifice, heroism, and love for mankind. On August 24, 1901, at Las Animas Hospital in Havana, Cuba, she gave her life to find a cure for yellow fever.

In tribute to her for that sacrifice, Dr. Fernando Lopez-Fernandez, medical director of Martha Washington Hospital, unveiled her portrait in a ceremony on August 24, 1973. The portrait was donated by the Clara L. Maass Memorial Hospital in Belleville, N.J. Dr. Lopez-Fernandez' presentation speech was entitled "Clara L. Maass and Las Animas Hospital, Havana, Cuba."

Mr. Robert C. Hartmann, Sr., president of Martha Washington's Board of Directors, and Mr. Frank W. Brown, the hospital's administrator, were in attendance at the commemorative ceremony. Mr. Hartmann accepted the portrait which will hang in the R. C. Hartmann, Sr., auditorium when it is completed, and his acceptance speech was entitled "Clara L. Maass—A Martyr of Science."

Dr. Lopez-Fernandez, who is also director of medical education of Martha Washington Hospital and former medical director at Las Animas Hospital, has been actively seeking national recognition of the noble sacrifice of Clara L. Maass and has been informed by the Postmaster General that the Citizen's Stamp Advisory Committee, at its next meeting, will consider issuance of a commemorative stamp in her honor in June, 1976, the 100th anniversary of her birth.

It is an honor for me to join the officers, medical staff, and employees of Martha Washington Hospital in this tribute to Clara L. Maass. Her portrait will be an inspiring reminder of the dedicated and devoted efforts of this nonprofit general hospital in meeting the health needs of our community.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAZI INVASION OF POLAND—SEPTEMBER 1, 1939

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been closely identified with Poland for the past quarter century and more, have considered this date of September 1 to be of real significance. It was on this very date 34 years ago that that skunk Hitler launched his devastating attack upon the innocent people of Poland and set the wheels of his awesome war machine in motion.

We listened in horror to the vivid firsthand accounts of radio observers as they described the ruthless sweep of the Nazi divisions leaving behind death and wanton destruction. We read with avid interest the tales of Polish resistance to this violation of the sovereign rights of the Polish people. We were thrilled with the heroic stand taken by the Polish military forces and by patriotic citizens willing to die to preserve their independence. But we were saddened to learn how futile was this resistance to the might of the Nazi hordes.

So it is this day that we must remember as the day which most truly marks the beginning of the holocaust which would sweep the world and become identified as World War II. Few of us listening to the news 34 years ago were capable of envisaging that this blood bath visited upon our good Polish friends would ultimately involve our own country along with most of the other nations of the world.

As we look back in retrospect, we realize, too, how little could we anticipate the heights to which Polish resistance would ultimately reach. Overwhelmed by the superiority of Nazi Luftwaffe, Panzer, and Wehrmacht power, the Polish military found it necessary to regroup outside Poland. With brilliant military leadership such as displayed by my respected friend, the immortal General Anders, the Polish military units fought side by side with us and our other Allies. Today's history books attest to the valor of Polish fighters. From Africa through Italy, France, and the low countries into Britain, Polish fighting men fought gallantly and all too many of them died in our joint efforts to rid the world of the Nazi menace.

At home the civilian populace fought just as bravely against unspeakable privation and torture. With the swift thrust of the German war machine, widespread death and destruction left cities and villages in smoking ruins. Those brave Poles who survived met new horrors with which they had to contend. Here, too, the traditional Polish spirit of independence and ability to survive prevailed and resistance against their oppressors could not be subdued.

Mr. Speaker, I think we Americans should look upon this day as one commemorating not only the unwarranted

invasion of a peaceful nation by Nazi terrorists, but a superb manifestation of those sublime traits which have for centuries manifested Polish integrity, independence and courage. I salute the people of Poland and all our Polish-American citizens. I urge them to keep constantly burning in the flames of their minds their national pride and their love of independence unto the day when once more the people of Poland will be utterly free.

### AN UNFORGETTABLE STATESMAN

### HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. SARASIN, Mr. Speaker, this week all of Connecticut is honoring an outstanding elder statesman whose record of public service and accomplishment is deserving of national attention. The Honorable Raymond E. Baldwin, who has served his State in all three branches of government, recently celebrated this 80th birthday and is being feted this Saturday by colleagues, friends, and admirers drawn to him in his more than 40 years of public life.

Mr. Baldwin's career has included three terms as Governor of Connecticut, service in the U.S. Senate, and 24 years on the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors, ending when he stepped down as chief justice 10 years ago at the mandatory age of 70. Most men would have been satisfied with this unparalleled career, never equaled in Connecticut history, but in the past 10 years, Ray Baldwin has added more accomplishments to his distinguished record. He served as a State referee and presided as chairman of the 1965 convention, which drafted a new constitution for the State of Connecticut.

I am particularly proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues the record of this exemplary man, for Mr. Baldwin has a long association with my own hometown of Beacon Falls, Conn. For many years he spent his summers at the farm his grandfather maintained for years in our town and in 1971, Ray Baldwin honored Beacon Falls by dedicating the plaque commemorating the 100th anniversary of the town.

A veteran of World War I, Ray Baldwin worked his way up the political ladder, beginning with his appointment as prosecutor of the town court in Stratford, Conn., in 1927. He later served as both town attorney and town judge in Stratford. He was subsequently sent to the State legislature, where he became majority leader in 1933. He went on to be elected Governor of Connecticut in 1938, 1942, and 1944. He was drafted to run for the U.S. Senate in 1946 and was elected in a landslide. In 1949, he resigned his Senate seat to accept appointment as an associate justice of the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors, retiring as chief justice in 1963.

He remains today one of the most respected and loved public figures in Connecticut.

In the words of a recent editorial in the Morning Record of Meriden, Conn.:

This chronological rundown tells nothing of the legislation he sponsored or his political philosophy. But he had a progressive record and a solid character and integrity that made him stand out as a statesman. As he turns 80, he should be honored not only as Connecticut's Republican of the century—which he is—but as a man who has helped keep alive the public's faith in popular government.

I am proud of Connecticut's Raymond E. Baldwin and I commend your attention to his record. He is a man whom all of us of any political persuasion would do well to emulate.

### PORT OF PHILADELPHIA

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia's port continues to be one of the busiest cargo ports in the United States.

Due to the construction of two new major terminals, Philadelphia has shown large increases in tonnage handled during the first 3 months of this year.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a statement released by the Philadelphia Port Corp. about this matter:

#### PORT OF PHILADELPHIA

The Port of Philadelphia continued to register tonnage gains in the handling of general cargo for the first three months of 1973. At the same time, Philadelphia increased its share of the Eastern Seaboard market while both Baltimore and New York suffered declines.

Philadelphia remained the second busiest United States general cargo port.

Figures issued by the Bureau of Census of the United States Department of Commerce credited the Port of Philadelphia with handling 1,709,700 tons of cargo compared with 1,652,959 tons for the comparable three months of 1972. This 56,741 ton increase (or +3.4%) compared favorably with Baltimore and New York which showed declines of 70,994 (-4.2%) and 125,032 (-2.9%) tons respectively. (See attached table.)

In share of market—the important barometer used to measure activity in competing ports—Philadelphia enhanced its position over the comparable period in 1972 by 1.1% while Baltimore slipped .5% and New York declined .6%.

Frederic A. Potts, President and Chairman of the Board of the Philadelphia Port Corporation, explained that studies show that each ton of cargo processed by the Port of Philadelphia generates at least \$25 in direct benefits to Philadelphia's economy and assists in assuring a healthy business climate in the port community.

Mr. Potts said that among the wide variety of imports and exports are iron and steel, paper, transportation equipment, meats, fruit, vegetables, tobacco, chemicals, plywood, news print and machinery. He stated further that the port's continued growth is attributable—in large measure—to the construction of two modern major marine terminals which now service 12 international containership lines on a regular basis.

Mr. Potts noted that this increase has created a need for two new additional container cranes which are presently being constructed. Both, he said, will be operational by next spring.



COMPARISON OF GENERAL CARGO BUSINESS  
PHILADELPHIA-BALTIMORE-NEW YORK

	3 Months 1973	3 Months 1972	Difference 1973 versus 1972	
			Amount	Per- cent
<b>Tonnage of general cargo:</b>				
Philadelphia.....	1,709,700	1,652,959	+56,741	+3.4
Baltimore.....	1,628,505	1,699,499	-70,994	-4.2
New York.....	4,179,810	4,304,842	-125,032	-2.9
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>7,518,015</b>	<b>7,657,300</b>	<b>-139,285</b>	<b>-----</b>
<b>Share of market (percent):</b>				
Philadelphia.....	22.7	21.6	-----	+1.1
Baltimore.....	21.7	22.2	-----	-.5
New York.....	55.6	56.2	-----	-.6
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

HELP GIVEN BY CONGRESS FOR  
BASE CLOSINGS

## HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for House Joint Resolution 512, the Housing Authority Extension which is before the House today, and H.R. 8606, amendments to the Small Business Act scheduled for House action tomorrow.

Both are vital pieces of legislation and all facets of the measures deserve our support. But I would like to address myself today to one section of each bill which specifically provides assistance to communities and firms in areas adversely affected by the closing of military facilities. The inclusion of these provisions marks a formal recognition by the Congress that the Federal Government is responsible for assisting those people whose livelihood is harmed by a Federal policy over which they have no control and a recognition that previously existing Federal programs are not adequate to meet these needs.

The Housing Authority Extension would require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to give priority in processing applications for certain housing and community development programs to State and local units of government adversely affected by Department of Defense base closings.

The Small Business Act Amendments conference report would allow the SBA to make disaster and other loans to small businesses harmed by the base closings.

These provisions are of vital importance to New England and other parts of the country experiencing serious cutbacks in military expenditures and the closing of major military installations. In Massachusetts alone, some 12,000 civilian jobs will be lost due to the closing of the Boston Naval Shipyard, Westover Field, and other facilities. The administration, moreover, has not been prompt in assisting Massachusetts, or any other State, in its adjustment process.

These funds are very important for the economic stability of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and other States affected. Moreover, these provisions are vital because they will become permanent features of the law, so that when base closings are announced in the future, such assistance will be immediately forthcoming, rather than making the local communities, firms and workers wait on the Congress for action.

It is my firm belief that when changes in Federal policy layoff significant proportions of local labor forces—and when that was not the intention of the policies—the Federal Government has a responsibility to workers, firms, and communities affected to help them plan for their redevelopment, and to provide them with financial support to ease them over the initial shock of decreased Federal revenues.

The Federal Government has been slow to recognize this principle. Where it has recognized its responsibility, as with jobs lost due to imports, the assistance it has offered has come very slowly, in very small amounts. It is about time that the Federal Government was held accountable for the effects of changes in policy on the lives of the people of this country. These provisions of these two conference reports are small but I hope significant steps in the right direction.

IN MEMORY OF MAYOR JOSEPH  
HEALEY

## HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, what does it take to build a town? It takes unyielding belief, tenacious determination, discerning leadership and selfless dedication. It involves persistence and the spirit to continually move forward. It calls for flexibility, the capacity to face squarely all new challenges, and it requires the ability to learn, adapt, incorporate and grow with change. Joseph Healey, former mayor of Kearny, N.J., gave the essence of his heart and his hopes to his town. And, with his recent passing, the life and actions of a man so special will remain indelibly impressed not only in the history of Kearny, but its very soul.

My closeness with Mayor Healey extends almost four decades. From his early entry into county politics in 1932, to his mayoral years, to his term as State assemblyman, to his active participation in the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association, Mayor Healey saw his town as composed not just of people, but of parents, children, families, of human beings deserving the highest respect, devotion and love.

Although deeply saddened at my dear friend's death, I cannot help but also feel quite privileged—privileged because our friendship was indeed most precious. I have seen Joseph Healey as devoted husband and father, and I have watched his children, Jay, Tommy and Mary Ann

grow and mature from their early years. His wife Ann, and my wife and I have shared happiness and milestones experienced by only those with the deepest of ties. My personal loss, the loss to the Healey family, to the people of Kearny, and to all who were touched by this man's good works and fine deeds cannot easily be put into words. Mayor Healey leaves us a legacy filled with love, devotion and accomplishment. May the commitment he held for all his people serve as a guiding light for all who are chosen to govern.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT AMEND-  
MENTS: UNNECESSARY AND UN-  
DESIRABLE

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Congressman CHARLES THONE and I have sent a letter to all Members that indicates our opposition to H.R. 8547, the Export Control Act Amendments, because we feel that this bill is both unnecessary and undesirable.

In our letter we indicated that one of the reasons this bill is undesirable is that it fails to recognize the important role that agricultural exports have contributed to our balance of payments. We pointed out that if we are to continue to import essential commodities and at the same time maintain a reasonable balance of payments, we must export commodities which are competitive on the world market.

Mr. Speaker, agricultural commodities are highly competitive. Agriculture has had a positive net influence on the U.S. balance of payments every year since 1961. The future is bright. There is every indication that agricultural exports will reach a new high during this present fiscal year—unless they are placed under export controls.

H.R. 8547—which is scheduled for House consideration tomorrow—would make it easier to impose export controls on agricultural commodities. This is undesirable.

Mr. Speaker, for this and the other reasons outlined in our letter to all Members I urge our colleagues to reject H.R. 8547.

So that our colleagues might be informed of the role of agricultural commodities in the U.S. balance of payments, I ask that relevant excerpts from a publication by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond—volume 59, May 1973—be inserted in the RECORD:

[Excerpt from a Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond publication, v. 59, May 1973]

INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND  
THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(By Thomas E. Snider)

Agricultural commodities have figured importantly in U.S. foreign trade since colonial times. Foreign markets have always been important to U.S. farmers and appear likely to be of increasing importance in the future. Currently, they provide an outlet for about 15 percent of total U.S. farm output. Trade

in agricultural commodities is, of course, a two-way street and the U.S. is also a major market for many agricultural products produced abroad. In 1972, for example, agricultural commodities accounted for about 12 percent of total U.S. imports. But at the same time, they accounted for approximately 18 percent of total exports, leaving this country with a sizable balance of trade surplus in agricultural products. Prospects that this surplus may be enlarged in the near future are a major reason to hope that the unsatisfactory balance in this country's trade with the rest of the world can be corrected soon.

**Importance of Agricultural Exports:** U.S. farmers in 1972 supplied about one-sixth of the agricultural commodities entering free world trade, with U.S. agricultural exports reaching a high of \$8.05 billion. This was an increase of more than 57 percent since 1960. The output of 1 of every 5 harvested acres was exported in 1972 and foreign sales accounted for 15 percent of the total cash receipts from farm marketings. In that year, export sales accounted for more than one-half of the U.S. production of soybeans and rice, more than two-fifths of the cattle hides and tallow, and over one-third of the wheat and tobacco.

In terms of value, oilseeds and products was the most important export item in 1972, followed by feed grains and wheat and wheat flour. Soybeans and soybean products accounted for a large fraction of the value of oilseeds and products. Aggressive marketing in the face of strong foreign demand for high-protein feed, coupled with the sharply increasing U.S. harvest, has made soybeans the leading dollar earner in foreign markets. Soybeans now account for more than one-fourth of the total value of U.S. agricultural exports. This country's share of world soybean exports has risen from 2 percent in 1934-38 to approximately 90 percent in 1972. Production from more than one-half of U.S. soybean acreage is exported, and more than nine-tenths of all soybean and soybean product exports are commercial sales for dollars.

The United States is the world's largest exporter of unmanufactured tobacco, accounting for about one-fourth of world exports of this commodity.

**The Agricultural Trade Balance:** Exports of agricultural commodities exceed imports by a substantial margin and, consequently, provide one of the major bright spots in an otherwise negative U.S. balance of payments situation. The role of agricultural exports in helping curb the flow of dollars from the U.S. may be measured by their contribution to our balance of trade and the balance of payments. The balance of trade is the difference between the value of total merchandise exports and total merchandise imports. The balance of payments, on the other hand, records all types of economic transactions involving the exchange of goods, services, and financial assets between U.S. residents and residents of the rest of the world.

Although the U.S. has experienced deficits in its balance of payments in most years since the early 1950's, 1971 was the first year since 1935 that a trade deficit occurred.

In agricultural trade, the U.S. balance with the rest of the world has been in surplus in every year of this period. This surplus amounted to \$1.9 billion in 1971, only slightly below the peak for the period reached in the middle 1960's. Without this surplus, the overall U.S. trade deficit of \$6.4 billion in 1972 would have been \$9.4 billion.

**Balance of Payments.**—The USDA estimates the gross contribution of agriculture to the balance of payments in the following manner. Realized dollar returns and savings on noncommercial exports are added to the

dollar value of commercial sales. These realized dollar returns and savings are in the form of (1) the dollar value of foreign currencies generated under PL 480 and used overseas by the Government to pay such bills as embassy expenses, military outlays, and costs of market development operations and (2) repayments for exports made under Government credit to foreign nations. Agricultural imports are then subtracted from this figure to determine the net contribution to the balance of payments (Table IV). In 1971 agriculture's net contribution to the balance of payments was \$1.13 billion, the second largest net contribution since 1960. Agriculture has had a positive net influence on the U.S. balance of payments every year since 1961. The peak year in agriculture's net contribution was 1966 when it totaled \$1.17 billion.

**Factors Affecting Export Prospects:** Estimates for fiscal year 1973 place agricultural exports at about \$11 billion, almost \$3 billion above 1972's record high. Most of the increase will be in grains and soybeans. While exports of these commodities to most customers will be up over last year, the large purchases by the Soviet Union are the single most important item. As of January 1973, Russia had purchased over 400 million bushels of wheat, around 250 million bushels of corn, and 40 million bushels of soybeans.

While agriculture's net contribution to the U.S. trade position is growing, agricultural trade as a share of total trade has declined recently. Since 1960 agricultural exports have declined from 24 to 18 percent of total exports. Recent large sales to communist bloc nations and improved prospects for additional sales to these countries notwithstanding, potential growth of farm exports faces several restricting factors. Foremost among these are (1) increased agricultural production by the less developed nations, which is diminishing the need for our aid exports; (2) numerous tariff and nontariff barriers on agricultural commodities; and (3) expansion of the European Economic Community to include the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Denmark in the area under the Community's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).

THE CONTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURE TO THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS  
[In millions of U.S. dollars]

Item	1961	1971
Commercial agricultural exports.....	3,569	6,556
Plus realized dollar returns and savings on noncommercial agricultural exports:		
Public Law 480.....	155	322
Mutual security (AID) foreign currencies used by U.S. agencies.....	15	(1)
Export-Import Bank principal and interest dollar repayments.....	31	80
Gross contribution.....	3,770	6,958
Less agricultural imports.....	3,756	5,826
Net contribution of agriculture to U.S. balance of payments.....	14	1,132

<sup>1</sup> Less than \$500 000.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, World Monetary Conditions in Relation to Agricultural Trade, May 1972 p. 29

Common Market countries account for nearly two-fifths of the world's total imports and, in fiscal 1972, these nine nations took nearly a third of total U.S. farm exports. The United Kingdom alone bought \$430 million worth of our farm products in fiscal 1972.

Exports to the Common Market are restricted by the Community's Common Agricultural Policy, and the recent expansion of the Common Market area is certain to have an unfavorable impact on U.S. exports of agricultural commodities. The CAP is a series of agreements among members designed to establish free agricultural trade within the Community and to protect domestic agriculture from imports. The CAP protects agri-

cultural producers in member countries through variable levies and other devices that force final import prices above domestic prices. The biggest impact of Common Market expansion to include nations with previously less restrictive agricultural import policies will be on tobacco, grains, rice, and fresh and canned fruits and juices. Soybeans have been entering the Common Market countries without duties or other restrictions and will continue to do so in the expanded market.

While a record year for agricultural exports in fiscal 1973 seems assured, the factors listed above serve to make long-term forecasts difficult if not impossible. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to assume that U.S. agricultural exports will continue to make significant contributions to the nation's balance of trade and balance of payments positions.

BIPARTISAN ELECTIONS FOR LOCAL OFFICIALS IN WASHINGTON, D.C., FAVORED BY BUSINESS, LABOR

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia self-government and governmental reorganization bill, H.R. 9682, soon to be voted on in the House sets up elections for a local mayor and city council for the District of Columbia.

Testimony before the House District of Columbia Committee was overwhelmingly in favor of party designation for those elections.

Business favored party designation. Mr. Walter F. McArdle, president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade voiced the support of business in these words:

These legislators (city council) should be elected by partisan ballot.

We support the election of the chief executive of the District of Columbia on a partisan, city-wide ballot.

LABOR AGREES

The spokesman for labor agreed. Mr. George Apperson, president of Greater Washington Central Labor Council told the committee:

We think it would be wrong to prohibit partisan politics in elections in the District of Columbia. Partisan politics helps to focus responsibility and that's what we need in the District—responsible politics and responsible government.

GOP FAVORS

The District of Columbia Republican Party testified in favor of party designation in these words:

We believe the Mayor should be elected in partisan elections. There is no question but the present political parties in the District of Columbia can provide the machinery by which a candidate aspiring to office can best bring his or her views to the electorate.

The League of Women Voters also spoke in favor of party designation as follows:

We support a legislative body broadly representative of the community, elected in partisan elections, some by ward and some at large. The chief executive should also be elected in a partisan election.

When the House votes on H.R. 9682, 2 weeks from now, we will be voting for

a new government for our Nation's Capital. The new Mayor and new City Council will be elected through primary and general elections with party designation.

#### EXPERIENCE IN MINNESOTA

In my own State of Minnesota, non-partisan elections for mayor and city council in the large cities did not work well. The State legislature has reinstated party designation. I believe this is wise.

Congress should provide the same system of government for Washington, D.C., that most major cities of our country have—an elected mayor and city council with party designation.

#### CIGARETTE BAN

### HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess just concluded, I was disturbed to learn that Mr. Richard O. Simpson, the chairman of the new Consumer Products Safety Commission, has said he is prepared to seek a ban on cigarettes under authority he claims to derive from the Hazardous Substances Act of 1960, which his agency administers.

On learning of this development, I immediately issued a statement calling for Mr. Simpson's resignation on the basis of his clearly unlawful attempt at bureaucratic empire-building.

The following series of articles and statements will bring my colleagues up to date on this important subject, which poses a threat to the economy of my district and my State, and which also threatens to further erode the liberties of all Americans.

This matter bears not only on the controversy involving tobacco and tobacco products but also on the issue of how far we intend to allow a bureaucrat to go in flaunting the express intent of the Congress. I urge my colleagues' careful attention and consideration in this matter:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 23, 1973]

#### CIGARETTE BAN TO BE ASKED BY FEDERAL SAFETY OFFICIAL (By Gerald Gold)

NEWARK, Aug. 22.—Richard O. Simpson, chairman of the new Federal Consumer Product Safety Commission, said today that he was prepared to seek a ban on all or some cigarettes if, as expected, an examination confirms the surgeon general's findings in recent years on the hazardous nature of cigarette smoking.

Mr. Simpson said he was awaiting a petition from Congressmen calling for the commission to set standards for cigarettes, although the commission could act on its own.

The staff of Senator John E. Moss of the Senate Commerce Committee has begun studying the possibility of such a petition. Mr. Simpson said he felt congressional backing would enhance the chances for successful action against cigarettes.

A spokesman for the Utah Democrat said the staff was working on a petition that would call for the commission to set maximum levels for tar and nicotine in cigarettes. Those brands with contents above that level would be banned.

Mr. Simpson agreed that such an approach probably would be the opening one by the commission. He said he could not say specifically whether any cigarettes now on the market would be able to meet the standards, since the guidelines had not been drawn up yet.

Mr. Simpson mentioned the possibility of action on cigarettes in passing in an address this morning at the Product Liability Prevention Conference at Newark College of Engineering attended by several hundred representatives of professional, technical and trade groups. Later, in an interview, he expanded on his comment.

He said the commission has the power to set cigarette standards or ban cigarettes under the Hazardous Substances Act, which defines a toxic substance as "any substance (other than a radioactive substance) which has the capacity to produce personal injury or illness to man through ingestion, inhalation or absorption through any body surface."

The Consumer Product Safety Act, which set up the commission specifically exempts tobacco from the commission's purview, but the Hazardous Substances Act, which the commission also administers, does not.

Despite the labeling of cigarette ads on television and radio, Mr. Simpson noted, cigarette sales have increased. The Agriculture Department has reported that domestic cigarette consumption went up 2.5 per cent in the 10 months that ended in April, 1973.

#### POWERS OF COMMISSION

The inference, Mr. Simpson said, is that the labeling and the TV-radio ban have not worked. Under the Hazardous Substances Act, the commission can halt the sale of a product if it finds that, despite cautionary labeling, the product is still a hazard.

After receiving a Congressional petition, the commission procedure would be to examine the petition, go over the supporting evidence (including the findings of the surgeon general of the Public Health Service), propose regulations or standards and publish them in the Federal Register, receive comments from industry and others and then, assuming it stood by the finding that cigarette smoking was harmful, publish final regulations banning some or all cigarettes. The whole procedure would take a number of months.

Mr. Simpson said he expected that any action or proposal would be challenged at the outset by the industry and that the issue would probably go before the courts.

"His expectations for a fight are exactly right," a tobacco industry spokesman said in response to questions. The spokesman, Horace Kornegay, president of the Tobacco Institute, the trade association of the major cigarette manufacturers, said:

"I thought it had been understood for years that the Hazardous Substances Act does not include tobacco. The Food and Drug Administration has taken that position. The act was never contemplated to cover tobacco. It was to prevent household injuries, such as children swallowing cleaning fluids and that kind of thing."

Mr. Simpson maintained, however, that the "reasons for labeling cigarettes dangerous ought to stand up under the Hazardous Substances Act, too." He said that among the criteria for banning products was the severity and frequency of the injuries they cause, in this case "cancer and death."

He emphasized that "we have a serious expectation of achieving a ban," and asserted that he felt the agency "should and will be able to achieve it."

In his address at the Newark College of Engineering, Mr. Simpson stressed the "motivations" that he hoped would encourage full compliance by industry with the agency's regulations and actions on product safety in all fields.

"One of these 'motivations' is criminal penalties," he said. "Whereas corporations can pay civil penalties, people who work for corporations pay criminal penalties. I am personally inclined in a criminal proceeding to seek out the board chairman or the corporate president, in addition to other officials, because I believe they are in the best position to assure corporate compliance."

However, he noted that he had no intention of conducting a "witch hunt" of products and strongly urged industry to work with the agency in voluntary compliance. Mr. Simpson said that so far he felt everyone he had talked with in industry had generally been cooperative.

He said his agency had completed compiling a priority list of product categories in order of the safety hazards they presented and would make the list public next week.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 24, 1973]

#### MIZELL ATTACKS IDEA OF CIGARETTE BAN

(By William May)

WASHINGTON.—A federal official's proposal for a ban on cigarettes that do not meet certain standards on tar and nicotine content faces certain congressional opposition.

Richard O. Simpson, chairman of the newly organized Federal Consumer Product Safety Commission, said in a speech in Newark, N.J., on Wednesday that he is ready to ask for such a ban if recent findings on the hazards of cigarette smoking are confirmed.

Although the commission could act on its own, Simpson said, he is waiting for congressional backing for a petition calling on his agency to meet maximum levels for tar and nicotine in cigarettes. Brands with contents above such levels would be banned. Such a petition is said to be under study in the Senate Commerce Committee.

Rep. Wilmer Mizell, R-N.C., attacked Simpson's stand as representing an "audacious bureaucratic empire-building scheme."

In a statement from his office here yesterday Mizell called for Simpson's resignation as an "additional step to insure that such unlawful and self-aggrandizing efforts are not rewarded or repeated in the future."

Mizell said he would also move to counter Simpson's argument that the consumer commission has the power to set standards or ban cigarettes under the Hazardous Substance Act which defines a toxic substance as "any substance (other than a radioactive substance) which has the capacity to produce personal injury or illness to man through ingestion, inhalation or absorption through any body surface."

"The Consumer Products Safety Act that established this commission contains a provision specifically excluding tobacco and tobacco products from the commission's range of authority," Mizell said. "The fact that the Hazardous Substances Act, which the commission also administers, does not contain a similar specific exemption in no way nullifies or compromises the legislative command of the Consumers Products Safety Act that the commissions not deal with tobacco."

When Congress reconvenes, Mizell said, he will offer an amendment to the Hazardous Substances Act "to specifically exclude tobacco and tobacco products from the jurisdiction of that act."

Rep. Robert W. Daniel Jr., R-Va., said he would give "every recommendation in this field a fair evaluation."

"I do feel there is a limit to the role the federal government can play as a big brother in telling Americans what is good and bad for them," he said.

Daniel said he would do what he can "to protect the tobacco growers of Southside, Virginia."

Other members of the Virginia and North Carolina congressional delegations were out of the capital during the August recess, and

their offices had no comment on the Simpson speech.

"The Federal Hazardous Substances Act was not designed for, or intended to be used in any way" in connection with cigarettes, according to Horace Kornegay, president of the Tobacco Institute.

He said application of any provisions is "wholly inconsistent" with the cigarette labeling and advertising legislation passed by Congress in 1965 and 1970.

The tobacco industry, he said, resents Simpson's threats of "criminal penalties" to motivate business toward voluntary compliance. "Such attempts at blackmail are intolerable," Kornegay said. "Our record in voluntary compliance with government agencies is second to none."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILMER D. MIZELL CONCERNING NEW YORK TIMES ARTICLE ON AUGUST 23, 1973 WRITTEN BY MR. GERALD GOLD REGARDING THE PLANS OF CHAIRMAN RICHARD O. SIMPSON OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION TO BAN CIGARETTES

The Consumer Product Safety Commission's decision to make an unlawful attempt to impose a ban on cigarettes poses a threat to the economy of the Fifth District and North Carolina, and it represents an audacious bureaucratic empire building scheme. But this attempt will not succeed.

The Consumer Products Safety Act that established this Commission contains a provision specifically excluding tobacco and tobacco products from the Commission's range of authority.

The fact that the Hazardous Substances Act, which the Commission also administers, does not contain a similar specific exemption in no way nullifies or compromises the legislative command of the Consumer Products Safety Act that the Commission not deal with tobacco.

As a means of guaranteeing that the law is clear and fully obeyed, I will, on the day the Congress reconvenes from its August Recess, offer an amendment to the Hazardous Substances Act to specifically exclude tobacco and tobacco products from the jurisdiction of that act.

As an additional step to insure that such unlawful and self-aggrandizing efforts are not rewarded or repeated in the future, I am calling today for the resignation of Mr. Richard O. Simpson, Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and I will urge my colleagues in the Congress to endorse that action as well.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILMER D. MIZELL IN FURTHER REGARD TO THE IMPLIED PLAN OF MR. RICHARD O. SIMPSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION TO BAN CIGARETTES

The statement of Mr. Richard O. Simpson, Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission in a speech on August 22, 1973 prompted me to make an immediate reply. Simultaneously, I began a detailed examination of the Hazardous Substances Act of 1960 under which Mr. Simpson claims jurisdiction to deal with tobacco and tobacco products despite a Congressional mandate upon creation of this Commission not to become involved in this area.

Mr. Simpson's position is totally in error and his claim of jurisdiction of these products is without foundation in law and is contrary to the will of Congress. My conclusion is that no legislation is needed today as neither the Hazardous Substances Act of 1960 nor the legislative history formulated then and since give support to the suggestion. Tobacco and tobacco products are the subject of other acts of Congress. The Hazardous Substance Act, the Consumer Product Safety Act and the events in between make this quite clear.

Mr. Simpson, in seeking to become a super-bureaucrat has misunderstood the role given him by Congress. He is plainly off base.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 24, 1973]  
UNIT AIMS TO CURB, OR BAN, CIGARET SALES BY LISTING SMOKES AS HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

WASHINGTON.—A new battle on cigarette smoking is heating up.

The fledgling Consumer Product Safety Commission plans to propose regulations that could ban the sales of some, or all, cigarettes as hazardous substances.

The plan, disclosed by the commission chairman, Richard Simpson, after a speech in Newark, N.J., comes as a surprise—and, indeed, a shock, to the tobacco industry. For one thing, the Consumer Product Safety Act, which created the independent commission, specifically excludes tobacco products from the agency's jurisdiction. However, Mr. Simpson said the commission can use its authority under another law, the Hazardous Substances Act, to regulate cigarettes as a substance that causes injury or illness to humans.

The plan quickly drew fire from Tobacco Institute Inc., which termed the proposal "a sheer bureaucratic arrogation of power." The institute is the cigarette industry's trade association. The plain fact is that the federal Hazardous Substances Act of 1960 wasn't designed for, or intended to be used in any way, in connection with questions relating to cigarette smoking and its alleged effects on health," said Horace Kornegay, president of the Tobacco Institute. "We cannot and won't voluntarily comply in an overzealous attempt to terminate the existence of an industry that has been part of America since 1607," he added.

Although the commission believes it has the authority to move on its own, Mr. Simpson said it plans to act on the basis of a petition being prepared by Sen. Frank Moss (D., Utah). Sen. Moss' petition would propose maximum allowable levels for tar and nicotine in cigarettes. The Senator has been a leading sponsor of anti-cigarette legislation, including the 1971 law banning cigarette advertising on television.

In Louisville, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. said it hadn't any comment to make on the commission's proposal, but noted that it was "following the matter with interest." Lorillard Corp., owned by Loews Corp.; R. J. Reynolds Industries Inc.'s tobacco division; Philip Morris Inc. and American Brands Inc. also declined comment.

The commission's plan also is a surprise because attempting to ban cigarettes is an unusually controversial move for a new agency. The five-member commission began operations in May. Yet it does have unusually broad powers to regulate the safety of a wide range of consumer products, stretching from toys to mobile homes.

One tobacco-state Congressman, Rep. Wilmer "Vinegar Bend" Mizell, a North Carolina Republican, attacked the commission's plan as an "unlawful" and "audacious empire-building scheme." Rep. Mizell, a former major league baseball pitcher, also threw a high, hard one at Mr. Simpson by calling for his resignation. The Congressman said he plans to introduce legislation that would specifically exempt tobacco products from the Hazardous Substance Act.

A spokesman for the Product Safety Commission responded that the commission and Mr. Simpson plan to remain firm in their position. He noted that Mr. Simpson actually had publicly mentioned the possibility of regulating cigarettes before Wednesday but that the idea hadn't received wide publicity. "This isn't a trial balloon. He's serious" about the cigarette plan, the spokesman added.

One reason the commission is considering acting against cigarettes is that the consump-

tion of cigarets has continued to rise despite health-warning labels required on cigarette packages in recent years under a program administered by the Federal Trade Commission. The FTC earlier released a statistical report showing that the number of cigarettes sold in the U.S. last year increased for the third straight year, to 561.7 billion cigarettes, up from 547.2 billion in 1971.

ON THE DENIAL OF A SOVIET VISITOR'S VISA TO CONGRESSMAN DRINAN

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed regrettable that the Soviet Union has seen fit to deny a visitor's visa to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ROBERT DRINAN of Massachusetts.

The Soviet Union's action in regard to Congressman DRINAN's request to visit is particularly unfortunate since his motivation and purpose was for the highest purpose.

His intention was to gather impressions from a firsthand visit through which he could help interpret the current status of families in the Soviet Union desiring to emigrate, many of whom are related to his own constituents. In this way many other Members of Congress could have been able to better understand how best to serve the cause of détente between our two great nations. His objectives would have been fair and objective.

Notwithstanding this unprecedented action, it is my sincere hope that the Soviet Government will reconsider this harsh action in a genuine effort to bring about better relations and understanding between our two nations.

An article by Congressman DRINAN describing the denial of his visa which appeared in the September 2, 1973, New York Times, should be of particular interest to every Member of the House of Representatives:

UNWANTED BY THE U.S.S.R.

(By Robert F. Drinan)

WASHINGTON—On Aug. 2, I received confirmed reservations to travel to Kiev, Moscow and Leningrad from Aug. 20 to Aug. 31. On Aug. 15, a cryptic cablegram from Intourist, Russia's tourist agency for foreigners, canceled all my reservations because of "unforeseen circumstances."

My petitions and protest to the State Department and to Ambassador Dobrynin brought no rescission and no reasons. I spoke personally on the phone with Henry Kissinger who assured me that he would bring up the cancellation of my visa with Ambassador Dobrynin that very afternoon. Mr. Kissinger's office later reported that he did bring up the matter and that Russia's Ambassador would cable Moscow.

I spoke with the highest officials of the State Department that I could reach. They asserted that they were protesting although their statements were vague and unconvincing. I got nowhere with my repeated request that Secretary Rogers personally intervene. State Department officials recognized that I was the first member of Congress to be denied a visa to Russia.

In February of this year a group of eight American clergymen, of which I was a member, saw their visas denied. It was openly known, however, that these clergymen were going to Russia as delegates of the National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry. My application this time mentioned tourism as the only reason for the trip.

The State Department did little to protest the affront to American clergymen in February. They did little more when I alone was barred from Russia in August. On Aug. 24, I gave up hope of traveling to Russia. Confusion dominated the office of Mr. Kissinger, now Secretary of State-designate. My phone calls to the State Department were not returned.

And so I became the first member of Congress to be denied a visa by the Soviet Government. My involvement in efforts to try to liberate Soviet Jews could be the only reason. Will the 280 other House sponsors and 75 Senate sponsors of the Jackson-Vanik amendment be subject to the same affront? Will they be denied entry to Russia while American and even Israeli athletes are admitted?

Christian churches in America have a deepening sense of guilt about their silence and inaction concerning the harassment of Russia's three million Jews. Will Russia now broaden its policy of keeping American clergymen out if these individuals have demonstrated a sympathy for Soviet Jews? And will the U.S. State Department acquiesce in such a policy as it did in February and again in August?

I expect to importune the Russian Government and the U.S. State Department until I am allowed to visit the Jewish communities of the U.S.S.R. I hope that millions of Americans will make it clear to the Congress and to the Kremlin that they will oppose trade with the Russians unless the Kremlin stops barring American Christians interested in Soviet Jews from visiting the Soviet Union.

**CONGRATULATIONS TO HARRY MAZZONI**

**HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 5, 1973*

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the hard-working dedication and dynamic perseverance of Harry Mazzoni and the resounding success of his 3-year effort to achieve final justice for thousands of people who were tragically and wrongfully deprived of money which they, in a good faith, deposited in the City Savings Association of Chicago.

In 1964, this savings and loan institution collapsed as a result of fraud and the willful and wanton negligence of State officials charged with supervising such organizations and protecting depositors.

Harry Mazzoni, representing some 16,000 defrauded depositors, was the tireless driving force and resourceful leader through seemingly endless court battles and impenetrable bureaucratic jungles. When a Federal district judge finally ruled that the State was liable for losses suffered by these depositors, it was Harry Mazzoni who insistently pushed for an appropriations bill in the State legislature.

The political experts warned that the chances of passing such a bill were nil and believed success was out of reach—but not Harry Mazzoni. Faced with official skepticism and the discouragement of his people, Harry Mazzoni reacted by fighting even harder.

The Illinois Legislature has now passed the compensation bill and Governor Walker has promised to sign it. It is a victory for Harry Mazzoni and a victory for simple justice.

Most of the defrauded depositors are old, many are poor. One lady had received \$6,000 compensation for a factory injury—these funds were gone. Another woman fled Communist Poland to live in a free country—and all of her savings were wiped out. Another widow, too old and sick to work, lost money she had received from her husband's life insurance policy.

I congratulate Harry Mazzoni, who lives at 6545 North Oconto in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am proud to represent, and all of his coworkers, and State Legislators Ralph Capparelli, Roman J. Kosinski, and Roger P. McAuliffe, who worked with him for final victory. Harry Mazzoni has set an inspiring example for all Americans.

**A GOVERNOR CHALLENGES THE U.S. CONGRESS**

**HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 5, 1973*

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Governor of the State of Indiana, the Honorable Otis R. Bowen, delivered to the Rotary Club of Indianapolis on September 4, 1973, a major address in which he forthrightly threw down before the Congress of these United States the gauntlet to get down to serious business and enact positive legislation that will help our Nation solve the crises it faces in energy supply, highway construction, rail transportation, and many other areas. This noteworthy address deserves the serious attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and I am pleased to insert it herewith in the RECORD, with the hope that it will ignite a few fires in the appropriate places and stimulate some needed and long overdue action. The address follows:

REMARKS TO THE INDIANAPOLIS ROTARY CLUB,  
SEPTEMBER 4, 1973

(Address by Gov. Otis R. Bowen)

Government officials, I believe, have the duty to inform the public of current developments, trends, and problems. One could speak several times daily and not run out of material, but over a period of time the public would grow weary of the steady diet of gloom and doom. I do think that when we have somewhat related problems—ones with common denominators—it is helpful to put them into the same sack and then shake them around.

The issues I will discuss with you today are somewhat divergent, but they share the common ground that we are looking to the same source for a solution to each one of them.

They relate to energy, highway needs and our rail transportation problems.

Perhaps most bewildering of our current national concerns relates to energy. No one, it seems, can get a handle on the problem and there are many in high places who muddy the water with irresponsible public statements. There are those who believe the energy crisis is real. There are those who believe that it was created by Ralph Nader and the environmentalists. There are those who believe it is a phony ploy on the part of the energy industry to jack up prices. And there are just enough threads of circumstantial evidence in those last two assertions to confuse those of us concerned about the problem, and to provide fodder for society's mischief-makers.

The matter is further confused because some forecasted shortages either didn't materialize—or the public thinks that they didn't.

Last winter there were warnings of a fuel oil shortage. State government joined in those warnings because weather patterns and supply trends were pointing in that direction. Some areas suffered curtailments or brief cut-offs, but the problem in Indiana didn't materialize on the expected scope for one simple reason—the weather changed and we had almost a month of unseasonably warm temperatures. That alone forestalled the problem. In some other States, on the other hand, the shortage was a near disaster.

Last spring we were warned of the gasoline shortage, and gasoline companies hired T.V. stars all summer long to remind us of it.

Few Hoosiers encountered more than temporary problems in securing enough gasoline for summertime use, and I suspect that many of them now believe that the predictions were wrong. But were they? The gasoline shortage was critical in a few States—but unless you vacationed in Colorado or Florida you probably aren't aware of it. The fact that airline, bus, and rail travel was up considerably indicates that many people didn't use their family automobile for summer vacations . . . and that alone could have tipped the balance, although precise statistics are difficult to analyze. And I suspect the attention given to the potential shortage may have caused us, at least subconsciously, to reduce our use of automobiles.

And the petroleum industry was squirting out gasoline as fast as it could—which raises another question. The production techniques of the petroleum industry are so fixed and must be balanced so carefully that one must wonder whether they have borrowed against next winter's fuel oil reserves. Only time and weather conditions can tell the answer to that question.

I, for one, believe that the energy crisis is real, and I believe that two statistics are sufficient to make the case.

First, the United States—with only six percent of the world's population—consumes thirty-five percent of the world's annual energy output.

Second, the demand in the United States for energy has been doubling every ten years.

If we assume demand on that scale will continue, then we are talking in terms of twice today's electrical energy producing capacity just ten years from now—and twice the production of basic fossil fuels—unless we achieve major breakthroughs in energy efficiency.

Our concern for the environment and the accompanying new rules and regulations have had an impact, but not enough to make a significant dent in the overall trend.

Those basic statistics are frightening, particularly when you can make a good argument that we are in trouble even if we hold consumption at the present levels and do not plan for increases. For the short term at least, allocations based upon existing consumption seem to be a fact of life.

Industry shouldn't escape without blame

... There appear to have been attempts to take advantage of pricing situations. Our experience with the State's attempting to secure a supply of liquid propane gas for our L.P. dealers to distribute this fall is a good example.

You will recall last winter's critical shortage of that fuel. In fairness to them, I would say that our L.P. dealers do have problems in obtaining immediate financing and negotiating advance commitments, but an unwillingness to commit for prices well above last year's were an obvious barrier. So they dropped the ball, even though the Indiana Department of Commerce had lined up some sources—which today have found willing buyers in other States. We are still working on other possibilities—but the prices quoted today are even higher than those firmly quoted this spring.

The Federal Government—Congress in particular—has utterly failed to come to grips with the problem. A welter of bills have been introduced to appease certain constituencies and to provide fodder for news conferences and newsletters. But delays on the part of Congress are compounding the problem and the token efforts they are making are merely confusing the whole issue. Congress has done little more than play politics with the energy crisis—and it is high time that their feet were put to the fire.

Indiana's Highway Transportation future has also been enshrouded under a Federal cloud for the past several years. When I assumed office in January of this year, we were totally unable to rationally and economically plan, build, and re-build our Federal Highway network. This situation existed because the United States Congress had, at that time, yet to enact the necessary appropriation legislation so that States could continue their approved schedule of planning, acquisition and construction.

On August 13th of this year, President Nixon signed the necessary Federal Highway Appropriation Act. This legislation had been subjected to several months of congressional hassle between those that advocated mandatory diversion of Federal motor fuel taxes from their intended highway purposes to finance mass transportation projects such as San Francisco bay area rapid transit system, or Washington, D.C.'s subway system. While the legislation signed by the President did not require such diversions... and while its enactment was an absolute necessity to all fifty of our States... The 1973 Highway Appropriation Act can only be termed a mixed bag of blessings to Hoosiers. In short, it represents the type of good news-bad news dichotomy that is often the butt of many jokes—the only difference is that Hoosier motorists aren't laughing.

The good news is of course that Congress finally enacted a Highway Appropriation Act in any form. The bad news is that the form in which it was enacted further penalizes Hoosier motorists in relation to other States.

Indiana has been a donor state for motor fuel tax dollars for many years. According to highway commission figures, five years ago Indiana got back only 97 cents of each highway dollar we sent down the Potomac. Today, Hoosiers get back a whopping 43 cents of each motor fuel tax dollar we raise in Indiana. The results are that not only has Indiana's percentage of return been cut back, but the slash has been so great that it is beginning to effect the total dollar return of our highway money. The bill passed by the United States Congress gives Indiana less total highway dollars—dollars generated in our own State—for us to spend on our own roads over the next three years, than we had to spend over the last three years. This means that we will be further delayed in completing

our interstate highway network—a network vital to a sound pattern of economic growth.

It means also that major relocation, redesign, and reconstruction of our non-interstate Federal highway network—action vitally necessary for traffic safety purposes—will have to be shoved further back on the construction burner.

This situation results from congressional enactment of a motor fuel tax distribution formula which has grown progressively unfavorable to the Hoosier motorist.

Several months ago this administration proposed in testimony before the congressional subcommittee several revisions within this formula which we believe to be reasonable requests designed to rectify Indiana's deteriorating situation. In this testimony, we proposed three major points. Briefly these points were:

(1) That the Federal Government determine where the interstate system can be completed, and then complete it as rapidly as is possible.

(2) Repeal the 4 cent a gallon gasoline tax, or establish an 85 percent floor as a minimum rate of return for any State from highway funds.

(3) Review the total transportation needs of the Nation, study new and existing modes, determine where Federal responsibility exists and where it does not, then respond accordingly and deliberately and establish a fair and equitable means of financing the total program.

Additionally, in conjunction with the State highway commission, I advised our congressional delegation of the seriousness of the then current situation. While the majority of our delegation supported this position, that support was not in fact unanimous.

I am totally at a loss to discover a logical and defensible reason for our continuing deteriorating Federal highway situation—especially in light of the fact that we have two active and vocal Senators located in prestigious legislative posts. One would think that as their experience and prestige grew, our highway dollars returned would also grow—or at least they certainly would not shrink. But the sad reality is that in 1973, Hoosier motorists will pay 170 to 175 million dollars in Federal motor fuel tax revenues, all dedicated to highway use, only 76 million dollars of which will be spent for roads in our own State.

Our rail transportation situation is equally obscure.

I was heartened to learn last Friday that Amtrak—the National Rail Passenger Corporation—was abandoning its efforts to drop two-thirds of Indianapolis rail passenger service and end all passenger service to Terre Haute, Richmond and Logansport.

Congressman Hudnut and I had filed some rather vigorous protests against the proposal to drop the two trains, and my staff was frankly looking forward to the public hearings scheduled for this week because we believed we had enough information and sound arguments to nail them to the wall.

I would hasten to say that I believe Amtrak is doing a rather good job under some extremely trying circumstances and the discontinuance of the National Limited and Floridian actually was a brainchild of the U.S. Department of Transportation—not Congress itself.

Loss of this service would have been a severe blow to Indianapolis' goal to be a major transportation center. Right now, this city is the second largest rail passenger center in the Midwest. But don't let numbers deceive you though, for the quality of service needs upgrading. There isn't enough equipment to meet the demand. For the first time in years, potential passengers are being turned away because there aren't enough accommodations. The schedules need chang-

ing and the route structure needs revision if potential is to be realized.

But the real obstacle to improved service is the woeful state of the track beds, which compel traveling at snail's pace speed.

Modern turbine train service is being initiated between Chicago and St. Louis. Chicago-Indianapolis-Cincinnati Turbo Train Service is the dream of many people, but it won't materialize until the road beds are improved. And that won't happen until the Penn Central bankruptcy is resolved and until Congress determines what its general policy toward rail transportation will be.

I have previously warned of the staggering consequences that will occur if the Penn Central ceases operations. Congress has only shadow-boxed with the problem, yet the date for liquidation of the Penn Central System looms ever nearer.

Congress needs to overhaul the entire concept of railroad regulation. It must be testimony to the inherent economic value of rail transportation that a system so badly regulated and so riddled with weak management can survive this long. But the bankrupt rail legislation that is now being considered by Congress consists essentially of bail-out financial aid bills and legislation which sets up new offices to further study the problem.

If an orderly liquidation of the Penn Central occurred—one which transferred all essential routes to other railroads without any interruption in services—it might be the most preferable option. But the problems of the bankrupt eastern railroads won't be resolved until track improvements are brought about and until some sanity has been restored to regulatory practices. Failing these two points, we may only be postponing the day of nationalization of the country's entire rail system.

Yet it can be avoided, because some of the Nation's railroads are demonstrating the capability to run at a profit—at least to the extent that they are not hamstrung by unwise regulation.

Congress itself immediately should initiate the quickest possible study of the entire scope of Federal railroad regulation and replace the existing concepts which seem contrived to drive the railroads out of business.

Congress should act immediately on the bankrupt railroads. If its decision is to permit an orderly liquidation, it should not leave the details of that liquidation up to the courts or the Interstate Commerce Commission. Congress should insist that all routes not under abandonment petition by the Penn Central at the present time, be operated without even a week's interruption if a change of ownership occurs.

If Congress intends to bail out the Penn Central with Federal assistance, let it get on with the job. The foot dragging that is now occurring is only increasing the dollar cost of that rehabilitation.

Each of these three areas—energy, highways and rail transportation—are deeply complex areas in their own right. On the whole they would appear to have little immediate common ground as an object of individual impact and concern. Yet each of these areas is heavily entwined with Federal regulation, control, and/or finance. As these problems relate to Hoosiers... to you and me... our future largely depends upon the ability of Congress to establish order in the face of potential chaos. The urgency of this situation cannot and must not be underestimated. We must all join in—and support—the sound, rational and well conceived actions of Congress. But we cannot await these actions for a long period of time.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR WILLIAMS  
OF ARIZONA

## HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, these thoughtful remarks by Arizona Gov. Jack Williams are well worth everyone's time and very careful thought:

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR WILLIAMS OF ARIZONA,  
PHOENIX KIWANIS CLUB, AUGUST 28, 1973

The other day I read that we as a civilization have reached the end of the road and have no new path to take, no duty to carry out, and no purpose to fulfill.

The primary purpose of mankind has always been to survive in a natural world which has not invariably been friendly to us.

In our written, remembered and sensed history there has always been more work to do than we could do. Our needs were greater than their possible fulfillment. Our dreams were so improbable that we move their reality into heaven. Our ailments, our agonies and our sorrows were so many and so grievous that we accepted them either as inevitable or as punishments for some manufactured sins.

Quite suddenly much of the agony and hardships were done away with. Almost unlimited new power took the place of straining muscles and bent backs. Nature retreated before an avalanche of industrial and technological weapons. Man himself lived longer, grew bigger, learned more and created a paradise far surpassing anything any civilization had ever achieved before.

But man is never happy in paradise because he is always trying to achieve a greater utopia.

In our attempts to improve, we became convinced that we were poisoning the land, the oceans and the air. The ecology system was being irretrievably damaged, too many people were being born, we would have great famines by the eighties. If radioactive fall-outs didn't get us, we would surely be suffocated by smog. D.D.T., building up in the plants and meat animals, would be consumed as food and overwhelm our livers.

The industrial dust that our factories threw into the atmosphere would keep solar energy from reaching the surface of the earth and we would freeze. On the other hand, carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels would create a greenhouse effect by forming a blanket that would prevent heat radiation from the planet. A greenhouse by definition is the opposite of an ice age.

Although it was obvious you can't die at one and the same time by freezing and by roasting, or by starving and by overeating foods grown with the benefit of D.D.T. and commercial fertilizers, our doomsday prophets were unrelenting.

Since the world began, ecology has been with us. It was then, it is now, and it will be tomorrow just as the environment has always been with us. And gain throughout history man has been struggling to master the hostility of his natural environment—to find shelter and to be secure from flooding and to force nature to produce sufficient food to sustain life.

It is true that more people create more pollution and more problems. But, we are a long way from that point where we must stand jowl to jowl, thigh to thigh, and shoulder to shoulder, struggling with one another for standing room upon this planet.

Every once in a while I am besieged with letters protesting the number of people who have moved to Arizona and who are threatening the beautiful places that once were so isolated in our great State. These letters from people who, for the most part, have moved

here themselves and now want to prevent somebody else from coming.

I am one of those fortunate people who came here in the very early days when the population of Phoenix was 13,000. I am also one of the fortunate people who can speak with some authority about the land and the environment and the hardships that were encountered by those enterprising folk who braved nature, tamed nature, and created a veritable paradise that later did attract people.

This area was once described by a visiting Congressman as fit only for rattlesnakes and centipedes. In fact, I recall the creosote bush, the crawling creatures, the dust and heat of summer, this was indeed a veritable hellhole, especially in summer, improved only by those who came braving the hardship and taming nature which fought a vigorous battle to defeat mankind and destroy him.

It was not as if one civilization had not been tried and been reclaimed by nature, leaving only a few mounds here and there, covered with dust placed by the restless fingers of the wind as it swept over the alluvial soil, slowly removing any record of man's former occupancy.

The early pioneers traced out the canals of the ancients and planted the first cottonwood trees to hold the soil, sowed and watered the fields, developed the dams and the reservoirs, brought in the trees of many kinds seen here today; sowed and designed the golf courses and made possible a land that has far more attractions than almost anywhere else.

I will tell you, yes, each and everyone who wants to turn back the clock, that you probably could not survive, would not survive, would never have come had those who pioneered this effort not done all of the things that today you are criticizing them for doing.

And now, where are we now? Well, the winter has passed, the rain is over and gone and the still small voice of reason again is heard in the land.

A British scientist, John Maddox, who edits an influential magazine called *Nature* put the ecological movement—which, incidentally, he considers quite necessary—into its proper perspective in a remarkable book called *The Domsday Syndrome*. His good news is that the human race is not doomed to extinction. The population bomb is not going to explode. The food supply of the eighties will be quite adequate. D.D.T. is not going to poison our livers. We can't pontificate on what causes ice ages (after all, they came and went long before we had smoke-belching factories and automotive carbon monoxide exhaust), but the onset of the expanding polar icecaps will hardly hit us for some centuries to come.

Furthermore, Mr. Maddox rounds out his attack on the population bogey by explaining the promise of the so-called green revolution. New strains of wheat and rice have already prevented famine. We are not running out of the older metals, but even if we were, there are scores of acceptable substitutes. D.D.T., while a mixed blessing, has, on the credit side of the ledger, saved millions of lives in malaria countries.

In short, man has it in him to cooperate with the ecology system and at the same time maintain a continuous sound economic growth.

Isn't it strange that at an age when our society claims to be ruled by its intellect, we find repeated examples of over-emotional reaction bordering on the hysterical? And nowhere is this more plainly visible than it is in all matters dealing with the environmental problem with clean air, clean water, the preservation of the land.

The tragedy today is that a crusade to preserve balance between man and nature is in real danger of running off the tracks and, paradoxically, the most fervent environmentalist may be among the chief wreckers. Consider, for example, the wide-spread notion that clean environment may be ob-

tained by reducing or even abolishing our dependence on technology. This is a delusion. The truth is that most environmental problems require technological solutions—dozens of them. To control just one major water pollutant, human waste, we shall have to draw on all sciences and technologies from biochemistry to thermo-dynamics. Similarly, we need the most advanced technology for adequate treatment of the effluents that mining and manufacturing spew into the world's waters. It will take even more new technology to repair the damage caused by a third major source of water pollution in this country, the activities of farmers.

No matter how desirable the emphasis on pollution might be, the next decade is the wrong time for it in all the developed countries, and especially the United States. The next decade will bring a surge in employment seekers and the formation of young families—both the inevitable result of the baby boom of the late forties and early fifties. Young adults need jobs, and unless there is a rapid expansion of jobs there will be a massive unemployment, especially among low-skilled blacks and other minority group members.

The only way to avoid the evils before us is to expand the economy, probably a growth rate of four percent a year for the next decade, a higher rate than we have been able to sustain in this country in the post-war years. This, undoubtedly, entails great environmental risks. But the alternative is likely to mean no environmental action at all.

Today, everyone of us is a polluter. Punitive laws and regulations can force automobile manufacturers to put emission controls into new cars, but they will never be able to force 100 million motorists to maintain this equipment.

What we should do is to make it to everyone's advantage to reach environmental goals. Automobile owners who voluntarily maintain in working order the emission controls of their cars might, for instance, pay a much lower automobile registration fee. And if they are offered a sizeable tax incentive, the automobile companies would put all their best energies to work to produce safer and emission-free cars rather than fight delaying actions against punitive legislation.

Despite all the rhetoric on the campuses, we know by now that capitalism has nothing to do with ecological crisis. Pollution is fully as severe in the communist countries. Nor is the United States the world's foremost polluter; Japan holds this dubious honor by a good margin. No great American river is as much an open sewer as the lower Rhine or the lower Dnieper and the Volga in the industrial Ukraine. We should also know that greed has little to do with the environmental crisis. The two main causes are population pressures, especially the pressures of the large metropolitan populations, and the desire—a highly commendable one—to bring a decent living at a lowest possible cost to the largest possible number of people.

The environmental crisis is the result of success—success in cutting down the mortality of infants (such as giving us a population explosion), success in raising farm output sufficient to prevent mass famine (such as giving contamination by pesticides and chemical fertilizers), success in getting people out of the slums and tenements of the 19th century city and into the joy and privacy of the single home in the suburbs (such as giving us urban sprawl and traffic jams).

The environmental crisis, in other words, is largely the result of doing too much of the right thing.

Do you realize that in the early days, when I first came to this area, horse and mule corals were a part of community life and as a result the flies from the manure were thick enough to form clouds across the city on a sunny day. Babies died at an alarming rate,

especially in the summer from what was called "summer complaint."

The flies are gone today. The babies live today. There is a population explosion. We solve it by returning to the manure and the flies? No.

In the early days the number of crops that could be grown and the amount of food that could be produced was infinitesimal compared to what can be done today with the use of advanced insecticides and fertilizers. Consequently, a single farmer can feed a great many more people than a great number of farmers could seventy years ago. In fact, Dr. Fritz W. Went of the University of Nevada says enough food can be produced for fifty times the present population of the planet.

As for the urban sprawl that some would criticize, this actually is a dispersal of people into beautiful areas with lawns and homes and landscaped grounds that only the rich could have afforded not too long ago in history.

I know the crowded conditions of the metropolitan city are alarming to those who prefer the open spaces that once existed in the Salt River Valley. But all that you see here is the result of man working to solve other problems. These other problems were so intense and desperate that men died because of them. The life of hardship endured by the pioneer woman in this valley was beyond comprehension today.

Some years ago, on a junket with the junior league, when I was mayor of Phoenix, we paid a visit to what are known as the inner-city slums. As we fastidiously prowled among these homes, I suddenly realized that everyone in the so-called inner-city slums was living better than I lived at the time when I entered my teens. Furthermore, every one of them lived with far more comfort than the richest pioneer did 100 years ago in this valley.

It is true that the crowded conditions are enough to appal some who would prefer to have more space. There is still a lot of room in this state and if you'll give up the opera, the symphony, the culture and the medical advantages of this area, along with the employment opportunities, you have a choice of a number of isolated spots in which you can live to your heart's content without a soul around you.

The art museum and galleries, the recreational facilities, the sports and games that are played here are the result of facilities of a large metropolitan area.

You cannot have it both ways. Peter F. Drucker, writing in *Harpers Magazine*, suggests how best to protect the environment. First, he says, is to develop a birth control method that is cheaper, more effective, more acceptable to people of all cultures than anything we now have.

Second, we need to learn how to produce electric energy with a minimum of pollution. Third, devise ways of raising crops for rapidly-growing populations without at the same time doing irreversible ecological damage through pesticides and chemical fertilizers.

People are working on these problems. It is probably true that this Nation, the cleanest and brightest of all Nations, needed the prodding of the ecological lobbies. However, with the prodding now comes the time for sober contemplation of what must be done. Until we get the answers, I think it had better be decided we keep on building power plants and growing food with the help of fertilizers and such insect-controlling chemicals as we now have.

The risks are well known, thanks to the environmentalists. If they had not created a widespread public awareness of the ecological crisis, we might not have stood a chance. But such awareness by itself is not enough. Flaming manifestoes and prophecies of doom are no longer much help and a search for scapegoats can only make matters worse.

The time for sensations and manifestoes is

about over. Now we need rigorous analysis, united effort and very hard work. We need to realize that the back-to-nature movement somehow has spawned a new breed of activists, one for whom exaggeration, distortion and contempt for truth—like the rapid, throaty and retarded cry of the cuckoo—became the distinguishing marks. There has been much misinformation.

But worst of all, there has been an attempt to destroy progress. Progress and growth and change are the only acceptable alternatives to a status quo which in the end will result in all of us being destroyed by our own lethargy. We are prone to forget that in the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth and then said, "let us make man in our image, after our likeness and let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the fowl of the air, over the cattle, over all the earth."

Man, a puny creature upon the earth at that time, multiplied and held his own against gargantuan creatures and catastrophic threats.

Volcanoes burst forth their violent fury, spreading deadly ash around the world to such an extent that our present pollution would seem but a grain of sand in contrast. Man survived.

The great glaciers came down with their freezing cold, gouging canyons and ravines and destroying life, and yet man survived.

The winds blew from the far corners of the Heavens and the rains came and the erosion carved great gashes across the face of the earth and threatened man, and yet he survived. Against the heat and against the cold and against the most violent forces of nature from drought to flood, from famine to plenty, man has achieved. In some places, and the United States is certainly one—and this area is the best example of it—a supremacy over the threat of nature to make a paradise on earth.

All that people complain today is the result of what man has accomplished in thwarting the most vigorous powers of nature to destroy him.

I find now a strange disinclination to admire man and an inclination to hate him. In this distrust and dislike of our fellow man we find the most dangerous seeds of all. Instead of being each other's keeper and a brother to all mankind, we will become indeed antagonists, not through the deadly thunder of war, which is the final answer to diplomacy, but in the more insidious hatred in which we will kill our own. This, by genocide, by abortion, by every form of destruction that man in his genius can create, we will destroy our own because in the end we will hate ourselves.

This to me is the heart and the soul that inspired some of the venomous responses I get to the problem I have faced serving as a Governor. The problem has been a simple one for me, having lived a lot of the history of this State. To carry on the great works that men first began here; to make it even more pleasant than it is now; to provide by growth the jobs that are necessary for those who were born here, who go to schools here and who graduate from our universities.

To make a place for those who come from elsewhere lest we wind up so selfish that we refuse to share with others what we ourselves have enjoyed.

It is not that every person who comes here takes away a little bit; it is that every person who comes here adds a little bit and what he adds can be as in the past a measure of benefit for all.

This is the ultimate challenge and it is on this basis that I as Governor asked the legislature to pass Arizona's first air control laws. It was on this basis that I as the Governor insisted that smelter operators take prompt action.

It was on this basis that I as Governor urged the subsequent legislature to strengthen our air quality control laws, and it was I,

as Governor, who urged the adoption of motor vehicle inspections to control emissions.

We have been fighting on two fronts—one to improve the quality of air over Arizona and the quality of life in Arizona. And that war we are winning.

On the second front we defend ourselves from the over-emotional, irrational attacks of the ecology extremists. Whatever we have won, and whatever we will win, we are sure that someone will say we could have done it quicker, we could have done it better by following a different method of attack.

The point is that we are doing it and we are going to accomplish the objective of the environmentalists and the ecologists without seriously crippling the economy of Arizona, without throwing people out of work, without demanding the unnecessary expenditure of social resources, and without losing our sense of balance or our sense of humor.

Now, thank you so very much, and let us all hope that the winter is past, the rain is over and gone, and the still small voice of reason again is heard in the land.

DAVID N. DINKINS AND  
ELECTION REFORM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable David N. Dinkins has retired as president of the New York City Board of Elections after serving as one of the Nation's leading spokesmen for election reform.

Dave Dinkins, a former member of the New York State Assembly, brought a commitment that every citizen should be able to vote to his post. As a result, he and the other members of the Board of Elections began the long and arduous task of overhauling the elections procedures of our Nation's largest city.

As Mr. Dinkins said:

Non-registration is an acknowledged national scandal in a country possessing a great national heritage as a participatory democracy.

I fully agree with these words.

Along with William F. Larkin, another member of the Board of Elections who was also retired, he backed a mail voter registration program which would make the Constitutional right to vote a reality for millions of functionally disenfranchised Americans.

I hope that the example set by David Dinkins and William Larkin will be followed by the new members of the Board of Elections, and that New York City will move into the 20th century in the area of electoral reform.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE  
INTERIOR MORTON

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, during the recently completed congressional recess it was my privilege to attend and partici-



pate in the dedication of the Earth Resources Observation System Data Center and the Karl E. Mundt Federal Building in which it is located, at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. At that ceremony the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior spoke, and I feel his remarks provided a very fitting beginning for this vital project which promises so much for all of industry and society. I commend the Secretary's remarks to the attention of the Members of the House:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROGERS C. B. MORTON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., AUGUST 7, 1973

The EROS Data Center is a product of unique insight and vision. It evidences our efforts to shape our future, by matching the aspirations and spirit of our people with the benefits of our technology. It is a major step—hopefully the first of many—in our quest to understand our environment and ourselves.

Although often overshadowed by the more spectacular milestones of our space program, EROS is the first major dividend from America's space effort that can be shared by all mankind. In a few short years EROS has gotten down to the pressing task of solving our real earthbound environmental problems.

EROS has truly global dimensions. For the benefits and scientific data from EROS are being made available to people and nations throughout the world.

In terms of bits of information, and sheer volume alone, there is probably more data stored here at the EROS Data Center than in any building on earth. In less than two years, and operating out of temporary facilities not far from here, the EROS Data Center has produced over 25,000 photomages a month, servicing user needs from across the world. And by 1978 we will be processing five or six times that amount. This fact reflects the scale of the EROS program—and the dimension of the problems and challenges EROS seeks to meet. The problem of the environment and man's need to develop and safeguard the earth's resources is not limited to national borders. These are truly global problems, that can only be met by action on a global scale.

The promise of EROS has already become a reality. Initial experiments here at the Data Center have demonstrated the value this new tool has in developing land use planning, in monitoring natural phenomena, and in exploring the limits of our natural resources. And this is just a beginning.

The Skylab and ERTS programs, for example, have provided invaluable data to meet our energy and environmental needs. Satellite data has contributed to our evaluation of the environmental impact of oil development on Alaska's North Slope. An examination of the ERTS image of the northern tundra regions does not reveal evidence of significant degradation over the large area as a result of oil explorations during the 1940's and 1950's. If serious damage had been done, the satellite photos would have revealed it. Thus, ERTS has proved itself to be a major tool in environmental impact assessments.

The problems of the environment are, in part, a result of the triumph of our technology. EROS is a major effort to turn technology around to meet not only human needs—but the needs of the environment. The great reward of EROS, is that it gives us an unobscured look at our natural world, and the effects of our relationship with our environment.

It clearly reveals: The scars and pock marks from open pit mining; the sediment and siltation of our lakes and rivers; as well as the air pollution enveloping our great industrial centers.

EROS will only provide us with data, however. Human judgment will still dominate the quality of our environment in the future.

This dedication is a celebration of the spirited leadership of a few earth scientists and elected officials. Each of them had disparate interests. All of them, however, foresaw the role space technology could play in enhancing our environment. While most people envisioned the emerging challenge of our space program as determining simply whether we could go beyond our air ocean—these men demanded more. They wanted to know what our space program could do for man.

Dr. William Pecora, who was one of America's greatest earth scientists, had a clear perception of the energy, resource, and environmental problems confronting us. He had a belief that new technology, such as space development, could help us meet these challenges. His leadership in EROS literally launched the earth sciences into the space age.

Ben Reifel had a keen interest in developing the economic base of South Dakota.

Former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall recognized the need for a continuing inventory of the effects resource development has on the environment. His belief in the need to explore new solutions to old problems was critical during the early years.

Al Shock, Mike Shermer, Louis Warren, and others from Sioux Falls, grasped in a single meeting the potential significance of the EROS program and the fact that the geography of the world was changing.

It is especially fitting that the EROS Data Center will be located in the newly named Karl E. Mundt Federal Building. For it was Senator Mundt's leadership in the Congress that brought the vision of a few earth scientists into reality. It was Senator Mundt who foresaw the need to match Federal support for space technology with the new horizons in earth science.

EROS has already succeeded in bringing promise to reality. It has given us a new insight into our natural world and ourselves. Hopefully, it will guide us to new relationships with our environment—and lead to a more peaceful world.

Thank you.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary will hold a series of hearings on compliance with title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act by hospitals and other facilities receiving medicare and medicaid funds.

Hearings will commence with testimony from the General Accounting Office on September 12, 1973, and will continue on September 13, 17, and 24 with testimony from other witnesses. Hearings will begin at 10 a.m. each day in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building.

Those wishing to submit statements for the record may address their inquiries to the Judiciary Committee, 2137 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

### POSTAL WORKERS AT BUFFALO SHOW DEDICATION IN CRISIS

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week, on the eve of the Labor Day weekend, the Post Office Sectional Center at Buffalo, N.Y., was faced with a major crisis when it lost power for all its automated equipment.

A large circuit breaker exploded, interrupting electric service for most of the huge facility. This occurred in late evening Thursday, August 30. Because of difficulty in obtaining correct parts, service was not restored for 24 hours.

Such a breakdown would create a crisis at any time, but in this instance there were complications of timing that threatened to delay over the weekend monthly checks for many, many thousands of social security beneficiaries, veterans, and other pensioners.

There has been considerable criticism of the Nation's postal system in the past few years.

But here was a case of monstrous proportions where the postal workers who make up the postal system responded in yeoman fashion and insured delivery of all first-class mail before the holiday weekend.

Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate to express my appreciation and commendation for the dedicated efforts of the postal workers in the Buffalo postal facility. They deserve our deepest gratitude.

When the magnitude of the crisis was realized, the management and workers at Buffalo joined in setting up a temporary workroom utilizing old-fashioned manual sorting cases.

Postal workers, though most of them never have been trained for manual sorting, pitched in and began hand-sorting the first-class mail. Priority was given to social security and other pension checks.

Workers on duty stayed overtime to help. Off-duty workers, notified of the problem, gave up their preholiday plans and came in to work overtime until the mounting backlog could be brought under control. Some 500 workers responded.

A word of praise is due, too, for the supervisors in charge who used the authority and responsibility which they now have to use whatever means necessary in order to keep the mails moving.

Mr. Speaker, the story of what happened last week at the Buffalo Post Office, a major postal facility serving a very large and populous area, is detailed in a series of three newspaper stories which I include as a part of my remarks: [From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Sept. 1, 1973]

#### BREAKDOWN CRIPPLES BUFFALO POST OFFICE: ELECTRICAL BREAKER EXPLODES

The Buffalo Post Office at 1200 William St. was crippled for more than 24 hours by an electrical failure Thursday and Friday, causing delays in delivery as postal workers returned to the old practice of sorting the mail by hand.

An estimated 600,000 pieces of first-class

mail, but especially the end-of-the-month welfare and Social Security checks were given priority as 300 workers manned old-fashioned sorting cases in an attempt to get the most important mail delivered today.

The power normally used to operate sophisticated mail sorting and stamp canceling machines in the 10-year-old main post office building failed at 9:56 p.m. Thursday when an over-sized circuit breaker handling two 23,000-volt power lines exploded without apparent reason.

The large circuit breaker, on explosion sent its ceramic insulation flying across the building's basement. It was replaced Friday evening and full power was restored at 10:30 p.m.

The breakdown occurred just as the Post Office had considered itself caught up and prepared for its two-day Labor Day holiday. However, because of the combination of the holiday and the power breakdown, much of the mail posted Friday will not be delivered until Tuesday or Wednesday, postal officials said.

#### OVERTIME WORK

Still, nearly 500 postal workers were called in to work overtime Friday and today in an effort to get the first-class mail sorted for delivery.

Acting Postmaster James Leary said 25,000 welfare checks worth an estimated \$4 million should be delivered on schedule today in Buffalo and Western New York, as would 140,000 Social Security checks.

Leary also said he hoped payroll checks mailed to Western New Yorkers would also reach home mail slots today.

Leary said he was concerned about mail received at the Buffalo Post Office for sorting and redistribution by truck to other cities in the state. Buffalo is a major transfer point for this mail, and much of the sorting equipment used in the redistribution process was affected by the power failure.

Dominic Mesi, a tour superintendent at the Post Office said Friday night that "more than a million pieces of mail and parcel post" are handled at the William St. office each day. Of that, about 600,000 pieces are first-class, he said.

With only the first-class being handled by hand Friday, Mesi said about 137,000 pieces of third class "junk mail" remained untouched, as did about 20,000 pieces of parcel post. There were also 26 vans filled with sacks of various class mail backed up at the docks, waiting for sorting and distribution to points as far east as Albany. Some of the normal Buffalo mail, according to Mesi, was sent unsorted Friday to Pittsburgh and Rochester for sorting.

#### SORTED BY HAND

"It'll take us about two days to get even with the world again," Mesi said. "Everything was in good shape for the weekend before this."

Mesi said even with a doubled work force Friday it was difficult just to handle the first-class mail because "most of these people aren't trained to sort by hand and because of the dim lights."

Lights were returned to the large windowless sorting room at 5 a.m. Friday when a \$70-an-hour portable generator was installed by R. B. Uren Equipment Rental, 7401 Buffalo Ave., Niagara Falls.

The long delay in getting the circuit breaker repaired was caused by the immediate unavailability of parts. Manufactured by Lapp Insulator Co. of LeRoy. Postal officials in Buffalo called the LeRoy Postmaster, James O'Malley, at 2 a.m. Friday and had him go to the home of the Lapp president to expedite delivery of necessary replacements.

The first insulators delivered for the circuit breaker didn't fit, however, and Lapp had to send an engineer to Buffalo to modify and adapt the insulators.

#### AUTO LIGHTS USED

Workmen used the headlights of automobiles in the basement of the building to guide them in the repair work.

Meanwhile, Buffalo Congressman Thaddeus J. Dulski said he would launch an immediate investigation into the cause of the power failure.

Chairman of the House Post Office Committee, Dulski said he wants "to find out if other new postal facilities (in the nation) are as vulnerable to power shortages and how much it would cost to equip them with a stand-by or reserve facilities." At 10 years, the William St. Post Office is considered new, Dulski said.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express,  
Sept. 2, 1973]

#### NEITHER RAIN NOR POWER CUT HALTS FIRST-CLASS MAIL DELIVERY

(By Sally Fox)

An emergency effort by U.S. Postal Service employees working overtime after the restoration of power at the Buffalo Post Office helped postal officials to make good their promises Saturday, as hundreds of thousands of pieces of first class mail were sorted, transported and delivered on time.

At 1 p.m. Saturday James Leary, acting officer in charge of the Main Post Office at 1200 William St., reported that all first class mail on hand would be delivered, despite a power failure Thursday night and Friday which had created a huge pile-up of unprocessed mail.

"Right now we are about 16 hours behind on non-preferential second and third class mail," he said, "but we expect to be caught up on that by the time of our next delivery on Tuesday."

Huge sorting machines and conveyor belts at the giant office had clattered back into action at 10:30 p.m. Friday, 24 hours after an over-sized circuit breaker serving the entire complex of mail handling facilities and offices exploded, bringing all operations to a temporary halt.

#### BACK TO AUTOMATION

As the lights and equipment came back on, workers who had resorted to old-fashioned handsorting methods in an attempt to move high priority mail returned to their stations at the sophisticated automated machines.

And by midday Saturday, operations in the mailing room, where some 650,000 pieces of mail are received for processing daily, were virtually back to normal.

Leary said he was pleased with the efforts of the 1,500 employees, many of whom had been scheduled for time off over the long holiday weekend but readily agreed to work extra shifts at the crippled facility.

"The public should be proud of the way the postal workers responded to this emergency situation," he said. "We said we would get the mail out on time and we did it. It hasn't been delayed more than an hour or so in delivery."

#### CHECKS AT STAKE

Many had been concerned at the time of the power failure that 63,000 welfare checks and several thousand Social Security checks scheduled for delivery to county residents Saturday would not arrive in time to buy necessary supplies for the Labor Day weekend, but Leary said special priority handling had made it possible to get them sorted and delivered on time.

Delivery of the checks on Saturday caused a rush on local banks by recipients anxious to cash them before the long weekend.

Miss Barbara Golonka, a clerk in the Adam, Meldrum & Anderson branch of the Manufacturers and Traders Trust Co., said

Saturday the office overflowed with eager customers. "This place is wall-to-wall people today," she said.

The situation was the same at the M&T branch at the Boulevard Mall, another of the handful of area commercial banks holding business hours on Saturday. "This is the busiest day we've had here in more than two years," said Miss Allyson Gillies, a teller at the bank.

#### THOROUGH EFFORT

While workers at the William St. Post Office worked overtime in the mail room, carriers and truck drivers throughout the Buffalo area also made a special effort to see that the mail was delivered.

Donald T. Zucarelli, a parcel post carrier, said he and many others were working double duty. "Remember, the postal service is the United States government, and that means it's a tight operation," he said.

"There are still some carriers in the system who have pride in their jobs," he added, "and as long as this is true we will always make sure that the mail gets through."

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express,  
Sept. 3, 1973]

#### OVERTIME WORK CLEARS POST OFFICE

Overtime work by a full staff at Buffalo's Main Post Office, 1200 William St., over the weekend cleared away the last of a mountainous accumulation of mail delayed in sorting because of a power failure last Thursday.

Postal Service workers hit the bottom of the pile on the second, third and fourth-class mail about 6 p.m. Sunday. Area residents will receive the delayed mail on Tuesday. There is no carrier delivery today.

#### PRICE TAG

Officials expect to know Tuesday what the massive effort to untangle the mail will cost.

The building was operating with almost a full crew, all on overtime, most of the weekend instead of the holiday crew of about one-quarter of the staff.

The power failure did not cause any damage to machinery which sorts mail. Power was restored just after 10 p.m. on Friday, 24 hours after the electrical system failed. Within 10 minutes the sorting machines were operating at full speed.

Power went off Thursday night when the single circuit breaker serving the entire complex failed. Insulators atop the unit either exploded or melted, spraying ceramic chips and oil around the "power vault" in the basement. There was no backup and there was no power at all until 5 a.m. Friday when an emergency generator was used to provide enough light for employees to sort mail by hand.

#### MURDER BY HANDGUN: A CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 14

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, with the reconvening of Congress, I must, unhappily, recommence inserting the tragic accounts of daily handgun murders. The 14th case is of two incidents of unrelated murders committed in the District of Columbia.

Ricardo Stewart, while operating his apartment elevator in Northwest Washington, became embroiled in an argument with a passenger who, it is alleged, shot him in the head.

Earlier the same morning, the police, alerted by an anonymous telephone call, found the unconscious body of Gerald Reaves in his apartment building. He died from multiple gunshot wounds a few hours later.

These men were attacked and murdered in their own residences, one by a resident of the same building. These men were only two of the 21,000 Americans murdered in the United States every year. They merit only one paragraph each on the back pages of the Washington Post. Are we so numb to murder and handgun death that a whole life—a whole person—is dismissed in 42 words and no one really cares?

THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT ACT REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM LEHMAN

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce H.R. 10049, the Community Education Development Act of 1973.

The purpose of community education is to enhance the educational opportunities for all members of a community. This is done by promoting the more efficient use of existing school facilities beyond what is now considered normal school hours. After hours and on non-school days, the school can be utilized as a community center operated in cooperation with other groups in the community to provide educational, recreational, cultural, and a variety of other community and social services in accordance with the needs, interests, and concerns of the community.

Community schools are an idea whose time has come. The past 2 years have seen the number of community schools grow from 200 to 700. Clearly, the time has long since passed when community schools could be considered experimental.

My own State of Florida has set aside both money and personnel for its community school effort. More than half a million Florida citizens now participate in community school programs and it is estimated that by 1980 there will be 450 community schools in Florida.

This bill seeks to encourage those States which would like to initiate a community education program as well as those States which have already taken steps in this direction.

The bill proposes grants to States to either establish, expand and improve, or maintain a community education program. Well over 1,000 community schools throughout the Nation would benefit from these State grants.

Grants would also be available to strengthen the community education re-

sources of State educational agencies and to train community education directors and coordinators. In addition, a National Clearinghouse on Community Education programs would be established in the U.S. Office of Education.

The average cost of a community school is only about \$20,000 per year. Considering the enormous benefit to the community, a community education program provides the best value for the dollar of any education program today.

The text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis follow:

H.R. 10049

A bill to promote the development and expansion of community education throughout the United States

*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 "Community Education Development Act of 1973".*

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. Whereas the school, as the prime educational institution of the community, is most effective when it involves the people of that community in a program designed to fulfill their educational needs, and whereas community education promotes a more efficient use of school facilities through an extension of school buildings and equipment, it is the purpose of this Act to provide recreational, educational and a variety of other services, in accordance with the needs, interests and concerns of the community, through the establishment of the community education program as a center for such activities in cooperation with other community groups.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 3. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education;

(2) "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(3) "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary education, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law;

(4) "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency which has administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school;

(5) "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (A) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (C) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than

a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (D) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (E) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited.

For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered;

(6) "community education programs" means a program in which a public building, including but not limited to a public elementary or secondary school, is utilized as a community center operated in cooperation with other groups in the community to provide recreational, educational, and a variety of other community and social services for the community that center serves in accordance with the needs, interests, and concerns of the community.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, \$17,500,000 for the fiscal year 1975, and \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year 1976, to enable the Commissioner to make payments under section 6(a).

(b) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 1 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall allot such amount among the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance.

(2) The remainder of such sums shall be allotted among the States (except those provided for in paragraph (1)) according to their relative populations.

(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (b) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (b) for that year but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amounts reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (b) for such year.

STATE PLANS

Sec. 5. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this Act shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) designates a State agency which shall, either directly or through arrangements with other State or local public agencies, act as the sole agency for administration of the State plan;

(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the States from its allotment under section 4(b) will be used to assist them (A) to establish new community education programs, (B) to expand or improve community education programs, or (C) to maintain and carry out community education programs,

except that no assistance shall be provided under this clause (C) with respect to a program which was not assisted under clause (A) or (B) during the preceding fiscal year.

(3) provides that the selection of local educational agencies to be awarded grants under the program shall be based on (A) proof of interest in the community to be served in the establishment, expansion, or improvement of community education programs, (B) the adequacy of the physical resources available for the program, and (C) a consideration of whether other funding alternatives are available;

(4) sets forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this Act for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and private funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for and in no case supplant such State, local and private funds;

(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to any other public agency) under the plan; and

(6) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereto which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

Sec. 6. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 4(b), the Commissioner shall pay to that State an amount equal to the Federal share of the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a), the Federal share shall be 50 per centum in the case of a program described in clause (A) of section 5(a)(2), 40 per centum in the case of a program described in clause (B) of such section, and 30 per centum in the case of a program described in clause (C) of such section.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

Sec. 7. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under section 5(a), or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such State agency, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 5(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program provided for in the State plan until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

#### JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 8. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 5(a) or with his final action under section 7(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for

the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

#### ASSISTANCE TO STRENGTHEN COMMUNITY EDUCATION RESOURCES OF STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

Sec. 9. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out a program for making grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the resources of their State educational agencies in the field of community education.

(b) For purposes of making grants under this section, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,060,000 for the fiscal year 1974, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

(c) Grants under this section to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall not aggregate more than \$20,000 in any year. Grants under this section to the other States for any fiscal year shall not exceed \$40,000 each.

#### TRAINING GRANTS

Sec. 10. (a) The Commissioner may make grants to institutions of higher education to develop and establish, or to expand, programs which will train persons as community education directors and coordinators.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for making grants under this section.

#### NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 11. (a) There is hereby established a national clearinghouse on community education programs within the Office of Education. The purpose of the clearinghouse shall be the gathering and dissemination of information received from community education programs, including but not limited to information regarding new programs, methods to encourage community participation, and ways of coordinating community services.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974 and each succeeding fiscal year.

(c) The Commissioner shall establish a permanent liaison between each community education program and the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall also make available to each community education program such technical information as they may require, and this shall be coordinated with the national clearinghouse.

#### LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS UNDER THIS ACT

Sec. 12. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act for religious worship or instruction.

(b) Section 432 of the General Education Provisions Act is amended by inserting after "Emergency School Aid Act;" the following: "Community Education Development Act of 1973;"

#### REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

Sec. 13. The Commissioner shall transmit to the President and the Congress annually a report of activities under this Act.

#### H.R. 10049

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

*Short Title:* the "Community Education Development Act of 1973"

*Statement of Purpose:* Whereas the school, as the prime educational institution of the community, is most effective when it involves the people of the community in a program designed to fulfill their educational needs, and whereas community education promotes a more efficient use of school facilities through an extension of school buildings and equipment, it is the purpose of this Act to provide recreational, educational and a variety of other services, in accordance with the needs, interests and concerns of the community, through the establishment of the community education program as a center for such activities in cooperation with other community groups.

*Section III: Definition of Terms.* "Community education program" defined as a program in which a public building, including but not limited to a public elementary or secondary school, is utilized as a community center operated in cooperation with other groups in the community to provide recreational, educational, and a variety of other community and social services for the community that center serves in accordance with the needs, interests and concerns of the community.

*Section IV: Authorization of Appropriations.* Authorizes \$15 million for FY 74, \$17.5 million for FY 75 and \$20 million for FY 76 to enable the Commissioner to make payments under Sec. 6(a). One percent of such amount shall be reserved for allocation among the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. Provision is also made for reallocation from time to time.

*Section V: State Plans.* The State plan must designate a State agency which shall act as the sole agency for administration of the State plan. The State plan shall also set forth a program under which funds allocated to the State will be used to assist them to: a) establish new community education programs, b) to expand or improve community education programs, or c) to maintain and carry out community education programs. However, no assistance shall be provided under the last clause with respect to a program which was not assisted under the first two clauses. State plans must also provide that the selection of local educational agencies to be awarded grants under the first two clauses will be based on proof of interest in the community; adequacy of the physical resources available for the program; and a consideration of whether other funding alternatives are available. The State plan shall also include procedures to assure that Federal funds made available under this Act shall be used to supplement State, local and private funds, and not supplant them. Provides for

the making of such reports as the Commissioner may reasonably require and sets forth fiscal control procedures that must be followed. The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which complies with the above provisions.

**Section VI: Federal Share.** The Federal share shall be 50% in the case of the establishment of a community education program; 40% in the case of a program in which the community education program is to be expanded or improved; and 30% in the case of the maintenance of a program assisted previously in either establishment, expansion or improvement.

**Section VII: Administration of State Plans.** Provides hearing procedures for the States when their plan is disapproved or when the Commissioner notifies the States that their eligibility for participation will be revoked for failure to comply with the provisions of the Act.

**Section VIII: Judicial Review.** The State may file with the U.S. Court of Appeals a petition for review of the action of the Commissioner if either the State plan is disapproved or the Commissioner finds that the State plan no longer complies with the provisions of this Act.

**Section IX: Assistance to Strengthen Community Education Resources of State Educational Agencies.** The Commissioner shall make grants to the States to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the resources of their State educational agencies in the field of community education. \$2,060,000 is authorized for this purpose. \$20,000 of this amount shall be divided among the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The remainder shall be divided among the States. No grant to a State under this section may exceed \$40,000.

**Section X: Training Grants.** \$3,000,000 is authorized for each of FY 74, FY 75 and FY 76 for grants to institutions of higher education to develop, establish or expand programs to train persons as community education directors and coordinators.

**Section XI: National Clearinghouse on Community Education Programs.** A National Clearinghouse on community education programs is established in the Office of Education to gather and disseminate information received from community education programs. \$1 million is authorized for this purpose for FY 74 and each succeeding fiscal year. The Commissioner is also directed to establish a permanent liaison between each community education program and the Commissioner, and to provide each community education program such technical information as they may require, coordinated with the National Clearinghouse.

**Section XII:** Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act for religious worship or instruction.

**Section XIII:** The Commissioner shall transmit to the President and the Congress annually a report of activities under this Act.

U.S. FOREST SERVICE—FRAME-  
WORK FOR THE FUTURE

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, land is the single most important factor which will limit the growth of our standard of living and the consumption of our resources. This in brief is the summary of the future of our land resources given by the Chief of the Forest Service, John R. McGuire.

In his evaluation of the land situation he stresses that there is not enough land in these United States to supply all of our people with all their needs and desires. Something is going to have to give.

How the U.S. Forest Service is looking ahead to meet some of the needs of the future—needs expressed in such basic terms as meat on the table, timber for homes, energy for homes and commerce, wilderness for personal restoration—are outlined in the remarks of Chief McGuire before a Convention of the Audubon Society. I felt that his comments were worthy of consideration by all of us here in the Congress. Therefore I insert his remarks entitled "The Public Lands: Our Margin of Environmental Quality" in the RECORD at this point:

THE PUBLIC LANDS: OUR MARGIN OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

It is a real pleasure to be here with you today. The subject of quality in land management is of particular interest to me, and this panel offers an excellent opportunity to exchange thoughts on the subject.

However, I do have a question about the connotation one might draw from the convention theme—"The Public Land: Our Margin of Environmental Quality." We might draw the conclusion from the theme that we expect our public lands to provide the only sure margin of environmental quality.

I am firmly convinced such a conclusion would be erroneous.

Vast as they are, and even with the wide variety of programs being applied at both the federal and state levels, the public lands alone cannot be expected to provide our society with all it needs in a "margin of environmental quality." All lands and land managers must bear a responsibility for a part of that margin of quality.

The inadequacy of relying solely on public lands for an environmental quality margin can be illustrated in two ways. First, the distribution and location of the public lands in relation to our population just doesn't work out right. In general, our areas of dense population have a small share of the public lands.

While some aspects of environmental quality are transportable, in thought if not physically, many other aspects of quality are not. They must be at least reasonably accessible to people in order to contribute effectively to the experience of quality.

Second, the public laws that established the National Parks, National Forests, the Wildlife Refuges and Wild and Scenic Rivers also established limitations. These lands were set aside for special purposes which denied them to a number of other uses.

So while I think the public lands have a major role in maintaining or providing a "margin of environmental quality" for our natural resources, I do not believe the role to be exclusive, nor do I believe that we can allow ourselves to think of public lands in this way.

I believe the public lands and private lands share equally in assuring environmental quality.

Now, let me talk specifically about the environmental goals and programs of the Forest Service—in other words—how the National Forests fit into this broader environmental quality picture for the nation.

A single set of objectives and policy statements has been developed covering our program responsibilities. Entitled "Framework for the Future," 11 major objectives and 46 expressions of National policy are spelled out to provide basic direction to the Forest Service.

Two of our objective statements have the greatest relevancy to the general theme of Public Lands and Environmental Quality. One is: "Promote and achieve a pattern of

natural resource uses that will best meet the needs of people now and in the future." The other is: "Protect and improve the quality of air, water, soil, and natural beauty."

How are people related to these objectives? Developments in transportation, communication, data processing, research and even international finance have brought a large share of the world's goods to this nation. This in turn has created a desire for more and more of the products of our industrialized society.

American people as a whole will be reluctant to reduce their established levels of consumption. Many interest groups and individuals will compete actively for their share of goods. But the limiting factor will be the land itself. Even now, there is no longer enough land to supply everyone with everything he desires at the same time.

These assumptions are illustrated in part by the ever-increasing array of demands that are made on public lands. The National Forests feel these demands acutely.

A FEW EXAMPLES

Recently the sharply rising prices for lumber resulted in focusing attention on the National Forests as a practical source of increasing supplies of timber in the shortest possible time;

Meat prices are at an unprecedented high, making a continuing program of livestock grazing on National Forest System land an important management activity. In fact, long-range projections suggest a 50 percent increase in demand for forest range grazing by the year 2000;

The demand for additional wilderness continues, and wilderness use grows. Recreation visits of this and other kinds are at record levels; and

Energy and fuel concerns have made headlines in recent weeks. These headlines reflect an urgency for increased exploration and use of fuel reserves underlying large acreages of public lands, and energy needs of the future are predicted to be even greater.

Lumber, livestock grazing, wilderness, energy; contrasts in demands such as I have illustrated are commonplace on National Forest System lands. Dealing with or responding to these demands is not.

Again, let me cite some examples, this time of actions dealing with the previously mentioned illustrations:

THE TIMBER SUPPLY NEEDS

I just recently agreed to take measures to increase the sale of timber on National Forest lands during this calendar year and to establish higher levels of production for the next several years, all, of course, well within the allowable harvest principles under which we operate.

This commitment on the part of the Forest Service was a direct action toward achieving a major agency goal and fulfilling a national need for housing and other wood products.

But the decision was far more complicated than it sounded. We had to ask: "What about the other environmental factors—the soil, the water, the wildlife habitat, the wilderness, the natural beauty?" Do we forget them, as so many seem to feel we will?

The answer is short and clear. No we do not.

The use of multidisciplinary teams, systematic analysis, evaluation of alternative courses of action, and public involvement are all parts of the process that can assure we maintain a proper perspective in managing the forest environment.

What's more, we in the Forest Service have learned a number of lessons in the last few years. One of these is a heightened sensitivity to environmental concerns.

We took the position that timber sales could be increased only if financing and manpower were made available, not only for the timber job, but for assurance of the protection of wildlife, soils, water, aesthetics, and

other values which could be affected by an accelerated level of timber sales.

#### ENERGY AND MINERAL DEMANDS

In order to help meet present and future energy and mineral demands on National Forest lands, we have initiated Project SEAM (Surface Environment and Mining). It is an on-the-ground, problem-solving research development and applications program geared primarily to deal with problems of surface mine reclamation where coal and other minerals are to be developed.

It will consider surface mine problems throughout the West, with the emphasis on "how" to develop for minerals while protecting the other natural resources involved. Preliminary studies have already begun in New Mexico, Idaho and on the Nevada-California border.

#### IMPROVED RANGE

Just yesterday, the Forest Service published a comprehensive scientific survey of the nation's range resources. Forest and range grazing lands on 1.2 billion acres were inventoried in the lower 48 States. Assessments were made of probable demands through the rest of the century. From this assembled information a spectrum of alternatives were produced to guide us and other grazing land managers to most efficiently meet those demands.

#### MORE WILDERNESS

That the public demand for wilderness would require additional actions from us was apparent as early as 1967. Though National Forest System lands already encompassed virtually all the designated wilderness, it was only a beginning.

Since then, we have conducted an inventory of all National Forest roadless areas that are generally 5,000 acres or more. We sought out the opinions of people on the merits of these areas for further study of their suitability for inclusion in the Wilderness System. From over 1,400 roadless areas, 235 were tentatively identified as warranting

further study. We hope soon to complete analysis of public comments on the draft Environmental Statement and make a selection of areas most suitable for study as future wilderness.

The bulk of the inventoried areas is in the West.

In the East, the demands—and needs—for wilderness have become just as obvious. Even though the East and South is heavily developed and the wilderness opportunities are sparse, an Amendment to the Wilderness Act with specific criteria for the area East of the Mississippi could be established. Congress is presently considering an Administration Bill, along with several others. With public involvement again as an assist, we feel there are more than 50 areas in National Forests which deserve study for wilderness designation.

I hope these examples illustrate both the size of demands and the variety of actions the Forest Service must take to keep pace with evolving needs and concerns.

We are jealous of our part of the responsibility in maintaining environmental quality and we are proud of the steps we have taken in meeting them.

But unlike Ptolemy, we know our lands are not the center of the environmental universe.

And it's this point I want to stress, in conclusion.

Other federal lands and agencies have their unique contributions. State and county agencies and lands are vital parts of the picture. And, of course, the private landowner must be brought more fully into the national effort to maintain, yes, even improve the environment.

Both our private and public forest lands have their roles, if we are to achieve the national objectives for quality environment and for production of food and fiber. These lands, no matter what the ownership, must be parts of a coordinated context which will assure that the future is as bright for the next generations as it has been for us.

#### TRADE FOR FREEDOM?

### HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, each year I receive many letters from constituents whose ethnic roots are in countries now behind the Iron Curtain.

Their pleas are the same: Please speak out for the freedom of our brothers and sisters under Communist rule; do not let them be forgotten.

Recently I received a letter from Vac-lav Dufek, chairman of the Niagara-Buffalo, N.Y., chapter of the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

Mr. Dufek pointed out that August 21 was the fifth anniversary of the "shameful invasion of Czechoslovakia by Russian armies and its occupation since."

Newsweek magazine reports that the Russians still have 80,000 troops in Czechoslovakia and that Soviet-backed Communist Party Chief Gustav Husak has achieved "normalization" with a combination of Russian financed consumer imports and a purge eliminating "liberal-minded Czechoslovaks from the government, the party, the economy, the schools and even the arts."

We have the ability to do something for these people, Mr. Dufek states:

Now when Soviets need our grain and want access to the financial credits and technology of America is the time to gain some concessions for the captive people living behind the Iron Curtain.

## SENATE—Thursday, September 6, 1973

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in whom we live and by whom the humble are guided in judgment, come to us as we come to Thee. Grant us grace and wisdom sufficient for our tasks. Help us to attack the old problems with fresh vigor, to approach the new problems with utmost dedication, and at all times to labor with abiding faith in Thee. In all our ways make us worthy of the high calling to be servants of the common good.

We pray in His name who came not to be ministered unto but to minister and give His life for others. Amen.

#### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 5, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WILLIAM P. ROGERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union, written by Paul Miller and Calvin Mayne, entitled "The Nation Owes William P. Rogers an Enormous Debt of Gratitude."

Before the Chair rules, may I say, quoting from what the President has said about Secretary Rogers, the following:

Throughout, your service has been completely dedicated and completely selfless. The Nation owes you an enormous debt of gratitude.

It surely does.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I came to the Senate this morning prepared to place in the RECORD the editorial captioned "The Nation Owes William P. Rogers an Enormous Debt of Gratitude," which was published in the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union. I shall not