been more-or-less similar. For this reason, the CLC authorized an average increase of $74 for GM, $74 for Ford, while Chrysler and American Motors both received a bit less.

But my market survey shows that the automakers took advantage of the CLC ruling—and exploited the key word "average"—to increase inordinately the price of their smaller cars. As the table below illustrates, the burden of the increase fell on that segment of the market that has shown the liveliest growth—the market for smaller more efficient and cheaper cars. For example, while the Chevrolet Vega increased $281.90, the price of an Impala increased by only $50.90. With these results, I am left to one conclusion: Detroit has manipulated the CLC ruling to bolster their profits in the small car market. In fact, their motivation for initially seeking the increase was false and misleading. I have written a letter to CLC Director John Dunlop requesting his staff to investigate this wanton violation of the intent of his agency's ruling.

The automakers have a moral responsibility to prepare the American people for the inevitable changes ahead. As a nation we can no longer afford the luxury of inefficient, overpowered automobiles. The move toward smaller cars—much heralded by Detroit as evidence of their good faith in meeting our Nation's transportation and energy needs—is an illusion. Detroit's present tactic of gouging the economy-minded auto buyer—by inflating small car prices, limiting their availability, and dampening their appeal—reveals a shallow commitment by the automakers to the genuine needs of the American people.

There is going to be no easy path out of our energy dilemma. Shortages will occur this winter and again next summer. Detroit, however, has the capability of providing the Nation with answers for the future. This is a challenge unparalleled in the history of American industry. To insure that Detroit considers and meets this challenge, the Vanik-Moss bill, which is cosponsored by 39 of my colleagues in the House, will create a profit incentive for efficiency.

Using existing technology, Detroit can manufacture automobiles which have all the qualities of comfort, safety, and efficiency. Up until now, however, there has been little incentive for the automakers to maximize the operating efficiency of their product. A graduated excise tax, as I have proposed, will insure that the transitions that must be made will be accomplished with a minimum of disruption to the industry, the workers, and the American economy as a whole.

The table follows:

LIST PRICES OF 1973 AND 1974 CARS

	1973	1974	Increases
General Motors:			
Chevrolet:			
Vega	$2,060.00	$2,341.90	$281.90
Vega wagon	2,285.00	2,472.90	187.90
Impala	3,726.00	3,776.90	50.90
Impala wagon	4,171.00	4,190.40	19.50
Oldsmobile:			
Omega 2D	2,664.70	2,814.70	150.00
Omega 4D	2,692.70	2,842.70	150.00
Delta 88 2D	4,177.05	4,189.05	12.00
Delta 88 4D	4,238.00	4,250.05	12.00
Ford Motor Co.:			
Pinto	2,021.00	2,292.00	271.00
Pinto wagon	2,343.00	2,543.00	200.00
Maverick	2,248.00	2,441.00	193.00
LTD	4,001.00	4,083.00	82.00
LTD wagon	4,515.00	4,615.00	100.00
American motors:			
Gremlin	2,161.00	2,222.00	61.00
Hornet 2D	2,363.00	2,423.00	60.00
Hornet 4D	2,407.00	2,463.00	56.00
Hornet wagon	2,740.00	2,764.00	24.00
Matador 2D	2,996.00	2,996.00	0
Matador 4D	3,017.00	3,061.00	44.00
Matador Brougham	3,060.00	3,214.00	154.00
Chrysler-Plymouth:			
Dodge:			
Dart 2D	2,467.00	2,597.00	130.00
Polara 2D	4,317.00	4,495.00	178.00
Plymouth:			
Valiant 2D	2,499.00	2,673.00	174.00
Valiant Duster	2,428.00	2,563.00	135.00
Fury II 2D	3,747.00	3,792.00	45.00

BASE PRICE FOR IMPORTS

Fiat: 128 2D sedan	$2,343.00	(1)	(2)
Datsun: 610 2D sedan	3,200.00	3,200.00	0
Toyota: Corolla S1200	2,044.00	2,145.00	$101.00
Mazda: Rx3	3,295.00	(1)	(3)

[1] Not available until January 1974.
[2] Dealers feel a $100 to $300 increase.
[3] Dealers feel a $25 to $30 increase.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SYSTEM USES NASA TECHNOLOGY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, combining space developed technology with down-to-earth needs continues to be an important contribution of our national space effort. A recent NASA press release describes an emergency medical unit now in use in Houston, Tex., which is helping to save lives through aerospace technology. I am including this NASA press release to alert my colleagues and the general public to the possibility of utilizing this technology throughout the United States:

NEW EMERGENCY MEDICAL SYSTEM USES NASA TECHNOLOGY

A compact, 18-kilogram (40-pound) medical unit containing essential equipment to help meet a victim's diagnostic and therapeutic needs at the scene of an emergency—including two-way voice and telemetry communications—has been developed by SCI Systems, Inc., Houston, based in part on technology derived from NASA's manned space flight program.

Called Telecare, the ambulance-stored unit permits trained emergency medical technicians to administer prompt, professional care under radio supervision of a physician who may be miles away in a hospital emergency room or even in his office.

It is during the first critical minutes after arrival of a rescue squad at the scene of an emergency that quick, accurate diagnosis and therapy prescribed by a physician can be instrumental in saving a patient's life—particularly cases involving heart attacks, shock or drowning.

The overall concept of the system brings together six major elements to cope with medical emergencies: trained personnel, diagnostic and therapeutic equipment for use in the field, communications, vehicles, physicians and hospital facilities.

The Telecare unit is a key component of the total system. Despite its suitcase-size it contains the following equipment—brought together for the first time in a single portable package:

A respiratory resuscitation system,

A 15-minute oxygen supply contained in a lightweight canister developed from space technology,

An electrocardiogram display and telemetry system,

A defibrillator for external heart stimulation,

A semi-automatic indirect blood pressure measurement system using a special microphone placed beneath a hand-inflated cuff, similar to the blood pressure device used in the Skylab program,

A basic pharmaceutical pack.

Optional equipment can include an electroencephalogram, to permit remote observation and detection of brain waves stemming from technology first devised for the Skylab sleep analyzer, and a strip chart recorder and tape recorders.

The unique communications system permits full duplex communication between the physician and the emergency medical technician, including a backup system using telephone circuits. In addition, electrocardiogram data on a patient's condition and voice transmissions can be sent simultaneously to the base station over a single radio frequency by the multiplexing process. This permits continuous transmission of medical data as well as two-way voice communication without the use of switches.

Comprehensive field tests of the Telecare system were successfully conducted earlier this year by SCI Systems, Inc., under direction of the Harris County Medical Society in Houston.

As a result, the City of Houston is equipping 28 rescue vehicles with Telecare units and training technicians in their operation. The system is expected to be in operation before the end of the year.

Cities throughout the country are currently evaluating Telecare for possible incorporation in their own emergency medical services programs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, November 5, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let the peace of God rule in your hearts, and be ye thankful.—Colossians 3:15.

Eternal God, our Father, whose creative spirit is ever calling us to new frontiers of thought and action, we pause in Thy presence as we greet the coming of another day. For the daily task and challenge, may we rise renewed in Thee; in the heat and stress of duty may our souls find strength in Thee. With a greatness of spirit, a genuineness of motive, and a goodness of life may we make ourselves ready for the responsibilities of these hours.

Kindle in our hearts and in the hearts of all people a real love for peace and may the rule of Thy spirit increase in

the minds of men until justice with good will shall be established in our land and in every land.

In the spirit of the Master, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1769. An act to reduce the burden on interstate commerce caused by avoidable fires and fire losses, and for other purposes.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PERMITTING TWO IRANIAN CITIZENS TO ATTEND U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 735) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy two citizens and subjects of the Empire of Iran.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR CERTAIN CREW MEMBERS WHOSE SHIPS ARE BEING INACTIVATED AWAY FROM THE HOME PORT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10369) to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide entitlement to round trip transportation to the home port for a member of the uniformed services on permanent duty aboard a ship being inactivated away from home port whose dependents are residing at the home port.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas, or whoever is handling this bill, what effect the home porting of the fleet in Greece will have and how this legislation would affect the home porting of the 6th Fleet, or portions thereof, in Greece. Would it have any effect at all?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the answer to the gentleman's question is in the negative, that it would have no effect.

Mr. GROSS. It would have no effect whatever?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 10369

A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide entitlement to round trip transportation to the home port for a member of the uniformed services on permanent duty aboard a ship being inactivated away from home port whose dependents are residing at the home port

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The text of section 406b is amended by inserting "or inactivated" after "overhauled " and "or inactivation" after "overhaul" whenever they appear.

(2) The catchline of section 406b is amended by inserting "or inactivating" after "overhauling", and by making a similar change in the analysis of chapter 7.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING MAXIMUM TIME ON ADDITIONAL ACTIVE DUTY THAT A RESERVE OFFICER OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE MAY BE REQUIRED TO PERFORM ON COMPLETION OF TRAINING AT AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10366) to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the 4-year limitation on additional active duty that a nonregular officer of the Army or Air Force may be required to perform on completion of training at an educational institution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 10366

A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the four-year limitation on additional active duty that a nonregular officer of the Army or Air Force may be required to perform on completion of training at an educational institution

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 4301(b) and 9301(b) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "but not longer than four years" in the sentence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE VOLUNTARY ASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN RESERVE MEMBERS IN THE READY RESERVE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10367) to amend section 269(d) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the voluntary assignment of certain Reserve members who are entitled to retired or retainer pay to the Ready Reserve, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 10367

A bill to amend section 269(d) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the voluntary assignment of certain Reserve members who are entitled to retired or retainer pay to the Ready Reserve, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 269(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the last two sentences and inserting in place thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, any qualified member of the Army Reserve retired under section 3914 of this title, any qualified member transferred to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve under section 6330 of this title, any qualified member of the Air Force Reserve retired under section 8914 of this title, or any qualified member of the United States Coast Guard retired from active service under section 355 of title 14, United States Code, may, with his consent, be placed in the Ready Reserve and participate in such training duties as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, including those duties described in section 270 of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 684(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following sentence: "Notwithstanding subsection (a), a Reserve of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps described in that subsection who performs active duty for thirty days or less or inactive duty training may receive both the payments to which he is entitled because of his earlier military service and the pay and allowances authorized by law for that active duty or inactive duty training."

SEC. 3. Section 3914 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in place thereof the following: "He then becomes a member of the Army Reserve, and if otherwise qualified, may be appointed for service in the Army National Guard of the United States or the Army Ready Reserve.

SEC. 4. Section 8914 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in place thereof the following: "He then becomes a member of the Air Force Reserve, and if otherwise qualified may be appointed for service in the Air National Guard of the United States or the Air Force Ready Reserve."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND CONVEYANCE IN LOUISIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9295) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the State of Louisiana for the use of Louisiana State University.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 9295

A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the State of Louisiana for the use of Louisiana State University

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey, without monetary consideration, to the State of Louisiana, for the use of Louisiana State University, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property at Robson, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, containing 99.956 acres in section 19, township 16 north, range 12 west, and sections 24 and 25, township 16 north, range 13 west, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, being a part of lot 3 (Martin survey) Robson Plantation and described as follows:

Beginning at a point 260 feet south and 230 feet west of northwest corner section 30, township 16 north, range 12 west, thence north 42 degrees 37 minutes east, 2,986 feet to Harts Island Road, thence along road north 44 degrees 55 minutes west, 1,381 feet to intersection with Robson-Forbing Road; thence along latter road south 30 degrees 25 minutes west, 523 feet south 51 degrees 40 minutes west, 832.5 feet south 48 degrees 15 minutes west, 1,008.4 feet south 24 degrees 40 minutes west, 572 feet (all courses along both roads being a distance of 40 feet from centerlines of said roads); thence south 35 degrees 20 minutes east, 567 feet along Bayou Pierre; thence south 1 degree 30 minutes east along Bayou Pierre 530 feet; thence south 85 degrees 02 minutes east along drainage canal 641 feet to place of beginning.

SEC. 2. The real property conveyed pursuant to this Act shall be used consistent with the purposes of Louisiana State University, including, but not limited to, the maintenance of a pecan production research station.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

"WAR POWERS BILL, THE VETO IS WRONG," AN ARTICLE BY THE HONORABLE DONALD M. FRASER

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of the House will find most perceptive and thoughtful an article by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable DONALD M. FRASER of Minnesota, concerning President Nixon's veto of the war powers bill.

Mr. FRASER's article, which appears in the November 3, 1973, issue of the New Republic follows:

WAR POWERS BILL: THE VETO IS WRONG

(By Hon. DONALD M. FRASER)

A socialist orator is supposed to have once said that "while yesterday we stood at the edge of a precipice, today, thanks to the Socialists, we have taken a step ahead." Apparently the editors of *The New Republic* believe that the enactment of the war powers bill would be such a step. In "A Bad War Powers Bill," (October 27 issue) they contend that this measure "defeats its own purpose" and that it would somehow expand the President's authority to draw us into new wars. Mr. Nixon, for his own reasons, vetoed the bill.

As a member of the conference committee that approved the war powers bill, I feel that *The New Republic* seriously misinterprets this unique legislation. It does place important new restrictions on the President's war-making power: first, he must consult with Congress before introducing US armed forces into any hostilities; second, he must provide a full report to Congress within 48 hours after taking such action; third, he must withdraw troops within 60 days if Congress has not expressly authorized continued US military involvement (a 30-day extension is permitted if the safety of the troops requires it); fourth, he must immediately withdraw troops if Congress mandates it through a concurrent resolution, a measure which does not require a presidential signature.

This bill does not expand the President's authority. It states that none of its provisions shall be construed as granting any authority to the President "which he would not have had" in the absence of the bill.

The first section simply recites the constitutional powers of the President to introduce armed forces into hostilities when 1) war has been declared, 2) a specific statutory authorization is on the books, and 3) a national emergency is created "by attack on the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces." Despite the clarity of this language *The New Republic* sees loopholes where none exist.

The editorial maintains that an attack on the armed forces anywhere gives the President authority to act. But this interpretation ignores the words "national emergency." As I pointed out on the floor of the House, an attack on an isolated unit of armed forces does not constitute a national emergency. The 1964 PT boat attack on destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin could not be considered a national emergency. A nuclear attack on the Sixth Fleet clearly would.

Curiously the editors contend that there is no restraint on the President's authority to use US troops to rescue American citizens abroad. But we recite the President's powers in the bill and rescuing US citizens is not one of them. Such a provision was included in the Senate bill but was dropped in conference.

The editorial is flatly wrong in claiming that the bill would allow the President to commit troops under treaties that have been ratified. Exactly the opposite is true. The bill says that such authority shall *not* be inferred from any existing or prospective treaty, unless there is *legislation in addition* that specifically authorizes the President to commit troops.

Finally, *TNR* ignores a key provision that gives Congress authority to mandate military disengagement at any time. The constitutionality of this provision has been questioned but this new authority would clearly operate as a powerful restraint on any President.

In large part the war powers bill is significant as a political document rather than as a legal statement. Sen. Fulbright emphasized this in urging support for the final bill, having opposed the Senate version.

Legal restraints on the President have proved to be ineffective during the last 25 years, as *The New Republic* correctly points out. Most conferees accepted this fact acknowledging that the President may continue to ignore statutory limitations even if the war powers bill were to become law. We recognize that the President might have the power to use military power beyond the territorial limits of the United States, but the question of his authority would emerge as a clearly defined issue. Congress could call him to account under the terms of this bill. That point is emphasized by Harvard law professor Roger Fisher in a recent letter to some House members urging them to override the President's veto: ". . . the political restraints that the resolution establishes should far outweigh any effect of opening the door. The door now, unfortunately, is wide open. Speeches on the floor of the House are likely to be a less effective way of closing it than are the procedural requirements of the joint resolution. The requirements of reporting to Congress and the necessity of a congressional debate should cast their shadow forward and operate as an appreciable deterrent. Everyone knows the purpose of the resolution and the mood of the Congress which adopted it. Its political impact on a future President will be a reflection of these items, not the result of intricate legalistic arguments from the language."

If Congress fails to override the veto, we will have lost an opportunity to restrain growing presidential usurpation of Congress' war-making responsibilities. To leave the President unrestrained is to take inordinate risks with our democratic system.

THE CASE OF MENDEL LEIBOVICH TREER

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the past month has been packed with national and international crises. Our calendars are overcrowded, but the cause of human freedom which is the motivation behind the Mills-Vanik amendment, deserves a place on the busiest of calendars. I welcome the opportunity to be among those of my colleagues who have participated in this vigil on behalf of all peoples who are not free to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Mendel Treer is a 71-year-old shoemaker from Zaporozhye in the Ukraine. In November 1972, Treer and his daughter, Liubov, a teacher, applied to the local OVIR—passport office—for exit permits to Israel. Treer said that he wished to be reunited with his brother.

But OVIR ignored Treer's eligibility to emigrate under the "reunion of families" policy and twice rejected his application. This elderly, ailing man made trips to Kiev and to Moscow to have his application reviewed; but it was returned to the local OVIR. Again emigration permits were denied.

The Treers were told that since they were born in the Soviet Union they were obliged to live only in the Soviet Union. Another high official told them that as long as he lived and was in a position of authority they could not leave Zaporozhye.

On July 15, 1973, Treer wrote to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet describing his plight and stated:

I want to spend the last years of my life in my historical homeland together with my relatives.

Months have passed and the father and daughter are still waiting for permission to emigrate to Israel.

The Soviet Union must lift these restrictions on free emigration. It is urgent that the 93d session of this House pass the Mills-Vanik amendment by an overwhelming majority and go on record as being on the side of human freedom.

STRIP MINING LEGISLATION

(Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in a meeting in conjunction with the Environmental Subcommittee of that committee, for about the fifth or the sixth day in the last 3 weeks on the failure of an amendment to carry, the minority asked for a quorum call and thereby stopped markup on the very important Surface Mining Act of 1973 from going forward.

This is the second year we have labored on a strip mine bill in this same committee. We reported out an excellent bill which this House passed by a large margin under suspension of the rules in October 1972, and the Senate then allowed it to die.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor now to ask my friends in the interest of this country, if they are taking part in any "deal" to try to frustrate this legislation, I want them not to think that they will be getting a better bill next year than they would be this year. If they do believe that, they are sadly mistaken.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a filibuster going on which is instigated by the coal industry and the utilities industry in order to avoid regulation which this Nation is demanding, not only in the way of regulation but hopefully in the way of phasing out strip mining.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, many Members and coal company executives now admit they would rather have had last year's bill than this year's. I believe they will be better off with the present bill than one still further in the future. I hope they will not repeat the same action as they did last year. For if they delay again they may well be flirting with an eventual banning of all strip mining, the position I know is not the answer for the State of Wyoming or the Nation at the present time.

CREATION OF A SANTA BARBARA ENERGY RESERVE

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, around noon on January 28, 1969, an offshore oil rig situated on leased Federal seabed off Santa Barbara, Calif., was the site of one of the most significant occurrences in the process by which America was awakened to the hazards of environmental pollution. The blowout at platform "A" released thousands of gallons of crude oil and natural gas into the sea.

It may be difficult for some to recall without a brief reminder the spontaneous reaction of millions of citizens across the land when the television cameras brought to their living rooms the blackened beaches and suffocated wildlife of Santa Barbara along with thousands of citizen volunteers struggling valiantly to restore nature suddenly thrown into disarray. When the initial tide of emotional reaction subsided and the rate of leakage from platform "A" slowed to a few barrels a day, the search for a long-term answer to the difficult task of protecting this environmentally and geologically fragile area began.

As the President's Council on Environmental Quality recommended, the logical procedure was to cancel leases which, if developed, would pose a significant continuing threat to the environment. Along with myself, California's two Senators, then George Murphy and ALAN CRANSTON advocated such a course. In June of 1970, the President proposed legislation to cancel 20 Santa Barbara leases. The difficulty, of course, is that depriving the oil companies of their rights to develop oil that can be produced from these leases—for which many millions were paid—requires compensation.

A key feature of several of the many legislative proposals I have introduced to respond to the Santa Barbara Channel oil problem has been that recompense for leaseholders in the channel, once determined by the courts, would be paid from proceeds of oil sales from Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, at Elk Hills, Calif. This method avoids the substantial drain from the general fund of the Treasury and substitutes one reserve of oil, in the Santa Barbara Channel, for another.

Senators CRANSTON and TUNNEY, and the administration since April of 1971, have also proposed the substitution of Elk Hills oil for Santa Barbara oil. Many Members of both Houses have cosponsored these proposals in the interest of protecting the delicate ecological balance of the channel. Unfortunately, there are some old bugaboos associated with the Naval Petroleum Reserve.

Recently our colleague from Sacramento, Calif., the Honorable JOHN MOSS, raised questions about the operation of the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve, and particularly the financial interest of oil companies in possible production from the Reserve. Hearings held by the Armed Services Committee on October 17 and 18 and available to all Members, deal at some length with these matters and satisfy me that the private gain to any company which would derive from production at Elk Hills is the result of contractual arrangements which have, for the most part, been ratified by Congress as well as the executive branch.

Although incidental to the primary purpose of the Santa Barbara Channel bills, the Elk Hills aspects of these proposals will be of interest to Members in formulating their conclusions as to the merit of such legislation. In the interest of presenting a concise treatment of this matter for the consideration of the Members, I am including a letter from Mr. L. T. Vice of the Standard Oil Co. of California at this point in the RECORD:

STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif., November 3, 1973.

Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: You have requested the comments of my company, Standard Oil Company of California, as to the letter of October 18, 1973, from Representative Moss of California to the President with regard to his proposal for a limited open-up of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 (Elk Hills) for a limited period, and Representative Moss' remarks to the House when he had a copy of his letter inserted in the Congressional Record on October 24, 1973.

We are happy to oblige.

I shall discuss first my company's participation in the development and operation of Elk Hills, and secondly the current disposition of oil therefrom including the contract with Shell Oil Company which Representative Moss mentioned.

We are not involved in the Teapot Dome Reserve, also mentioned in Representative Moss' letter.

I shall not discuss Representative Moss' general and inflammatory remarks about the oil industry, except to say that we disagree with them in every particular, and that they are irrelevant to the President's proposal with regard to Elk Hills.

CREATION OF THE RESERVE

As you may know, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 was established in 1912 and is located in the Elk Hills in Kern County, California. At the turn of the century, government lands in the West were rapidly being turned over to private ownership. At the same time there was a growing realization of the importance of oil for the Navy, which was then changing from coal to oil burning ships. Accordingly, President Taft withdrew large tracts of potentially oil-bearing public lands in California and Wyoming from eligibility for private ownership, and in 1912 set aside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 by Executive order.

A good many sections of the lands covered by this Executive order had, however, already passed into private ownership, in accordance with the government's policy of the time. While the Executive order establishing the reserve governed the further use and disposition of the government lands included in the reserve, it had no effect on the privately-owned lands so included, and the owners of those lands remained free to use them or dispose of them as they saw fit.

In 1944 there were approximately 44,000 acres of land within the reserve. Of these approximately one-fifth were privately owned in fee by my company, Standard Oil Company of California, and the remainder, or approximately four-fifths, were owned by the United States and administered by the Navy. The Standard lands were and are not all in one block, but are checkerboarded throughout the reserve.

Also, by 1944 three geologic "zones" underlying the reserve known to be commercially productive of oil and/or gas had been discovered. These are the Dry Gas Zone, the Shallow Oil Zone, and the Stevens Zone.

Within the Shallow Oil and Stevens Zones are several separate oil pools or reservoirs. These underlie both Navy and Standard lands within the reserve, and production from the lands of one could reduce the amount of oil underlying the lands of the other, with the result that the government's policy of conserving its oil in the ground until needed in time of emergency could not be effectively implemented if Standard were to produce from its own lands as it had the right to do. For this reason, in the years prior to World

War II, Standard did not develop its lands within the reserve to the extent that it would otherwise unquestionably have done.

On the threshold of World War II, and with the threat of the condemnation of Standard's underdeveloped lands, active negotiations began either for an exchange, purchase or condemnation of Standard's lands within the reserve, or for their operation as a unit with Navy's lands. A purchase or exchange would have required a substantial expenditure by the government. As an alternative arrangement, Navy and Standard agreed to operate all of the lands within the reserve as a unit, and on June 19, 1944, entered into a Unit Plan contract for the reserve.

THE UNIT PLAN CONTRACT

A Unit Agreement is an arrangement, common in the petroleum industry, under which the owners of two or more separate parcels of land in a common pool or field agree to operate all the lands overlying the pool or field as a single unit, and to share production and costs in agreed-upon proportions. Such an arrangement is usually for the life of the field and the parties have the same objective, i.e., to produce currently at minimum expense and at maximum rates, consistent with good engineering practice.

The Unit Plan contract here involved, however, is unusual because its long-range purpose (after certain emergency production during World War II) is not to produce currently but to conserve in the ground as much of the oil in the field—both Navy's and Standard's—as is feasible, until needed for a future emergency. This required Standard to agree to the curtailing of its production from its lands, along with that of Navy from its lands, once World War II was over, for which Standard was entitled to compensation. Accordingly, the parties agreed that in consideration for Standard giving up control over the development and operation of its lands, Standard would be allowed to take certain quantities of Shallow Oil Zone oil, most of which were produced during World War II, until Standard had received 25 million barrels of oil, or an amount equal to ⅓ (one-third) of its share of the estimated recoverable oil in the Shallow Oil Zone, whichever was less—all of which production was charged to Standard's share of the oil in the Shallow Oil Zone. The period during which Standard received this oil is referred to in the Unit Plan contract as the "primary period." After the primary period, production was to stop, except to the extent necessary to cover Standard's out-of-pocket expenses in connection with the operation of the reserve, and except for production for the purpose of protecting, conserving, maintaining and testing the reserve.

Provision was also made for exploration and development, and for the drilling, equipping and maintenance of wells in the reserve so that it could be produced upon short notice in the event of a national emergency. It is a truism, of course, that once oil wells are drilled they must be inspected and tested periodically to make sure that they still retain their capacity to produce.

Incidentally, the Unit Plan contract for Elk Hills was submitted to and approved by both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, was specially authorized by an Act of Congress adopted in 1944, and after execution by the Secretary of the Navy was approved by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

THE AMENDATORY AND SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT

After the Unit Plan contract was entered into, exploration within the reserve showed that part of a Stevens Zone pool extended outside the reserve. There was no mechanism provided in the Unit Plan contract for drilling outside the reserve, however, to determine how far. Accordingly, in December 1948 Navy and Standard entered into an amendatory and supplemental agreement which provided in Part II for exploration jointly by the parties of lands of both Navy and Standard in a "proposed extended area" outside the northwest boundaries of the reserve, and for the inclusion under unit operation (down to and including the Stevens Zone) of any lands found to be commercially productive of oil from any pool or pools then productive within the then existing boundaries of the reserve. Under this amendatory and supplemental agreement certain additional Navy and Standard lands were included within the Unit, and Standard received an extension of the "primary period" as consideration for the inclusion of its lands.

Again, the 1948 amendatory and supplemental agreement was submitted to and approved by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, and was approved by the President of the United States.

PRODUCTION TAKEN BY STANDARD

In other words, 25 to 30 years ago, as a consideration for giving up its control over its own privately owned and proven oil lands at Elk Hills, which Standard had a clear right to develop and produce, Standard was permitted to take a certain quantity of oil from the reserve, most of which would in all probability have been produced anyway in the World War II emergency, and all of which was charged solely to Standard's overall share of oil in the Shallow Oil Zone, thus depleting Standard's share in that zone while leaving Navy's share of the oil untouched and intact in the ground.

Since that time, the only oil which Standard has received from Elk Hills has been in strict compliance with the Unit Plan contract and has been produced at the direction of Navy for the purpose of protecting, conserving, maintaining or testing the reserve—including oil produced to test the readiness wells referred to above—or to reimburse Standard for its out-of-pocket costs in the reserve—the latter on the theory that it would be grossly unfair to require Standard not only to forgo the development and operation of its own proved oil lands at Elk Hills, but to suffer a net out-of-pocket monetary loss in so doing.

Representative Moss' statement that "at given intervals. Socal has been permitted to remove significant quantities of oil from Elk Hills under agreement with government" must therefore be read in the light of the above.

Further, I cannot agree with Representative Moss' statement that "another windfall profit could be in order for Socal if Elk Hills is opened up . . .," whether for national defense or otherwise. So far as I know, no one has seriously suggested that Standard received an undue or unfair consideration for giving up control over its fee lands at Elk Hills when it was permitted 25 to 30 years ago to take a quantity of oil which was going to be produced anyway all of which was charged solely to Standard's agreed share of the oil in the field and not in any way to Navy's share. Since then Standard has adhered to its agreement with the government regarding Elk Hills and its oil as well as Navy's oil has been kept shut up in the ground with the exception of the relatively minor quantities noted above. To say that Standard would receive a "windfall" because Standard would now be able to produce and take an additional quantity of its own oil, if the government concludes that the national interests require that Elk Hills be opened up, strikes me as grossly unfair and prejudicial to my Company.

NO POSSIBILITY OF STANDARD CANCELLING THE UNIT PLAN CONTRACT

Incidentally, there is no danger of the existing Unit Plan contract for the governance of Elk Hills being unilaterally terminated by Standard because of an open-up by the government which otherwise follows the provisions of the Unit Plan contract, no matter what the purpose of the open-up may be, and we are prepared to give the government any needed assurances on this point.

THE OPERATION OF THE RESERVE

Subject to the provisions of the Unit Plan contract, Navy was given exclusive control over the exploration, prospecting, development and operation of the reserve. Navy was also given the right at its discretion to operate the reserve directly with its own personnel or to contract for such operation. Navy entered into a contract with Standard for Standard to operate the reserve, and since that time has entered into two subsequent operating agreements with Standard.

Each of these operating agreements has also been approved by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, and by the President of the United States.

THE WORKING OF THE UNIT PLAN CONTRACT

Under the Unit Plan contract all exploration, prospecting, development and producing operations on the reserve were placed under the supervision and direction of an operating committee comprised of two petroleum engineers, one to be appointed by and represent Standard and one to be appointed by and represent Navy. In order to provide technical advice and to make certain specified determinations based upon petroleum engineering data, an engineering committee was also established, consisting of the members of the operating committee ex officio and four other petroleum engineers or geologists, two to be appointed by and represent Navy, and two to be appointed by and represent Standard.

The "percentage participations" of the parties in each productive zone within the Elk Hills Unit were fixed as of November 20, 1942, and are to be revised retroactively from time to time in the light of new knowledge gained. Generally, as to each zone, production is to be shared by the parties currently in accord with their then existing participating percentages, and costs are to be paid currently in accord with receipts of production, because of the special provisions of the Unit Plan contract, however—e.g., the provision that Standard was to be permitted to take World War II production, up to 15,000 barrels per day (to be charged to its share of the Shallow Oil Zone oil) during the "primary period"—it was inevitable that the parties from time to time would become "out of balance" with their participating percentages both in oil received and costs paid. In addition, any retroactive revision of the participating percentages of the parties in a given zone will automatically place the parties "out of balance" in that zone. Accordingly, the parties provided for certain "catch-up" mechanisms and provided that at the end of the life of each zone there should be an appropriate cash adjustment to effect an ultimate balancing of production and costs with final participating percentages.

It is because of these special provisions that Standard is at the moment behind in costs and ahead in oil to the extent of approximately $24,000,000, as Representative Moss notes. However, Standard does not "owe" this amount to Navy, as Representative Moss says, or indeed any amount. On an open-up, Standard would be required to reduce its take of production to ⅓ of its participating percentage share (which would work out to be about 12 percent to 14 percent) until oil balance occurs, and then to increase its share of current cost payments until cost balance occurs. You can see, therefore, that in overall operation the Unit Plan contract is a fair one, and does not favor Standard at the expense of Navy or the United States.

DRILLING AROUND PERIPHERY OF RESERVE

Lastly, I should like to commend on Representative Moss' statements with regard to drilling by my Company around the periphery of the reserve.

In his remarks to the House, Representative Moss said "federal regulations prohibit issuance of oil and gas leases by BLM within a mile of a naval petroleum reserve boundary. Over Navy protests and in violation of such a rule, the BLM issued such leases around and adjacent to the Elk Hills reserve to—by sheer coincidence—Standard Oil of California, which proceeded to drill a well within 1 mile of the reserve boundary and, by luck and accident, I am sure, hit major oil strikes." Representative Moss adds that "this has resulted in significant drainage of oil pools under the Elk Hills reserve," and refers to "Socal's illegal drilling near the Elk Hills boundary." Essentially the same statements are Representative Moss' letter to the President

Representative Moss has been misinformed. The BLM has not issued any leases adjacent to or within 1 mile of the reserve to Standard Oil Company of California, over the protests of Navy or otherwise. Standard does hold two government leases on the South Flank of Reserve No. 1 issued to another company in 1920, which company was acquired by Standard in 1943. Both leases are in the Buena Vista Hills field within Reserve No. 2, however, which field has been produced commercially by numerous owners and lessees ever since its discovery and development around 1910. Further, in 1955 the BLM issued a government lease outside the northwest corner of the Reserve No. 1 to American Marc, Inc. In 1965 and 1966 Standard acquired this lease by assignment. Later it drilled several wells thereon, the closest of which was over ¾ of a mile from the Elk Hills Unit. Some of these wells were and are productive from a zone not known to be productive within the Unit. Three wells penetrated a zone (not a pool) which is known to be productive within the Unit, and were shut in. By agreement between Navy and Standard, a well was then drilled to this zone approximately half way betweeen Standard's wells and the boundary of the Elk Hills Unit, and proved to be not commercially productive. Clearly, then, none of these wells of Standard's can be said to be draining or injuring the Unit.

Standard does own outright a substantial amount of land around the periphery of the reserve. As part of our stepped-up exploration program undertaken to help alleviate the growing shortage of petroleum and petroleum products in California, we drilled an exploratory well earlier this year on a section of our own fee land just outside the northern boundary of the reserve. Since the well was drilled on our own fee land, outside the reserve, it cannot possibly be characterized as "illegal." The well was successful, and discovered a new and productive pool of oil. Present indications are that the pool does not extend within the reserve. We have given all the information on our well to the government, however, and if it should turn out that the pool does extend within the reserve, the government has ample authority to protect it, and we would fully expect it to do so.

DISPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT OIL FROM ELK HILLS

Representative Moss' fear that Shell Oil Company will reap "windfall profits" if Elk Hills is opened up as the President has proposed seems to me to be unjustified. While it is true that Shell has a contract executed in May 1970, to purchase Navy's unit production at Elk Hills for a period of five years, under Article IX thereof the contract is terminable at will by either party on six months' notice to the other. Shell is therefore not in a position to "claim all new production," as Representative Moss fears.

At to how and to whom the new production going to Navy might be sold, the Director of Naval Petroleum Reserves can, of course, give you the facts better than we can, but I do know that in past years Navy's production from the Elk Hills area, both within and outside the Unit operation, has been sold at various times to Wilshire, Douglas, Mohawk, Rothschild and Edgington. In each case, Navy has offered the oil for bidding on the open market, and companies desiring to purchase the oil may add a bonus over and above the posted prices for comparable oil produced from other fields in the vicinity. And in each case, the purchaser has had no difficulty in getting the oil out of the field, and disposing of it or utilizing it as he saw fit.

Incidentally, Navy's non-unit production in the Elk Hills area is presently going to the Mohawk Petroleum Company, I understand.

CONCLUSION

In view of the developing energy shortage in this country, it seems to me undeniably in the national interest that the President's proposals for dealing with that shortage receive a fair and objective hearing by all concerned. Accordingly, we very much appreciate your interest in the facts with regard to Elk Hills, and hope that the above will assist you in your inquiry.

Respectfully,

L. T. VICE.

FRANK SMALL, JR.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland, (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Prince Georges County and of the State of Maryland are mourning the loss of one of our most outstanding citizens and a former Member of the House of Representatives, Frank Small, Jr.

Frank Small was a man of modest and simple beginnings. Born on a farm in Temple Hills, Md., Mr. Small showed the ambition and drive which led him to high responsibilities in government and business. He became the president of the Clinton Bank and after the merger of this bank with the Equitable Trust Co. of Baltimore he served as its vice president. He was also the president of the Clinton Realty Co. at the time of his death.

Mr. Small was a devoted and sincere political leader. He served in the State house of delegates in 1927 and 1928; was a member of the board of county commissioners from 1930–34; was a member of the Republican State Central Committee from 1934–42 and served as its chairman for 4 years. He was a delegate to the Republican Conventions in 1940, 1944, and 1956 and served in the U.S. House of Representatives during the 83d Congress. He was the Republican nominee for Governor of Maryland in 1962 and I was privileged to serve as his coordinator in that campaign.

Mr. Small was a member of the Maryland Racing Commission from 1937–52 and served as the commission chairman during 1951 and 1952; was a member of the Maryland Commission of Motor Vehicles from 1955–57. He also served as president of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners.

I admired Mr. Small very much and learned most of what I know of politics from him. He was a close friend of mine and I extend my deepest sympathy to his children and grandchildren.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM: COMMITTEE OF TWENTY'S OUTLINE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on October 25—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 35019–35022—I spoke here to urge that the United States withdraw our endorsement of the Nairobi fixed but adjustable exchange rates monetary reform. I recommended that this body not approve any so-called reform which deprived the United States of its present option to float the dollar in exchange markets as a regular procedure. I said:

With the air thus cleared, the Committee of Twenty can go on in a streamlined way to meet its July 31, 1974 deadline. Questions such as SDRs, convertibility, the dollar overhang, intervention will yield easier solutions as a result of this clearing of the air. I shall discuss these questions in a second speech in a few days.

I now undertake that discussion. For purposes of clarity, the simplest procedure is to touch upon the issues in the same order, using the same headings, as in the IMF Committee of Twenty's "First Outline of Reform," issued at Nairobi on September 24, 1973.

PRESSURES; THE EXCHANGE RATE MECHANISM; MULTICURRENCY INTERVENTION

The Committee of Twenty's outline of reform envisages the reinstitution of fixed par values for the currencies of member states. Market exchange rates would be allowed to fluctuate within 2¼ percent above or below the stated par for each currency. In the absence of a change in par values, intervention by monetary authorities would keep market exchange rates within the designated margin. The outline states:

Countries may adopt floating rates in particular situations, subject to Fund authorization, surveillance and review.

I have already indicated in my October 25 speech the reasons I object to the need for any IMF authorization permitting a country to adopt a floating exchange rate as a matter of regular policy. Each IMF member, I believe, should have the option of permitting the external value of its currency to be determined day to day in exchange markets. This option should be fully equivalent to the alternative of announcing a par value, and should not entail any sanction, or for that matter privilege, for those countries opting in favor of floating rates.

Since the reformed international monetary system will be based in part on fixed par values, the question arises when and how these values will be changed. The outline indicates that changes in par values will result from

consultations among Fund members, guided in part by changes in reserve stocks sufficiently large to indicate that serious payments disequilibria in fact exist. Countries that refuse to make the exchange rate changes or to take the other policy actions recommended by the Fund would be subject to a graduated series of pressures designed to induce these countries to conform to the best judgment of a majority of the Fund's membership.

Such procedures seem reasonable for that group of IMF member states that elect to announce par values for their currencies and to formulate their economic policies for a fixed rate regime. Agreement on the technical details of such arrangements should not provide any unsurmountable obstacles or prolonged delays, especially if the reform adopted gives each Fund member the option, without prejudice, of allowing exchange markets to determine the external value of its currency.

Surveillance by an appropriate body of the IMF will also be necessary for those countries electing to let their currencies float. The Fund should be charged with the responsibility of insuring that these countries observe the established guidelines regarding central bank intervention in exchange markets, and that other policies, including monetary and fiscal policy, are not used to bring about competitive exchange rate changes. Monetary and fiscal policies should in general be directed toward the maintenance of domestic full employment and a satisfactory rate of noninflationary economic growth. Of course, such policies will sometimes have external effects, and for countries whose international transactions constitute a third or even a larger fraction of their gross national product, such external repercussions will certainly, at times, be necessary and desirable. A review group in the IMF would be well situated to evaluate these differences in the economic characteristics of member states, and to draw appropriate conclusions about whether their policies are appropriate.

The exchange market intervention activities of countries adopting floating rates are of central importance. This issue does not arise for those nations announcing par values, since intervention by their monetary authorities will be directed toward maintaining actual market rates for their currencies within the margins specified by the IMF. Apparently because the Committee of Twenty's outline is based on a presumed return to fixed but adjustable parties, and sanctions floating rates only as "providing a useful technique in particular situations," it did not address the issue of guidelines for exchange market intervention by the monetary authorities of countries with floating rates. But if the United States and numerous other countries adopt floating as a long-term practice, as I believe they inevitably will, intervention guidelines must be established among IMF members.

I can think of only one legitimate objective of central bank intervention in exchange markets when rates are otherwise being allowed to float, that is, to preserve orderly market conditions in the face of an imminent breakdown. When Federal Reserve Board Chairman Burns testified before the Joint Economic Committee last August 3 and argued that intervention had been necessary to prevent a market breakdown, I asked him how he characterized a disorderly market. In response, he submitted the following useful staff memorandum:

FEDERAL RESERVE STAFF MEMORANDUM IN RE: DISORDERLY MARKETS

Disorderly markets have certain features in common: exaggerated rate movements, wide spreads in quotations, a stifling of the intermediary role of professional dealers, and an unresponsiveness of prices and orders to the fundamentals operating at the time. Disorderly markets are by their nature unstable; in the absence of some stabilizing influence, disorder can increase to the point at which the market ceases to function.

The developments leading up to the Federal Reserve intervention in foreign exchange markets in July provide an illustration of how markets become disorderly. In May, foreign exchange traders of banks and commercial concerns were beginning to take the view that they were likely to sustain losses when they held a long position in dollars overnight and, conversely, to realize profits when they were short of dollars. In these circumstances, traders became increasingly unwilling to expose themselves to the risks of holding dollars. The market found it increasingly difficult to accommodate dollar sales as they appeared. A moderate-sized dollar offer in normal conditions could have been easily handled would be passed from one dealer to another. Traders, hoping to make their rates unattractive to potential dollar sellers, widened very substantially the spreads that they quoted between bid and asked rates. As sales of dollars for foreign currencies continued in this atmosphere, market conditions worsened, and by early July the dollar declined by 2 percent or more each day against major continental currencies.

In the face of this widespread selling and rapidly changing exchange rates, market participants lost confidence in their ability to assess exchange-rate relationships. Traders concentrated their attention on movements in spot rates for major continental currencies and virtually ignored the other currencies and all forward exchange rates; consequently these markets virtually dried up. Moreover, major corporate customers suspended much of their normal foreign exchange business, and by July 6, a number of New York banks were refusing to quote exchange rates and had suspended all foreign exchange business—even in the major currencies.

As conditions in the exchange markets deteriorated during the first week of July, the need for official intervention to restore order in the markets was recognized by monetary officials here and in Europe. A communique implying that such intervention would be undertaken was issued on July 8 by the central bank Governors meeting at the B.I.S. in Basel, Switzerland, and intervention was in fact undertaken by several central banks, including the Federal Reserve, during the ensuing days, with the result that order in exchange markets was restored. The need for official intervention at that time was also recognized by the financial press, including supporters of floating exchange rates. For example, the London Financial Times, in its editorial of July 9, called the situation in the exchange market "not only absurd but dangerous" and urged immediate implementation of "a set of informally-agreed rules to govern the . . . period of floating." Several days later, the New York Times urged a reformed monetary system that would be "less crisis-prone than either the now dead fixed rate Bretton Woods system or the present state of disorderly floating, and growing export, import and capital controls."

As I see it, if a country elects to have the market establish the external value of its currency on a day-to-day basis, the function of any intervention by monetary authorities ought to be to help the market fulfill this role. After a dozen years of fixed parities sustained by massive central bank intervention whenever a crisis threatened, followed by 2 years of switching back and forth between floating rates and fixed parities, exchange dealers, exporters, importers, and international investors cannot be expected to adapt painlessly to generalized floating. The ease with which the international monetary system has adjusted to floating, the continued brisk expansion of trade and investment, the relatively small magnitude of exchange rate fluctuations in the face of unprecedented political upheavals, and the self-correcting ability of the market that has been manifested in recent weeks all testify to the intelligence and flexibility of exchange dealers, traders, and investors.

In the face of a domestic monetary crisis, the function of a central bank is to lend freely. When for any reason all the bets in the exchange market start running only one way, the central bank needs to enter the picture and make a market.

IMF guidelines for intervention by the central banks of countries adopting floating rates will most likely contain a list of what these institutions may not do. The Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on International Economics in its report of August 14, 1973, concluded:

> Under no circumstances should intervention in exchange markets by U.S. monetary authorities be massive, continuous, and committed to maintaining a fixed exchange rate between the dollar and any other particular currency. . . . Any intervention that is conducted should be limited in amount, used from time to time, rather than continuously, and applied with respect to an underlying trend rather than a particular rate.

This is sharply at variance with the intervention objective suggested by IMF Managing Director Witteveen in his opening address at Nairobi of "using in-

tervention to prevent * * * excessive deviation from exchange rates considered to be appropriate in the medium term." The inability of officials to judge accurately what are appropriate exchange rates in the medium term has been amply demonstrated in the last 5 years.

A suggestion was offered at Nairobi by Otmar Emminger, deputy governor of the West German Central Bank, that when the dollar strengthens sufficiently to reach the set of exchange parities proposed by officials in February 1973 the dollar be stabilized at that point. Stabilization to prevent a further rise in the exchange value of the dollar would be achieved through sales of dollars by central banks in exchange markets. Mr. Emminger's suggestion would come into play when the dollar was worth 2.67 deutsche marks, as contrasted with its current level of about 2.40.

The set of parities proposed by officials last February was inappropriate at the time, as the market quickly demonstrated. There is no reason to believe that it would be appropriate at the time the dollar again touches these levels. Of course, Mr. Emminger may have proposed stabilization of the dollar in part to permit foreign central banks to run off some of their excessively large dollar holdings. One can hardly blame foreign countries for desiring to divest themselves of some of their paper money and exchange it for goods or more profitable investments. This issue I shall return to in discussing the problem of the dollar overhang.

CONTROLS, DISEQUILIBRIATING CAPITAL FLOWS

The Outline of Reform says on the subject of controls:

> There will be a strong presumption against the use of controls on current account transactions or payments for balance of payments purposes. . . . Countries will not use controls over capital transactions for the purpose of maintaining inappropriate exchange rates or, more generally, of avoiding appropriate adjustment action.

Nations permitting their currencies to float, like those announcing fixed parities, should similarly not resort to exchange controls to influence the value of their currencies. Countries with floating currencies will have no need to rely upon trade or capital flow restrictions, since exchange rates can adjust to eliminate any payments surplus or deficit.

CONVERTIBILITY

The outline states:

> All countries maintaining par values will settle in reserve assets those initial balances of their currencies which are presented to them for conversion.

Thus, as long as the United States allows the dollar's external value to be determined day to day in exchange markets, we would assume no obligation to convert any additional dollars that might be acquired by foreign monetary authorities into SDR's, gold, or foreign exchange. Moreover, to the extent that the fluctuating rate system functions efficiently and without interference by monetary authorities, there should be no additional dollar accumulation.

But for countries adopting fixed parities, the Outline asserts:

> That there is a need for some elasticity within the settlement system, particularly to finance disequilibriating capital flows.

The use of official credits to counteract the impact on exchange rates of large international transfers of liquid assets is, as we have seen in the past, likely to be ineffective, to foster the maintenance of disequilibrium exchange rates, to have severe inflationary consequences in the countries attracting such flows, and to build up massive international debts that are difficult to liquidate. In attempting to curtail speculative capital flows, international monetary authorities should rely upon the harmonization of monetary policies, to the extent that domestic considerations make this feasible, and upon movements in exchange rates to choke off the transfers.

PRIMARY RESERVE ASSETS

If the United States and several other major countries opt to permit their currencies to float in exchange markets, the need for SDR's by the remaining IMF members adopting fixed parities will be minimized. Moreover, given the dollar accumulations of recent years, the global stock of reserve assets is now excessive. There should be little need for additional SDR's until a substantial portion of these dollar reserves are spent in the United States to purchase goods, services, or investments.

CONSOLIDATION AND MANAGEMENT OF CURRENCY RESERVES

As long as the dollar remains a major currency used to finance international trade, it will also continue to be used to some extent as a reserve currency. The reduction and eventual elimination of current official dollar holdings in excess of working balances is not a problem that can be easily or quickly resolved. Perhaps at some time in the future U.S. authorities will be prepared to consider bilateral funding or consolidation of these balances within the IMF. But any proposed exchange of dollar reserves for a few issues of SDR's would need to be carefully managed to avoid the danger of diminishing the attractiveness of SDR's by creating an excessive amount of them.

Another way gradually to amortize the overhang would be to maintain a slight undervaluation of the dollar by permitting foreign central banks to intervene in exchange markets on a regular basis. Official institutions could thus gradually sell off their excess dollar holdings to private foreigners purchasing goods and services in the United States or investing either in equities or real property. But under no circumstances should intervention by foreign monetary authorities be linked to a specific exchange rate between the dollar and any other particular currency. Nor should the degree of undervaluation be large enough to create a price incentive for foreigners to suck away commodities that are scarce in the United States and so create undesirable pressures for export controls. Sales of dollar holdings by monetary authorities should be gradual and gaged with reference to the trend in the dollar's external value as determined by exchange markets. The rate at which the dollar overhang can be reduced should be subject to continuous negotiations between United States and foreign monetary authorities.

THE LINK AND CREDIT FACILITIES IN FAVOR OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Since the need for SDR's is likely to be small, developing countries would benefit only to a minimal degree from any arrangement that would merely increase slightly the proportion of these assets allocated to them. Under these circumstances, an appropriate remedy would be to allocate all newly created special drawing rights to the developing countries. Those industrial nations maintaining fixed parities and desiring to increase their reserve stocks could then earn their SDR's from poorer states. Through this mechanism, transfers of real resources to speed the economic growth of poorer countries would be facilitated.

TOWARD A PROMPT INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

If the document drafted by the Committee of Twenty includes floating as a fully equivalent and equally desirable alternative to establishing a fixed parity, IMF members should be able to agree quickly on the shape of the proposed reform. After all, the substance of this reform has been in place since last March, and is working far more satisfactorily than did the old fixed-rate regime.

CPA AT FDA, CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the huge volume of the Federal Food and Drug Administration proceedings and activities that would be subject to Consumer Protection Agency advocacy under pending bills has precluded me from listing them all in one RECORD insertion.

To avoid speculation and confusion on these controversial bills, I have asked various agencies frequently mentioned in the CPA bill hearings to list for me their 1972 proceedings and activities, divided into the various categories in which the CPA would have a right to be a party or participant under the bills.

I have been sharing this material with the Members through publication in the RECORD. Yesterday I inserted part of the FDA response; today I shall insert the remainder. FDA, according to the hearings on these bills, will be one of the prime targets for CPA advocacy.

The bills, now before a Government Operations Subcommittee on which I serve, are: House Resolution 14 by Congressman ROSENTHAL, House Resolution 21 by Congressmen HOLIFIELD and HORTON, and House Resolution 564 by Congressman BROWN of Ohio and myself.

The major difference among the bills is that the Fuqua-Brown bill would not

allow the CPA to appeal to the courts the final actions and refusals to act of other Federal agencies. The other two bills would grant such an extraordinary power to this nonregulatory agency.

The remainder of the FDA response begun yesterday is now inserted in the RECORD for the important reasons already stated:

FDA RESPONSE—CONTINUED

Question 2. What regulations, rules, rates, or policy interpretations subject to 5 USC 556 and 557 (that is, APA rulemaking on the record) were proposed or initiated by your agency during calendar year 1972?

Answer:

Food and Drug Administration (FDA): The provisions of 5 USC 556 and 557 could apply in any FDA rulemaking proceeding listed under question 5 or FDA adjudicatory proceeding listed under question 3.

Question 3. Excluding proceedings in which your agency sought primarily to impose directly (without court action) a fine, penalty or forfeiture, what administrative adjudications (including licensing proceedings) subject to 5 USC 556 and 557 were proposed or initiated by your agency during calendar year 1972?

Answer:

Food and Drug Administration (FDA): 1. New Drugs—human use. New drugs must be approved by FDA before they can be marketed. Strictly speaking, this process is not initiated by FDA but rather by the drug's sponsor. During fiscal year 1972, FDA received 448 new drug applications. In addition, FDA received 3,258 supplemental new drug applications (seeking changes in approved methods, labeling, formulations, etc.) FDA does not publish notice of receipt of new drug applications in the *Federal Register*. Notice of approval or denial of a new drug application for human use usually is given to the sponsor and is generally not published in the *Federal Register*. This information is, however, available to the public through weekly listings.

Many revocations of new drug applications are not generally published in the *Federal Register*. FDA has, however, made it a practice to publish the results of its drug efficacy review in the *Federal Register*.

The following lists notices regarding actions on new human drug applications and of notices concerning the drug efficacy review of human drugs published in the *Federal Register* during calendar year 1972.

2. New Drugs—Animal Use: As with drugs for human use, drugs for veterinary use must be given FDA approval before they may be marketed. During 1972 actions were completed on 545 New Animal Drug Applications. *Federal Register* notices were published with respect to the following new animal drugs during 1972 (numbers are *Federal Register* pages):

Applications, approvals, refusals, etc.:
Animal New drugs:
Acepromazine maleate, 28055.
Acetazolamide, 9048.
Albaplex, 9793.
Aklo-3, 26456.
Aminopentamide hydrogen sulfate, 16539.
Aminopropazine fumarate, 8379, 26828.
Ammonium chloride, 74, 10980.
Anthelmintics, proposed rules, 16200.
Antibiotic-containing preparations, 15946.
Aqua-Strep, 10014.
Aquasol A, 6776.
Arsanilic acid, 3000, 10979.
Arsenamide sodium, 12791.
Aureomycin and combinations, 10014, 15946.
Bacitracin and combinations, 9317, 21960.
Benzathine penicillin G, 13468.
Betamethasone valerate, 6925.
Biosol, 17230.
Bisophene, 18575.
Boldenone undecylenate injection, 11723.
Broiler premix medicated, 26456.
Bunamidine hydrochloride, 24816.
Buqinolate, 4429, 9669.
Butonate liquid, 18530.
4-*tert*-Butyl-2-chlorphenyl methylphosphoramidate, 12172.
Cadmium sulfide, 7111.
Calcium amphomycin, 20164.
Carbadox, 20683, 23906.
Castor oil, 11723.
Cephaloridine, 1170, 20938.
Cerumenex Vet Drops, 24453.
Chloramphenicol preparations, 7497, 12936, 14768, 16076, 19149.
Chlordiazepoxide or chlordiazepoxide hydrochloride preparations, 18482.
Chloroquine hydrochloride, 8564, 11740.
Chlorothiazide, 2178.
Chlortetracycline, 2960, 9317.
Chorionic gonadotropin, 4333, 25230.
Clopidol, 13531, 18615.
Corticosteroid drugs, 24343.
Coumaphos, 3633, 6734.
Crystalline trypsin, liquid, 11723.
Crysticillin, 10014.
Daribiotic, 22891, 26355.
Decoquinate, 2960, 12792, 16077.
Dexamethasone sodium phosphate, 26453, 26537.
Dichlorophene, 5697, 6471.
Dichlorvos, 12633, 20939.
Dictycide, 26454.
Diethylcarbamazine, and combinations, 7783, 24031.
Diethylstilbestrol, 2961, 5264, 12251, 15747, 25307.
Dihydrostreptomycin, 5764, 6509.
Dimethylsulfoxide, 5746, 11241.
O,O-Dimethyl O-(2,4,5-trichlorophenyl) phosphorothioate, 5020.
Disophenol, 21632.
Dithiazanine iodide, 19611.
Dynafac, 4003.
Enheptin soluble, 23285.
Entromycin bolutab, 9354.
Erythromycin thiocaynate, 3000.
Ferric oxide, 14872, 18448, 23905.
Flucinolone acetonide, 14385, 16176, 17171.
Flumethasone, 13281.
Gentamycin sulfate, 6925, 21808.
Glyceryl guaiacolate, 12936.
Griscofulvin, 4333, 12633.
Hepzide blackhead control, 23285.
Hexachlorophene, 11739, 18531, 18575.
Hexamethyltetracosane, 7110.
Hi-Co Nox Medicated, 13815.
Histocarb soluble, 23285.
Histosep-S, 23285.
Hydrochlorothiazide, 13281.
Hydrocortisone preparations, 409, 20938, 20164, 21905.
Intramammary infusion products, 9317.
Iodinated casein, 4730.
Iodochlorhydroxyquin, 13281.
Ipronidazole, 7881, 17387, 24743.
Iron dextran complex, 7080.
Iron hydrogenated dextran, 16076, 18910.
Isopropamide, 12066, 20939.
Kanamycin sulfate, 20164.
Kao-strep Powder, 10014, 15946.
Kaobiotic suspension, 28285.
Kaolin, 409, 3079.
Ketamine hydrochloride, 21429, 21905.
Lactated potassic saline injection, 10980.
Lead arsenate, 492.
Lentovet, 10014, 15946.
Levamisole hydrochloride, 740, 15701, 16540, 23905.
Lincocin forte, 9794.
Lincomycin, 16077.
Lincomycin-neomycin-methylprednisolene, 9764.
Megasul (Nitrophenide) premix, 25560.
Mepine, 16628.
Methetharimide, 7110.
Metoserpate hydrochloride, 6996.
Multiple-vitamin preparations, oral, etc. 18576.
Naloxone hydrochloride, 3053.
Neomycin-sulfacetamide, 409.
Neomycin sulfate and combination preparations, 1130, 6956, 8406, 10676, 12718, 14228, 14385, 15947, 16176, 18530, 21905, 22374, 22891, 23110, 28111.
Neo-My-Sol solution, 9354.
Nequinate, 5372, 9211.

3. Biological products for human use: On July 1, 1972, the Bureau of Biologics (formerly the Division of Biologics Standards) was transferred from the National Institutes of Health to FDA. The Bureau issues Federal licenses for manufacture by establishments and products after determining that prescribed standards for safety, purity, and efficacy have been met. The licensing authorization is found in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

Question 4. What adjudications under provision of 5 USC Chapter 5 seeking primarily to impose directly (without court action) a fine, penalty or forfeiture were proposed or initiated by your agency during calendar year 1972?

Answer: Food and Drug Administration (FDA); None. The marketing approvals and disapprovals ordered by FDA (without court action) which are discussed in question 3 have as their primary purpose the protection of public health rather than penalizing industry.

Question 5. Excluding proceedings subject to 5 USC 554, 556, and 557, what proceedings on the record after an opportunity for hearing did your agency propose or initiate during calendar year 1972?

Answer:

Food and drug Administration (FDA); Most FDA regulatory action is taken through rulemaking under 5 USC 553. Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, certain kinds of regulations require opportunity for a hearing and must be promulgated according to the formal on the record rulemaking procedures, with judicial appeal, prescribed in sections 701 (e), (f), and (g).

This would include certain of those regulations listed under question 1 which were issued under sections 401 (food standards), 403(j) (special dietary foods), 406 (poisonous ingredients in foods), 501(b) (test methods for strength and purity of certain drugs), 502(d) (habit forming drugs), 502(h) (labeling of drugs subject to deterioration), 502(n) (prescription drug advertising), 506 (insulin), and 706 (color additives). Sections 408 (food additive petitions) and 507 (antibiotics) also provide for formal rulemaking procedures.

Question 6. Will you please furnish me with a list of representative public and nonpublic activities proposed or initiated by your agency during calendar year 1972?

Answer:

Food and Drug Administration (FDA); 1. Correspondence and other communications and meetings with consumers, industry, scientists, and Congress.

2. Internal operating procedures for inspectors, analysts, etc.

3. Informal enforcement actions (e.g., 1,029 recalls in 1972).

4. Intramural research and methods development.

5. Research performed under contract or grant.

6. Advisory committee meetings.

7. Educational campaigns to alert consumers to hazards of particular products (e.g., toy safety in 1972).

8. Inspections of establishments (10,610 in 1972).

9. Informal defect action levels for various products.

10. Shellfish certification program.

Question 7. Excluding actions designed primarily to impose a fine, penalty or forfeiture, what final actions taken by your agency in calendar year 1972 could have been appealed to the courts for review by anyone under a statutory provision or judicial interpretation?

Answer:

Food and Drug Administration (FDA): (See questions 1 and 3.) A listing of the types of actions during 1972 which could have been appealed to the courts by anyone would almost duplicate these lists which show FDA's proposed and/or final rules and adjudications during 1972. Appeal to a United States court of appeals may be taken under a specific statutory provision (e.g., with respect to the regulations named under question 5 or with respect to actions on new drug applications.) Even if there is no specific statutory provision for review appeals of an FDA final action may be had in a United States district court. Any citizen has standing to challenge FDA actions, administratively or in the courts, and it would be appropriate for an independent Consumer Protection Agency to have the same rights.

FRANCIS J. FOLEY

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, October 31, one of the finest men in American politics and a close personal friend of mine died, Francis J. Foley, chairman of the St. Clair County, Ill., board.

Known to all as "Red" Foley, this remarkable man used the political process for the purpose it should be used—to give better government to the people. Red Foley was a politician in the finest sense of the word.

County board chairman, township official, regional government leader, and Democratic Party power, Red Foley used the leverage of power at his disposal to provide forceful leadership and reform for the public benefit.

At this point, I include the editorial tribute of November 1 that the Metro-East Journal paid to Red Foley:

FOLEY MADE POLITICS WORK

Sure, "Red" Foley was a politician, and we should be glad of it, for his life and his work gave politics a better name in an age when it needs it.

Mr. Foley took the route that politics affords to the poor, rising from jobs as circus roustabout and tavern keeper, to become supervisor of East St. Louis Township and chairman of the St. Clair County Board, a man of substance and success.

Mr. Foley used the power that politics embodies for its best purpose—to give better government to the people.

When he became board chairman in 1962 he inherited a county with a reputation for vice, a county deeply in debt, a county whose leadership was enatangled in political factionalism.

Mr. Foley's firm hand and fast gavel brought a measure of unity and order to the county board.

He insisted that board committees do their work; he knew how, and when, to work out a compromise; he was able to create alliances that would hold up when it came time for the board to take some needed but perhaps unpopular action.

Mr. Foley, the one-time saloonkeeper and gambler, came down hard on the side of propriety in his years at the head of St. Clair County government. Soon after he became chairman be halted the open vice that operated in some areas of the county, and just last year made certain that night club dancers keep their clothes on.

Mr. Foley took over a county that was chronically in debt and turned it into a county that operates in the black.

He paid off old bills with a judgment funding bond issue, insisted that the fee offices turn over their revenues to the general fund, brought professionalism and efficiency to budgeting, tax collection and administration, made sure that county employes, whether they were appointed politically or not, work at their jobs.

Mr. Foley was a blunt and ready speaker, who brought color and zest to the otherwise drab business of arguing some technical point of bi-state planning or settling some item in a county budget.

He had a knack for reducing some complex debate to the human level: "He said to me . . . so I said . . . so we did it that way . . ."

So Francis J. "Red" Foley, who died at his home early Wednesday, will be missed.

We will miss his strong voice as chairman of the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council.

We will miss his strong rule as chairman of a board that has given better government to St. Clair County.

And a lot of us will miss running into him in East St. Louis or Belleville, miss the quick greeting and handshake, miss hearing him argue a point or speak his mind, miss the feeling that we just met someone worth knowing—a good politician.

Part of Red Foley's greatness was that he never forgot the people. His generosity was expressed in private ways that only a few knew about.

During World War II, for example, he saw to it that the local paper was mailed to servicemen from the home area. "Send him the paper," he would say, handing over a $5 bill, "and when that runs out, let me know and I'll give you some more."

In that way, Red Foley made sure that 50 men or so kept in touch with news from home during the war.

As colorful and as strong-willed as he was, Red Foley was one of the most considerate and generous men that I have ever known. He was a credit to the human race.

I include, at this point, the editorial from the Friday, November 2, Belleville, Ill., News Democrat. As the editorial concludes:

The man who takes his place is going to have one helluva job trying to follow in his footsteps.

The editorial follows:

FRANCIS FOLEY

Francis J. Foley was a product of the scandal-ridden East St. Louis political machine that for decades has transcended party lines in order to gain its objective—power and more power.

But Foley had the knack of rising above his tutors and he reached the pinnacle of his success in spite of handicaps that would have toppled most men.

His education was limited to high school and his business training was confined to operating a tavern in the days when East St. Louis was truly a gang-ridden town.

Once elected chairman of the old County Board of Supervisors, however, he soon displayed qualities that confused not only his critics but also his friends.

"Whoever heard of 'Red' talking down the bankers and getting them to go along with a bond issue of more than a million bucks," was the gist of the talk in the courthouse when he embarked the county on a program that eventually led to the settlement of debts, putting the county on a sound financing basis and making St. Clair one of the better-governed larger counties in Illinois.

Foley, an Irish Democrat from East St. Louis, was able to worm his way into the hearts of Belleville's conservative Republican bankers. How he did it—no one can actually say—but the fact remains he did it.

Many Belleville businessmen expressed sincere regrets when they learned "Chairman Red" had died of a heart attack last Wednesday morning. Everyone acknowledged Foley came from an old school of politicians but to a man they also agreed he was able to do a job that brought credit to himself and to the county.

Down through the years, no man has ever put in more hours in handling the county's top administrative job. It's true he was paid well for his efforts but it also must be remembered he rendered a dollar's service for every dollar he drew.

Despite all the criticism that he evoked, no one ever accused him of shirking his duty. No one ever challenged his sincerity or his integrity. At times his judgment was questioned but never his devotion to the cause he espoused.

Well do we remember the time he stood up in court and told a visiting judge he was prepared to go to jail rather than grant a license to a Stookey Township tavern.

He lost the case and eventually had to issue the license but a hawk-like watch was established at this emporium. Complaints about it are rare today.

Saloonkeepers thought they had a friend when Foley was elected board chairman and assumed the office that goes with it—excise commissioner for the unincorporated areas of the county. They soon found out how wrong they could be.

Not only did he drive out gambling and prostitution but he vigorously enforced the closing hours. And woe to the tavern that sold intoxicants to a minor. It meant one thing only—license revocation.

The best part of this tough attitude was that he was able to convince the Illinois Liquor Control Commission and the courts, in a majority of the cases, that he was right.

As chairman of the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council, Foley had more than his share of reverses because the Missouri delegation ganged up on him. Still he was able to push through many of his pet projects.

It's a shame he won't be around if and when work begins on the $350 million airport on the Illinois side of the river in the Millstadt-Columbia-Waterloo district. He gave every bit of his energy in pushing this project, fighting such political giants as ex-St. Louis Mayor Al Cervantes and St. Louis County Supervisor Larry Roos.

It's also a shame he won't be here when they dedicate the $10 million Courthouse in 1975. It was Foley who pressured the County Public Building Commission into keeping the Courthouse in downtown Belleville.

Frequently he remarked: "If we take the Courthouse out of downtown Belleville, Main Street can roll up the sidewalks. That's the only way we will save the downtown stores."

Only time will prove if he was right but, judging from the amount of shopping done by jurors and witnesses in court cases now being heard, we think he had a pretty good perspective.

And finally no comment about Foley would be complete without mention of his devotion to his family. You could talk all you wanted to about "Red" but you never said anything against his wife, Alice, or his daughter, Nancy.

As rough and tough as he was in his dealing with politicians, businessmen and even judges that's how sweet he could be when it came to Alice and Nancy.

Red Foley will be missed—not only in St. Clair County but also throughout the metropolitan area.

The man who takes his place is going to have one helluva job trying to follow in his footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, I have lost a good friend. Fortunately, I have many fond memories of Red that I will carry with me in his absence.

AMERICA AHEAD OF POLITICS

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I represent a Democratic district; the voter composition is 97½ percent Democratic and less than 2½ percent Republican. With my constituents, Americanism and principle must always come ahead of partisan politics and political party.

My constituents are highly intelligent, they would not tolerate for a moment my taking a position out of step with principle. They expect me to speak up and speak out, and if I should not do so, my tenure in the Congress would soon be ended.

Mr. Speaker, there are two significant matters I would like to bring to the attention of the House and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

First. My correspondence is running 12 to 1 in favor of President Richard M. Nixon. In today's first mail there were 54 pro-Nixon and 2 anti-Nixon communications. My records are available for inspection.

Second. Some of the finest newspapers in America are domiciled in my district. They put it on the line and say what they think is correct. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting editorials that ran in the Monroe Morning World under the date of October 29, 1973, and in the Ouachita Citizen under date of October 29, 1973. Both are to the point and, in all probability, composed after due deliberation by the topnotch business people and good Americans who wrote the editorials.

I would like to admonish my colleagues to read these editorials carefully. They are indeed food for thought. Read them the second time, and then the third time, if you have time. I believe your conclusions would be that these highly respected newspapers believe in justice above politics, fairness above persecution and, above all, Americanism above unproved accusations.

The editorials follow:

[From the Ouachita Citizen, Nov. 1, 1973]

CRITICAL YELLERS HARASS NIXON

Richard M. Nixon will probably be recorded in history as the most harassed president up to his time. He has shown great courage and durability in his survival up to this time, but if he makes it to the end of his second term it will be a miracle.

Nixon's blood-thirsty political opponents will not let up until they crack the armor of his resistance to their onslaught. We regard much of the news media, particularly a great many of the television network commentators as arch political critics who lend themselves to the objectives of the vanguard of liberal political professionals who are hounding the president.

These electronic jackals, who parade under the cloak of privilege given them under freedom of the press guarantees, are not worthy to be called journalists. They are tools of the liberal left and by no stretch of the imagination can they be considered objective journalist.

And Nixon told them so in his press conference last Friday night when he cited them as "alarmists" and bias merchants. The president assured them in answer to one question, that he did not hate them. "You don't hate those whom you do not respect," Nixon told them with a smile.

None of the biased commentators have seen fit to give Mr. Nixon credit for being a president with backbone enough to bring the communists to the line and end the Viet Nam war with honor and bring American prisoners there home "on their feet instead of on their knees." Nor do they give him any credit for his firmness which resulted in concluding middle east hostilities and forcing Russia to a hands off policy there.

Their reaction to one Nixon accomplishment after the other is to yell about some negative currently on the troubled scene in America.

When the president deals firmly with the communists this coterie of liberal commentators yell that he is bringing the nation to the brink of a holocaust conflict with Russia.

Nixon's handling of American foreign policy should have earned for him at least one compliment from any opinionated objective commentator. Yet, some of these yellers have never said anything complimentary.

We can come to only one of two conclusions when we observe these nightly pontificators who never see any good in our great president. They are either so dedicated to the political enemies of Mr. Nixon that they don't care about the integrity of their chosen profession or they are dedicated to the downfall of America in favor of some un-American ideology.

There should be an investigation to determine why some of these electronic "journalists" appear to be short circuited.

[From the Monroe Morning World, Oct. 29, 1973]

BIG LIE EFFECTIVE AS EVER; BLASTS BY NIXON JUSTIFIED

A dark page in the history of American journalism has been written in the news coverage—primarily by the electronic media—of the momentous events of the past week or so.

Perhaps never has mere speculation—much of it rabid—been so played up to distort fact with opinion. Absolutely never has a President of the United States been subjected to such cheap, irresponsible and disrespectful behavior by the news media, principally the "personality" people of national television, as was President Nixon at his news conference last Friday.

One can shut one's eyes, substitute the name of 1964 presidential candidate Barry Goldwater for that of President Nixon, and get a 1973 replay of the concerted campaign of villification heaped upon the admirable and since vindicated Goldwater.

The big media presentation of both men—Nixon and Goldwater—has been virtually the same: trigger-happy, war-monger, fascist, dishonest, mentally-deranged, etc.

Today, television is falling over itself in a rush to quote the feverish mouthings of such men as AFL–CIO President George Meany, talking about the "dangerous instability" of the President, Archibald Cox suggesting presidential crookedness, and others, with never a hint at the crass political motives that inspire them or the mass hysteria that makes them seem credible.

Where nothing exists, the media—again, mostly the electronic group—manufactures it. In the latest Mideast crisis, it appeared that the United States and Soviet Russia might wind up facing each other over the barrels of loaded guns. Yet, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger actually was asked if the decision to alert U.S. military forces in that potential showdown was the "act of a rational man." On other recent occasions, after presidential appearances, incredible hints were floated that the President of the United States was under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

The depth of this degradation was evident when Kissinger defended the alert on the grounds that President Nixon only approved it as a recommendation of the National Security Council and was not involved in the deliberations leading to it. The stunning lesson from this is that an act in the express interest of the nation was acceptable to the news media only if it originated through someone other than nation's chief executive.

Such bias, the result of willful politicizing by electronic media barons operating behind the mask of freedom of the press, is frightening and can be deadly. Adolph Hitler's use of the "Big Lie" in pre-World War II Germany—the constant repetition of even the most outrageous lie until it is accepted unthinkingly as truth—was devastatingly effective. As it left Germany in shambles, so could it destroy this country.

The snide allusions to the President's mental capacity are but one example of this technique. At every step on the way to peace in Southeast Asia, the President was pictured as a war-monger for taking the hard-nosed actions which proved to the enemy that peace was the only way to save himself. Though the President took the history-shaping steps to achieve accords with Russia and Red China, he is now depicted as using possible war with these behemoths as a distraction from domestic disarray.

Of course, it makes no sense. The Big Lie does not need to. Repeated often enough—daily, say—on the evening news, it passes for truth.

After months of bitterness and confrontation, when the President finally agreed to compromise on the issue of the Watergate tapes, the media overshadowed this significant development with the lesser story of the President's firing of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox. Though the President was unquestionably within his rights to fire an employe, this story, blown out of proportion, was almost in itself responsible for the present impeachment clamor.

But the absolute bottom was hit last Friday at the news conference. The tone of the questions were patently insulting in many cases, delivered in an air of prejudgment. Even worse was the arrant and obvious disrespect which put before the nation the image of mere newsmen, so puffed up on self-importance, that they were actually shouting and back-cracking at the highest elected official in the land.

Indeed, the tumult would have gotten worse if the President had not, sensibly, broken off and left. So abused has press privilege become that it is no wonder that press conferences have been rare. The President invariably faces, not healthy curiosity and useful skepticism, but bald hostility—monstrous and unrelenting.

Indeed, it is no surprise that the President feels, as he said, no respect for those in the media who, knowing the true facts, nevertheless persist in delivering their own distorted interpretation of selected facts and

half-truths. It is to his credit that he was man enough to say so. The contrast between the even tones of the President, his coolness and courage under deliberate abuse, and the rowdy slurs of the assembled newsmen was striking.

Despite calm and control, however, he pulled no punches, declaring: "I have never seen such outrageous, vicious, distorted reporting in 27 years of public life." Pointing to television, apparently particulary to CBS, he observed: "When people are pounded night after night with that kind of frantic reporting, it naturally shakes their confidence."

If the news conference established anything, it was the fact that the confidence of the President himself has not been shaken. Neither has his capacity to act effectively in a crisis, as in the Mideast, despite the spiteful drone of suspicion. Or his ability to discern the face of any enemy in the guise of free speech.

Hopefully, the American people also can now discern the degree of importiality—or lack of it—in much of the "news treatment" they are being saturated with. Old-school journalists are as appalled and offended as the President.

Of course, the President's charge was not a blanket indictment. Neither is ours. But he is as obviously and rightly fed up as many journalists are with the corruption of the Right to Know into the right to know only what a relative few network news executives want to be known. Not only are facts selected and emphasized arbitrarily, but "analyses" are thoughtfully provided to spare the public the effort of thinking their way to the desired conclusion.

The transformation of the nation-commander-in-chief into a surrealistic combination of mongol warload, buffoon-like clown, homicidal maniac and second-story thief is more than the violation of a privilege. It is the violation of a sacred responsibility.

If the President really had the dictatorial powers and assassin's mentality that he is accused of, he could stop this destructive display of raw hatred toward him. Indeed, it could never have started. Those who have freedom are the only ones able to complain of a lack of freedom.

The President has neither that kind of power nor that kind of inclination. At least, however, it was good to see him plainly and openly calling the hand of those behind these power-hungry subterfuges.

IMPACT OF FUEL SHORTAGE ON THE ECONOMY

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would rather not make this speech. But there are some things which must be said.

We are going to have hard times this winter. We all now know that heat for homes, schools, offices, and plants will be short as will be fuel for autos and airlines, but very little has been said about the impact on the economy, on people's jobs and incomes of drastically reduced energy consumption. We have approached it largely in terms of reduced airline travel, reduced speed limits, and suggested lower home temperatures or use of lights. The ramifications go far beyond that and it is time to say it loud and clear; serious fuel shortages this winter mean factories reducing output or closing down, swelling unemployment, and a whole host of other impacts on people's incomes. The English coal strike in 1972 provides an example of the effect of an energy shortage. Electricity production was cut by 15 percent, and industrial users of electricity were first placed on a 3-day workweek and, as the strike continued, forced to lay off much of their work force. By the 6th week of the strike, unemployment was estimated to have risen to 10 percent of the work force.

Let me spell out the dimensions of our current trouble in exact terms: even before the Middle East fighting, the Interior Department projected an adequate supply this winter of home heating oil only under the following conditions: First, if the winter was warmer than usual; second, if refinery operations were continued at near-capacity rates; third, if foreign companies with excess refinery capacity cooperated in making available to us their excess products—and that the Arab countries made available sufficient crude oil both for us and foreign refineries; and fourth, if sufficient transport was found to handle the record amount of imports required this winter.

The probability that all these conditions would be met was considered unlikely, and therefore experts considered spot shortages this winter unavoidable. This shortfall could have run from 100,000 to 300,000 barrels during the winter.

The situation is now much grimmer. Renewed hostilities in the Mideast have already cut oil production by over 4 million barrels per day, with all exports from Arab countries to the United States prohibited. This action will increase the winter's shortage to nearly 2 million barrels per day.

Some of us in the Congress have been begging this administration to take the lead in a full force energy conservation program. That effort has won only nodding acknowledgement from the administration leaders, but now, with a crisis upon us, administration officials have suddenly changed their tune and with unrealistic optimism are projecting that a conservation program will deliver us from the brink. That is simply not true; voluntary conservation without monetary incentives to save does not in the short run have that potenial.

It is all very well for the Treasury Department to issue sweeping statements that 3 million barrels a day can be saved by easy conservation methods, but in fact, without strong incentives to save, not much happens. Last summer, in spite of gasoline allocations, sales limitations, and considerable publicity on possible shortages, gasoline sales continue to rise. Even though it is true that a 3-degree reduction in all home temperatures would save the equivalent of 500,000 barels per day of heating oil, it is impossible to enforce such action.

If we restrict our efforts to exhortation, consumption will not be significantly affected until inventories run out, and all the effects of the shortage will pile into the first quarter of 1974 resulting in cold homes, closed factories, and high unemployment.

To cut back consumption of energy at any time will be painful, but it will be less painful if we spread it out by starting now. That is why now is the time to restrict gasoline consumption by rationing or higher taxes or both. Now is the time to force conservation of heating oil, of jet fuel, of electric power. This will not be popular, but the sooner such actions are implemented, the less severe the winter's hardships will be.

Implications of all this cut across the economy in the way Americans live. Since we will not have energy to meet all demands this winter, we have to sort out those which are wasteful and unimportant from those which are necessary. Major decisions will be required. It is impossible for me to list or even to anticipate all of them, but here are some impacts that I see and some suggestions for actions that ought to be taken.

Automobile manufacturers and the public had better quickly face a hard fact: The bigger car is going to be in real trouble within a few months. As gas rationing or much higher prices at the pump descend upon us, retail sales and resale values of larger cars are going to suffer drastically. People limited to 15 gallons a week, or whatever, are going to put them in the tank of a car which will go 300 miles rather than 150.

The auto industry already has a plateful of problems; maybe it is unfair to add this one, but it is coming anyway and plans should be made to minimize the impact on men and women who work in plants to make the larger model cars.

Many efforts on the energy front will pay off only in years or decades. For example, the much touted Alaskan pipeline won't deliver a drop of oil this winter, or the next, or the next. But there are things we can do right now, which will soften the impact on people's incomes and their health. Such actions would include:

First, gas rationing, or a staff gas tax. In Europe it costs $12 to $15 to "fill 'er up." Much higher costs would cause everyone to save every drop.

Second, require an inverted rate structure on residential and commercial utility rates. Beyond some basic home allowance all rates might double to discourage those who squander unnecessary amounts rather than present rates which become cheaper as wasteful use increases.

Third, action might be considred to discourage new vacation or second home developments. With utilities hard pressed to maintain present demands and with first homes in short supply, the less unnecessary construction we have, the better.

Fourth, the Defense Department uses large amounts of energy; without interferring with essential defense needs, greater care can result in enormous savings. Other civilian branches of government including Congress should get in line, too.

There are a host of other suggestions such as permanent daylight savings time to reduce evening lighting loads, limited hours for commercial establishments, lower speed limits, reduced advertising signs and lights, and so on; of course, I do not want to imply that omitted suggestions are not equally important.

The point is, whatever actions are to be taken, they should be implemented now—contingency plans for use when the homes go cold and factories close are inadequate. Every gallon of fuel saved by moderate—if inconvenient—methods in November means that much less unemployment or cold homes in February.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN P. SAYLOR

(Mr. SKUBITZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, October 28, 1973, was a sad day for Mrs. Skubitz and me and so it will remain during our lifetimes for on that day passed from this Earth a man whom we treasured as our friend—John Phillips Saylor of Pennsylvania.

John Saylor was truly a man for all seasons. He was large of heart and spirit and of body to match. He was a statesman in all that word implies. His was no petty mind, hemmed in by partisan considerations and political motivations. His concern, manifested in a hundred ways, was always for what was good for the greatest number; what was right for the land he loved and the Nation he endeavored to make better.

When I came to this august body 11 years ago and was named to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, fate and the parliamentary procedures had treated me well for it brought me close to John Saylor. From that day onward, he was my mentor, my counselor, my friend in times of trouble, and above all, my leader. From him I learned that one can fight sharply for his beliefs and be magnanimous in victory and courteous in defeat. From him I learned that this Earth we live upon is a precious land that can be easily despoiled. From him I learned that we who live today owe a duty to those who come after us to preserve and protect the heritage that our fathers left us.

Others have echoed more eloquent tributes than is within my small ability but none feel more strongly and deeply the sense of loss that is with me in the passing of this excellent Congressman, this loving husband and father, and above all this great gentleman. His like will not be among us soon. To his wife, Grace, and to his son and daughter, John Phillips, Jr., and Susan, go our heartfelt condolences.

Mr. Speaker, many citizens throughout this land mourn the passing of our eminent friend, John Phillips Saylor. Not the least among them is Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., a member of the executive committee of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, an organization I might add, that in my opinion stands preeminent in its long history of work for environmental protection of our land.

Dr. Smith was a long time personal friend of Congressman Saylor. They appreciated each other and their problems. Dr. Smith, unlike so many in the environmental field, recognized the problems of a legislator and the need for compromise in certain situations.

Mr. Speaker, I now enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his tribute to our late friend and I am pleased to do so. It follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,

Washington, D.C.

A BIG LOSS OF A BIG MAN

The Honorable John Phillips Saylor, Representative from the 12th District of Pennsylvania, died October 28, 1973. In the field of conservation, John Saylor stood as tall as the Redwoods he spent so much of his life to protect. The general recognized efforts that he put forth were slow in coming from the general public. Tragically, some of the instant conservationists know not of his long term and outstanding accomplishments. Much should and will be written about the Congressman's contributions in a wide variety of areas and we shall not recount the almost endless individual bills and acts which he either authored or helped bring to fruition to better manage and conserve our natural resources in the public interest. Rather, we should like to emphasize that Congressman Saylor, from the day he was elected to the House of Representatives—almost a quarter of a century ago, was a conservationist first and a politician second.

His was not a popular position and he ran the gamut of criticism from political friend and foe alike. It was not unusual for him to find his position to be a lonely one but it must have been rewarding to find that some years subsequent—it prevailed. John Saylor never hesitated. If he thought he was right to oppose his own party on an issue with great vigor and resolve, he would do so. Those who knew the Congressman are aware of how strenuous and effective that activity was. By the same token, he would support with equal enthusiasm a position of the opposite political party if he was convinced of its correctness. To maintain this kind of independent integrity and still attain an effective leadership with his colleagues resolved any doubt as to the greatness of this conservation pioneer.

He was fond of sharing credit and often pointed to the professionals who labored so long in behalf of constructive conservation policies. He went out of his way to offer them protection that occasionally only a Congressman can give. By the same token, his criticism could be stinging if he thought that bureaucratic pettiness was failing to block a hazardous program or support a good one.

To John Saylor's everlasting credit, there are others today who are extremely helpful in behalf of conservation programs. Everyone appreciates the new awareness but they were far fewer and the difficulties were infinitely greater through the years and early decades during which John Saylor spent his every effort. He would say, "Don't you pretify me—I haven't always been right and there were many times of despair." We can agree with that, but the percentage of his accomplishments is a goal for all of us. We will be lucky if we come close.

SPENCER M. SMITH, Jr.,
Secretary, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KETCHUM (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MCCOLLISTER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOGAN, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. REUSS, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. FUQUA, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. YATES, in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCOLLISTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANRAHAN in two instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. WINN in two instances.
Mr. QUIE.
Mr. MADIGAN.
Mr. ARENDS.
Mr. HOGAN.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. CONYERS in 10 instances.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. SARBANES in five instances.
Mr. WALDIE in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.
Mr. JOHNSON of California.
Mr. BOLLING.
Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in five instances.
Mr. WAGGONNER.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1769. An act to reduce the burden on interstate commerce caused by avoidable fires and fire losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2410. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the development of comprehensive area emergency medical services systems.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 6, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1501. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1974 for accelerated energy research and development efforts (H. Doc. No. 93–175); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1502. A letter from the Director, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, transmitting a report on the Federal contributions program of civil defense equipment and facilities for the quarter ended September 30, 1973, pursuant to section 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1503. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for congressional relations, transmitting a report on assistance-related funds obligated for Cambodia during the first quarter of fiscal year 1974, pursuant to section 655 (f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by Public Law 92–226; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1504. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to Public Law 92–403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1505. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1506. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Hungarian Claims Agreement of March 6, 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1507. A letter from the Chairman U.S. Water Resources Council, transmitting the Council's report on the Pearl River comprehensive basin study, Mississippi and Louisiana, pursuant to Public Law 89–90; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1508. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract for the operation of a public transportation service between San Francisco and Alcatraz Island, Calif., for a term ending December 31, 1978, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271 and 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1509. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the administration of the Emergency Rail Facilities Restoration Act, pursuant to section 11 of the act (Public Law 92–591); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1510. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on a study of automobile odometers, pursuant to title IV of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act of 1972; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1511. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1154(d)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1512. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of two aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(28)(I)(ii)(b)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1513. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Act [8 U.S.C 1182(d)(6)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1514. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1254(c)(1)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1515. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to insure that the compensation and other emoluments attached to the Office of Attorney General are those which were in effect on January 1, 1969; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1516. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a report of a building project survey under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, for Palmer, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1517. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that consumer protection would be increased if the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, improved its administration of intrastate meat plant inspection programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 9142. A bill to restore, support, and maintain modern efficient rail service in the northeast region of the United States, to designate a system of essential rail lines in the northeast region, to provide financial assistance to rail carriers in the northeast region, to improve competitive equity among surface transportation modes, to improve the process of Government regulation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[*Submitted Monday, Nov. 5, 1973*]

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 11254. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. Res. 680. Resolution authorizing the printing of proceedings unveiling the portrait of the late Hon. Philip J. Philbin; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

325. The Speaker presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the Charles River watershed proposal of the Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

348. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Hawaii County Council, Hilo, Hawaii, relative to the appointment of Representative Patsy T. Mink as a delegate to the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

349. Also, petition of Vladimir A. Zatko, Tamal, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Monday, November 5, 1973*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

PRAYER

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

Our Father God, amid the stress and strife of busy days, we are grateful for unhurried moments of communion with Thee. We open our hearts for the indwelling of Thy love. We open our minds to Thy truth. Teach us, by the light of a great faith, how to be victors over life and not victims of dark powers of defeat. That we may live victoriously, give us a faith fit to live by, a self fit to live with, and a cause fit to live for. Inspire and guide with Thy spirit, the President, all leaders of our Government, and especially the Members of this body, that they may be found faithful stewards of the Nation's trust.

We pray in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).