

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. STEED, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. WIDNALL and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 10478. A bill to prohibit the telecasting of professional basketball games during certain periods when regularly scheduled intercollegiate or interscholastic basketball or football games are played, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 10479. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to study applications of solar energy, to establish a system of grants for solar energy research, and to establish the Solar Energy Data Bank; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MATHIS of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 739. Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Congress, by three-fourths vote of both Houses, to override decisions of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

298. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to the Douglas Fir tussock moth; to the Committee on Agriculture.

299. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to quality standards for filberts imported into the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

300. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the phase IV economic regulations concerning service stations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

301. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to the continuation of title III Federal funds for elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

302. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to the continuation of the Tongue Point Job Corps Center; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

303. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Roseville munitions disaster of April 28, 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

304. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to the allocation of scarce petroleum products; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

305. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SISK introduced a bill (H.R. 10480) for the relief of Rodney E. Hoover, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

284. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to members of the Armed Forces who are still either prisoners of war or missing in action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

285. Also, petition of Milton Mayer, New York, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PHASE IV REGULATIONS RELATING TO RETAIL SALE OF GASOLINE

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on September 21, 1973, I joined with my distinguished colleagues in introducing a Senate resolution to reflect the sense of the Senate that retailers of gasoline should be allowed to pass through increased costs from their suppliers. In my introductory remarks I mentioned a meeting with officials of the Cost of Living Council on September 17, 1973, for the purpose of discussing the phase IV regulations relating to retail sale of gasoline. I also mentioned that I would include as an extension of my remarks, my opening statement to the Cost of Living Council at that meeting.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the following statement be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI

On July 18, 1973, the President of the United States said: "The fundamental pricing rule of Phase IV is that prices are permitted to rise as much as costs rise, in dollars per unit of output, without any profit margin on the additional costs." He made that statement pursuant to the authority delegated to him by Congress through the Economic Stabilization Act wherein he was directed to issue standards which "shall be generally fair and equitable."

Notwithstanding these clear directives by the President and the Congress, the Cost of Living Council has promulgated regulations relating to the sale of gasoline which have resulted in the grossest hardships and inequities.

Information available to my office indicates that the following situation appears to be typical in New Mexico: The average dealer leases his station from an oil refinery company or owns his own independently. He does not own his own refinery nor has he any say over the terms and conditions of sale of his product from the refinery that supplies him. On the average, he will sell 15,000 gallons of gasoline per month. From the time the gasoline hits his station he will incur a number of actual costs. He will pay about a cent and a half per gallon for rent. It will take about two cents per gallon to pay overhead expenses such as utilities, insurances, taxes, telephone, and operating supplies such as windshield towels, etc. And he will pay about two and one half cents per gallon wages and that does not include any amount for the station owner or lessee himself to take home. Thus, his actual cost per gallon, based on a 15,000 gallon month is about six cents. Under the Phase IV regulations he may mark up his gasoline by the same amount it was marked up on January 10, 1973 or seven cents per gallon whichever is more. As New Mexico was involved in a severe price war on January 10, the markup, almost without exception is seven cents and not more. It is out of this seven cents that he must pay these six cents of actual costs per gallon. That leaves him one cent per gallon to take home or approximately \$150.00 per month.

Under the regulations, the seven cents markup must be on his August 1, 1973 cost. So if the costs are increased to the retailer due to the increased costs of import crude, for example, the retailer must absorb that increase in cost himself in that \$150 and may not pass that on to his customers. Such a result is grossly unfair to what is probably already the lowest paid group of blue collar workers in the country.

The situation is even worse for that group of small businessmen who constitute what the regulations term as "reseller-retailer," that is they perform the operations of both the wholesaler and the retailer. As he is a related party, that is to say, as a wholesaler he is distributing the gas to himself as the retailer, his August 1 cost basis on which he may add the seven-cents margin is his cost

from the refinery. That is to say, if he performs both the functions of a wholesaler and a retailer, not only must forego any profit he made at the wholesale stage but he is not even allowed to pass on his actual, provable wholesale costs. According to figures quoted in the National Petroleum News, the average cost per gallon to perform the wholesaling operation alone is 3.5¢. Our survey in New Mexico indicates that the cost there is closer to 4¢ per gallon merely to perform the wholesaling operation alone, that is, to get the gasoline from the refinery to the station retailer. If that 4¢ wholesaling cost is added on to the 6¢ retail cost, it costs the small businessman who performs both the wholesale and retail operations 10¢ in actual, provable costs to pump a gallon of gas. Yet his markup out of which he must pay those costs is 7¢. Therefore, it costs the wholesaler-retailer three cents out of his pocket or savings account every time he walks out on the driveway to pump a gallon of gas. And it goes without saying that his plight becomes even worse as his costs are increased by the refiners and he is not allowed to pass those on. It becomes cheaper to close the station than it does to stay in business.

Under these regulations, as I understand them, if either of these two classes of gasoline distributors were big enough to own their own refinery, then they would be guaranteed their profit margin and also be allowed to pass on their increased costs. Further, they would be allowed to use a May 15, 1973 rather than a January 10 date on which to determine their markup. New Mexico was not in a depressed situation on May 15 as it was on January 10, but because they are not so big it appears they are being penalized. There is no justification for those results.

I am told that the economic theory on which the Phase IV price regulations are premised is that if the retailer is not allowed to pass on his increased costs, then he will apply pressure back up the ladder to the refiner not to increase costs. The economic soundness of such a theory cannot be questioned in an economy where there is the free flow of goods controlled only by the laws of supply and demand. Yet such is not the case with the purchase and sale of gasoline.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We have for some time had a severe gasoline shortage. Refiners can sell all amounts of gasoline they can produce. If dealer "A" refuses to buy from the refiner because the cost of gasoline has increased a penny a gallon, then all he must do is offer it to dealer "B" to sell it. It is a sellers' market. Given this economic fact, this reverse pressure theory fails. Such failure cannot be better illustrated than to realize that in New Mexico, there have been two significant price increases on the part of the refineries already this summer, one in June and a second just days ago with retailers vigorously resisting but unable to do much more.

Mr. Owen, the goals of Phase IV cannot be criticized. It is the means being employed to implement them that must be examined. Can it be justified to allow the refiner to pass on his costs, yet not the retailer? Can it be justified to allow the independent third party reseller, or wholesaler, to charge his costs and also keep his profit margin, yet not even to allow the reseller-retailer to charge his actual proveable wholesale costs, much less his profit margin? I think not! This Council is urgently requested to reexamine its Phase IV oil regulations as they relate to the retail sale of gasoline so that we may move toward that goal as set out in the Economic Stabilization Act itself to set standards which "shall be generally fair and equitable." I commend the Council for its recent announcement to do just that and I urge that it be done quickly.

NEW CUBAN POLICY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, all of us I am sure will be watching with interest for a new direction in the administration of the State Department under its new Secretary. Cuba is one area where Secretary Henry Kissinger should direct his earliest attention.

American policy on Cuba has as we all know been in limbo for the last decade. In that time, several developments have occurred which warrant, in my opinion, a new and detailed look at Cuban policy.

The current state of affairs between our Government and Cuba was summarized in a scholarly but succinct way recently by John N. Plank, a professor of international affairs at the University of Connecticut. I am submitting the summation he offers, as printed in the Los Angeles Times of September 14, 1973, for review by my colleagues at this time:

THE STUBBORN U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA: OUT OF STEP WITH THE WORLD MAJORITY

(By John N. Plank)

Not long ago a senior State Department officer remarked, casually and complacently, "Our Cuba policy is set in concrete." As a statement of fact, his comment is accurate enough: The basic lines of U.S. policy toward the government of Fidel Castro were laid down more than a decade ago and have not been changed substantially since then.

But the durability of a foreign policy is in itself no adequate measure of that policy's effectiveness, and we Americans can rightly ask ourselves whether the established Cuba policy any longer serves our own national interests, the interests of the Cuban people, or the broader interests of the Western Hemisphere and the world.

Cuba policy as designed and implemented under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy,

Johnson and Nixon has depended on two major instruments—political ostracism and economic denial. It has had one constant objective: to do all that might prudently be done to ensure the failure of Premier Castro's experiment with revolutionary socialism.

Castro's regime, however, now has endured for more than 14 years, and its end is nowhere in sight. Moreover, although his experiment cannot be counted a stunning success, it is certainly not an unqualified failure. Ironically, too, U.S. policy has given Castro precisely the scapegoat he needs to account for many of his regime's economic shortcomings, and has provided him with the external enemy he needs to justify his arbitrary, totalitarian rule.

A sensible reading of the record would indicate that fundamental changes in our Cuba policy are called for. That judgment is reinforced when account is taken of the broader hemisphere and global contents within which the United States and Cuba act.

As far as the hemisphere is concerned, the United States must acknowledge that support for its exclusionary policy toward Cuba is eroding rapidly. Canada and Mexico have never accepted that policy and more recently Argentina, Chile, Peru, Barbados, Guyana, Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago have accorded full diplomatic recognition to Castro's government. (Chile's position is expected to change with the overthrow of Salvador Allende.)

It is only a matter of time until the United States, instead of leading a majority of hemispheric states in an effort to isolate Cuba, will find itself in a minority position on the issue. Indeed, the secretary-general of the Organization of American States has already announced that in his view a full review of hemispheric Cuba policy—with an eye toward "lifting the sanctions imposed . . . more than a decade ago"—is in order.

Our European allies—Britain, France, Spain and others—are out of sympathy with our Cuban practice and are taking advantage of our absence to exploit the Cuban market themselves, their trade with Cuba being restricted only by Cuba's ability to pay. Japan, too, has active economic relations with Cuba.

Cuba is an outspoken member of the United Nations, and enjoys good diplomatic relations with most states of the world, both socialist and nonsocialist, whether in Europe, Africa, Asia or the Middle East.

Evidently, then, the United States is out of phase with majority world opinion regarding Cuba, and is finding it increasingly difficult to justify its Cuba policy to others. A decade ago, the United States could claim that ostracism of Castro's Cuba was required because (1) Marxism-Leninism was incompatible with the values of the societies of the Western Hemisphere; (2) Castro was in a military alliance with an extrahemispheric power, the Soviet Union and (3) Castro was attempting to export his revolution to other Latin American countries through subversion, terror and guerrilla warfare.

Today, however, those arguments lack persuasive power. Not only has a socialist government been freely elected in Chile, but also the hand of U.S. friendship has been warmly extended to the People's Republic of China.

Castro's military dependence on the Soviet Union cannot be seen to pose a serious strategic threat to the United States or other American states. To the extent that any such threat exists, it must be viewed as coming directly from the Soviet Union, not from its Caribbean satellite. And Castro's efforts to export his revolution, to make the Andes the Sierra Maestra of Latin America, have been dismaly unsuccessful.

Why, then, does the United States not change its Cuba policy to make it more consonant with the facts and trends of today?

The answer is twofold:

First, if the United States were to change its policy, it would expect some reciprocity

September 24, 1973

from Castro and the available evidence indicates that Castro has concluded that economically he does not need the United States (Cuba has now been brought firmly into the Soviet orbit and is the recipient of a substantially Soviet subsidy), while politically the enmity of the United States is of immense domestic and international usefulness to him.

Second, President Nixon is under no great domestic pressure to change current Cuba policy. Present practice can be maintained indefinitely at low cost and minimal risk. Cuba does not bulk large on the horizons of most Americans; indeed, acute awareness of Cuba is confined largely to members of the Cuban refugee community, and most would be offended by any softening of our official posture.

Early and significant change in our Cuba policy is unlikely, therefore, despite the strong case that can be made for such change. But Mr. Nixon and Henry A. Kissinger have surprised us before. It is conceivable that they will decide that the time has come to reach an accommodation between Washington and Havana.

Kissinger said in Senate testimony last week that the United States was willing to discuss with other OAS members the possibility of modifying the current embargo against Cuba. Perhaps such discussion might be followed by quiet U.S.-Cuban negotiations on specific issues of trade and settlement of small claims by American's over Castro's expropriation of their property.

Already, in February of this year, the two nations signed an agreement to control hijackers through prosecution or extradition.

Such steps toward accommodation deserve the understanding and support of all Americans.

FRED R. KEITH

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on Friday of this past week I had been scheduled to speak on the campus of Campbell College at Buies Creek, N.C. My duties in the Senate prevented my leaving Washington that day.

I was disappointed for a number of reasons. For one thing, I am a former trustee of Campbell College, which is now being guided to further greatness by Norman A. Wiggins, a longtime friend of mine. Dr. Wiggins is a splendid college president, and my State—indeed the entire Nation—will profit immensely from his great efforts. I would so much have enjoyed a trip to the campus.

Second, my mission in planning to go to Buies Creek last Friday was to pay tribute to a distinguished North Carolinian and generous benefactor of Campbell College, Mr. Fred R. Keith of St. Pauls, N.C.

The occasion last Friday, Mr. President, was the dedication of a new golf course at Campbell College, in tribute to Mr. Keith. Preliminary to my speech, I had prepared a few remarks in testimony to the fine citizenship of Mr. Keith.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these preliminary remarks be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FRED R. KEITH

Some advance information was sent to me a few weeks ago about this dedication ceremony today. I found out a lot of things about my good friend, Mr. Fred Keith, that I had not known before. I had known that he was a good, solid, successful citizen—but I was simply astonished at what this fine man has meant to so many.

Much can be said about the blessing that Mr. Keith has been to Campbell College. But the fact is, Mr. Keith, has been a blessing to everything he has touched. He doesn't brag. He goes ahead and does the job that needs doing.

A little research discloses more than 50 organizations, institutions and other endeavors to which he has contributed a remarkable spirit of leadership. Hospitals, schools, agriculture business, banks, municipal government, fire fighting—you name it, and he's supplied his wisdom and his energy. He has been mayor of his town, he has been an active participant in politics and government—doing his best, as always, to make things better than he found them.

He's the kind of citizen who makes me glad that I'm a North Carolinian and an American—because, in a very real way, Mr. Keith symbolizes the spirit of America.

My friend, Norm Wiggins supplied me with an insight that tells something of the nature of Mr. Keith. An official of this fine institution remarked recently that when "Mr. Keith takes an honest and healthy swing at anything, you can be sure that he wants to do it right. He has this reputation at home, too. Mr. Keith is one of the few registered Republicans at St. Pauls. Republicans are outnumbered there by at least ten to one. But the Democrats of St. Pauls have elected Mr. Keith Mayor for six terms. That tells you something about him."

One of Mr. Keith's business associates had a word for those who might wonder about his sponsorship of a golf course.

Mr. Keith is a fine church man, but he's wise enough to know that a facility like a golf course can be a character-builder, and I am sure that will be the result of this splendid facility which will mean so much to the young men and women attending Campbell College.

So, it has been correctly said that Fred R. Keith is one of the most valuable public servants ever produced in Eastern North Carolina. And, of course, as one who has served in years gone by as a trustee of Campbell College, I know personally that Fred Keith is one of the top-ranking trustees ever to serve this institution.

I am here today principally because of my respect and affection for Mr. Keith. He is one of Nature's Noblemen, and I join you in expressing to him a deep sense of appreciation and admiration. God bless you, Mr. Keith.

NUCLEAR SAFETY IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial comment by Thomas G. Ayers, chairman and president of Commonwealth Edison Co., appeared in the July-August issue of Edison Service News, the company's employee magazine. It affords a reasonable perspective on the nuclear safety issue:

THE CASE FOR NUCLEAR POWER

Despite a record covering some 675 plant-years of operation around the world without a single radiation fatality, the safety of nuclear power plants continues to be challenged. Most recently the issue was brought

before the federal courts in connection with a suit seeking the shutdown of 20 nuclear power units, including four of ours. It is therefore appropriate to comment on the extreme concern for safety and protection of the public that governs the building, operation and regulation of every nuclear power plant.

To begin with, no knowledgeable critic today suggests that a nuclear power reactor will explode. What some do charge, however, is that the reactor will run out of cooling water and touch off an unacceptable release of radioactivity.

The matter of concern is the heat which remains in the nuclear fuel rods after a shutdown of the reactor. This heat steadily declines, but it amounts to several per cent of the full-power value for several hours after shutdown. To prevent melting of the fuel rods, the fuel must be cooled even after shutdown. This is done by running the reactor's main coolant system as long as necessary.

Extraordinary measures are taken to build and operate this primary cooling system to minimize any interruption in the flow of cooling water. But in the unlikely event of a failure, it is backed up with emergency core cooling systems which were developed through the exhaustive review process of the Atomic Energy Commission. These back-up cooling devices have no function during normal reactor operation, but would automatically take over in the event of a sudden and total shut-off of the normal coolant flow.

The emergency core cooling systems of each reactor consist of not one but four separate subsystems with some of these built in duplicate. This chain of safety precautions compares with having a half-dozen braking systems on an automobile, each backing up the other. Each of the cooling systems is tested before plant operation to establish that they will provide the proper quantity of water in the required time. They are tested periodically after the unit goes into operation to be sure they are ready for service if needed.

These layers of carefully engineered safeguards, together with the quality assurance and regulatory surveillance that attend the design, construction and operation of all nuclear plants provides the basis of our confidence in nuclear power safety.

A FARM WOMAN SPEAKS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last week Mrs. Gross and I were privileged to attend a dinner with 100 Iowa Farm Bureau Federation women who were visiting Washington.

At that dinner, Mrs. Herbert Johnson, chairman of the Iowa Farm Bureau Women, made an excellent speech on what could well be called the "State of Our Nation."

Mrs. Johnson, the wife of a farmer living near Charles City, Iowa, put special emphasis on the threat to our most basic industry—farming—a threat that is posed by too much government, especially at the Washington level.

Because I believe that Mrs. Johnson spoke for the great majority of this country's farm men and women, I commend her remarks to the Members of Congress from urban districts.

All of us have a vital stake in the well-

being of agriculture and all of us would benefit from a better understanding and appreciation of the problems confronting America's farm families.

The speech follows:

Mrs. HERBERT JOHNSON

Distinguished guests and Farm Bureau friends, we appreciate the presence here of every single one of you. We recognize the dedication, the honesty, and the integrity required to be a good government leader. We are aware, as well, of our own obligation to be a thinking, informed constituency. Only thus will a leader in the political arena be enabled to be a statesman, looking ahead to the way his decisions will affect the next generation, rather than a politician, looking ahead only to the next election. The world is in desperate need of statesmen, and they will be long remembered.

I have chosen to base my brief comments on two quotations: "Life is made of marble and mud", from Hawthorne's House of Seven Gables and "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times . . ." from Dickens' A Tale of Two Cities. Both quotes apply in many respects to our country, to agriculture, and to our own lives. The proportion of marble and mud depends largely on us. We can increase the marble and decrease the mud if we try. Our mix depends on our attitude, our understanding, our appreciation for the things we have, and, more especially, on the amount of effort we are willing to put forth to make things better.

It is the best of times: In many ways we have never had so much reason to be thankful, so much marble in agriculture. Farmers, by and large, even had a good net income this past year. There were record prices and record farm production at the same time. This year we expect a gradual simmering-down of the general economy, which will affect agriculture and the food industry, but there is little doubt that farm prices will move into winter on an upward tilt.

Forecasters assure us that the price bubble is not going to pop in 1973 or in early 1974. Demand for the key grains is solid. The Administration would like to smother food costs, but the price ceilings so far have backfired, as we in Farm Bureau said they would. Economists said they would. Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz said they would. We predicted that the boycotts, the price freezes, and other controls would only delay the inevitable explosion in food prices. With costs, especially feed expense, streaking past prices, livestock producers are taking a second look at their plans for the future. Those who raise corn and beans are inclined to sell rather than feed. They are assured of tiptop grain prices so why risk growing livestock. Also, many farmers have a deep-seated distrust of government planners . . . a feeling that maybe those who engineered the food price freeze, export controls, etc. aren't through tinkering. We well remember all the pressure for members of Congress for a food price freeze last spring when the Senate Democratic caucus voted to roll back food prices to the level of January 16. Senate members, by their vote of 84 to 5 early in August to lift the beef price freeze immediately, apparently are now convinced of the failure of price controls. This failure stuck out for everyone to see, if they would. It now seems likely that the giant tidal wave for price controls on food has moved back out to sea, washing with it the advocates of said price controls. We are sure there will be more efforts, such as export controls, to hold down food prices, but we feel that food at bargain basement prices has finally gone the way of the \$800.00 automobile, of the \$2.00 shirt and the 5¢ cigar.

As a nation, the end of the Vietnam conflict probably overshadows everything else, especially since it was brought about in an honorable way in the eyes of the world, and our POW's brought home.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

There appears to be reduced national tensions as evidenced by fewer protests and hardly any riots. In fact, we've almost forgotten the massive protests, riots, fires, explosions, which were the context in which Watergate evolved. Recent statistics showed that serious crimes declined last year by 2%, marking the first decrease in 17 years.

According to some social and political scientists, there would seem to be some marble even in Watergate in the form of some socially redeeming features to the whole affair. One is that the Watergate revelations will simply inhibit future Presidents and their staffs from abusing their burgeoning power as their predecessors have for at least 30 years. Another is the way the checks and balances system works to restrain an overwhelming Chief Executive. The televised Senate Watergate hearings have offered a refresher course on the Constitution. That document's resilience offers marble to our way of life.

Iowa Farm Bureau Women have awarded 18 2-year scholarships each year for the past 27 years. As we interviewed the top 36 applicants for these scholarships this year, I felt that the quality of education in Iowa must be improving. The young people are better informed, more poised, and more capable of expressing themselves well than were the applicants a few years before them, certainly better than ourselves at that age.

As farmers we are pleased to be engaged in a growth industry. This term may surprise you. We have checked with stock brokers and analysts. They tell us that growth industries have these qualities: (1) a permanent demand for the product (2) an increasing demand for the product (3) an adequate number of trained personnel (4) it must be an efficient industry. Farming measures up by all of these criteria as one of the leading growth industries in the nation.

I am sure you already know this, but I want to say that we are, I think, justifiably proud of the importance of agriculture to Iowa. We are marble to our beloved state. Every \$1.00 of farm income generates at least \$3½ of income up and down Main Street and in the factories and offices of Iowa's cities and towns. This economic fact is the weather vane of Iowa's future. Iowa's rich soil already produces more wealth than all the gold mines in the world. Our food production is the envy of the world—it wants more of our farm output, and is willing to pay high prices for it, particularly for high protein food—animal proteins. This growing need will place an even greater demand on Iowa's highly efficient partnership between industry and farmers. Farm Bureau ladies, it should make us stand tall.

We are not complainers. We are not protestors. We recognize that, in many ways it is "the best of times". In most ways there is more marble in our way of life than ever before.

However, in some ways, it is "the worst of times". It is important that we talk about problems so that we can seek solutions. Even though our national posture and our personal lives contain most marble, the mud in the crevices can be extremely dangerous if not given attention. This is our purpose in discussing the matters of concern to us. One is the overdependence on controls and edicts to try to correct problems. A recent survey showed that those who call for more and more state intervention into the lives of individuals are calling for a policy which the majority of Americans reject. The plight of the American Indian is conspicuous evidence of the sorry results of extremes of manipulation and intervention. They resent the paternalism of people coming out to the reservations asking only to be of service in their own inimitable ways, quoting from Vine Deloria, Jr. in his book, "Custer Died for Your Sins." We in agriculture resent, also, the rules and regulations imposed by

persons who know better what is good for us than we know ourselves. There is a dangerous lack of understanding and appreciation for the private enterprise system. Obviously the functions of price are poorly understood. The governmental approach to economic problems has too often seemed to be one of floors, ceilings, or price fixing, none of which solve the underlying economic inequity.

Mrs. Nullinger has very ably expressed our concern over inflation. There's no way to stop inflation unless we stop building into our economy cost-price-push factors like increasing the minimum wage, unemployment compensation, social security benefits, etc. These by themselves sound good until we realize that inflation eats up the increases, and does inestimable harm to those on fixed incomes.

Farmers are extremely concerned about transportation strikes. We certainly do not object to longshoremen receiving higher pay if the demand for their labor and the supply available so dictate. We are opposed to the government legislating longshoremen's and Teamsters' Union monopoly power to lock down the transportation system of America. The country cannot permit transportation strikes. Consequently, we must either establish machinery for settling these strikes as they occur, or settle each one by an act of Congress. We are normally opposed to compulsion, but in dealing with a monopoly like transportation, we believe compulsory arbitration of "the best final offer" variety should be a big improvement over political settlements dictated by Congress, with the inevitable, disastrous delays. The good prices prevailing in agriculture depend heavily on export markets. Foreign buyers tell us they would like to depend on us exclusively for some product or products but dare not because of the fear of a dock strike. Why should a handful of laborers have the authority to lock farmers out of foreign markets?

Some unwarranted restrictions in the form of environmental and safety standards dangle as a millstone from the farmers' neck. As a practical matter, on the bulk of Iowa farms, you will find owner-operators and family members involved in the actual work. Safety to them is a personal matter. If the issue were simply one of safety, the remedy would be simple. It isn't. The farmer does not have the power to "pass on" added costs of production entailed in the use of safety and environmental controls.

No one appreciates the beauty of the countryside more than do farmers. No one is more concerned about family health than farm women. We support reasonable, intelligent efforts to prevent pollution. Iowa Farm Bureau Women selected this as one of their major study and action program emphases the past two years. We pledge our support for any necessary legislation to avoid jeopardizing the health of consumers.

On the other hand, some proposals being considered would make it virtually impossible for the family-type farmer to keep on farming. With today's consumer unrest, it is inconceivable that consumers would support the imposition of any restrictions which would place added pressure on food costs, particularly when the interest and position of the vast majority of the nation's farmers has been virtually ignored. Many of the standards at best attack pocket problems which are clearly localized. We get concerned about government leaders who pay lip service to preserving the family farm then vote for rules and regulations which definitely threaten its survival.

Our final concern is over a fundamental change which seems to be taking place in our process of translating public opinion into laws. More and more our government is resembling the kind of "direct democracy" about which James Madison wrote: "Such democracies have ever been spectacles

September 24, 1973

of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property." Our founding fathers felt the true interest of our country would be best served by a representative democracy whereby the people elect representatives to write the laws for them. Working at its best, the public views would be refined and enlarged by being passed through the medium of a chosen body of citizens with wisdom, called a legislature or a Congress.

The instantaneous and universal reporting of public events which is now occurring could lead into this kind of direct democracy. The Greek system, where citizens wrote laws in open assemblies, did not lead to good government. As Benjamin Franklin said, when asked following the Constitutional Convention, "What have we?", he replied, "A Republic, if you can keep it!"

To try to diminish the clashes between our executive and legislative branches of government, which intensified beginning with Franklin Roosevelt, and has climaxed in the Watergate mess, we need Senators and Representatives chosen for courage and statesmanship by a constituency willing to support them with patience and forbearance. We would like to try to be that kind of constituency.

UNITY REMAINS THE GOAL

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as a further clarification of the West German Supreme Court's interpretation of the basic treaty between East and West Germany, I am including in the RECORD an explanatory article from the Cologne paper. I have placed in the RECORD additional statements on two earlier occasions so that the Congress might have an opportunity to examine what is at stake in this verdict:

[Translation from the German article from *Kölner Rundschau*, Aug. 1, 1973]

UNITY REMAINS THE GOAL

(By Rudolf Heizler)

A verdict which satisfies both parties, is a rarity. That applies to the ruling of Karlsruhe on the basic treaty. The federal government exults over rejection of Bavaria's claim, it is triumphant because the seven judges did not declare the treaty incompatible with the constitution. The Bavarian government is satisfied because the judges accorded a very clear interpretation to the basic treaty as well as to the basic law in the area of reunification.

The ruling of Karlsruhe does not only effect the past by giving its subsequent constitutional blessing to a treaty already in validity. At least of equal importance is its effect on the future. The verdict imposes very close limits on the political activities of the government vis-à-vis the GDR which must not be transgressed. The decision of July 31, 1973 is no blank cheque for the coming negotiations between the two parts of Germany.

In regard to the subject matter at issue, it is probably the most important verdict ever passed by Karlsruhe. It receives added weight through the fact that it was passed unanimously. There is no minority vote. That gives the treaty an unusual moral power, which no politician will find it easy to ignore.

For the federal government the reasons for the verdict also contain something of a scolding by stating that in regard to the timing on validating agreements it should be born in mind in the future that every law can be examined. The court wants no repetition of the time pressure applied to this treaty. The guiding principles of the decision state expressly that the executive should not try to disregard the constitutional court. Most likely, the court would not have accepted disregard by the government in this proceeding either, if it had not been determined from the start to give its constitutional seal on the basic treaty.

Some parts of the guiding principles deserve emphasis: The claim to reunification is confirmed expressly as "restitution of the national unity." Willy Brandt's notion of the nation as an eternal value beyond the existing borders with common cultural traditions of both German states obviously does not suffice the constitutional court.

A German citizen is not only a citizen of the Federal Republic. The inhabitants of the GDR also possess German citizenship and thus full legal protection, just like any other German citizen. There are not two German citizenships, one for the FRG and one for the GDR. That means that every resident of the GDR may stay in the Federal Republic (for example following his successful flight), if his flight was motivated by purely materialistic or private and not by political reasons (such as persecution because of his oppositional attitude). Restriction to the political right to asylum is thus eliminated.

The twin character of the basic treaty is also clearly stressed. It is basically a treaty of international law. However, according to its substance it is a treaty of a special nature which settles "above all inter-se relations", i.e. relations between each other. The GDR is therefore no foreign state in the eyes of the court, and Member of Parliament Dietrich-Wilhelm Rollmann (CDU) may continue to use the address "fellow-countrymen" when he is in East Berlin. Trade must not turn into "external trade" and may thus not be subjected to custom duties.

The wall, the barbed wire, the death-stripe and the shooting order are not compatible with this basic treaty according to the verdict of the seven judges. These are clear words which are certain to be met with great uneasiness on the other side. If the federal government takes this verdict seriously—and that should not be doubted after it welcomed it so heartily—its negotiations with the GDR will become very difficult in the successor agreements. The constitutional court has limited its leverage very closely. Any efforts to consider the GDR as a state like a hundred other states would be clearly unconstitutional. Agreements to that effect will be canceled by Karlsruhe.

Relations between West Germany and East Germany are not relations subject to international law. But neither may they turn into international relations. The foreign minister of the GDR, Otto Winzer, contested the special relationship between the two parts of Germany during the ratification debate in the East German "People's Chamber" on June 13. Thus interpretation of the basic treaty differs considerably with regard to a very decisive issue. The constitutional court sees the treaty differently, and it forces the federal government to see it differently than Otto Winzer.

The verdict does not permit development of the basic treaty in direction of international relations. Reunification and state unity continue to be the objectives. The federal government will have to enter the next round of the inner-German negotiations on this basis. That will surely not delight those responsible on the other side of the wall and the barbed wire.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SKYLAB PROVES MAN'S FLEXIBILITY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the *Japan Times*, June 28, 1973, offers a good perspective on the Skylab program as it proceeds with outstanding success into its second mission. This editorial describes well the achievements of astronauts Charles Conrad, Joseph Kerwin, and Paul Weitz, who capably and courageously made Skylab work when it appeared that the entire mission would be lost. As the remainder of the Skylab program unfolds, it becomes clearer each day that their achievements provide substantial lessons for the future of the space program. Clearly, man has a significant role to play in repairing, retrieving, and altering during the course of a mission the spacecraft that performs useful functions for us here on Earth. The achievement of Skylab makes the development of the Space Shuttle, now underway, even more important. The editorial follows:

[From the *Japan Times*, June 28, 1973]

SKYLAB PROVES MAN'S FLEXIBILITY

The three American astronauts in the first Skylab mission established a long list of impressive records but above all proved that man can not only survive but think and work effectively during prolonged space voyages.

Their achievement makes possible the second Skylab mission. Three more astronauts are scheduled to rendezvous with Skylab July 27 to begin 56 days of occupancy—twice the time spent aloft by the first crew. And the first and two forthcoming missions will represent a big step toward the day when men will be able to visit Mars and the other planets.

American astronauts Charles Conrad, Dr. Joseph Kerwin and Paul Weitz orbited for 28 days, breaking the old record set by the ill-fated Soviet Soyuz crew which remained in space for 23 days and 18 hours. The Soviet spacemen were killed in preparing to descend to earth.

The Americans manned the largest and heaviest spacecraft ever launched. Skylab is 40 meters long and weighs 100 tons. They made 391 orbits around the earth traveling 1,700,000 kilometers—both new records for manned orbiting space flights. And for the first time in space history, they carried out repair work outside an orbiting craft.

For Skylab commander Conrad, the space flight that ended last week was a personal achievement. He now has spent more time in space than any other man—49 days, one hour and eight minutes during four missions. And although Conrad is 43 and older than the other two astronauts, he experienced less trouble in readjusting to the earth's gravity after the crew splashed down in the Pacific Ocean in their Apollo spaceship.

For 24 hours after the astronauts came back, there was concern about their physical condition and some doubts if man could withstand the rigors of weightlessness for such a long period of time. All the astronauts were wobbly on their feet and suffered from dizziness and nausea due to ear and circulatory difficulties in readjusting from zero gravity to the earth's gravity.

However, after 12 hours of sleep, doctors pronounced that all three had made a rapid recovery, and they were given permission to

fly to the Western White House at San Clemente to meet visiting Soviet Communist Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev and President Richard Nixon.

Conrad never had any doubts. Immediately after the splashdown, he declared the mission a success and stated that he and the other two Skylab crew members had proved that men could live and work in extended periods of weightlessness. The doctors later concurred.

But the "fix-it" crew of Skylab did much more than prove men could adjust to weightlessness for four weeks. Through their risky repair work on a solar panel, they saved the entire Skylab project from failure. In Houston, Skylab Director Kenneth Kleinke made this interesting observation: "We demonstrated that man, whether he be on the ground or in the air, is the most flexible, adaptive, non-specialized machine in existence today."

We can all draw encouragement from the fact that we are still better than machines and that there is the need if not the necessity for manned space flights. Only men with tools saved Skylab from disaster.

Although testing the endurance of man in prolonged weightlessness was one objective of the Skylab program, there were others of great scientific importance. The Skylab crew brought back to earth 30,000 photographs of the sun which were the clearest yet taken, 14,000 photographs of the earth's resources and nine miles of magnetic tape which recorded other earth data.

One of the most spectacular observations was made only a few days before the mission ended. The Skylab crew was able to photograph a massive solar flare from the sun measuring 40,233 kilometers in width. Excited scientists were convinced that these photos would help explain this phenomenon which periodically disrupts radio communications on earth and causes magnetic storms that cause power blackouts.

The accomplishments of the first Skylab mission were many and significant not only for the future of space travel but in increasing man's knowledge of the sun and his own earth. We look forward to the even longer missions of Skylab and to the knowledge which will be obtained for the benefit of all of us on earth.

MERITORIOUS BILL

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I joined the Honorable CHARLES VANIK and other Members of the House of Representatives in the introduction of the Fuel Economy Act of 1973.

Stated simply, the purpose of this legislation is to stimulate the development and sale of more efficient automobiles by imposing a graduated excise tax based on fuel consumption. It would also have the effect of reducing the Nation's energy demands in future years.

I was pleased to read an editorial recently in the Clearwater Sun newspaper in Clearwater, Fla., commenting on the legislation and calling it a "meritorious bill."

Mr. VANIK and the other sponsors of the bill will be pleased to know that there is a good deal of support for this legislation and I would like at this point to have the editorial by Mr. James L.

"Colonel Clearwater" Beardsley printed in the RECORD.

MERITORIOUS BILL

We are impressed with the common sense and obvious merit behind a consumer-oriented bill introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Reps. Bill Gunter (D-Fla.) and Charles A. Vanik (D-Ohio).

They have introduced the Fuel Economy Act of 1973 designed to stimulate the development of more efficient automobiles while at the same time reducing the nation's energy demands.

Under the Gunter-Vanik bill, a graduated excise tax on autos would favor cars offering higher gas mileage per gallon, and would become effective with the 1977 model year, when the cars go on sale July 1, 1976.

A standardized testing procedure would be developed by the Department of Transportation, and any cars offering 20 miles per gallon or more would be tax-free.

Reps. Gunter and Vanik point out that the average American car now gets 13 miles to the gallon. The excise tax on these would be \$120 to \$140 for the 1977 model year, and if the manufacturer has made no improvements, the next year the tax would double.

The bill stipulates that revenues raised from the tax would go into a fund to assist in research into and development of alternatives to the internal combustion engine.

The bill would offer a strong incentive for auto manufacturers to produce a more efficient product. In view of the high cost of gasoline and the gasoline shortage, this is a measure that should get Congressional approval.

NATIONAL OFFICE FOR MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 10462, to establish a national office of migrant and seasonal farmworkers within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This legislation would affect between 4 and 6 million U.S. migrant and seasonal farmworkers and place the responsibility for coordinating the program in HEW. The Federal office would be responsible for the development of a national farmworker policy which includes setting program priorities and goals and allocating funds to meet the needs of agricultural workers. The bill also directs the Secretary of HEW to appoint a special task force that would study and investigate the problems facing farmworkers and develop a national migrant policy and strategy.

This proposal would replace our present system of resolving migrant problems through a multitude of Government departments and agencies. This diffusion of programs has resulted in ambiguity and conflicts in goals, lack of a unifying approach to migrant needs and frustration among farmworkers. My bill would correct these wrongs and make one single agency at the national level responsible for migrant programs.

A companion measure, H.R. 10461, would prohibit revenue sharing under

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Federal laws and programs designed to serve migrant and seasonal farmworkers. Due to the mobility of the farmworker population State and local governments are unable to meet their needs. In fact, they have traditionally shirked their responsibility to migrants.

It is ironic that in a country popularly thought of as affluent, migrants continue to live in poverty and despair. Their life encompasses a rootless, almost nomadic existence characterized by low wages, poor housing, and often long periods of unemployment. In 1971 nearly 1.6 million workers existed solely on farm wage labor. On the average they were employed 94 days, earning a total of only \$1,095—an average daily wage of about \$11.95. Wages for migrant farmworkers continue to be the lowest of the working poor. In addition, the work itself is unpredictable. Even when a worker has traveled many hundreds of miles to harvest a crop, adverse weather conditions like floods or frost may mean no work at all. Equipment breakdowns and shortages can cause further delays.

But even if he finds work, he is not likely to receive the minimum hourly wage for farmworkers, which is presently \$1.30. Further there are virtually no overtime provisions in this type of work. Untrustworthy employers often manipulate the wages and hours so that a migrant or seasonal farmworker will get even less than he thought he was bargaining for. This situation helps to explain why children of migrant families are forced to work. It is estimated that one fourth of the farm wage workers in the United States are under 16 years of age.

Child labor has resulted in the loss of educational opportunity for farmworker families. Migrant children, for instance, are enrolled in school sometimes less than 80 percent of the school year. During that year they are likely to attend a number of schools in different areas. They are usually not accepted by their classmates, nor understood by their teachers. What they experience is a deep sense of rejection and alienation from society and its institutions.

Another obstacle facing migrant workers is unsanitary and unsafe housing provided by growers. Some migrant workers and their families have been known to live in chicken coops with no sanitary facilities. Growers have used the need for housing as an advantage to keep workers from organizing and bargaining for fair wages and adequate living conditions. It has been reported that some labor camps have become virtual prisons for the workers and their children.

This cycle of poverty and lack of opportunity is perpetuated by the daily advances made in farm technology. While many of these improvements have helped increase our crop yield, they have also caused further unemployment among seasonal farmworkers. Since 1960 the need for seasonal farm labor has dropped nearly 30 percent, and further job losses due to mechanization will continue to occur.

This is a very stark picture but one

September 24, 1973

which is painfully real. The establishment of a national office for migrant and seasonal farmworkers would be an important beginning in meeting this Nation's responsibility to the migrant population. Further, it would help consolidate the various migrant programs now scattered throughout the Federal bureaucracy. Instead of duplication of efforts, conflicting program standards, there would be a national migrant policy and strategy.

I firmly believe that both H.R. 10461 and 10462 would bring about a rededication to improve the social and economic conditions facing farmworkers. Further, these bills would create a national office and unifying approach so that farmworkers can begin to better their life and share in this country's prosperity. I urge my colleagues to join me in establishing this national approach and commitment.

JOSEPH MANN, JR., ON THE SHORTAGE OF BLACK DOCTORS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one major reason for the present crisis in health care faced by black Americans is the tragic shortage of minority doctors. For too many years American medical schools have practiced racial exclusion and have refused to train black doctors. Now, even as the number of minority medical students is increasing, it is evident that there is still a drastic underrepresentation of blacks in the health professions. In addition, the Nixon administration has blocked attempts to improve the delivery of medical care to all people in the United States, further intensifying the shortage of quality health services to low-income families.

Joseph Mann, Jr., senior vice president for operations of the New York City Health and Hospitals Corp. has explained the situation in an article appearing in the September 15, 1973, issue of the Amsterdam News as part of the newspaper's series on "Blacks in America":

BLACK HEALTH CARE: ONLY 7,000 BLACK DOCTORS

(By Joseph Mann, Jr.)

The Kerner Commission reported that the nation is moving towards two separate societies, one Black and one white. One poor and one affluent. The truth of this statement is apparent in the area of health care.

Although health care is an annual multi-billion dollar business Blacks are receiving an ever decreasing share of health care services these monies provide. The cost of health insurance is rising with the costs of health care services. Voluntary and private hospitals are still rejecting Blacks who cannot pay.

While group medical practices funded by state and federal monies are popping up in fancy buildings throughout the nation, the Black family has seen little money spent in building these facilities in our communities.

Health care services remain fragmented and sparse.

HEALTH CARE CRISIS

With the increasing exodus of doctors and other health professionals from the inner cities, Blacks are faced with a growing health care crisis. Even if transportation were provided for Blacks to travel outside their communities for health care, they do not have the money nor the health insurance coverage to pay for the care they would receive.

Health care has developed into a multi-layered problem. The lack of adequate resources in terms of money, facilities, and professionals in the Black community feeds upon the problem of the inadequate allocation of existing resources. Blacks must work to get additional city, state and federal monies for facilities and the education of manpower while we work towards the restructuring of priorities in the present services.

Although the nation is faced with a monetary crisis, monies are available to meet the health care needs of the people. With the end of the Vietnam War millions of dollars which flowed into that effort can now be redirected.

NEED QUALITY SERVICES

In the reallocation of existing resources voluntary and private institutions which have received public monies for their survival should be held accountable. They should be required to provide their share of comprehensive and quality health care to the poor Blacks.

Modes of health care delivery such as Neighborhood Family Care Centers have been developed which revolve around the treatment of the family as a unit.

This health care vehicle seeks to treat existing health care problems with the emphasis on preventive care and educating the family in how to maintain good health once it has been acquired.

Information on nutrition, proper diet, immunizations, exercises and the vital roles they play in health care is provided to the family as a unit instead of on an erratic basis. Blacks have relied too heavily on the fragmented care received during visits to the hospital emergency rooms.

However, there are not enough outpatient facilities to cope with the growing demand for services in the areas of mental health, child care, drug abuse and more.

ONLY 7,000 BLACK PHYSICIANS

Through community organizations, legislation, community boards of municipal hospitals and through whatever mechanisms they can Blacks must get these resources into their communities at convenient locations and operating at hours tailored to their needs.

Grants, loans and scholarships must be found to graduate Black health professionals. Of a total of 305,000 physicians in the nation only 7,000 are Black. Methods must be de-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

vised whereby these Blacks are encouraged to return to their communities.

HASTINGS' TEAM IS A WINNER

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, we hear considerable talk these days about the San Diego Padres coming or not coming to Washington.

I, of course, am among those thousands who look forward to the return of big league baseball to the Nation's Capital.

However, should the decision be an adverse one, and I certainly hope not, I am suggesting that all is not lost for right here on Capitol Hill, we have a team that might as well be just what Washington sports fans are looking for—a champion.

I am speaking for Jim's Giants, winners of the House Congressional Softball League for 1973.

Jim's Giants, and I say this with unabashed immodesty, was sponsored by me but I hasten to add that I had nothing to do with the team management, which no doubt accounts for its lofty record of 16 victories against only 1 loss.

I will be merciful and not mention the names of the Congressmen whose teams suffered defeat at the hands of Jim's Giants but I do want to pay tribute to those who so ably represented my office.

Making up the pennant winning team were Terry and Linda Rothschild, Matt Cary, John Mullen, George Lynch, Randy Cole, Jay Woodall, Dick Fontaine, Bob Johnson, Ellen Rayner, Ellen Weick, Susie Chandler, Clare Ryland, Art Lang, Dick Raeon, John Wisiackas, Jim Wright, Bruce Thevenot, Bill and Mike Malone, George Altenbach, Scott Bell, Art Kusinski, and last but far from least, the team captain, Jennifer Sampsell, who not only is a good long ball hitter but also has a stellar record batting out correspondence as a secretary in my office.

RETAIL PUMP PRICES—REGULAR GASOLINE

[In cents]

	Pump prices			Increase in purchase price interim period	Total loss in gross profit		Pump prices			Increase in purchase price interim period	Total loss in gross profit
	Sept. 11, 1972	Sept. 11, 1973	Decrease (Increase)				Sept. 11, 1972	Sept. 11, 1973	Decrease (Increase)		
Springfield, Ill.	38.9	36.7	-2.2	+2.0	-4.2	Danville, Ill.	38.9	35.2	-3.7	+2.0	-5.7
Jacksonville, Ill.	38.9	35.2	-3.7	+2.0	-5.7	Marshalltown, Iowa	35.9	34.2	-1.7	+2.5	-4.2
Champaign, Ill.	37.9	35.2	-2.7	+2.0	-4.7	Ottumwa, Iowa	36.9	34.2	-2.7	+2.5	-5.2
Bloomington, Ill.	37.9	36.2	-1.7	+2.0	-3.7	Clinton, Iowa	34.9	35.2	(+ .3)	+2.5	-2.2
Galesburg, Ill.	37.9	36.7	-1.2	+2.0	-3.2	Waterloo, Iowa	35.9	35.2	-.7	+2.5	-3.2

Unless the regulations are changed, an important segment of our fuel delivery system will be destroyed and along with it the fuel supply of many consumers,

who will be unable to find alternative sources during the approaching cold winter months.

The result of all of this will be a de-

PETROLEUM MARKETS AND PHASE IV REGULATIONS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, phase IV price regulations for petroleum marketers have placed independent service station operators and fuel dealers and jobbers in an impossible economic situation. Many are operating at a loss and face bankruptcy. Some have already gone bankrupt and are no longer serving their customers who must now frantically search for new fuel sources.

Arbitrarily the Cost of Living Council has frozen the margins which independent service stations may charge at the January 10, 1973, levels, while stations owned by the major oil companies may charge May 15 prices.

For example, one small dealer in Illinois operates several service stations. This dealer purchases petroleum products from a major refiner and performs the functions of both jobber and retailer within one enterprise. Under phase IV regulations, he is defined as a reseller-retailer.

As I understand the regulations, there are three types of retailers defined: Retailer, reseller-retailer, and refiner-retailer. Retailer and reseller-retailer prices are limited to August 1, 1973, costs plus gross profit margins of January 10, 1973. Refiner-retailers are permitted to use the pump prices as of May 15, 1973. These regulations clearly discriminate in favor of refiner-retailers and should be revised immediately.

Retail prices were depressed at most gasoline retailers on January 10, 1973. Therefore, their gross profit margins were inadequate to meet normal operating expenses and phase IV has locked them into this loss position.

The effect of having profit margins frozen at January 10 levels upon this small dealer in Illinois is no profit at all, only losses. Following is a chart of this dealer's prices both 1 year ago and today. You will note that in each case his prices are lower today than they were a year ago—due to phase IV regulations—yet he must pay more for the gasoline he sells today than he did last year. Consequently, he is now operating at a loss.

Chart follows:

increase in competition among fuel suppliers, an increase in monopoly power among the major oil producers, and higher prices for all consumers. Already

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

this trend is becoming an epidemic, and the Cost of Living Council's oil pricing policies are one of the major causes.

There is no rhyme or reason for this discrimination, which requires independent stations to sell gas at below cost, while the major stations are permitted to make a handsome profit.

When House Joint Resolution 727, to make continuing appropriations, is before the House tomorrow, I shall offer the following amendment to end that discrimination:

None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Cost of Living Council to formulate or carry out a program which discriminates among petroleum marketers in the method of establishing prices for petroleum products.

I hope that the amendment will be accepted. All it will do is require that all service station owners be treated alike, no matter where the Cost of Living Council sets the price of gasoline.

COMPLETE STATE "SPACE MAP"

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Birmingham Post-Herald of August 27, 1973 carried a most interesting article on the first "space map" of Alabama. This program, which is a part of the Earth Resources Technology Satellite effort, is providing improved and up-to-date mapping services which, heretofore, were either unavailable or too expensive to be done by other more conventional means. Space related activity of this type is improving our daily lives. Our need is to continue to support this type of work and intensify our efforts for the benefit of all the people. The article follows:

COMPLETE STATE "SPACE MAP" NOW MADE AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC

TUSCALOOSA.—State Geologist Phillip E. LaMoreaux Sunday announced the availability of the first complete "space map" of Alabama compiled through pictures taken from the Earth Resources Technology Satellite.

LaMoreaux said Alabama is the first among all state geological survey offices in the nation to make the map available to the general public.

He said 11 photographs imaged by the satellite between last July and this past March have been made into a mosaic to produce the map.

"The result is a cooperative effort and example of the continuing technological revolution within the earth sciences," LaMoreaux said. The mosaic was pieced together at the Experiments and Evaluation Office of the Mississippi Test Facility at Bay St. Louis by Henry T. Svehlak. The text was written by C. Welchowsky of the Remote Sensing Section of the Geological Survey of Alabama.

The scale of the map being released to the public is about one inch to 18 miles. LaMoreaux said that a band collecting red light was used to construct the Alabama map, providing maximum contrast between cleared land and forested land. This information, he said, will allow state agencies to plan for Alabama's growth and development more efficiently than in the past.

Cultural features are particularly prominent on red band products, he said, and all Alabama's major cities appear in light grey tones.

Cultivated land of the Black Belt, which runs from east to west across Alabama, appears as a very light tone, while the forest areas of the Bankhead, Talladega and Conecuh National Forests appear quite dark as does the large pine forest areas north of Mobile and Baldwin Counties.

The photograph used for Mobile Bay was apparently made in the spring, LaMoreaux said, because suspended sediment is quite evident, indicating heavy discharges from rains.

Several undetected lineaments and circular patterns were found in the photographs on Alabama's surface, indicating zones of possible mineralization and ground water movement, he said.

Copies of the map are available from the publication sales department of the Geological Survey of Alabama at the University of Alabama.

NCPC VETO POWER—H.R. 9682

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as one who has served on the National Capital Planning Commission as a representative of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on planning provisions in H.R. 9682.

This bill, which will be considered by this august body during the month of October, incorporates a unique mechanism for the protection of the Federal interest in planning within the District of Columbia.

In title II, section 203 of H.R. 9682, the National Capital Planning Commission is authorized to act as the primary agency for insuring the preservation of the historic and national character of this Nation's Capital, both through review and veto power over comprehensive plans for this great city, and through controls over development in the city. To accomplish these ends, section 203 provides that the District of Columbia City Council must submit all comprehensive plans, or plan amendments, to the Planning Commission for its determination of the impact of the plans on the interests and functions of the Federal establishment. The sole judgment of the plan's impact is to be made by the Commission.

The NCPC has a 45-day period in which to make its decision. If the Planning Commission determines that a comprehensive plan or a plan amendment has a negative impact upon Federal interests and activities, H.R. 9682 requires that the city council either modify the plans to remove the source of the negative impact, or that it submit them to the Commission for reconsideration. In the event of a second determination that the plans would have a negative impact on the Federal interest, the city council would be forbidden to implement them.

In addition to the previously stated means for protecting the Federal interest in planning, the National Capital Planning Commission is given the sole authority to determine the conformity of zoning regulations proposed for Washington, D.C. Under the laws and regu-

September 24, 1973

lations of the District of Columbia, building permits are not issued to a contractor or to a developer unless the design and purposes of the building are consistent with the zoning ordinances for the structure's proposed site. The authority granted the NCPC insures that not only would any plans for the District preserve the character and design of the city, but that development and construction in the District would not proceed unless it were equally as protection of the Federal interest in this city.

J. HOLLAND RANNELLS

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I was saddened by the death of J. Holland Rannels, an unselfish community leader and pioneer of cable television in western Maryland. The Cumberland News-Times recently ran a background story on Mr. Rannels which I would like to share with you now in memory of his contributions to our area and the Nation. J. Holland Rannels will be missed, but his accomplishments will long be remembered.

The article follows:

PRESIDENT OF PVTV DIES AT AGE 70

J. Holland Rannels of Romney, founder and president of the Potomac Valley Television Company in Cumberland, died yesterday at Hampshire Memorial Hospital. He was 70.

Mr. Rannels, a former operator of Chrysler-Plymouth agency in Romney, came to develop one of the first, and at one time the largest community cable television system in the United States. The local operation began with three channels that year, eventually expanding to the present 12-channel system.

He was a past director of the National Television Association and a member of the Pioneer Club of Cable Television.

A member of Romney United Methodist Church, he served on its official board. He also was a member of All Ghan Shrine Club, its Provost Guard, BPO Elks Lodge 63, Western Maryland Chamber of Commerce, South Cumberland Business and Civic Association and Cumberland Country Club. In Romney, he was a member of Clinton Lodge 86, AF & AM, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, an honorary member of Volunteer Fire Company and a director of the Hampshire County Library.

Mr. Rannels was an Army Air Force veteran of World War II. Active in community affairs in Romney, he was instrumental in the founding and building of Hampshire Memorial Hospital, the Romney swimming pool, remodeling of the United Methodist Church, restoration of Indian Mound Cemetery and Branch Mountain Cemetery at Three Churches. The football field at Hampshire High School was named Rannels Field in appreciation for his participation in that effort.

A native of Three Churches, W. Va., he was a son of the late John B. and Hettie (Martin) Rannels.

Surviving are his widow, Anita (Moler) Rannels, a daughter, Mrs. Buford L. Saville, Cumberland; a son, John R. Rannels, Romney, four grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

The body is at the Shaffer Funeral Home in Romney, where friends will be received after 2 p.m. today.

A service will be conducted at Romney Methodist Church tomorrow at 2 p.m. Rev.

Ronald R. Brooks will officiate and interment will be in Indian Mound Cemetery. The body will be taken to the church one hour prior to the service. A graveside service will be in charge of Clinton Lodge 87.

Pallbearers will be R. L. Sumner, Bernard Hughes, Ralph W. Haines, William E. Orr Jr., Richard J. Hare, and Bruce Anderson.

The family requests that expression of sympathy take the form of contributions to the Hampshire County Memorial Hospital or Library in Romney.

WELFARE REFORM—WHAT NEXT?

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the battle over the family assistance plan, one of this country's leading social policy experts has come forward with some useful new approaches to the problems of poverty and dependency.

Mitchell Ginsberg, writing in *Commonweal*, maintains that we must return to the original concept of welfare as a residual program for those with no viable alternatives.

But first, Ginsberg goes on to say, we must provide avenues of escape from the current bloated and chaotic welfare system by strengthening social insurance programs and implementing a policy of full employment.

I want to take this opportunity to insert Mitchell Ginsberg's article in the RECORD:

WELFARE REFORM—WHAT NEXT?

(By Mitchell I. Ginsberg)

Those of us who are still concerned about the problems of poverty in America must recognize the fact that there will be no significant reform of the welfare system for the next few years. Politics and programmatic inadequacy killed the Family Assistance Plan, and no well-conceived or enthusiastically-supported alternative can be expected in the near future.

That is not to say that the urgency for welfare reform has lessened, either among the nation's 15 million welfare recipients, the approximately 40 million more who are below or just above the poverty line, the program's administrators, public officials and millions of American taxpayers—all of whom agree that welfare is a failure. But there, unanimity ends. The nation is divided on the definition of poverty—what it is and what to do about it; indeed, whether to do anything about it at all. Therefore, the urgent jobs today are reviving a concern for America's poor, developing a consensus on solutions and arousing a constituency. I suggest that this can be done by concluding the arguments about why FAP failed, resisting regressive legislation, correctly defining poverty problems and subjecting alternative solutions to rigorous analysis before formulating the next round of legislation.

First, some thoughts on the three-year struggle over the FAP. Those who were knowledgeable enough about it to explain and fight for it were probably too close to it to be objective about why FAP failed. Jim Welsh of the *Washington Star* in a thoughtful and penetrating *New York Times Magazine* article of January 7, 1973 and Pat Moynihan in his thorough and interesting book, *The Politics of a Guaranteed Income* have provided differing interpretations of what happened and why.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In placing the Welsh article in the Congressional Record, Senator Abraham Ribicoff, who played a strong leadership role in the fight for welfare reform, said: "Welfare reform . . . was the victim of political posturing and misunderstanding on all sides. There is enough blame to go around, but there is no point in dwelling on that theme." While that makes sense, perhaps some looking back will help avoid repeating mistakes and false allegations in the future.

I do differ with Pat Moynihan in his interpretation of the role of social workers and liberals, however defined. What he overlooks is that many individuals and groups opposed the bill mainly because they didn't think it was good enough. Whether they were right or wrong is a matter of judgment. But it was not concern for their jobs or lack of concern for the poor that motivated their opposition.

Many who supported and worked to secure the passage of FAP also disagreed with some of its specific provisions, and sought to have them changed. The President's bill as it passed the House under the leadership of Ways and Means Committee Chairman Mills—with its coverage of the working poor and its provision for federal standards and administration—had good potential for progress in welfare. But we did not think FAP was "the greatest piece of legislation since the New Deal," a claim that the bill certainly contradicted as time went on and it was weakened rather than strengthened. What we did see in FAP was something better than what we had, or were likely to get in the near future. It was to be a beginning, not an end.

To suggest that liberals killed the bill is to overlook the work done by such organizations as the AFL-CIO, the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, the UAW, the American Jewish Committee and many others. It is true that many social workers and their allies opposed the bill out of conviction even if sometimes with exaggerated rhetoric. However, most of them would be astonished by the contention that they had that much influence on Congress.

Who can ever really know why a bill fails to pass? In my judgment FAP's best chance was in 1969-70. It failed then because of inadequate preparation and effort by the Administration and other supporters; the determined opposition of Senator Williams, Senator Long and most other members of the Finance Committee; divisions among the bill's supporters; and the fact that the latter were consistently out-maneuvered by the opposition.

In 1971-72 the chances were never good, especially as the election year developed. Once welfare became an election issue that clearly appeared to favor President Nixon, there was little hope of passage of a bill that would remove welfare from the campaign. The last chance disappeared in the spring of 1972. Jeff Peterson of Senator Ribicoff's staff, Leonard Lesser of the Center for Community Change and I represented the Senator in lengthy negotiations with the staff of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Labor to work out the so-called Ribicoff-Richardson compromise. An agreement was reached that was acceptable to Senator Ribicoff and his colleagues and apparently to HEW and Labor Secretaries Richardson and Hodson.

The President was then faced with three options: to stay with his own bill; to attempt to work out an agreement with the Finance Committee; or to go along with the Ribicoff-Richardson compromise. It appeared clear that the last alternative provided the only reasonable prospect of legislation, but the first had greater political advantage.

At Senator Ribicoff's suggestion, I called Pat Moynihan and outlined the compromise, asking for his support and intervention with the President. He said that the terms of the agreement made complete sense and "were in line with what the President originally sug-

gested." He agreed to call the President and get back to us in a few days.

Neither Senator Ribicoff nor I heard from him. About a month later he told me that he had tried his best, but that the President would not go along with the compromise. Actually, there was no guarantee that the compromise would have passed the Senate even with the President's support. It was near the end of the session and Senator Long with some colleagues was threatening a filibuster. But without Presidential support, passage was impossible.

To most of us it was clear—welfare was more important as a political issue than as a program.

The significance of all this for the future lies in the fact that meaningful welfare reform lacked a significant political constituency. In a national referendum such a program would have met overwhelming defeat. The public pressure that might have helped FAP was almost entirely lacking. Well, what does happen next? As I have indicated, probably not much in the near future. Those of us who supported meaningful welfare reform are likely to be immediately busy seeking to prevent more regressive legislation and regulations than now exist.

At the same time what is needed is a major rethinking of the basic approach to the issue of welfare and related programs. Aside from the politics there were basic substantive difficulties in the FAP approach which were never adequately considered. Senator Williams and his colleagues may have exaggerated the "notch problem"—the fact that a family can lose considerable benefits by earning a few more dollars and thus face a disincentive to earning more—but that is a problem, and not enough attention was given over to it until it was too late.

Also, there is the extremely difficult and indeed thus far the largely insurmountable problem of providing at least a minimally adequate level of payments for those who can't work, while maintaining reasonable incentives for those who do work but require supplementation. To cope with this problem it has been proposed that welfare recipients not have all their earnings subtracted from their payments, thus avoiding the so called 100 per cent tax rate. But how much should be disregarded? Set the amount too low and presumably you create disincentives to work. Set it substantially higher, the costs rise sharply and many more people are on welfare.

Tinkering with the present welfare system is obviously not the route to the legislation of responsible programs. In addition to problems such as those I have just mentioned as besetting FAP, there is the overwhelmingly negative attitude toward welfare throughout the country. And just changing its name doesn't help. As a western state legislator put it, after I had spoken about FAP to a national conference he attended: "Commissioner, you explained the plan very well and I know you are trying to help the poor, but what we mean by welfare reform is getting people off welfare, not adding more."

While it is true that welfare reformers are interested in getting poor people the help they need rather than simply adding to the rolls, this appears to many to be a distinction without a difference. Therefore, it is crucial to take a step back and look at the nature of the problems the system was supposed to confront.

A fundamental factor often overlooked is that the primary reason people are on welfare is that they are poor. Whatever else may be involved, there are still about 25 million people below the poverty line—approximately \$4,000 a year for an urban family of four—and another 25 to 30 million at or just above it. That means 50-60 million Americans below what almost all of us would concede is a minimally decent standard of living. By any definition that's a problem, and it helps not at all to say that "the poor will always be

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

September 24, 1973

with us," or that "they are rich in comparison with the poor in other countries."

A second key fact is that welfare is neither the basic cause of nor the solution to the poverty problem. Nor was the welfare program ever intended to be so. Basically, it was designed as a residual program to take temporary care of those not covered by one or another of the more basic programs. It has been the failures in our education and health systems, in our supposed commitment toward full employment, in our social insurance system including unemployment insurance, that have thrust on welfare a responsibility it was never designed to handle.

Up to now we have not been able to get beyond the confusing and largely fruitless debate about eligibles, fraud, employables, illegitimacy, management or lack of it, etc. These are important issues because of the money involved and the effect on public support or lack of it. There are both ineligibility and fraud, and to the maximum degree possible, they should be eliminated. (Incidentally, the need to differentiate between these two is long overdue. It is clear that more than half of the cases of ineligibility and over-payment are caused by mistakes, not fraud; and the mistakes are much more often made by the worker than by the recipient. Given the unbelievable complexity and variety of welfare systems in the 50 states and over 400 welfare jurisdictions, some of the mistakes seem impossible to eliminate. We must do better, but real progress will come only with significant change in a largely unworkable system.)

Meanwhile, the debate rages on about ineligibility. I don't know what the real figure is, and I doubt that anybody does; probably somewhat higher than I and my fellow professionals have usually estimated. At the same time it is much lower than the general public assumes. Let's do everything we legitimately can to reduce ineligibility and overpayments, but let's also be equally concerned about the eligibles rejected and those who receive under-payments.

Much the same sort of debate has gone on about the number of employables on welfare. An estimate largely depends on the extent to which one includes female-headed families (AFDC, the largest welfare category) in the discussion. Contrary to public belief, there are very few employable men on welfare, although the status of men who are related to welfare families but are not themselves on the rolls is a question not to be casually dismissed.

I have long felt that the issue of AFDC mothers' working is a highly over-rated one. Many mothers and their families would be better off with the mother employed. However, shouldn't that be their choice as it is for non-welfare mothers? The evidence overwhelmingly is that many more mothers want to work than are able to because of the unavailability of jobs or day care for their children. Leonard Goodwin in his recent book *Do the Poor Want to Work?* has shown that "welfare recipients, whatever their race or time spent on welfare have essentially the same work ethic and life aspirations as do employed middle-class people."

The issue remains not willingness to work, but the availability of jobs. What is puzzling is the lack of attention given this essential issue. With an official unemployment rate only now getting down to 5 percent and the actual figures including the under-employed—those who have given up looking for work, etc.—more than double that, where are the jobs that welfare recipients are to fill? If these jobs are available, why the unemployment and the under-employment?

Much has been said recently about poor administration in welfare. Programs need to be better administered, and welfare has been slow to adopt modern management techniques and equipment. Until very recently, who was willing to invest the necessary resources?

It is only a few short years since I spoke publicly about having to operate a billion dollar welfare program like a "corner candy store."

While doing everything we can to improve welfare administration, however, we should also respect the recent words of John Venerman, Under Secretary of HEW—"We are at best fighting a holding action in welfare administration today and . . . this state of events cannot greatly improve under existing law." Also, one of the very helpful studies in Public Welfare carried out for the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy chaired by Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee makes the point that: "The present welfare system is an administrative nightmare: it may also be an administrative impossibility."

This review of the major difficulties with the present welfare program points to what I believe are inevitable conclusions: We must move to make welfare the residual system it was originally designed to be, by separating out as many individuals and groups as possible and keeping in the program only those for whom there are no viable alternatives. At the same time, we must have no illusions that any improved system can make up for the failures of such systems as health, education and employment. Not to do something significant about these systems will simply perpetuate dependency; but that is a subject for several other articles.

There are no blueprints to achieve welfare reform objectives, and there is no one program that provides a solution. Various alternatives will have to be considered and in some cases tested to provide a meaningful package of programs.

Over a period of time an expansion of the social insurance systems will be an absolutely essential element of this package. One significant step has already been given responsibility for administering the program for the aged, blind and disabled. (Incidentally, the removal of requirements to take liens on a recipient's possessions and to hold relatives responsible for their care are two little-noticed, but very important improvements.) Over a period of time these programs can be more closely integrated into social security, although problems of funding and of the effect on the insurance concept will make this a politically touchy issue.

Separating out the unemployed and the clearly employable from welfare is another essential step. My colleague, Tom Joe, recently of HEW and now with McKinsey & Company, who has been doing some creative thinking in this area, points out that of 2.6 million parents in AFDC in 1970, 355,000 were employed either full time or part time; of those not currently employed, 1.6 million had previous employment experience and more than 1.1 million or 44 percent had actually been on unemployment insurance and had exhausted their benefits.

It is neither logical nor feasible to expect welfare to be responsible for most of these people. Much the same is true for their first job. What we have to recognize is the real problem: lack of work and adequate jobs. Only when we fully accept this essential fact can we move toward a solution. Inevitably, this means a strong commitment to a true full-employment policy which would guarantee jobs for all. Where the problem is lack of work, let us provide work and real jobs, not rhetoric like workfare and work ethic. For a nation presumably committed to the concept of work, our failure to develop and implement a realistic policy of full employment is baffling, to say the least.

As part of this type of employment policy, the unemployment insurance system or some similar program would become the mechanism for dealing with the weak spots and the limitations. Obviously, this would mean a drastically revised and strengthened unemployment insurance program with higher

benefit levels, longer coverage, federal standards and some federal financing. Such drastic changes present many difficulties and will require the most careful working out. They will encounter very strong political opposition. But meaningful debate and action on them is long overdue. After all, unemployment insurance was the mechanism established for loss or lack of employment. It is time we began to use it more effectively rather than continuing to shift the burden to a welfare system which obviously cannot handle it.

This approach would remove most of the unemployed from welfare. Something would then have to be done about the working poor. Equity requires that some provision be made for the large number of persons who work full time but whose incomes are below an acceptable level. Their inclusion in the Family Assistance Plan was one of its most innovative features, but covering them under welfare creates many problems that appear to defy both practical and political solutions. The greatly expanded food stamp program has helped somewhat and a more realistic minimum wage with fuller coverage would reduce the number to be aided. But some federal system of supplementation of earned income for the working poor remains essential. There is a variety of possible approaches including but not limited to children's allowances, tax credits and wage supplements. Each one needs to be discussed thoroughly, planned and tested for workability, costs and political feasibility. But the problem will not go away, nor can it be allowed to sink back into limbo.

What I have outlined is a conception rather than a plan that probably raises more questions than it answers. What is needed is a package approach that separates the unemployed and the working poor from those on welfare. Only then can we begin to define welfare as a truly residual program. Only then can we begin to develop a federally administered and financed income maintenance system at an adequate level for those in need and who will continue to be in need until health, education and other systems begin to carry out their responsibilities more effectively.

TITLE I AND THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION—A PROBLEM THAT MUST BE SOLVED

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, currently a great number of school districts across the Nation are suffering losses in their programs for the educationally disadvantaged funded by title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act because of the effects of the provision in both the continuing resolution and the Labor-HEW appropriations bill holding each State harmless to the total number of dollars it received in fiscal 1972.

Since fiscal 1972 we have learned the effects of the 1970 census and have discovered that there have been shifts in title I funds even more dramatic than I had predicted. The number of title I eligible students in some areas has doubled while other areas have had a decrease in title I students. Since we had to wait until fiscal 1974 to apply new census statistics, changes which took place over a 10-year period were imposed in one fell blow.

Since the hold harmless provision in

the continuing resolution did not protect local school districts in any way, the effects of the State hold harmless provision was to skew the distribution within

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

States even more than the census has indicated. One of the major tragedies is that the State hold harmless prevents money from reaching children in those

States which have gained population. The table below shows the gains and losses among States as the result of that provision.

TABLE A

State	Fiscal year 1974 ESEA I, part A estimated allotments with 1972 floor	Fiscal year 1974 ESEA I, part A estimated allotments without 1972 floor	Percent of formula allotment with fiscal year 1972 floor	Loss or gain under hold harmless	State	Fiscal year 1974 ESEA I, part A estimated allotments with 1972 floor	Fiscal year 1974 ESEA I, part A estimated allotments without 1972 floor	Percent of formula allotment with fiscal year 1972 floor	Loss or gain under hold harmless
Alabama	\$42,202,992	\$22,685,091	+19,517,901	186.04	Nebraska	\$8,461,135	\$7,789,028	+672,107	108.63
Alaska	4,108,676	4,745,528	-636,852	86.58	Nevada	1,666,084	1,950,597	-284,513	85.41
Arizona	11,523,805	13,047,637	-1,523,832	88.32	New Hampshire	2,801,095	3,304,210	-503,115	84.77
Arkansas	26,470,169	13,383,963	+13,086,200	197.78	New Jersey	60,773,155	73,044,917	-12,271,762	83.20
California	151,796,957	183,335,748	-31,538,791	88.80	New Mexico	11,203,896	10,614,276	+589,620	105.56
Colorado	14,061,868	16,598,162	+2,536,294	84.84	New York	255,282,719	309,962,830	-54,680,111	82.35
Connecticut	17,099,599	20,457,938	-3,358,339	83.58	North Carolina	61,621,074	35,255,652	+26,385,422	174.78
Delaware	3,649,464	4,212,224	-562,760	86.64	North Dakota	5,447,877	4,140,123	+1,307,754	131.59
Florida	39,837,839	40,721,904	-884,065	97.83	Ohio	51,107,359	61,063,079	-9,955,720	83.70
Georgia	42,188,006	32,050,692	+10,137,314	139.63	Oklahoma	20,300,817	17,010,041	+3,290,776	113.35
Hawaii	4,636,313	5,594,705	-958,392	82.87	Oregon	12,858,310	15,009,650	-2,151,340	85.67
Idaho	3,977,755	4,307,637	-329,882	92.34	Pennsylvania	74,583,599	88,482,429	-13,918,830	84.27
Illinois	82,549,907	100,027,048	-17,477,141	82.53	Rhode Island	6,041,948	7,252,309	-1,210,361	83.31
Indiana	20,487,387	24,353,714	-3,866,327	84.12	South Carolina	37,107,533	18,991,562	+18,115,971	195.39
Iowa	16,645,654	12,594,561	+4,051,093	132.17	South Dakota	6,870,494	4,632,141	+2,238,353	148.32
Kansas	12,478,897	11,930,161	+548,736	104.60	Tennessee	38,712,613	20,021,999	+18,690,611	193.35
Kentucky	38,302,224	23,014,304	+15,287,920	166.43	Texas	93,439,492	81,923,055	+11,516,437	114.06
Louisiana	37,989,922	31,943,897	+6,046,025	118.93	Utah	5,302,785	6,304,179	-1,001,374	84.12
Maine	6,549,274	7,617,589	-1,068,315	85.98	Vermont	3,014,806	3,268,002	-253,196	92.25
Maryland	24,521,223	29,564,565	-4,943,342	83.28	Virginia	37,084,416	29,347,081	+7,737,335	126.36
Massachusetts	33,505,700	40,254,091	-6,748,391	83.24	Washington	19,676,262	23,307,758	-3,631,496	84.42
Michigan	65,576,522	78,255,320	-12,678,798	83.80	West Virginia	21,681,593	12,118,337	+9,563,256	178.92
Minnesota	23,183,881	22,160,878	+1,023,003	104.66	Wisconsin	19,931,228	23,752,279	-3,821,051	83.91
Mississippi	44,154,990	22,829,237	+21,325,753	193.41	Wyoming	1,821,060	1,891,064	-7,004	101.59
Missouri	28,547,584	24,025,663	+4,521,921	118.82	District of Columbia	13,478,984	16,197,598	-2,718,614	83.22
Montana	4,379,638	4,425,127	-45,489	98.97					

Even more stark is the comparison of how much each State receives for each title I child as a result of the State hold

harmless. As the table below shows, some States receive as much as 80 percent of the cost of educating a child while others

are receiving as little as 19 percent. That sort of inequity is simply not defensible.

TABLE B.—ESEA, TITLE I, PT. A, ALLOTMENT ANALYSIS OF STATE HOLD HARMLESS CONTAINED IN H.J. RES. 636 (PUBLIC LAW 93-52)

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Fiscal year 1972	Estimated allotment with 1972 floor	State average per pupil grant using 1972 floor allotment	Percent column 3 is of State average per pupil expenditure	State	Fiscal year 1972	Estimated allotment with 1972 floor	State average per pupil grant using 1972 floor allotment	Percent column 3 is of State average per pupil expenditure
Alabama	\$42,103	\$42,203	\$402.72	76.07	Nebraska	\$8,338	\$8,461	\$229.92	28.48
Alaska	2,282	4,109	290.35	19.99	Nevada	1,274	1,666	176.97	22.45
Arizona	11,201	11,524	185.48	24.86	New Hampshire	2,394	2,801	217.27	22.48
Arkansas	26,235	26,470	427.01	82.33	New Jersey	51,141	60,773	225.17	19.83
California	135,234	151,797	170.58	19.94	New Mexico	11,026	11,204	222.96	32.36
Colorado	12,843	14,062	170.42	20.97	New York	207,039	255,283	295.12	19.84
Connecticut	13,940	17,100	200.19	19.83	North Carolina	60,833	61,621	390.50	63.84
Delaware	3,327	3,649	199.77	20.05	North Dakota	5,417	5,448	267.14	38.98
Florida	37,844	39,838	175.44	22.45	Ohio	44,587	51,107	170.51	22.35
Georgia	41,682	42,188	279.68	43.38	Oklahoma	19,820	20,301	254.99	40.88
Hawaii	3,639	4,636	195.95	19.92	Oregon	12,267	12,858	189.59	19.81
Idaho	3,838	3,978	188.84	30.95	Pennsylvania	73,925	74,564	183.75	20.20
Illinois	68,663	82,550	195.94	19.84	Rhode Island	5,846	6,042	188.96	19.85
Indiana	20,034	20,487	170.84	21.81	South Carolina	36,357	37,108	438.59	76.80
Iowa	16,581	16,646	284.97	32.95	South Dakota	6,683	6,870	328.20	45.64
Kansas	12,105	12,479	220.90	28.06	Tennessee	38,263	38,713	427.22	77.28
Kentucky	38,084	38,302	353.57	61.83	Texas	90,094	93,439	250.04	37.44
Louisiana	37,177	37,990	263.04	35.32	Utah	4,380	5,303	170.99	25.74
Maine	6,379	6,549	175.96	24.80	Vermont	2,621	3,015	190.39	23.88
Maryland	21,241	24,621	195.47	19.83	Virginia	36,127	37,084	270.71	36.65
Massachusetts	27,121	33,506	177.36	19.83	Washington	15,953	19,676	177.20	19.82
Michigan	55,196	65,577	192.75	19.83	West Virginia	21,494	21,682	389.77	60.51
Minnesota	22,936	23,184	257.28	25.58	Wisconsin	19,327	19,931	188.47	19.83
Mississippi	43,902	44,155	420.34	89.51	Wyoming	1,810	1,821	212.40	24.08
Missouri	28,205	28,548	253.76	35.14	District of Columbia	9,285	13,479	221.55	19.84
Montana	4,217	4,380	208.43	26.00					

In place of the 100-percent State hold harmless in the continuing resolution which will come to the floor this week, I intend to offer an amendment to hold local districts harmless to 85 percent of the amount they received in fiscal 1973. The effect of this amendment will be

twofold: First, it will permit moneys to shift to States which have gained population since 1970; and, second, it will restore funding to many districts which lost it because of the combined effects of the State hold harmless provision and the 1970 census. In this latter case dis-

tricts will be able to absorb the decrease over a period of years rather than having to suffer the loss in one blow. The effects of the amendment which I intend to offer are shown in table C. I urge your support for this amendment.

TABLE C

State	Fiscal year 1973 ¹		Fiscal year 1974 ² ESEA I, pt. A, estimated allotment with 85 percent of 1973 floor
	actual allotments	estimated allotments	
Alabama	\$36,401,903	\$31,524,245	
Alaska	3,733,423	4,673,262	
Arizona	10,996,734	12,698,616	
Arkansas	23,079,131	20,428,998	
California	125,654,918	170,843,900	
Colorado	13,203,916	15,962,163	
Connecticut	14,082,445	19,322,569	
Delaware	3,493,086	4,148,008	
Florida	37,021,551	40,952,113	
Georgia	42,634,436	37,055,629	
Hawaii	4,137,759	5,183,201	
Idaho	3,943,640	4,253,677	
Illinois	75,824,607	92,778,336	
Indiana	22,141,108	23,156,157	
Iowa	15,708,515	13,788,634	
Kansas	11,130,264	11,438,319	
Kentucky	33,227,526	28,619,608	
Louisiana	34,566,397	30,464,800	
Maine	6,513,282	7,181,685	
Maryland	22,269,455	27,777,141	
Massachusetts	28,935,270	37,794,665	
Michigan	61,574,584	74,181,276	
Minnesota	22,830,751	20,727,689	
Mississippi	37,905,476	32,844,431	
Missouri	26,213,359	23,336,876	
Montana	4,228,832	4,395,566	
Nebraska	8,041,771	7,338,379	
Nevada	1,313,805	1,862,867	
New Hampshire	2,584,343	3,147,063	
New Jersey	51,464,849	68,540,040	
New Mexico	8,944,790	10,099,385	
New York	212,916,666	286,662,020	
North Carolina	56,460,652	50,055,178	
North Dakota	5,265,065	4,875,990	
Ohio	49,873,001	57,783,899	
Oklahoma	18,554,888	16,610,786	
Oregon	11,776,238	14,647,518	
Pennsylvania	72,188,475	82,577,993	
Rhode Island	5,572,597	6,782,218	
South Carolina	32,163,595	28,589,346	
South Dakota	6,065,968	5,348,790	
Tennessee	33,551,724	29,337,452	
Texas	91,309,880	86,089,986	
Utah	4,785,278	5,971,062	
Vermont	2,987,323	3,206,751	
Virginia	34,407,313	30,616,220	
Washington	17,234,129	22,326,879	
West Virginia	18,328,333	16,018,586	
Wisconsin	20,489,168	22,559,486	
Wyoming	1,739,326	1,858,127	
District of Columbia	11,571,059	15,176,036	

¹ 1973 allotment based on \$1,585,000.² 1974 allotment based on \$1,810,000.

AMERICA HAS NO CONFIDENCE IN ITS OWN COMPOSERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans continue to wonder why our national policies seem more oriented toward helping foreigners than our own people. Another example of this seems to be the recent fury unleashed over the announcement that a non-American has been commissioned to compose an opera in honor of the bicentennial of the United States.

One would hope that upon reaching our 200th anniversary that we would have developed some confidence in the creative ability of our own citizens. After all, Americans are the descendants of every other country on the face of the Earth.

Why should we increase funding for the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities if we do not have confidence to use American artists for an American celebration?

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The related newsclipping follows:
AN AMERICAN BICENTENNIAL OPERA WRITTEN
BY A FOREIGN COMPOSER?

(By Paul Hume)

About four months ago the Chicago Lyric Opera announced that it had commissioned an opera to honor the bicentennial of the United States.

For every reason this seemed a fine idea. The arts should, and obviously are going to play a major role in celebrating our 200th birthday. It is always a good idea to commission a major new work even though there is no guarantee that the final result will prove to be great or merely good. It might possibly even be bad. From the Chicago company, which has, throughout its 20 years of life, kept fairly close to the conventional in repertoire, the commission for a new opera sounded especially promising. Until you saw the name of the composer to whom the commission was given.

His name, if you can believe it—and I have double-checked—is Krysztof Penderecki! Just in case you are not up on the world's leading composers, Penderecki certainly is one. He is 40. And he is Polish. Not Polish-American, Polish.

When I first heard this news, I decided to wait a bit to see if the Lyric Opera would not quickly follow up the announcement with the names of several United States composers whom they were also commissioning. To such a group of commissions it would be hard to object.

But no such word came from Chicago. Finally, I telephoned and asked if they were going to commission anyone else to write them an opera for our 200th birthday party.

The answer was blunt: "No."

When I expressed a certain surprise, not to say sheer disbelief, mingled with obvious disappointment, the company's director of publicity said, "Well he (Penderecki) certainly is the world's leading opera composer, isn't he?"

The answer to that one, dear friends in Chicago, is "No." To stay with that line for a second, Penderecki has written one opera, "The Devils of Loudoun," to the same story as the Whiting play, "The Devils." Performed several seasons ago in Santa Fe, it turned out to be a very absorbing version of the play with some highly dramatic and intense music. The production suffered from a misbegotten stage set that continually broke up what should have been a very swift flow from scene to scene.

That, which is the sum of Penderecki's operatic work, can be heard in a very accurate recording on Phillips 6700042.

As for other operatic composers of greater experience and at least as much stature and accomplishment, the names of England's Britten and Tippett and Argentina's Ginastera come at once to mind as having vastly more proven knowhow.

The point, Chicago, however, is that the commission, or a commission, for 1976 should go—how can there be any question about it?—to any one of a large number of this country's composers. Their names? It is almost insulting to the wealth of this country's musicians to print a partial list, but since Chicago has felt that Poland was its best supplier for our nation's birthday observations, I may be pardoned for listing a few who have qualifications as varied as they are substantial.

Ranging from their 20s to the 70s, in alphabetical order, and now living in the East, the Midwest or the Far West, we could suggest these names: Argento, Barber, Beeson, Bernstein, Copland, Crumb, Ferris, Holby, La Monte, Levy, Mollicone, Rorem, Schuller, Schuman and Ward. Someone else might very well name 15 others. If the Chicago Lyric Opera has not heard of these men it is simply another indication of its

September 24, 1973

failure to relate itself to the music of the country it thinks it is honoring.

The American Music Center, representing the community of American composers, has already registered a strong protest against the Lyric's contemptuous move. It is hard to think of a major opera company serving the city that houses such famous American names as Sears, Marshall Field, Walgreen Drugs and The Loop turning to Poland for its new music.

One further suggestion can be made at this point with which the Chicago Lyric could make handsome amends for its unbelievable goof: Without having to commission a single note, it could announce the U.S. premiere of Roger Sessions' "Montezuma," an opera with American roots by one of the great musicians of this country. That would be an artistic coup entirely appropriate to the finest aims of our 1976 celebrations. Well, Chicago—how about it?

INTRODUCTION OF THE SOLAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1973

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's economy has thrived on the ready availability of cheap fossil fuels. We inefficiently consume energy with a naive ignorance of the implications of our actions. Only recently have we come to understand the costs in dollars, in harm to the environment, and impact on national security of our present pattern of energy use.

GROWING AND CHANGING ENERGY NEEDS

The Clean Air Amendments of 1970 established a necessary, comprehensive Federal-State program to achieve acceptable nationwide air quality by 1975. With this vitally important legislation, we have made significant changes in the way we consume our energy. In an effort to rid our air of sulfur oxides, we have shifted from high sulfur coal to more acceptable alternatives such as natural gas and low sulfur crude oil. We have also taken significant steps to curb the pollutants discharged into our air by automobiles. All of these efforts to clean our air have had impacts in the shape and size of our energy budget.

Further, as our economy has grown and our energy needs have expanded, we have approached the limits of our domestic capacity to produce petroleum economically and in sufficient quantity. And because of our society's overwhelming dependence on crude oil, we have been forced to look elsewhere in search of oil. Unfortunately, as our dependence on foreign supplies grows, there is the very real threat that our national security will be compromised to narrow but powerful foreign interests. Our need for foreign oil will become so great that a few nations will be able to hold us ransom to constantly increasing prices. They will be able to try to hijack our foreign policy into courses alien to our Nation's traditions and beliefs. Even now, there are ominous rumblings that the producing nations want to renegotiate ownership

questions and the 1971 Tehran agreements on crude oil prices. Continued petroleum consumption will create the most serious balance-of-payments difficulties. Following current projections, petroleum imports could mean a dollar outflow of as much as \$20 billion a year by 1985.

FAILURE OF ADMINISTRATION'S ENERGY POLICY

All these factors have combined to paint a gloomy picture of our energy future. President Nixon has suggested limiting our commitment to clean air as a way out of our immediate dilemma. At the same time he has proposed a multi-faceted program to encourage domestic oil production through the construction of the Alaskan pipeline, the acceleration of leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf, and the extension of more tax benefits to the oil industry.

These proposals, if enacted, would have catastrophic results on the quality of our national life and the long-range health of our economy. The critical message of our present energy shortages have escaped the President. The fact is that we cannot continue wasting our national resources with impunity. Quite simply, our store of fossil fuels is finite. Continued careless expansion of production and consumption will only hasten the day when we reach the bottom of our energy barrel.

FOSSIL FUELS AND THEIR DANGER TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Just as important as the economic argument against mindless expansion of production and consumption, is the critical need to protect our environment from further degradation. Every ounce of fossil fuel that is converted to heat alters our environment. When our consumption ranges in the millions of barrels a day this threat to environmental quality suddenly becomes quite real. The Council on Environmental Quality in its just-released fourth annual report notes an ominous trend in this regard with the increase worldwide of the concentration of carbon dioxide—CO₂—in the atmosphere. CO₂ is a natural byproduct of the combustion process. The significance of CO₂ as a pollutant is its capacity to prevent heat from escaping from the Earth's lower atmosphere. A "greenhouse effect" is created which has significant long-range implications for our Earth's climate. To quote from the CEQ report:

The most notable example of a potential global air pollution problem is the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

The simple fact of the matter is, we are releasing into the Earth's atmosphere during some 200 years, most of the stored solar heat energy created in oil and coal fields over a 400-million-year period. How can we expect anything but the ultimate environmental disaster—a major change in our atmosphere and climate—a change of unknown consequences to all future generations of man?

SOLAR ENERGY

The scandalously low level of funding for solar energy research is a primary failing of this administration's energy strategy. Following the projections of the Solar Energy Panel of the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, di-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rect energy from the sun could provide up to 80 percent of the heating and cooling requirements in 90 percent of all new houses and single-story commercial buildings. The panel suggests that a realistic schedule for equipping buildings with solar equipment is 10 percent of new buildings constructed in 1985, 50 percent in 2000, and 85 percent in 2020. Following these projections solar energy could provide considerable savings in fossil fuel costs. According to the panel's report:

Equivalent annual values of probable fuel savings at these three intervals are \$180 million, \$3,600 million and \$16,300 million. Gas and oil costs are estimated at a present average price of \$1.50 per million BTU delivered to residential customers.

This does not consider the tremendous potential of using solar energy to meet other energy requirements, including electricity generation and even the development of hydrogen fuels for automobiles.

The technological feasibility for accomplishing this conversion is well established. In fact, economic studies cited by the Solar Energy Panel of the National Science Foundation and National Aeronautics and Space Administration show that solar space heating in most areas of the United States is less expensive than electric heating. In some areas solar energy is economically competitive with oil and natural gas. The following table, taken from the Solar Energy Panel report illustrates the competitive position of solar space heating. Obviously, as the cost of fuels and electricity spiral upward, the advantage of limitless solar energy will increase.

COSTS OF SPACE HEATING (1970 PRICES)

[In dollars per million Btu useful delivery (7)]

Location	Optimized solar heating cost in 25,000 Btu/degree-day house, capital charges at 6 percent, 20 years		Electric heating, usage 30,000 kWh/year	Fuel heating, fuel cost only
	Collector at \$/ft ²	Collector at \$/ft ²		
Santa Maria	1.10	1.59	14.28	1.52
Albuquerque	1.60	2.32	4.63	.95
Phoenix	2.05	3.09	5.07	.85
Omaha	2.45	2.98	3.25	1.12
Boston	2.50	3.02	5.25	1.85
Charleston	2.55	3.56	4.22	1.03
Seattle-Tacoma	2.60	3.82	2.29	1.96
Miami	4.05	4.64	4.87	3.01
				2.04

¹ Electric power costs are for Santa Barbara, electric power data for Santa Maria were not available.

² Publicly owned utility.

³ Electric power costs are for Seattle.

NOTES

Solar heat costs are from optimal systems yielding least cost heat.

Electric power heat costs are from U.S. Federal Power Commission, All electric homes, table 2 (1970). Conventional heat fuel costs are derived from prices per million Btu reported in P. Bafestra, *The Demand for Natural Gas in the United States*, tables 1.2 and 1.3 (North Holland Publishing Co., 1967). The 1962 costs were updated to 1970 by use of national price indexes on gas (121.1 in 1970 versus 112.8 in 1962) and on fuel oil (119.22 in 1970 versus 101.2 in 1962) as adjustment factors on each fuel price in each State. Bureau of Labor Statistics fuel prices indexes obtained from Gas Facts. Fuel prices were converted to fuel costs by dividing by the following national average heat (combustion) efficiencies: gas, 75 percent; oil, 75 percent. Heat efficiencies are from American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers, *Guide and Data Book*, 692-694 (1963 ed.).

All solar heat costs based on amortizing entire solar system capital costs in 20 years at 6 percent interest. Capital investment based on current prices of solar water heaters at \$4 per ft² plus current costs of other components, and on anticipated near-term solar collector price of \$2 per ft².

OBSTACLES TO IMMEDIATE USE OF SOLAR ENERGY

Reviewing these figures the obvious question arises, "If solar energy is technologically feasible and economically competitive with traditional fuels, why do we not see more solar houses being constructed?" The answer to this question must come in two parts. First, we must look at the nature of the building industry today. Second, we must understand the difficulties confronting the infant solar equipment industry.

The building industry is a highly fluid sector of our economy. Profits are made chiefly through speculation. As a consequence, there is a tremendous pressure to build quickly and at the lowest possible cost. Innovations which stress savings over the life of the building are not considered if there is a way to build with a lower initial cost. Solar energy equipment falls into this category. This problem of discrimination would substantially disappear if there were an incentive for the housing industry to shift from initial cost accounting to life-cycle cost accounting. The latter technique would provide a more comprehensive view of the complete cost of the building by taking into account maintenance costs over the life of the structure.

In addition, the very complex nature of the market discourages design innovation. The construction of any building involves a wide range of different interests—engineers, architects, local zoning boards, contractors, building inspectors, and so on. With such a confusion of interests, revolutionary design changes—such as solar heating and air conditioning—face tremendous obstacles before they can be introduced on a wide scale.

Compounding this problem created by the obstacles to innovation in the building industry is the lack of development in the solar equipment industry. At present, most solar installations must be customized to fit the particular structure. If component manufacture could be standardized around adequate design studies, the cost of solar equipment would decline considerably. Rightfully, this task should be performed by American industry. However, there has been little economic incentive to devote resources to solar development, although one can expect that higher fossil fuel prices will make solar energy increasingly appealing to industry in the future. But the enveloping crisis has shown us that we cannot leave our energy future solely to the vagaries and whims of the private sector.

INTRODUCTION OF SOLAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ACT

For these reasons I am introducing today the Solar Energy Development Act of 1973. This legislation seeks to speed up research and development into solar equipment needed to heat and cool residential and commercial buildings. My legislation offers three distinct but interrelated programs to move solar equipment from the realm of discussion and blueprints to actual use in our economy as soon as possible.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

First, the National Science Foundation is directed to establish a solar energy data bank. The data bank will serve as a central source for technical and scientific information as well as an evaluation center with respect to the development and use of solar energy. A formidable obstacle to the implementation of solar technologies is the lack of a central clearinghouse for studies, reports, case histories, and evaluative information. The data bank will not only collect vital information from worldwide sources but will also facilitate its dissemination.

Second, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to conduct, through the National Bureau of Standards, component and system design studies as well as cost analysis for the application of solar equipment to residential and commercial buildings. Any new solar energy equipment product, before it is marketed, must go through an extensive series of tests to assess its marketability. It is exactly this phase of market development which the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct under this proposal. The standardization and integration of solar equipment components is a vital step in the development of economical applications of solar energy. Equally, system design studies, emphasizing the interrelationships between designers, builders, and equipment manufacturers are an essential preliminary to the development of a successful solar equipment market.

Third, the Secretary is authorized to issue grants for research into the design, manufacture, and marketing of solar equipment. This grant-making authority will accelerate the movement of technology from the testing and evaluation stage to the point of commercial application. As with all our research efforts in the field of energy development, the question of timing is vitally important. The financial resources we commit today will determine the choices available to us tomorrow. While there are legitimate issues that must be examined before we develop a comprehensive Federal energy research and development strategy, there is no reason to delay on implementing a national solar energy program and there are two good reasons why we should begin immediately.

ACTION NEEDED NOW

First, the amount of money needed to develop solar energy is small relative to other alternatives. President Nixon has suggested a \$10 billion program to extend over 5 years to develop coal gasification, oil shale, geothermal energy, advanced power cycles and the like. The solar energy panel, on the other hand, suggests that a commitment of \$100 million over 10 years will bring solar energy for residential heating and cooling to general use.

Second, there are no risks involved in solar research. The question is not whether solar energy is technologically feasible, but how it will become economically and socially acceptable. Additionally, there are no environmental risks in solar research. The sun is a pollution-free source of energy. The same cannot be said for all the other, more popular

energy alternatives: oil shale, coal gasification, and atomic power.

At a time when the air is clogged with pollutants from our combustion chambers and our land is gouged in the search for more coal, and our waters are fouled by oil spilled from tankers and drilling rigs, we must search for ways to limit our overdependence on fossil fuels. The quality of our environment is not the only issue at stake, however. We, as a nation, simply cannot afford to continue on with our glutinous consumption of irreplaceable energy shortages. Our national security today, as well as our future well-being, demand that we reassess our true energy needs and draw them more in line with what we are capable of supplying from our domestic sources.

Energy conservation—including the expanded use of solar energy—deserves our most serious consideration. No less is at stake than the health of our economy and quality of our national life.

I hope that early consideration of this legislation will be possible. It is of fundamental and immediate importance to our world, our Nation and to each of us.

SOVIET LABOR CAMPS AND THE CONSCIENCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 23, the Washington Star-News featured an extensive article, "Soviet Labor Camps: The Nightmare That Does Not End," authored by its staff writer, Brian Kelly. The Star-News and Mr. Kelly cannot be commended too highly for attempting to call to public attention in the Washington area current information on existing labor camps in the Soviet Union. No other time could be more opportune to remind Members of Congress and executive branch officials of the brutal, inhuman conditions under which flesh-and-blood victims of Soviet oppression exist from day to day.

It is depressing to consider that these victims can expect little or no help from some American businessmen who are launching elaborate trade plans with their Soviet slavemasters. Nor is help apparently forthcoming from U.S. officials who, like the new Secretary of State Kissinger, cannot meddle in the Soviets' internal affairs. Fortunately, there are indications that the American people—they keep the businessman in business and the official in office—are beginning to sense something phony, false, and fraudulent about the cries of "peace," "détente," and "peaceful coexistence."

For a more complete treatment of the Soviet labor camps issue one should procure the excellent hearings issued by the Senate Internal Security Committee entitled "U.S.S.R. Labor Camps." These hearings in three parts can be obtained from the subcommittee, free of charge, while the supply lasts. They can also be

September 24, 1973

purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, for the price of \$2.50 per set.

The above-mentioned article, based mainly on the subcommittee's hearings, follows this acknowledgement to the Star-News and Mr. Brian Kelly of appreciation for their timely and concerned effort.

[From the Washington Star-News, Sept. 23, 1973]

SOVIET LABOR CAMPS: THE NIGHTMARE THAT DOESN'T END

(By Brian Kelly)

As his train rocked and swayed on the KGB's narrow-gauge railway in the forests of Russia's Mordovia region, Alexander Krimgold was stunned by what he saw in the clearings. One ugly compound after another. Barbed-wire fences. Fierce-looking patrol dogs. Watchtowers and armed guards.

A Russian Jew escorting a prisoner's wife to a visit with her husband, Krimgold really had no reason to be surprised. Like millions of others in the Soviet Union today, he knew about labor camps.

Still, he never had seen one, and his glimpse of the Potma camp complex in Mordovia two summers ago left him with an image straight from Dostoyevsky.

The terrible labor camps of Potma, he later wrote, lie along the tracks "like so many boils." Declaring that "the gloom can hardly be exaggerated," Krimgold says, "Potma is a fearful place which readily evokes Nazi concentration camps."

But Krimgold saw only Potma. He traveled only on the KGB's 37-mile private rail spur from Potma to Barashevo, a rail line mysteriously missing from official maps of the Soviet Union.

Now safe in Israel, he didn't see Russia's remaining "boils." On Wrangel Island in the Arctic Ocean, along the steppes, across the Urals, in the Ukraine—camps stretch across the entire USSR, from its borders with Western Europe to the vastness of Siberia in the East. Camps dot the plains and forests at the sites of new cities, lumber camps, hydro-electric dams, railroad and airport construction, coal mines and like projects requiring heavy labor. There are perhaps 1,000 of them in a nationwide system enslaving what many experts estimate to be 5 to 10 million persons. Many are political prisoners, members of the dissident movement that has surfaced in recent years, or people from minority groups—not only Jews, but members of every minority race or faith in the Soviet empire.

Camps for men, camps for women, for women with babies. Camps where men and women fall ill, and often die, from poor food, lack of medical care, exposure, outright brutality and overwork. Camps, in one case at least, where prisoners have been the guinea pigs in dangerous medical experiments.

In the last third of the 20th Century, it sounds like a forgotten nightmare, perhaps a last gasp of offsetting Nazi propaganda. A reminder of the terrifying Stalinist era in Soviet Russia.

But it is none of these. The details cited here come from survivors or observers of the hidden Russian labor camp system in the 20 years since Stalin's death in 1953, up to and including the last two years.

Krimgold says he saw the "boils" in July 1971. Reyze Palatnik, another recent emigrant to Israel, left a camp last December. It was "located in a swamp," she recalls. "Buildings damp . . . semi-cold existence, no medical services. One had to lose consciousness to be allowed off for the day."

In February 1972, Yuri Galanskov, the dissenting writer and intellectual, wrote the

International Red Cross and the United Nations, saying in part:

"The sixth year has begun . . . I am ill . . . duodenal ulceration. Denied food and sleep for more than five years now. Obliged to work eight hours a day. Every day a torture. Health deteriorating. I am gradually exterminated."

"No longer can keep quiet. Not only my health, but my very life, is now endangered."

Nine months later, Galanskov died in the Potma labor camps.

According to Mikhail Shepselovich, another recent labor camp graduate, such deaths are no mistake. "Annihilation is achieved through a slow process of destruction over a period of many years," he writes.

"Continuous malnutrition and the constant nervous tension to which a prisoner is subjected in his environment, is the essence of this method."

"The prisoner's medical treatment depends very much on his attitude toward his political views. A person who does not renounce his political convictions receives practically no medical aid."

"In a labor camp, such people are condemned to slow deterioration and death."

Such allegations are contained in a report recently published by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, "USSR Labor Camps", containing 280 pages of testimony from recent emigrants, from underground writings smuggled out of the USSR, extracts from other sources and a graphic, eyewitness account by Avraham Shifrin, a remarkable Soviet Jew, intellectual, lawyer and self-professed Zionist who said he spent a decade in 30 labor camps, more years quietly gathering evidence in Russia, and the past three years interviewing incoming Soviet Jews as they arrive in Israel.

In a personal appearance before the Senate committee, he provided corroborating documentation, including statements by 10 freshly arrived Israeli emigrants, among them Krimgold, Reuze Palatnik and Mikhail Shepselovich. In all, the Senate report may be the most extensive view the West has been given of Soviet Russia's labor camp system since Stalin's death in 1953.

The most graphic details are those supplied by Shifrin himself.

By Shifrin's account, he was arrested in 1953, on trumped-up charges of spying for the United States and Israel. Originally, he was condemned to death, but his own persecutors vanished in an internal KGB purge. His penalty reduced, Shifrin was released in 1963 to exile in "ex-prisonerland" in Kazakhstan.

Given a legal post with the region's government, Shifrin, then 40, sometimes was able to travel on "state business". He interviewed fellow labor camp survivors wherever he could find them and mapped the locations of the camps themselves. It is his estimate that Russia today operates a system of at least 1,000 labor camps.

In 1970, Shifrin was among the very first Jews permitted to leave for Israel, most of them "trouble-making" dissidents the Soviet regime was glad to see go.

According to Shifrin, the camps he knew were crowded with prisoners incarcerated for their ideological or religious beliefs. But he also tells a story of four or five Chukchi-Russian Eskimos—sentenced to 25 years for trying to harpoon a Soviet submarine. They thought it was a whale, he says.

He recalls a man, beaten and interrogated to the breaking point, who finally "confessed" he was a spy. "For which country?" he was asked. Afraid to name a great power such as the United States, he satisfied his tormentors by naming little Guatemala. His sentence also was 25 years.

More commonplace, however, were those whose thoughts were suspect. Arkady Voloshin, released last year, was sentenced for distributing a Jewish prayer book, planning

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hebrew studies and printing Hebrew textbooks, Shifrin said.

Once, stationed temporarily in a "transit" camp in between assignments to regular labor camps, Shifrin also encountered a group of strange, bearded men in handmade clothes and boots.

Religious fundamentalists, the bearded "Old Believers" had lived unknown and undisturbed in a forest village in the Northern Urals for 40 years—from the tumultuous civil war years of 1917-1919 until their discovery by a KGB helicopter in 1959.

When the KGB came to draft the young men, the Old Believers refused to go. They were arrested, but in the transit camp with Shifrin, they also refused to work. "We do not wish to work for the anti-Christ," they said. They were ordered to solitary confinement for six months, but still defiant, they turned to the camp commander, made the sign of the Cross and said, "Begone, Satan."

Shifrin says he saw many horrors. He saw companions mutilate themselves in despair or protest. Prisoners working in lumber camps would even chop off a hand and place it in the stacks of wood as a reminder of their plight to the lumber's eventual recipients, some of them in the Free World. Shifrin saw others gash themselves, then infect their cuts with plaque from their teeth to gain the respite of a hospital bed. Protesting inmates severed their ears or tattooed their foreheads with anti-regime slogans.

Some desperate prisoners sliced flesh from their own bodies to put in their thin soup, or drew their own blood to enrich their plain bread, Shifrin testified.

In response, Shifrin saw his guards react with terrifying cruelty. One man he knew was punished—and died—when they poured water on him in temperatures 30 degrees below zero. Another died tied to a stake in a region infested by gnats, his body swelling visibly as the tiny insects swarmed.

In the northern camps, a number of prisoners died each night during winter.

Then there was Wrangel Island in the Arctic waters. Shifrin never was there himself, but he met one prisoner who was.

According to the Wrangel Island survivor, inmates there were subjected to medical experiments— injections, strange diets, radiation exposure, oxygen and submersion tests. The same source reported seeing Raoul Wallenberg, the Swedish diplomat who organized a rescue effort for Hungarian Jews fleeing the Nazis in World War II, only to "disappear" when the Red Army stormed Budapest. Also languishing at Wrangel Island was Rudolph Trushnovich, a leader of the anti-Soviet NTS organization who was kidnapped from West Berlin in 1954.

Shifrin says he himself knew of many such cases, and met foreign prisoners of war in the Soviet camps as late as 1962, a full 17 years after the end of World War II.

Shifrin, in his appearance here this year, told of the existence of separate camps for men, women, children, even babies in arms. Once, he told the Senate committee, his prison train stopped alongside an ordinary-looking camp in the dreaded Potma complex, seven hours travel time from Moscow, the same string of "bols" that struck Alexander Krimgold two summers ago. About 200 to 250 women, each with "a baby on her hands," appeared at the camp gates.

Shifrin cited cells containing one bunk for seven persons held in a single cubicle 8½ feet by 10, and barracks holding as many as 500 persons in one long room. The camps he knew ranged from 250 to 10,000 in population. Invariably, the food was poor, often rotten. In some northern camps, where temperatures dipped to 30 and 40 degrees below zero, prisoners went to work in makeshift shoes cut from rubber tires. Frostbite was commonplace.

The Russian Zionist said the experiences had some value, however. The transit camps,

he discovered, were prisoner "universities," where the persecuted traded both information and hopes. Apparently in an effort to prevent internal organization or resistance among the prisoners, the regime constantly transfers them from one camp to another.

Shifrin cited the great uprisings of labor camp prisoners in the 1950s, some put down by Red Army tanks, but he also was moved by those who resisted alone, by less dramatic means. One, a rabbi Shifrin knew, was put into chains for months for insisting upon prayer. He spent 10 years on a diet of bread and water—"and he came unbroken from concentration camp." Another, a Ukrainian Christian and nationalist, was taken into the streets of Kiev once a year for 25 years and told, "only your signature that you are not now a nationalist, and you can go home with your family." When finally he was released last year, he was an old man, but still unbroken, Shifrin asserted.

If Shifrin's personal observations of life in the Soviet labor camps appear dated because of his release a full decade ago, the documentation he provided the Senate committee supports his contention that the camps have changed little since he was a prisoner. Krimgold's description of Potma in 1971, for instance, closely matches Shifrin's view of the same complex eight years earlier.

Shifrin, in the meantime, doubts the widespread labor camps are maintained only to crush political dissent. Historically he noted, mass arrests sending new waves of prisoner to the camps have taken place about every 10 years.

While the crackdowns appear to coincide with time of political stress in the U.S.S.R., Shifrin theorizes the real reason for the timing is to replenish the camps every 10 years, because most men cannot perform hard labor for more than a decade.

Invariably, he adds, the camps are bleak, built next to major building projects, mines and lumber camps. He himself worked upon a dam constructed largely of huge stones hauled into place by hand—like the Egyptian pyramids.

Convinced that world opinion has its effects upon Moscow, Shifrin urges a Free World outcry of revulsion against the Soviet slave labor system of the 1970's.

"We can help in two ways," he says. "First by exposing the facts, and second, by voicing our indignation.

"In helping them, we shall also be helping ourselves."

WORLD FOOD BANK PROPOSED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during the recent consideration of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973—Public Law 93-86—repeated efforts were made to include in the farm bill a strategic reserve provision to protect the American consumers from shortages of food and fiber. Every attempt to provide legislation for such a reserve was successfully blocked, probably because of the surplus-oriented syndrome which prevailed at the time.

The consumer groups felt such a food bank would prove to be a subsidy boondoggle for the farmers, while the farmers feared a reserve stock would be used as a tool by the Government to control market prices.

Now we learn that a "World Food

September 25, 1973

Bank" is proposed to curb food shortages in overpopulated developing countries. The World Food Bank is said to be the brainchild of economists from North America, Europe, and Japan. It will accumulate food stocks from all industrial nations to alleviate food shortages in underdeveloped countries and act as an international economic tool to control year-to-year world market fluctuations.

It should prove most interesting to the American people to see how their governmental leaders, who were recently bitterly opposed to a strategic stockpile of food for the American people, will now react to support of a World Food Bank for other than Americans.

The related newsclippings follow:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1973]

WORLD FOOD BANK IS PROPOSED

Economists from North America, Europe and Japan yesterday proposed creating an international food bank, from which food could be withdrawn to meet serious shortages.

They recommended an international agreement to fix the quantity of food that would be held in reserve—one participant suggested 100 million tons of grains—and to arrange a joint decision-making procedure on how and when the food would be used.

The costs of accumulating and saving the food stocks would be shared by all the industrial countries. Food reserves also would be available to the developing countries and could be used to smooth year-to-year world market fluctuations, they said.

The economists acknowledged that building the reserves would involve some sacrifice, including occasionally denying food to hungry people, and at the least diverting grain from livestock feed to direct use, meaning reducing available meat.

"The principal alternative is to do nothing . . . to build up for ourselves in a few years agricultural problems even more divisive than in the past couple of decades," said Philip H. Trezise, a former assistant secretary of state now working with the Brookings Institution.

The world food bank recommendation followed a three-day conference on world agricultural policy sponsored by the Brookings Institution and attended by 14 economists from the United States, Canada, Western Europe and Japan.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1973]

GRAIN RESERVE POLICY URGED

(By Jack Egan)

The depletion in world grain reserves this past year—particularly wheat—to the lowest levels in 20 years has ignited urgent calls for an international policy to set aside stocks as insurance in case of shortages.

The drawdown of reserves, primarily in the United States which has served as the world's major granary, has triggered volatile increases in the prices of wheat, corn and soybeans. These doublings and triplings have in turn been translated into higher food prices of all kinds and induced a searing general inflation in this country.

In addition there is concern that without grain reserves, only good weather in crop-producing countries stands in the way of widespread famine in certain areas of the world like the sub-Saharan or southern Asia.

Reserves are essentially a cushion against adversity. Famine can be avoided by tapping stocks of grain built up in years of abundance. In addition, the stocks moderate and largely stabilize food prices from the erratic

fluctuations fed by speculation against shortages.

The world has had a reserves policy for the past 20 years in the form of the huge—and burdensome—grain surpluses, mainly held by the U.S.

But they did serve their function as a form of insurance.

"They were good to have when the 1972 world crop was short," Don Paarlberg, the Agriculture Department's chief economist, said in a speech last week to the National Public Policy Conference.

"Had stocks been available we would not have seen wheat double in price from July 10 to August 13 this year, and then drop 15 per cent in three days, fluctuations that did little good for anyone," he continued.

Paarlberg noted that the U.S. government has built up stocks six times in the past 45 years under price-support storage programs, and liquidated them six times:

"Once in the depth of the Depression, hurtfully. But five times helpfully: During the droughts of the '30s, during the needs of World War II, during the Korean war, during the food crisis in India (in the mid-1960s), and most recently during the 1972 shortfall in world food production."

Paarlberg, discussing the 1973 Farm Act, pointed out that Congress rejected a proposal for the government to maintain reserves in anything more than token amounts. "But the idea is not dead," he added significantly.

The proposal for a grain reserve policy in fact has gained some diverse and powerful adherents.

A. H. Boerma, director-general of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, called for such a policy earlier this year. (The FAO has been meeting in Rome this week to decide what should be done in the event of a world grain shortfall this year, although world crop prospects have recently brightened, increasing the chances of squeaking through.)

A group of European, Japanese, U.S. and Canadian economists proposed this week that an international feed bank should be established which would supply food to meet serious shortages. The group, meeting under the auspices of the Brookings Institution, recommended that the costs be shared by all industrial nations including both importing and exporting countries and that the amount in reserve should be fixed by international agreement.

The Federation of American Scientists recently suggested that the U.S. "take the lead in encouraging a system of stable food reserves." The statement, drafted by population expert Paul R. Ehrlich and food expert Lester Brown, said that, in the absence of U.S. surpluses and excess acres to protect against shortages, this country should not be put in the position of choosing "during famines between selling our food to developed nations or donating it to the underdeveloped."

Several bills have been introduced in the Senate which propose a grain stockpile. *** who tried unsuccessfully to attach an amendment to the farm bill to set up a domestic grain and oil seeds reserve, has introduced separate legislation to require the government to set aside 600 million bushels of wheat, 150 million bushels of soybeans and 40 million tons of feed grains.

*** recently proposed legislation which would require the amount of raw agricultural products needed for domestic consumption plus "a reasonable amount for a carryover" to be subtracted from the year's total harvest before any was allocated for export.

In addition, up to 10 per cent of the exportable amount of a crop could be placed in a reserve for unexpected emergency situations abroad.

One of the large grain firms which participated in last year's sales to the Soviet Union, Cargill Inc., last week came out with its own "strategic agricultural commodity reserves" plan.

Cargill would establish enormous reserves—50 per cent of annual domestic consumption, export shipments and food needs for food grains (nearly 1 billion bushels for wheat alone), 25 per cent for feed grains like corn (1.5 billion bushels) and 25 per cent for oil seeds like soybeans (400 million bushels).

The difficulty with all of these proposals is two-fold. They would be expensive. And, in periods when even record domestic and world crops can't keep up with current demand, it is nearly impossible to build up reserves.

The current tight wheat situation illustrates both the benefits of having a reserve policy and also the difficulty in implementing one in the next few years without the government entering the market at very high prices.

Despite a record 1973 wheat crop of 1.727 billion bushels, there are sober fears that there may be actual shortages of some categories of wheat in this country by next summer.

U.S. wheat reserves, always ample in the past, were drawn down substantially in 1972 by a combination of the mammoth 400 million bushel sale to the Soviet Union and buying by other countries suffering from a series of crop disasters.

Reserves going into the new crop year beginning July 1 were 428 million bushels, for a total supply of 2.156 billion bushels. Domestic use for the year is projected at 755 million bushels, and the USDA expects exports to total 1.1 billion bushels. This would leave only 300 million bushels by next summer.

However, even the 300 million bushel carry-over figure for next year is in dispute. Actual exports of wheat, bookings for shipment to specific countries and to unidentified destinations already total more than 1.3 billion bushels—far more than the Agriculture Department has predicted—and it is only three months into the new crop year.

This activity has sent wheat to the stratospheric price of \$5.43 a bushel, triple what it was little more than a year ago.

USDA officials argue that much of the early buying has been precautionary to insure against the possibility of future export controls on wheat and that there is a lot of "water" to be squeezed out of the figures. Others are not so sure. The problem is that no one knows.

Conceivably, even if very little further purchasing takes place, next year's carryover would be drawn down to 200 or 100 million bushels or less, barring application of export controls at some point and the cutting of previously signed contracts—a repeat of the soybean situation.

The small carryover figure itself is deceptive, because in the aggregate it masks the possibility that some desirable categories of wheat used for baking or noodle products would disappear entirely. Also, the very last part of carryover stocks are often in the worst condition due to long storage and often have reduced protein content.

For the 1974 wheat crop, the first tentative estimates put out by the USDA predict another record, up nearly 10 per cent to 1.9 billion bushels.

But even with reduced export expectations contained in the department's 1974-75 figures and using the optimistic 300 million

bushel carryover for next year, the carryover by 1975 is put at just 405 million bushels.

What this means is that in 1975 after two years of all-out record production, the

amount of U.S. wheat reserves will be even less than they are coming into this crop year, and the price may be anybody's guess.

If the U.S. or any other government were

to stockpile from the domestic crop during the next two years, it would put even a greater strain on supplies for current use and greater upward pressure on prices.

SENATE—Tuesday, September 25, 1973

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the hope of the world, hasten the coming of Thy kingdom on Earth. Establish Thy rule within us. Enter our minds with Thy truth and dwell in our hearts with Thy righteousness and compassion. Establish Thy rule in our common life. Enter into our homes, our schools, our legislative assemblies and churches, our industry and commerce, our cities and countryside, our diplomatic and military services that the world may be turned from sin and sorrow and destruction toward truth and justice and the city of God; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 24, 1973, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I would just like to suggest to the cloakroom to remind Senators that after the first rollcall vote today, all subsequent rollcall votes will consume only 10 minutes, in accordance with the order of yesterday, with the warning signal to be sounded after the first 2½ minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania desire to be recognized at this time?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, my principal purpose this morning is to introduce a resolution calling for Senate review of the SEATO alliance, but before doing so I should like first to turn to another subject.

THE NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION REPORT: A LURKING THREAT TO IDAHO WATER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources, I have been conducting a series of hearings on the report of the National Water Commission. The hearings thus far have raised several alarming issues in terms of the future of agriculture in Idaho and the Pacific Northwest.

If the Commission's recommendations become national policy, it is clear to me that the Federal reclamation program, which has contributed so greatly to irrigated agriculture in the West, would come to an end. Not only would the newly proposed standards render new irrigation projects unfeasible, but they might well raise insurmountable barriers to all kinds of multiple-purpose water projects in the future.

For example, one wonders who the "direct beneficiaries" of a large flood control project might be, and how they could be separated out from the rest of the inhabitants of the downstream drainage basin, in order to assess them for their pro rata share of the cost? The practical difficulties of such a calculation boggle the imagination.

The report, in general, moves in the direction of terminating Federal support for water development programs. The Commission explicitly bases its conclusions on the assumption that the production of food and fiber need no longer be encouraged. This is reflected in the testimony before the subcommittee that "since the West has been won, there is no reason to provide additional interest-free money for new irrigation development in the 17 Western States as provided in the Federal reclamation laws." It is also embodied in the Commission's suggestion that additional water supplies for municipal and industrial uses in the arid regions of the West could be obtained by decreasing irrigated lands.

In the face of the sudden shortages of agricultural products, this suggestion seems a bit ludicrous. But, after all, the report is the result of a 5-year study, the basic data for which was collected—and most of the consultants' contributions were prepared—before our agricultural picture began to change. As a result, the

National Water Commission's recommendations are already out of date.

Today, the American farmer is the most efficient in the world. It is preposterous for the U.S. Government to hobble him at a time when the country must buy increasingly larger quantities of its mineral and fuel requirements from abroad. An up-to-date public policy should look toward unshackling American farmers, in order that they may export more food, once our own needs at home are adequately met. In this manner, we can earn the foreign exchange necessary to pay for our burgeoning imports of petroleum and other raw materials. Given the markets of a hungry world, the American farmer may well become our indispensable producer who enables this country to stay solvent in its international accounts. One can hardly conceive of a more inappropriate time to advocate what, in effect, would be the shutdown of Federal reclamation.

Another of the Commission's specific recommendations raises a warning flag for Idaho. The Commission urges the repeal of the hard-won legal moratorium against Federal studies for diverting water out of the Columbia Basin.

There are vast tracts of fertile, arid lands in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington which, with adequate irrigation water, would support a rich agricultural economy. Idaho, alone, has between 4 and 6.5 million desert acres of potentially irrigable lands. The region is still sparsely populated and could provide an alternative lifestyle for many of its young people who would prefer not to migrate to the big cities. Furthermore, there will be added demands for domestic, industrial, and municipal water supplies for our own growing communities. And abundant water—whether drawn deep in natural lakes and manmade reservoirs, or left wild and free-flowing—is essential to the fulfillment of our great potential for outdoor recreation.

So, we will need accurate projections and careful planning if we are to guarantee ourselves sufficient water supplies for the future. Furthermore, we must meet these needs without destroying the purity and natural grandeur of our rivers which are so important to the quality of life indigenous to the Northwest.

A comprehensive inventory of our future water needs has not yet been completed. In 1968, the Idaho delegation joined with other Northwest Senators to impose a 10-year moratorium upon any Federal participation in schemes to divert water from the Columbia Basin to the Southwest, so that adequate time for planning would be available. The National Water Commission would do away