required in various space throughout a building without reducing the level at work stations;

We have raised (by 4 degrees) the setting on room thermostats serving office space during the airconditioning season to a range of 76–78 degrees;

And, we have lowered the setting (4 degrees) on room thermostats serving office space during the heating season to a range of 70–72 degrees; and

In addition we have made appropriate temperature and lighting changes in other types of space to realize similar energy savings.

Lessors who provide building services and utilities have been notified by the regional PBS offices to take appropriate action to reduce the anticipated energy consumption during the next 9 months by 7 percent.

Federal agencies have been notified that the aforementioned practices are being initiated, to the extent feasible, in all GSA-managed buildings in a way which will not impair the provision of vital services, nor curtail the proper functioning of the departments and agencies. In addition, each Federal agency has been requested to designate a headquarters representative as a point of contact to assist in realizing these objectives.

These revised operating practices already have been adopted in our Central Office and Regional Office Building, both in Washington, with excellent results.

As an example of savings that may be realized, 22 percent of the fluorescent light tubes have been removed from buildings here in Washington, with an opportunity to do more. Assuming we are able to achieve similar savings throughout the nation, we will eliminate approximately 1.2 million tubes and save 164 million kilowatts of electrical energy each year.

We believe that with the changes in operation, we will be able to reduce our overall energy consumption by approximately 20 percent. This equates to over 1 billion kilowatt hours of electricity or 600,000 barrels of oil or 580,000 tons of coal that may be saved per year. But we're not stopping here:

—We have begun a building profile study to determine the energy consumption characteristics of existing buildings as affected by their physical features.

—We are conducting an Air Change Rate Study to determine the minimum number of air changes required for acceptable heating and air conditioning of buildings.

—We are conducting a study of lighting levels and distribution required for the performance of the various work tasks in Federal buildings.

—And we are conducting a study to develop a fully automated building control system using computer techniques and sophisticated equipment to optimize operations, manpower and energy utilization.

The research and the efforts in existing buildings will help GSA accomplish the President's conservation goal. They can be far more valuable, however, if we can get them out to industry and local government. To that end, we have written to all of the nation's governors and the mayors of 20 of our largest cities to urge their cooperation in the energy conservation effort.

We think we have a strong start in the race to alleviate an energy crisis. But all of our efforts are really minimal when you consider that we only have the responsibility for 200 million square feet out of 2.5 billion square feet of space. 200 million out of 2.5 billion!! That means that you are very important. Have your employees turn off lights, lower thermostats, etc. I hope we can rely on you for this assistance in our effort, and we will assist you in yours, because it will take the voluntary cooperation of many Federal employees if it's going to be a complete success.

Thank you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, October 24, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Charles F. Betts, associate conference council director, North Alabama Conference, the United Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

O living God, who has made today a time for greatness, be to this House of Representatives a sign that hope's promised hour is now.

May all of us receive this day's alarms as a call to choose for the truths we cherish. Against the winds that push toward war, may we take one step toward lasting peace. Surrounded by broken dreams of personal glory, may we act with a stronger trust in common people. Pressured by the insistent demands of human need, may compassion claim a new place in our hearts.

Stir us, O Lord, to live as those who intend the future. Give us courage to right those wrongs nearest us. And give us energy to shape the swirling forces of change for mankind's good. In Thy name 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 without amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5943. An act to amend the law authorizing the President to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States;

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of the hearings before the Subcommittee on the Near East of the Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled "U.S. Interests In and Policy Toward the Persian Gulf"; and

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution to reprint and print the corrected Report of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States.

The message also announced, that the Senate receded from its amendment to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H.R. 9639) entitled "An act to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts for the purpose of providing additional Federal financial assistance to the school lunch and school breakfast programs," and concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 with an amendment.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1526. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act to authorize the President to extend certain privileges and immunities to the Organization of African Unity.

REV. CHARLES F. BETTS

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I was honored today to have my brother-in-law, the Reverend Charles F. Betts, from my State of Alabama, give the opening prayer on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Reverend Betts is from Birmingham, Ala., and received the bachelor of arts degree from the University of Alabama, bachelor of divinity degree from Emory University, and served for 3 years as director of the Wesley Foundation at the University of Alabama.

He has served as pastor of several United Methodist Churches in Alabama and at the present time is the associate conference council director, North Alabama Conference, of the United Methodist Church.

I am very happy to have this member of my family to offer prayer here today.

TANKS AND PLANES FOR PEACE

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we must not let Watergate—serious and critical as it is—prevent an opportunity for lasting peace in the Middle East and throughout the world. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, there are those in the world who would take advantage of the Washington situation to advance their sinister ends. The second cease-fire in 24 hours has been broken by the aggressors, apparently fearful that their aggressive war is ending disastrously. When the third cease-fire is reached we must make sure that this is not a trick or stalling tactic by the aggressor nations, designed to stop the Israeli flanking movement and gain time to regroup and reattack with new Russian armament.

Regardless of cease-fires or resumption of fighting it is essential in the interest of peace that the United States provide Israel with military armaments for its defense. While the Russians continue to pour in arms and materiel to the aggressor nations the United States has no alternative.

Appeasement is not the answer. Submission to oil blackmail is not in the the interest of peace. Appeasement and blackmail led directly to World War II, the bloodiest in history. The raving racist Hitler was aided and abetted by appeasement. Blackmail was his trump card. We must not let it happen again.

Mr. Speaker, again I urge the House to approve the resolution calling for tanks, ammunition, and planes for Israel. Lack of modern equipment in Israel will only whet the appetitite of the aggressor and contribute to more war with the risk of a world conflagration. To strengthen Israel is a giant step toward world peace.

A RESOLUTION TO RESTORE COX, RICHARDSON, AND RUCKELSHAUS TO THEIR POSITIONS

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, while I believe the investigation to determine whether there are grounds for impeachment of the President, initiated by the House of Representatives, should continue and the Senate should make such inquiries as it chooses to make and the Watergate grand juries under Judge Sirica should continue their investigation, nevertheless, I think the President should immediately restore the office of independent prosecutor and rename Archibald Cox to that position, should renominate Elliot Richardson as Attorney General, and renominate William Ruckelshaus as Deputy Attorney General. I am introducing in the House today a resolution that it is the sense of the House and Senate that the President should do that.

THREAT OF VETO ON ALASKAN PIPELINE BILL

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, because I believe the whole House is entitled to know what goes on concerning the Alaskan pipeline conference, both behind the scene as well as on the scene, I take the time of the House this morning to tell of a threat of a veto.

I was visited yesterday by Mr. Roy Ash to convey that message to me, that he would recommend a veto unless the bill were changed materially. He requested changes in five areas.

Not only is it the 11th hour for Mr. Ash to be approaching me on this matter, but it is half past quitting time, because the conferees have had their last meeting. While we will review any technical or inadvertent mistakes in our deliberations, we are not receptive to Mr. Ash, or other members of the administration, who approach us at this late hour on opening up the whole bill to accommodate their wishes.

I am not impressed by Mr. Ash's threat that we must rewrite five provisions of the bill which he advocates, or else. I am including at the end of my statement the factsheet which was presented to me.

The five points that he mentioned included the provisions to exempt stripper wells from price controls. The conferees as of yesterday after being polled by committee staff, have agreed to a 10-barrel limit which had been in the original Senate bill. This partially removed objections by Dr. John Dunlop, Chairman of the Cost of Living Council.

On the other points, the conferees had given considerable consideration to: First broadening the Federal Trade Commission's regulatory authorities; second, taking from the Office of Management and Budget the prerogative of screening regulatory agencies questionnaires and turning them over to the General Accounting Office for review; third, Senate confirmation of the Director of the Energy Policy Office and the head of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration; and, fourth, the provision for liability without fault up to $100 million for oil spills at sea. This point certainly is not urgent as it will be 3 years until completion of the pipeline before any oil on tankers.

The conferees have given consideration to all of these points. Mr. Ash and other Government officials have had sufficient time since the Senate bill was passed in July and the House bill on August 2 to make their views known to the individual conferees but they have only now become dragons spouting fiery threats of a veto if their wishes are not followed by the conferees, the conference reconvened and the bill amended to, first, restrict power of the Federal Trade Commission; second, protect the power of the Office of Management and Budget over regulatory agencies; third, protect the power of the President to make appointments without Senate review; and fourth, reduce the extent of oil company liability for oil spills at sea.

Mr. Ash and his party were in my office when word came that the President had agreed to obey the order of the court in regard to the Watergate tapes.

Possibly Mr. Ash did not overhear, or did not get the message inherent in that announcement.

In any event, I did not appreciate what seemed to me rather highhanded ultimatums to reconvene the conferees and revise the bill to suit Mr. Ash's tastes about the OMB's powers, the President's powers, and the oil company's marine liability.

I am very much for the bill as it is being reported, and I believe a large majority of the House Members support it.

It was for that reason I assured Mr. Ash and his party that they were completely free—it was their right—to attempt to get someone to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to the conferees.

I believe in decisions openly and regularly arrived at—not deals consummated in executive meetings at the point of a popgun pointed by Mr. Ash.

Following are the objections Mr. Ash presented to me:

FACT SHEET—CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ACTION ON ALASKAN PIPELINE BILL (S. 1081)

The following agencies have deep reservations about the following provisions approved by the Conference Committee on the Alaskan Pipeline Bill:

Cost of Living Council—opposes exemption from the Stabilization Act of the output of leases the wells of which produce less than 20 barrels per day. Inasmuch as 40 percent of the nation's crude is estimated to come from wells under the twenty-barrel criterion, the maintenance of a ceiling on the balance would be untenable. Domestic prices would inevitably rise to world prices. The immediate effect would be to increase gasoline prices at the pump to 8 cents per gallon and home heating oil by an even greater amount.

Department of Justice—opposes authorization of the Federal Trade Commission to take its enforcement actions in its own name directly into Federal courts at all levels if the Department of Justice does not first take the action proposed by the FTC. This provision would set a precedent for similar autonomy by all other agencies and seriously damage the Department of Justice's control of federal litigation.

Energy Policy Office—The requirement that the incumbent Director (as well as the incumbent head of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration) would have to be confirmed by the Senate is particularly troublesome in view of the President's veto of a similar requirement for the OMB Director and Deputy Director on constitutional and policy grounds.

Offices of Management and Budget—opposes deletion of the authority granted OMB under the Federal Reports Act of 1942 to review and approve requests for business information by all independent regulatory agencies. The authority transferred to the General Accounting Office would be a review and advisory one only, so that GAO could not ultimately prevent an agency from making burdensome, duplicative requests. GAO opposes the transfer. The immediate and predictable result would be a proliferation of requests for information from industry.

Industry—We are informed that the petroleum industry is quite concerned with the strict liability provisions governing the sealeg portion of the oil transportation scheme. A significant burden of proof would be placed on the vessel owner or operator, and he would be liable for the first $14 million of allowable claims. The balance up to $100 million would be paid out of a fund created by taxing oil owners five cents per barrel. However, other legal liability could exist as well. Industry representatives have conveyed the initial reaction that these provisions require them to seriously reassess the desirability of becoming involved in the Alaska Pipeline venture.

THE PRESIDENT IS NOT OFF THE HOOK

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

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to release the Watergate tapes is a welcome one, but it is by no means the end of the constitutional and leadership crisis his administration has precipitated.

Still unresolved is the question of access to the letters and documents related to those tapes which Special Prosecutor Cox had been seeking. Still unresolved are the apparently endless leads which Mr. Cox and his staff had been following and which reportedly touch on crimes

not directly related to the Watergate affair, but which involves this administration at its highest levels.

In view of this, the House of Representatives must press on with its inquiry into grounds for impeachment and it must begin now to prepare for its prosecutorial role in an impeachment proceeding. I call upon the Judiciary Committee to move immediately to take on the investigative and prosecutorial functions demanded by a preimpeachment inquiry and the impeachment proceeding itself. In particular, the committee must begin now to put together the professional staff and other resources that are necessary and should such an effort require additional funds in the committee budget, I am confident the House will vote its approval.

In addition, the reestablishment of a completely independent special prosecutor to continue the work of Mr. Cox and his staff is an immediate and urgent priority. It is vital that the rule of law be reaffirmed and applied to the leaders of Government, as well as to private citizens. Unless and until that is done, our National Government will be crippled by a cloud of suspicion and distrust.

GROWING NEED FOR INDEPENDENT PROSECUTOR TO PURSUE INVESTIGATIONS ONCE UNDER MR. COX'S JURISDICTION

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I approved a letter to Mr. Archibald Cox concerning the ITT affair.

I wrote this letter as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Special Subcommittee on Investigations. This subcommittee has spent 10 months investigating the actions of the Securities Exchange Commission with regards to the ITT-Hartford merger, and other related matters to the ITT affair.

My letter makes four points:

First. Mr. William Casey, former Chairman of the SEC, in my judgment with the knowledge and encouragement of certain White House officials, did everything he could to keep from a committee of the Congress certain ITT documents.

Second. Possible improprieties involved with the transfer of Hartford stock by ITT to Mediobanca of Italy, and later to the Dreyfus Fund;

Third. Inconsistencies between the testimony by Charles Colson to our subcommittee and a memorandum he wrote to H. R. Haldeman over a year earlier; and

Fourth. The revelation before our subcommittee that officials in the White House passed documents held by the FBI to investigators for ITT.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to whom do I send my letter?

Mr. Henry Petersen announced last year that he had withdrawn himself from consideration of ITT matters. He said that he did so, because he had testified before the Senate during the Kleindienst confirmation hearings. Since these hearings form the main reference point for certain aspects of the ITT investigations, Mr. Petersen felt that he could not properly participate in the ITT investigations.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, serious study needs to be given to the question of who is going to finish, with thoroughness, the ITT investigation begun by Mr. Cox. One must contend now that there is a growing need for an independent prosecutor to pursue this and other investigations once under Mr. Cox's jurisdiction.

REFUSAL TO ACCEPT NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I note with some interest that Le Duc Tho has refused to accept the Nobel Peace Prize. I congratulate Mr. Tho on his decision because his announcement is a recognition of what every fair minded and impartial observer in the world recognizes, and that is that there does not exist any peace in South Vietnam. It has been estimated that 50,000 people have been killed since that so-called peace came into existence.

If Mr. Kissinger wants to be honest about it he should elect to turn down his share of the Nobel Peace Prize as well.

WATERGATE, ITT, AND NOMINATION OF GERALD R. FORD

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Texas who just referred to a letter he had written concerning ITT to Mr. Cox, that Mr. Cox was the wrong place for his letter to be sent. Mr. Cox was appointed Watergate special prosecutor, and any letter that the gentleman has written concerning ITT should be directed to the head of the Department of Justice.

Incidentally, yesterday I informed this House I was willing to debate the merits of the impeachment of the President. However, a President can be impeached for only certain reasons. The action of the President in releasing the tapes yesterday afternoon has removed the President from any probability of possibility of impeachment.

I would also like to say I stressed yesterday that a week ago last Friday the nomination of GERALD R. FORD for Vice President was met with acclamation by most Members of the House and the Senate and that we should rapidly move forward with the confirmation of GERALD R. FORD as Vice President.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to authorize industrial operations of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The projected plans for nuclear power development and expansion in the Hudson Valley in New York and throughout the United States has understandably troubled many of us. People are rightfully concerned about safety and want to be reassured. Therefore, now is the time for a full-scale scientific inquiry into the licensing and regulation of nuclear powerplants. The Congress and the American people have a right to know more about the problems and hazards involved before we make a commitment to nuclear power that will soon be irrevocable.

My bill would authorize a comprehensive investigation by the National Academy of Sciences, which would then report its findings and recommendations back to Congress within 1 year. During the period that the study is being conducted, the AEC would be prohibited from issuing any new construction permits. The scope of the inquiry will include such items with safety implications as: First, current AEC licensing procedures; second, present criteria for selecting the location of nuclear plants; third, plant security and design; fourth, ongoing AEC monitoring of plant operations; fifth, the level of routine radioactive emissions now permitted; sixth, environmental effects of nuclear plants; seventh, the risk of accident; and eighth, present plans for protecting the public should an accident occur.

I do not mean to downplay the seriousness of the energy crisis. We must deliver new energy sources as quickly as we can. But, at the same time, we cannot allow ourselves to be panicked into a nuclear energy policy that could prove disastrous in the long run.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SAYS HOUSE WILL CONDUCT ITS IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY IN AN ORDERLY, THOROUGH, AND EXPEDITIOUS FASHION

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, like everyone else, I was glad to hear that President Nixon has agreed to turn over the Watergate tapes to the court.

That is a very appropriate recognition of the fact that we are a Nation of laws and not of men, and that no man—not even the President—is above the law.

This action by the President, however, does not change the status of the impeachment resolutions referred to the Judiciary Committee yesterday. It permits the House and the Judiciary Committee to undertake the inquiry in an orderly, thorough, and expeditious fashion.

The House is not driving toward a preordained objective. It is, instead, conducting a careful and deliberate inquiry into possible grounds for impeachment.

But there is no doubt that we owe it to the American people to conduct the most conscientious investigation of

which we are capable. The House leadership has already said—and I repeat today—that we will support the Judiciary Committee with all the special staffing, financial assistance and other resources necessary to this inquiry. Chairman RODINO will be able to supplement his excellent judiciary staff with whatever specialists or experts he needs.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1973, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1081, GRANTING RIGHTS-OF-WAY ACROSS FEDERAL LANDS

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers in the conference on S. 1081, granting rights-of-way across Federal lands, have until midnight Friday to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

THE CASE OF BORIS PAVLOVICH AZERNIKOV

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is not complying with the very declaration they signed in 1966, the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man, which sets forth the principle of free immigration for all people. Today in the Soviet Union people are not free to emigrate.

Boris Pavlovich Azernikov is a physician who submitted documents for emigration to Israel at the end of June 1971, and on August 10 of that year was arrested.

Boris had attended an ulpan—program of intense Hebrew study—in Leningrad and joined the organization in April of 1970.

In June of 1970 Boris worked to create a Zionist youth summer camp. Then on June 15, a few hours after the so-called plane hijacking in the Leningrad airport a search was made in Boris' apartment and his place of work. He was not in Leningrad at the time but was vacationing in Odessa. Boris was not arrested, but a friend with him was and this friend was convicted at the second Leningrad trial to 5 years in prison.

After his return to Leningrad Boris was summoned for questioning by the KGB. He was summoned 25 times during the summer and autumn of 1970. The KGB had found typewritten brochures on Jewish culture, history, and language in this room in Leningrad.

During 1970 and 1971 Boris was required to testify in the first and second Leningrad trials in which he gave testimony in defense of the defendants. When Boris was arrested, after applying for his passport for emigration to Israel, he was presented with the same charges as those convicted at the second Leningrad trial. Judging by everything the KGB had no other "new materials" except his conduct at the two trials. The question is whether Boris' arrest is a warning of an even harsher policy in relation to the Jews in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the situation confronting Soviet Jews is awaiting our immediate attention. We are their only hope. We can help by passing the Mills-Vanik amendment.

SUCCESSFUL SURGERY ON THE HONORABLE JOHN P. SAYLOR OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would yield to Chairman JAMES HALEY of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs if he were here. I would like to report to the Members that he reported to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning the good news that our friend and colleague, Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, was operated upon this morning in Houston for the removal of a huge aneurysm from his aorta.

Mr. Speaker, the physicians have pronounced the surgery a success. I am happy to report this to the House.

RELEASE OF TAPES NOT ENOUGH

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was relieved as were most House Members by the announcement yesterday in court by the President's counsel that the tapes and various documents and memorandums will be released to Judge Sirica and that the President will comply with the law.

Nevertheless, I want to point out that last night I spent some hours in my district office. I could not get away because the phone was constantly ringing. I had three people helping answer the calls and I talked to many people myself.

Very few of them who called seemed mollified by this apparent concession of the President.

Something has happened—the dam has broken, as I said yesterday—and the people are expressing long pent-up feelings.

Mr. Speaker, the President and his supporters should be advised that the President has two strikes on him and that one more major defiance of morality and law that he committed in the firing of Mr. Cox or in the refusal in the first instance to obey a desire of the courts, will give momentum to impeachment proceedings that will not be stopped.

IMPEACHMENT SHOULD BE EXAMINED BY THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I was more than gratified a few moments ago to hear the very distinguished majority leader of the House, my friend, Mr. O'NEILL from Massachusetts, inject into these somewhat ribald discussions we have been hearing here in the last couple of days about the impeachment of the President, some reservation and restraint into the prior discussions. I want to thank him.

I believe he is entirely right that the impeachment procedure should be examined by the Judiciary Committee in a sensible light and the findings then brought to this floor.

I do not believe it is inherent upon this House membership to discuss mollification of the people by the President. Rather we should stick to the plain, ordinary truth without satire.

I am not alluding to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL). I allude to another Member who spoke on the floor today. I would like to compliment Mr. O'NEILL; his remarks were timely.

What has been done, what we have seen and witnessed in many respects here on this very floor, has been the conviction, without a bona fide indictment, of the President of the United States before the evidence is in.

I simply say if these people who are so hellbent to have the President removed from office have any information, regardless of what it might be, that it be just cause for impeachment, that would satisfy the constitutional requirements, then let them come forward now and speak their piece or forever hold it in the future.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 546]

Alexander	Gray	Moorhead, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Green, Oreg.	Myers
Ashley	Grover	Rees
Aspin	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Biaggi	Harrington	Ryan
Blatnik	Harvey	St Germain
Bolling	Hastings	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Hébert	Saylor
Brown, Ohio	Heckler, Mass.	Shipley
Buchanan	Henderson	Shriver
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.	Sikes
Burke, Fla.	Ketchum	Steele
Carey, N.Y.	Kuykendall	Steiger, Ariz.
Chisholm	Lott	Sullivan
Dellums	McCloskey	Symington
Derwinski	McKay	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Macdonald	Van Deerlin
Edwards, Ala	Mills, Ark.	Veysey
Gettys	Mitchell, Md.	Wyman

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 377 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce that the Chair will receive unanimous-consent requests, but not for speeches.

RICHARDSON AS SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the need for a special prosecutor has been made more imperative, not less, by the events of recent days. Still at stake is the integrity of the governmental processes which have now been under question for over a year.

The integrity of our Government, and the confidence of the American people in it, cannot be restored by lodging the responsibility for this investigation within the Department of Justice. Congress should establish and fill the office of the special prosecutor immediately.

This is not because the Department is without integrity. In fact, the events of recent days make clear that the leadership of the Department has demonstrated remarkable integrity at considerable personal sacrifice.

Nor do I mean to insinuate that the man who would be in charge of the investigation, Assistant Attorney General Henry Petersen, lacks the ability or desire to prosecute the Watergate case fully.

As Mr. Richardson stated yesterday, the investigation remains within the Justice Department now, "the situation is fraught with great difficulty." Perhaps the greatest difficulty will be the credibility of the entire investigation, not because of the people leading it, but because of the way they gained their position of leadership.

Always hanging over Mr. Petersen and others will be the sword of Damocles which slew Archibald Cox. Will the public believe that the sword has been forever sheathed?

If "the whole milieu of national concern" was the reason for the President's wise decision to give up the tapes yesterday, as Alexander Haig suggested, that national concern must be satisfied by continuing the independence of the special Watergate prosecutor.

In all that has developed in the last few days, one man stands head and shoulders above the rest—Elliot Richardson. He has demonstrated clearly that his integrity is above reproach. Of utmost importance to Congress, he has demonstrated that his word is binding; that he can make a commitment to Congress and stand by it, no matter who challenges it.

For this reason, I suggest that the Congress designate Elliot Richardson special Watergate prosecutor. His demonstrated integrity should be sufficient to assure Republicans and Democrats alike that he will keep whatever commitment he might make to Congress and to the American people in assuming this new responsibility. More than any other person, Mr. Richardson can help to restore the public confidence in the institutions of government, which is so lacking today.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 607, LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING PREVENTION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 607) to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of September 25, 1973.)

Mr. BARRETT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, S. 607, a bill to amend and extend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, was passed by the House on September 5, 1973, by an overwhelming vote of 368 to 11 and it previously passed the Senate on May 9, 1973. Your conferees met September 19 and have produced a conference report which reflects, in my opinion, the basic provisions of the bill as passed by the House. There were seven items in disagreement on this conference report and only two of them were major controversial points.

The conference report adopted the House provision authorizing the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, instead of the Secretary of HEW, to conduct research on multiple layers of lead-paint film and to submit a complete report on his findings and recommendations to the Congress no later than December 31, 1974.

The conference report also contains the Senate provision with the House provision providing for consultation of the Secretary of HEW and the Secretary of HUD with regard to steps and conditions to be taken to prohibit the use of lead paint in residential structures receiving any Federal assistance and would also prohibit the application of lead paint in the manufacture of certain toys and utensils that may be used by children.

Probably the most controversial provision in conference was the establishment of a new definition of the safe level of lead paint. The present definition of the safe level of paint is 1 percent lead by weight. The conferees adopted the House provision that the new definition of safe level of lead based paint would be 0.5 percent up until December 31, 1974, and that after December 31, 1974, the definition of lead-based paint would be 0.06 percent lead by weight except that if prior to December 31, 1974, the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, based on studies conducted in accordance with section 301(b) of this act, determines that another level of lead, not to exceed 0.5 percent, is safe shall be effective after December 31, 1974.

Authorizations contained in the Senate-passed bill were $300 million and in the House passed bill were $105 million. Conferees agreed on a total authorization of $126 million greatly below the level in the Senate bill and only $21 million above the authorizations contained in the House passed bill.

The conference report also contains the House provision providing for Federal preemption of any and all laws of States and local governments regarding the requirement prohibitions and standards relating to lead content in paints on any other surface coating in materials which differs from the provisions of this act or regulations issued pursuant thereof. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The final item in disagreement was the Senate provision providing that no funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of section 314(e) of the Public Health Service Act shall be available for lead-based paint poisoning control of the type authorized under the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. The conference report contains this provision.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this conference report basically reflects the bills as was passed by this body on September 5, and believe that the House should act promptly to approve this most important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on S. 607, the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act now before us.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) has stated, our conference was quite constructive. The report will verify that the bill has been strengthened without sacrifice of major features passed by the House.

As I have previously stated, there is an urgency associated with the prevention of poisoning of our children through the ingestion of lead-based paint. It is a matter that demands the application of all appropriate resources and facilities for the most comprehensive and effective results.

I urge passage of the bill as reported by the conference.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that in this bill today we have four times the amount of money authorized which is spent each year for rheumatoid arthritis, and three times as much money as is spent in the detection and research on diabetes. This is all out of proportion. Certainly I want to see sufficient funds in this bill to take care of children who have lead poisoning from the ingestion of lead-based paint, but, again, we are going overboard and spending too much in this area.

We are not basing our authorizations on morbidity, mortality, or economic impact of the disease.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 607, a bill to amend the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. The Senate approved the report last week and I urge the House to give its assent today. This is a good bill; although it does not provide the assistance I had hoped for when I introduced H.R. 3006, it does combine the best features of the House and Senate passed bills and represents a significant step toward detecting, curing, and preventing a disease which afflicts some 400,000 American children.

Fewer than 16,000 of these young victims actually receive treatment and half of them are left mentally retarded. About 200 youngsters die each year from lead poisoning.

In my city of New York there are 30,000 children who each year suffer from lead poisoning, but fewer than 1,000 cases are reported each year. Lead poisoning is a disease endemic to the slums. Although the city outlawed the use of lead in interior paints more than 10 years ago, leaded paint still remains on walls which have been covered with new nonleaded coats.

Nearly 2½ million children are vulnerable to lead poisoning because they live in substandard housing with leaded paint peeling off interior walls. Many mothers are unaware of the dangers of eating lead chips and are not prepared to indicate to the physician that such dangers exist in the home. What is more, the early symptoms of lead poisoning are vague—nausea, lethargy and crankiness—consequently both parent and physician have a difficult time attributing the symptoms to their proper cause.

Even hospital treatment to remove the lead is not a completely effective means to combat lead poisoning. Simply sending a deleaded child back to a leaded environment where he can once more swallow peeling chips of lead-based paint is as ridiculous as curing a man of pneumonia and then forcing him out into a freezing rainstorm with no shoes, no hat, and no coat.

This bill authorizes $63 million a year for 2 years for the detection, treatment, and elimination of lead-based paint poisoning plus research to find the best methods to remove lead-based paint from interior and exterior surfaces of residences.

This legislation, as approved by the conferees, limits the lead content of interior paint to 0.5 percent by weight until December 31, 1974. After that date, the limit drops to 0.06 percent, unless the Product Safety Commission shows that a higher level—not to exceed 0.5 percent—is safe.

I commend the conferees for writing a valuable piece of consumer health legislation and urge my colleagues to support this measure. Its enactment will stand as a tribute to our late colleague William Fitts Ryan of New York, who for so long worked for this type of legislation and to whom much of the credit must be given for the current awareness in the Congress and in the Nation about lead poisoning.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to on S. 607.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 600 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 600

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3927) to extend the Environmental Education Act for three years. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 600 provides for consideration of H.R. 3927, which, as reported by our Committee on Education and Labor, would extend for a period of 3 years the Environmental Education Act of 1970. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, with the time being equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee.

House Resolution 600 further provides that, after general debate, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, at which time it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee would rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall then be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation would continue the highly successful environmental education programs which were instituted under the authority of the 1970 act. While the primary focus of these programs has been in elementary and secondary schools and in local communities, environmental studies have actually been aided at all levels: from preschool to college and adult education levels.

The committee has noted that in fiscal years 1971 and 1972, a total of 236 projects in environmental education were supported in all of the 50 States, including 78 projects for curriculum, 33 for statewide assessment and dissemination, 21 community education programs, 20 outdoor study centers, 15 personnel training programs, and 69 other individual grants.

The result of environmental education on such a broad scale has been an increasing national awareness of the critical role that the individual citizen plays in helping to solve the problems of environmental pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the battle against pollution is a continuing one. Building upon accomplishments under the 1970 act, H.R. 3927 would assist the public to acquire a better understanding of such major problems as land use and area development, automobile pollution requirements and the energy crisis. To accomplish its objectives H.R. 3927 would authorize the following appropriations: Fiscal year 1974, $5 million; fiscal year 1975, $15 million; and fiscal year 1976, $25 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 600 in order that H.R. 3927 may be considered.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 600 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3927, extending the Environmental Education Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. The rule also makes the committee substitute in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The primary purpose of H.R. 3927 is to extend for 3 years the Environmental Education Act.

This act provides grants to encourage awareness of environmental problems. For example, in fiscal years 1971 and 1972, a total of 236 projects in environmental education were supported, including 78 projects for curriculum, 33 for statewide assessment and dissemination, 21 community education programs, 20 outdoor study centers, 15 personnel training programs, as well as 69 small grants.

There are no departmental letters in the committee report. However, the report indicates that administration witnesses opposed this bill, preferring instead the administration-proposed Better Schools Act, a special education revenue sharing, which would allow States and local school districts to support environmental projects as their priorities determine.

Minority views were filed by Members LANDGREBE, ASHBROOK, and HUBER arguing that there is no valid reason for extending this act. They point out that ecological issues have been brought to "the height of public consciousness." They also point out that this narrow categorical grant program, is not consistent with the President's budget, or his effort to provide broader categories of assistance, thus leaving more discretion at the local level.

Additional views were filed by Members QUIE, ERLENBORN, ESHLEMAN, KEMP, and TOWELL, noting that this act was never intended to be permanent legislation. They propose a 1-year extension to provide an orderly phaseout of Federal involvement.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of the position of a Member on the subject legislation, the rule is an open rule and should be adopted in order that the House may begin debate on H.R. 3927.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 15, answered "present" 1, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

YEAS—369

Abdnor	Cronin	Hanrahan
Abzug	Culver	Hansen, Idaho
Adams	Daniel, Dan	Harsha
Addabbo	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hawkins
Alexander	Daniels, Dominick V.	Hays
Anderson, Calif.	Danielson	Hechler, W. Va.
Andrews, N.C.	Davis, S.C.	Heinz
Andrews, N. Dak.	de la Garza	Helstoski
Annunzio	Delaney	Henderson
Archer	Dellenback	Hicks
Arends	Dellums	Hillis
Armstrong	Denholm	Hogan
Badillo	Dennis	Holifield
Bafalis	Dent	Holt
Baker	Devine	Holtzman
Barrett	Dickinson	Horton
Bauman	Diggs	Hosmer
Beard	Dingell	Howard
Bell	Donohue	Huber
Bennett	Dorn	Hudnut
Bergland	Downing	Hungate
Bevill	Drinan	Hunt
Biester	Dulski	Hutchinson
Bingham	Duncan	Ichord
Blackburn	du Pont	Jarman
Boggs	Eckhardt	Johnson, Calif.
Boland	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Colo.
Bowen	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, Ala.
Brademas	Eilberg	Jones, N.C.
Brasco	Erlenborn	Jones, Okla.
Bray	Eshleman	Jones, Tenn.
Breaux	Evans, Colo.	Jordan
Breckinridge	Evins, Tenn.	Karth
Brinkley	Fascell	Kastenmeier
Brooks	Findley	Kazen
Broomfield	Fish	Keating
Brotzman	Fisher	Kemp
Brown, Calif.	Flood	Kluczynski
Broyhill, N.C.	Flowers	Koch
Broyhill, Va.	Foley	Kuykendall
Burgener	Ford, Gerald R.	Kyros
Burke, Calif.	Ford, William D.	Landrum
Burke, Mass.	Forsythe	Latta
Burleson, Tex.	Fountain	Leggett
Burlison, Mo.	Fraser	Lehman
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Lent
Butler	Frenzel	Litton
Byron	Frey	Long, La.
Carey, N.Y.	Froehlich	Long, Md.
Carney, Ohio	Fulton	Lott
Carter	Fuqua	Lujan
Casey, Tex.	Gaydos	McClory
Cederberg	Giaimo	McCloskey
Chamberlain	Gibbons	McCollister
Chappell	Gilman	McCormack
Chisholm	Ginn	McDade
Clancy	Goldwater	McEwen
Clark	Gonzalez	McFall
Clausen, Don H.	Goodling	McKinney
Clawson, Del	Grasso	McSpadden
Clay	Green, Pa.	Madden
Cleveland	Griffiths	Madigan
Cochran	Gubser	Mahon
Cohen	Gude	Mailliard
Collier	Gunter	Mallary
Collins, Ill.	Guyer	Maraziti
Conable	Haley	Martin, N.C.
Conte	Hamilton	Mathias, Calif.
Conyers	Hammer-schmidt	Matsunaga
Cotter	Hanley	Mayne
Coughlin		Mazzoli
		Meeds
Melcher	Reid	Stubblefield
Metcalfe	Reuss	Stuckey
Mezvinsky	Rhodes	Studds
Michel	Riegle	Symington
Milford	Rinaldo	Talcott
Miller	Roberts	Taylor, Mo.
Minish	Robinson, Va.	Taylor, N.C.
Mink	Robison, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Minshall, Ohio	Rodino	Teague, Tex.
Mitchell, Md.	Roe	Thompson, N.J.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Rogers	Thomson, Wis.
Mizell	Roncalio, Wyo.	Thone
Moakley	Roncallo, N.Y.	Thornton
Montgomery	Rooney, Pa.	Tiernan
Moorhead, Calif.	Rose	Towell, Nev.
Moorhead, Pa.	Rosenthal	Treen
Morgan	Rostenkowski	Udall
Mosher	Roush	Ullman
Moss	Rousselot	Vander Jagt
Murphy, Ill.	Roy	Vanik
Murphy, N.Y.	Roybal	Waggonner
Natcher	Runnels	Waldie
Nedzi	Ruppe	Walsh
Nelsen	Ruth	Wampler
Nichols	Sarasin	Ware
Nix	Sarbanes	Whalen
Obey	Satterfield	White
O'Brien	Scherle	Whitehurst
O'Hara	Schneebeli	Whitten
O'Neill	Schroeder	Wiggins
Owens	Sebelius	Williams
Parris	Seiberling	Wilson, Bob
Passman	Shoup	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Patman	Shuster	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Patten	Sikes	Winn
Pepper	Sisk	Wright
Perkins	Skubitz	Wyatt
Pettis	Slack	Wydler
Peyser	Smith, Iowa	Wylie
Pickle	Smith, N.Y.	Yates
Pike	Snyder	Yatron
Podell	Spence	Young, Alaska
Powell, Ohio	Staggers	Young, Fla.
Preyer	Stanton, J. William	Young, Ga.
Price, Ill.	Stanton, James V.	Young, Ill.
Price, Tex.	Stark	Young, Tex.
Pritchard	Steed	Zablocki
Quie	Steelman	Zion
Quillen	Steiger, Wis.	Zwach
Railsback	Stephens	
Randall	Stokes	
Rangel	Stratton	
Regula		

NAYS—15

Ashbrook	Davis, Wis.	Martin, Nebr.
Camp	Flynt	Mathis, Ga.
Collins, Tex.	Gross	Poage
Conlan	King	Symms
Crane	Landgrebe	Young, S.C.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mollohan

NOT VOTING—49

Anderson, Ill.	Grover	Ryan
Ashley	Hanna	St Germain
Aspin	Hansen, Wash.	Sandman
Biaggi	Harrington	Saylor
Blatnik	Harvey	Shipley
Bolling	Hastings	Shriver
Brown, Mich.	Hébert	Steele
Brown, Ohio	Heckler, Mass.	Steiger, Ariz.
Buchanan	Johnson, Pa.	Sullivan
Burke, Fla.	Ketchum	Van Deerlin
Corman	McKay	Veysey
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald	Vigorito
Derwinski	Mills, Ark.	Widnall
Esch	Myers	Wolff
Gettys	Rarick	Wyman
Gray	Rees	
Green, Oreg.	Rooney, N.Y.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Hastings.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Wolff with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Esch.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas, with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Steele.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Aspin.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3927) to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3927 with Mr. ROUSH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ESHLEMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3927, a bill to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years.

BACKGROUND

The Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, Mr. Chairman, held hearings on this bill during April and May. On May 24, the subcommittee reported H.R. 3927 by a vote of 7 to 3 and on May 30, the measure was reported out of the full Committee on Education and Labor by a voice vote.

The strong favorable vote in both the subcommittee and the full committee reflects, Mr. Chairman, the bipartisan support the Environmental Education Act enjoys.

I should like at the outset, Mr. Chairman, to commend, in particular, the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee (Mr. PERKINS) as well as the gentleman from Minnesota, the ranking minority leader (Mr. QUIE), the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN), the gentlelady from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

FLEXIBLE AUTHORITY

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, the original act, signed into law on October 30, 1970, provides flexible and broad authority for support of environmental education activities, particularly in elementary and secondary schools and in local communities.

Specifically, the Environmental Education Act provides for:

The encouragement, and support of the development, demonstration, and evaluation of innovative and improved curricula in environmental studies;

The dissemination of significant materials for use in teaching at the preschool, elementary, secondary, college and adult education levels;

The initiation and maintenance of programs in environmental education at the elementary and secondary schools level;

Preservice and inservice teacher training programs;

The training of other educational and public service personnel, including community, business, and professional leaders, as well as Government employees at the local, State, and Federal levels;

Adult and community education programs;

The development of programs and materials for use by the mass media in dealing with ecological problems;

Outdoor ecological study centers.

GREAT NEED

Evidence of the great need for the environmental educational program, Mr. Chairman, lies in the following statistics:

In the 3 years in which this effort has been funded, fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, the Office of Environmental Education has received over 4,700 applications, with requests totaling approximately $180 million.

Yet the Office of Environmental Education, Mr. Chairman, has been able to fund only 286 projects at a cost of $5.843 million.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, both the educational community, and the public, understand the need to better inform our citizenry about the wide array of problems we call environmental if we are to adequately address such problems as air and water pollution and the energy crisis.

MAJOR PROVISIONS

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3927 extends the act for 3 additional years—that is through fiscal year 1976, at the following levels:

Fiscal year 1974, $5 million.
Fiscal year 1975, $15 million.
Fiscal year 1976, $25 million.

The bill further provides for the continuation of the Advisory Council on Environmental Education through June of 1976.

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 3927

Mr. Chairman, without exception, the question of the need for environmental education has not been challenged and the committee views this measure as the best Federal approach to environmental education activities.

There were suggestions that we extend the act for 1 year in order for the Education and Labor Committee to consider consolidating this program with other education measures. The committee has concluded overwhelmingly that environmental education should not be a part of a consolidation plan and agrees with the earlier actions of the subcommittee that the broad flexible authority reflected in this act does not fit the definition normally referred to as a "narrow categorical program."

PRESIDENTIAL SUPPORT

Mr. Chairman, there have been many expressions of support for the concept of environmental education, but perhaps none more heartening than the many statements issued in the past several years by President Nixon.

For example, the President said in his February 8, 1971, message to Congress:

The building of a better environment will require in the long term a citizenry that is both deeply concerned and fully informed. Thus, I believe that our educational system, at all levels, has a critical role to play.

On June 29 of this year, yet another eloquent statement of Presidential support was heard when the President delivered a lengthy statement on the energy crisis.

Said the President:

But the final question of whether we can avoid an energy crisis will be determined by the response of the American people to their country's needs.

And, he concluded:

I believe that the American people must develop an energy-conservation ethic.

The committee has therefore, Mr. Chairman, accepted the views expressed by President Nixon, as well as other members of this administration; namely, that environmental education studies and activities are a cornerstone of effective action aimed at solving environmental problems and enhancing environmental protection.

And we have accepted, as well, Mr. Chairman, the opinion of the many students, educators, environmentalists, and other public witnesses, that extension of the Environmental Education Act is essential to the development of better understanding on the part of the American people of the ecological problems we are now beginning to confront.

OTHER PROBLEMS

Mr. Chairman, let me take just a minute before concluding my remarks to comment on several problems which members of the Committee on Education and Labor have encountered with respect to the administration of the Environmental Education Act.

I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the intent of Congress with respect to the National Advisory Council on Environmental Education as well as the position of the Office of Environmental Education within the Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, when Congress originally approved the Environmental Education Act, we clearly intended that there be a strong and active advisory body for the Office of Environmental Education.

Yet the Advisory Council, mandated by the law, was not appointed for a full year after passage of the legislation, and we have discovered that the Council was not actively involved in the development and implementation of the environ-

mental education program as we intended.

So I want to make it crystal clear, Mr. Chairman, that the Advisory Council, which is continued by the legislation before us today, is to be fully involved with the continued development of the programs supported by the Office of Environmental Education.

Yet another area of concern, Mr. Chairman, has been the fact that, until recently, the Director of the Office of Environmental Education has not had the access to the Commissioner of Education which we in Congress intended when we approved this act.

So that there will be no misunderstanding on this point, either, Mr. Chairman, let me make clear the intent of Congress that the Office of Environmental Education is supposed to be an important element in the Office of Education, and the Director of that Office is to report directly to the Commissoner of Education, and not be submerged within the bureaucracy.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by noting that we debate this bill to extend the Environmental Education Act at a time of grave crisis with respect to the wise allocation and use of our resources.

For we must, within the very near future, make crucial decisions on the energy policies which will be established as national goals.

We will have to make some judgments, for example, on the wisdom of offshore drilling in the Atlantic to seek additional sources of oil.

We will have to decide the proper means of allocating scarce fuel oil so that families are not facing bitter winters without adequate heat.

And we will, of course, have to continue to grapple with the problems of automatic emissions which are now the most significant source of the pollutants which are befouling our air.

Mr. Chairman, it is critical to the formation of sound judgments on these matters of crucial national importance that the public be informed and aware of the issues involved.

The Environmental Education Act, Mr. Chairman, is designed to stimulate and strengthen public discussion of these issues. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join with me to support passage of H.R. 3927.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, initially I want to commend the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, our colleague from Indiana, JOHN BRADEMAS, for his work on this legislation. Largely through his insights and leadership in 1970, we constructed and approved an act which in a variety of ways deals with problems which we had ignored for too long a time.

The Environmental Education Act is a well-designed response to widespread pleas from school officials for aid to assist the public in a better understanding of environmental problems and what we must do about them. In the intervening 3 years, progress under the act has been substantial despite inadequate appropriations. Clearly the act has contributed toward the stimulation of a broad national awareness of and interest in ecological issues.

Everyone of the 50 States participated in well over 200 projects in environmental education which were supported in fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972. Thousands of teachers and community leaders received training and participated in workshops designed to deal with many areas of interest in environmental studies.

As has been indicated, appropriations have been modest. But Mr. Chairman, to the extent that these appropriations were available, the record shows a significant amount of activity under the act in line with congressional intent.

The bill before us today seeks to extend the act for an additional 3 years. The committee report provides ample justification and support for taking such action. I will mention only one item as it by itself demonstrates why the act should be extended. During the last 3 years, close to 5,000 applications have been received requesting funds totaling $180,000,000. Only 286 requests were funded.

In effect, the interest and requests of schools across the Nation are still pending and it is in response to these that we are urging the continuation of the program.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed authorizations for the 3-year program are more modest than I would want and far more modest than what our hearing record shows is needed. The proposed authorization for the current fiscal year is only $5,000,000. This is $20,000,000 less than last year's authorization. For fiscal year 1975 and fiscal year 1976, the authorizations move to $15,000,000,000 and $25,000,000 respectively.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I think it is a bill which deserves the support of the House membership.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, my love of the outdoors and the beauty of nature has always been a source of great strength and inspiration to me. I am concerned as an individual that this Nation do everything to protect our environment and the gifts that God has given to us. Anything that we, as Members of Congress, can do to provide the means which help protect and improve the quality of the world I favor. Quite often, however, the question of how best to achieve a goal becomes a point of disagreement. Today we have before us the Environmental Education Act which provides dollars to educate children about ecology and how they can contribute to a cleaner, healthier environment. While I am supporting this bill I think it is important that my colleagues be aware that there are other Federal dollars from other legislative authorities which are being spent within the public schools on this subject and, in fact, exceed the amount which is being expended under this act.

During the deliberations on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the Committee on Education and Labor I attempted to incorporate environmental education into a package of programs being consolidated in a new title. It was my feeling then that schools throughout the Nation should be given an opportunity to make the determination as to where environmental education programs fit in relationship to all other programs and that they—the local schools—should be allowed to establish and set their own priorities. I was convinced that the existing programs which are presently funded under title III of ESEA gave school systems the flexibility that I was seeking and were making a significant impact in our schools. A compromise consolidation plan was adopted by the committee but environmental education was not included as part of the agreement. While I still believe that environmental education should have been a part of the consolidation, and would hope that it would be incorporated in some future Congress, I feel that the consolidation which we developed was a good one.

So that Members may be better able to understand just why I felt environmental education would be a good basis for building a base of support under consolidation, I am inserting at this point a listing of title III projects on environmental education which was compiled by the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Services and Centers and was supplied to me by the Office of Education. Although the projects listed were funded in fiscal year 1972 they reflect what the Office of Education is still doing under this title.

TITLE III ESEA—ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION RELATED PROJECTS

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE III

Los Angeles City Unified School District, Los Angeles, California, $292,000.

Title: A Model Educational Program in Ecology, K-Adult Education

A comprehensive program in ecology from K-Adult Education will be developed, implemented and monitored. A sequential program in environmental education will be developed, and instructional materials for pupil and teacher use will be prepared. An ecology center complex will be established; two mobile ecology laboratories will be developed; and a television series on ecology for elementary and secondary school levels will be produced.

District School Board of Lee County, Fort Myers, Florida, $111,400.

Title: Model Strategy for an Effective Environmental Education Program.

A program to foster environmental awareness, sensitivity and responsibility on the part of students at all grade levels will be implemented. Curriculum materials for grades

6–8 will emphasize understanding ecological consequences. For grades K–5 materials will center on environmental awareness, sensitivity, and very basic ecological concepts. Students will acquire skill in sampling, surveying, and maintaining environmental conditions.

Community Unit School District No. 200, Woodstock, Illinois, $80,000.

Title: Woodstock Environmental Education Project.

An environmental education program will be established to develop positive attitudinal and behavioral patterns of teachers, students, and other citizens concerning environment so as to effect improvement and enhancement of environmental quality. Students, teachers, and parents will identify environmental problems of the area, State, and Nation; will formulate proposed solutions to identified problems and will develop materials and programs to augment the existing curriculum. Through these activities, participants will gain understanding of ecology and will learn to identify environmental problems, and to work through legal means for orderly solutions.

Shawnee Mission Unified District No. 512, Shawnee Mission, Kansas, $111,000.

Title: Cooperative Learning Through Environmental Activities in Nature.

An environmental education program will be established which will eventually serve the entire school district. The program will include cross-curricular involvement, interaction among children at all grade levels, indoor-outdoor ecological study, urban-suburban-rural-underdeveloped areas field studies, and cooperative use of existing county park facilities and nonprofit outdoor education foundation facilities. An environmental education laboratory will be cooperatively developed. Selected school personnel will participate in a summer workshop to develop the program and related audiovisual materials including programmed cassette tapes for small group student field study.

School District of City of Wyandotte, Wyandotte, Michigan, $240,000.

Title: Strategies for Environmental Education—Project SEE.

A model environmental education program aimed at developing people who are consciously aware of their environment and are motivated to assume an active role in efforts to maintain and improve the environment will be implemented. The curriculum will include specially designed environmental education packages which will be utilized by selected students. Efforts will be made to involve the entire community in the project on a continuing basis. University personnel will assist in the preservice and inservice environmental education of teachers.

Sole Supervisory District to Putnam and Westchester Counties, BOCES, Yorktown Heights, New York, $250,000.

Title: The Area Education Agency's Role in Developing Environmental Education.

An educational program involving two school districts will be developed. Activities in each district will focus on establishment of multi-district student environmental monitoring network concerning air, water, soil, waste, noise and population to function first within the project area and later to spread throughout and beyond the State. The project will also establish a clearinghouse to deal with environmental materials for elementary and secondary education and will plan for the active involvement of State Education Department and State Environmental, Conservation Staff, as well as the 45 other Boards of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES) in the State.

Golden Valley School District No. 275, Golden Valley, Minnesota, $162,469.

Title: Community Environmental Studies Program for Grades 5–12.

An environmental studies program will be established to promote environmental literacy through continued exposure to underlying principles and concepts presented within the matrix of the learner's immediate experience. Participants will make naturalistic field observations to describe the socio-ecological research, classical design and statistical procedures, controls, social action and survey methods. The learner's knowledge of man-land problems will stem from observations and experiences with environmental problems in the social context within which they occur.

Berks County School Board, Reading, Pennsylvania, $112,000.

Title: An Interdisciplinary Problem Solving Approach in Environmental Education.

An interdisciplinary, problem-solving curriculum in environmental education for all age levels will be developed in conjunction with the State-funded construction of facilities at the Nolde Forest State Park. The curriculum will be developed around five major resource areas—water, earth, biological resources, meteorological resources, and heritage—and will be pilot-tested in the Park facility and surrounding communities. Teacher training in the use of the facilities and curriculum will also be conducted.

Anderson School District No. 5, Anderson, South Carolina, $115,000.

Title: An Environmental-Ecological Education Center.

An environmental/ecological education center will be established for exceptional students, including academically talented and handicapped students. A resident and day environmental learning center will be developed on a 45 acre site near a lake. There all environmental resources and problems peculiar to the area will be investigated by the participating students and their teachers.

Carteret County Board of Education, Beaufort, North Carolina, $100,000.

Title: School Community Cooperative Environmental Studies Project.

A program designed to promote self-directed and investigation-oriented learning which molds schooling with education in the "real life" of the community and the total environment by placing students in actual situations to observe the functioning of the socioeconomic system. Three classes of juniors and seniors of "moderate abilities and ambitions" will be placed in a full-year, half-way elective course replacing their regular English, social studies, and science program in order to conduct individual and group field research in the community.

Laramie County School District #1, Cheyenne, Wyoming, $60,000.

Title: ECO Curriculum Development and Learning Laboratory.

A curriculum development and learning laboratory and satellite sites will be established to develop and present an environmental education curriculum for Grades K–12 and a special curriculum for handicapped children. The curriculums will emphasize knowledge of environmental problems, methods of solving these problems and will be developed by instructional teams from social, behavioral and hard sciences.

In addition, the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services has reported 60 projects totaling $4,419,051.

PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SUPPLEMENTARY CENTERS AND SERVICES

ALABAMA

Reading Enrichment and Outdoor Education, Tuscaloosa, Ala., $30,000.

ALASKA

The Kenai Environmental Education Program, Soldotna, Alaska, $85,463.

ARIZONA

Space Sciences In A Controlled Environment, Buckeye, Ariz., $25,000.

CALIFORNIA

Project MER (Marine Ecology Research), Pleasant Hill, Calif., $75,658.

Humboldt County Environmental Education Project, Eureka, Calif., $105,145.

COLORADO

Cultural Relationship of Man to His Environment—Past, Present, Future, Delta, Colo., $14,400.

CONNECTICUT

Pratt Outdoor Center, New Milford, Conn., $2,500.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Model Comprehensive Program in Urban Environmental Education, Wash., D.C., $130,000.

FLORIDA

Broad Spectrum Environmental Education, Program, Cocoa, Fla., $151,713.

Interdisciplinary Environmental Education, K–12, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla., $135,974.

Environmental Sensitivity Project, Pensacola, Fla., $81,000.

Environmental Laboratory, Arcadia, Fla., $50,000.

GEORGIA

Student-Teacher Environmental Relationships Investigations, $199,127.

Project Success Environment, $244,000.

ILLINOIS

Operation Survival Through Environmental Education, Grafton, Ill., $124,810.

The Upper Mississippi River Eco-Center, Thomson, Ill., $83,380.

INDIANA

Indianapolis Public Schools Resident Outdoor Education Program, Indianapolis, Ind., $10,000.

IOWA

Project Eco, Ames, Iowa, $84,547.

Handicapped Children's Nature Study Center, $17,923.

LOUISIANA

Environmental Education Curriculum, Development, St. Martinville, La., $93,293.

MAINE

Maine Environmental Education Project, Yarmouth, Maine, $52,385.

Maine Environmental Improvement, Yarmouth, Maine, $93,293.

MARYLAND

Environment—A Basis for Curriculum, Oakland, Maryland, $185,629.

MASSACHUSETTS

Project SCENIC, Auburn, Mass., $40,000.

Project QUEST (Quality Urban Environment Studies Training), Brockton, Mass., $56,465.

Project ECOS (Environmental Center for Our Schools), Springfield, Mass., $97,365.

MICHIGAN

Discovery Through Outdoor Education, Mt. Clemens, Mich., $54,985.

Education in the Natural Environment, Grand Rapids, Mich., $24,900.

MINNESOTA

Eco-Experiences, Grand Marais, Minn., $90,000.

MISSOURI

Environmental Ecological Education Program, Chesterfield, Missouri, $91,000.

MONTANA

Powell County Environmental Curriculum, Center, Deer Lodge, Montana, $27,100.

Environmental Education Curriculum Project, Hamilton, Montana, $20,696.

NEVADA

Verdi Outdoor Education Facility, Verdi, Nev., $36,000.

NEW JERSEY

Pollution Control Education Center, Union, N.J., $83,905.

Implementation of the New Jersey State

Master Plan for Environmental Education, Upper Montclair, N.J., $442,600.

NORTH CAROLINA

Environmental/Ecological Education, Morganton, N.C., $75,542.

Environmental/Ecological Education, Oteen, N.C., $75,542.

Environmental Science Study Curriculum, Washington, N.C., $84,965.

OHIO

Center for the Development of Environmental Curriculum, Willoughby, Ohio, $136,000.

Robinson Environmental Centers, Akron, Ohio, $125,000.

PENNSYLVANIA

Tayamentasachta, Greencastle, Pa., $14,752.

Transdisciplinary Involvement Program, Pittsburgh, Pa., $20,800.

Environmental Education Program, Pittsburgh, Pa., $5,678.

Project LIFE (Living Instruction for Ecology, Waynesburg, Pa., $27,000.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Oceanographic Science Conceptual Schemes Project, Charleston, S.C., $27,345.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Inter-Lakes Environmental and Outdoor Education K–8, Chester, S. Dak., $47,902.

Environmental Education K–12, Rapid City, S. Dakota, $42,400.

TEXAS

Study of Ecology of Lower Rio Grande Valley, Harlingen, Texas, $10,000.

Environmental Education Curriculum for Ft. Worth Indian School District Outdoor Learning Center, Ft. Worth, Texas, $20,000.

VERMONT

Development of Outdoor Ecological Laboratory, Bellows Falls, Vt., $15,000.

VIRGINIA

Craig County Conservation and Recreation Exploration (CARE), New Castle, Va., $77,000.

Program for the Gifted, Hampton, Va., $54,403.

WASHINGTON

Weather Satellite Station, Kirkland, Wash., $33,000.

Center for Ecological Studies, Mount Vernon, Wash., $55,016.

A Model Marine Science Lab, Poulsbo, Wash., $78,000.

Project Ecology (Environmental Career-Oriented Learning), Seattle, Wash., $25,000.

WISCONSIN

ICE—Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Green Bay, Wisc., $89,302.

K–12—Environmental Education Curriculum Menomonie, Wisc., $25,000.

WYOMING

Kemmerer Outdoor Lab, Kemmerer, Wy., $61,046.

GUAM

Environmental Education for Guam Schools, Agana, Guam, $53,102.

The total sum for projects submitted is $6,052,920.

ESEA TITLE III PROJECTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

ALASKA

The Kenai Environmental Education Program, Mr. Peter Larson, Kenai Peninsula Borough School District, Environmental Education Program, P.O. Box 1266, Soldotna, Alaska 99669.

ARIZONA

Project OUTREACH, Dr. Paul Plath, 2042 W. Thomas Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85015.

CALIFORNIA

A Model Educational Program in Ecology, Kindergarten Through Adult, Mr. Grant R. Cary, 1044 N. Hayworth, Los Angeles, California 90046.

An Environmental Approach to Investigation and Inquiry in Science, Mr. Leon Hunter, Barstow Unified School District, 551 South H Street, Barstow, California 92311.

Planning Solutions to Urban Educational Problems, Mr. William Webster, 1025 Second Avenue, Oakland, California 94606.

COLORADO

Cultural Relationship of Man to His Environment—Past-Present-Future, M. C. Kreutz, Route 1, Box 66, Delta, Colorado 81416.

CONNECTICUT

Pratt Outdoor Center, Dr. Daniel Hart, Paper Mill Road, New Milford, Connecticut 06776.

Project Outdoors, Mrs. Norman B. Newton, Natural Science Center, 269 Oak Grove Street, Manchester, Connecticut 06040.

Talcott Mt. Science Center, Mr. Donald La Salle, Montevideo Road, Avon, Connecticut 06001.

DELAWARE

Environmental Laboratory, Mr. Hess G. Wilson, New Castle-Gunning Bedford School District, Blound Road, New Castle, Delaware 19720.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Model Comprehensive Program in Urban Environmental Education, Mr. Rueben Pierce, Department of Science, Presidential Building, 415–12th Street, N.W., Washington D.C.

FLORIDA

Broad Spectrum Environmental Education Program, Dr. Clair Bemiss, 705 Avocado Avenue, Cocoa, Florida 32922.

Interdisciplinary Environmental Education K–12, Mr. John Arena, 3600 S.W. 70th Avenue, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33314.

Environmental Learning Laboratory, Mr. John A. Reynolds, P.O. Box 759, Arcadia, Florida 33821.

Environmental Sensitivity Project, Mr. Roy Hyatt, Environmental Studies Center, 2501 North Hayne Street, Pensacola, Florida 32503.

Model Strategy for an Effective Environmental Education Program, Mr. William F. Hammond, Gwynne Institute, 2266 Second Street, Ft. Myers, Florida 33901.

Resource-Use Outdoor Education Center, Mr. James M. Phillips, P.O. Box 539, Perry, Florida 32347.

GEORGIA

Student-Teacher Environmental Relationships Investigations, Mr. Fred Schlein, Savannah Youth Museum, 4405 Paulsen Street, Savannah, Georgia 31405.

ILLINOIS

Woodstock Environmental Education Project, Mr. James Hires, Woodstock School, 14124 South Street Rd., Woodstock, Illinois 60098.

Operational Survival Through Environmental Education, Mr. Ray Miller, Box 122, Grafton, Illinois 62052.

Sell: Student Endowment Learning to Live, Barry Gowin, Superintendent, Meridian Community Unit School District 101, Mounds, Illinois 62964.

IOWA

Project ECO, Dr. Luther Kiser, 120 S. Kellogg, Ames, Iowa 50010.

KANSAS

Cooperative Learning Through Environmental Activities in Nature (Project CLEAN), Mr. Ernie Kumpf, 7235 Antioch Street, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66204.

Environmental Education Demonstration Project, Mr. Donald French, 1601 Van Buren, Topeka, Kansas 66612.

KENTUCKY

Environmental Education, Mr. Harold Grooms, Bourbon County Board of Education, Paris, Kentucky 40361.

MAINE

Maine Environmental Education Project, Mr. Dean Bennett, Intermediate School, Yarmouth, Maine 04096.

MARYLAND

Environment—A Basis for Curriculum, Mr. Ernest Spoerlien, Garrett County Board of Education, 40 S. Fouth Street, Oakland, Maryland 21550.

MASSACHUSETTS

Project SCENIC, Mr. Paul Lemire, Randall School, West Street, Auburn, Massachusetts 01501.

Project SURVIVAL, Mr. Richard Todd, Locke Junior High, Allen Road, Billerica, Massachusetts 08121.

Project QUEST (Quality Urban Environment Studies Training), Mr. Bill White, Brockton High School, Brockton, Massachusetts 02402.

Project ECOS (Environmental Center for Our Schools), Mr. Clifford Phaneuf, 195 State Street, Springfield, Massachusetts 00108.

MICHIGAN

Strategies for Environmental Education, Mr. Thomas Sparrow, 639 Oak Street, Wyandotte, Michigan 48192.

MINNESOTA

Environmental Learning Center, Mr. Gerald Foldenauer, Cook County High School, Grand Marais, Minnesota 55604.

Education in the Natural Environment, Mr. Robert Block, 820 Pokegama Avenue North, Grand Rapids, Michigan 55744.

Inter-disciplinary Environmental Workshop, Mr. Robert Hofflander, Box 152, Windom, Minnesota 56101

Environmental Science Center, Mr. Richard Myshak, Independent School District No. 275, 5400 Glenwood Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55422

Community Environmental Study Project, Mr. Mike Naylon, 5400 Glenwood Avenue, Golden Valley, Minnesota 55422

Mobile Science Laboratory, Mr. Charles Carpenter, Brookside Junior High School, 1209 Columbus Street, Albert Lea, Minnesota 56007

Environmental Mobile Laboratory, Mr. Sherwood Cleveland, Box 191, Anoka, Minnesota 55303

MISSOURI

Environmental Ecological Education Program, Mr. Verlin Abbott, Parkway School District, 455 North Woods Mill Road, Chesterfield, Missouri 63017

MONTANA

Powell County Environmental Curriculum Center, Mr. Gary Swant, Powell County High School, Deer Lodge, Montana 59722

Environmental Education Curriculum Project, Mr. John Smith, 408 Daly Avenue, Hamilton, Montana 59840

NEVADA

Verdi Outdoor Education Facility, Mr. Brian Wise, Verdi Elementary School, Verdi, Nevada 89439

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Nature Study Center, Mr. Emile Rocheleau, Monadnock Regional High School, RFD #1, Keene, New Hampshire 03431

Squam Lakes Science Center, Mr. Gilbert Merrill, Holderness, New Hampshire 03245

Dartmouth Outward Bound Center, Mr. Frederick S. Bartlett, P. O. Box 481, College Hall, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

NEW JERSEY

Pollution Control Education Center, Dr. James M. Caufield, Union Public Schools, 2369 Morris Avenue, Union, New Jersey

Implementation of the New Jersey State Master Plan for Environmental Education, Dr. Edward Ambry, New Jersey State Council for Environmental Education, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

NEW MEXICO

Outdoor Education, Mr. John Cox, 724 Maple, S.E., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

NEW YORK

The Area Education Agency's Role in Environmental Stewardship, Dr. Frank Thompson, 42 Triangle Center, Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

NORTH CAROLINA

Environmental/Ecological Education, Mr. Earl Whitener, Burke County Schools, Drawer 989, Morganton, North Carolina 28655

School/Community Cooperative Environmental Studies, Mr. Will Hon, Courthouse Annex, Beaufort, North Carolina 28516

Environmental/Ecological Education, Dr. Larry Liggett, Environmental Education Center, 13 Veterans Drive, Oteen, North Carolina 28805

Environmental Science Study Curriculum, Mr. William Moffit, Washington City Schools, P.O. Box 466, Washington, North Carolina 27889

OHIO

Center for the Development of Environmental Curriculum, Mr. Dennis M. Wint, 37047 Ridge Road, Willoughby, Ohio 44094

PENNSYLVANIA

Knowledgeable Action to Restore Our Environment (Project KARE), Dr. Donald L. Wright, Colony Office Building, Route 7 & Butler Pike, Bell, Pennsylvania 19422.

An Interdisciplinary Problem-Solving Approach in Environmental Education, Mr. Louis Ritrovato, Nolde Forest State Park, Box 392—R.D. 1, Reading (Cumru), Pennsylvania 19601.

Tayamentasachta, Mr. Fred C. Kaley, Greencastle Antrim S.D., 370 S. Ridge Avenue, Greencastle, Pennsylvania 17225.

Transdisciplinary Involvement Program, Mr. Frank Christy, Fox Chapel Area S.D., 611 Field Club Road, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15238.

Environmental Education Program, Dr. Robert C. Campbell, State College Area S.D., 131 W. Nittany Avenue, State College, Pennsylvania.

Living Instruction for Ecology, Mrs. Alberta R. Covert, Central Green S.D., Waynesburg, Pennsylvania 15370.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Oceanographic Science Conceptual Schemes Project, Gary Awkerman, 3 Chisolm Street, Charleston, South Carolina.

An environmental-Ecological Education Center, Mr. Ryan Faulkenberry, Anderson County School District No. 5, P.O. Drawer 439, Anderson, South Carolina 29621.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Inter-Lakes Environmental and Outdoor Education K–8, Mr. Major Boddicker, Chester Area School District, Chester, South Dakota 57017.

Environmental Education K–12, Dr. E. R. McLaughlin, Instructional Materials Center, 827 Franklin Street, Rapid City, South Dakota 57701.

TENNESSEE

Oak Ridge Schools Phase II Simulation Project, Mr. Peter H. Cohan, Cooperative Science Center, Inc., 156 Adams Lane, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830.

TEXAS

Living Curriculum, 5th Grade, 3210 W. Lancaster, Forth Worth, Texas 76107.

Study of Ecology of Lower Rio Grande Valley, 1409 E. Harrison Street, Harlingen, Texas 78550.

VERMONT

Development of Outdoor Ecological Laboratory, Mr. William Lienhard, Atkinson Street, Bellows Falls, Vermont 05101.

VIRGINIA

Craig County Conservation and Recreation Exploration (CARE), Mr. Walton F. Mitchell, Jr., P.O. Box 245, New Castle, Virginia 24127.

WASHINGTON

Weather Satellite Station, Mr. Clayton Lanum, Lake Washington School District, Box 619, Kirkland, Washington 98033.

Center for Ecological Studies, Mr. Patrick Hayden, Mount Vernon School District, 1219 E. Division Street, Mount Vernon, Washington 98273.

A Model Marine Science Lab, Mr. Andrew Driscoll, School of Marine Science, Route 1, Box 631, Poulsbo, Washington 98370.

WISCONSIN

ICE—Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Mr. Robert J. Warpinski, CESA No. 9, 1927 Main Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.

K–12—Environmental Education Curriculum, Mr. David Schiotz, Menomonie Public Schools, 718 North Broadway, Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751.

WYOMING

Conservation Center for Creative Learning, Mr. Robert Legoski, Starrett Junior High School, Lander, Wyoming 82520.

Kemmerer Outdoor Lab, Mr. Bill Mowry, Kemmerer Junior High School, Kemmerer, Wyoming 83101.

ECO Curriculum Development and Learning Laboratory, Dr. Bill Edwards, Rural Route 1, Box 550A, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001.

PUERTO RICO

San Cristobal: Environmental Studies, Mrs. Ines Julia Guzman de Perez, Social Studies Program, Department of Education, Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Environmental Studies Program, Mrs. Doris Jadan, Outdoor Education Teacher, Department of Education, P.O. Box 630, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 7056, the Environmental Education Act extension. The passage of the Environmental Education Act of 1970 was a major step toward awakening the American public to the environmental problems and possible solutions which lie in the years ahead. The programs it has funded have begun the process of establishing an understanding of ecological issues.

It would be hard to do anything at all which would not help this much-neglected field. But, although the act of 1970 was a great beginning, neither the act, nor its administration has fulfilled early hopes. The Congress has not tried to accommodate to the wishes of an unenthusiastic bureaucracy, or more importantly, to the needs of local and regional environmental educators.

When this act passed in 1970 the public response was overwhelming. In that first year, without any advance publicity, almost 2,000 project funding requests were submitted within 2 weeks. Despite growing administrative apathy at the Office of Environmental Education and discouraging amounts of redtape, this outflow of interest and support continued. The Office of Environmental Education was moved five times in 18 months. The Federal Advisory Council was extremely late in getting started and never did fully function. Programs which were successful were not shared with those who were attempting similar projects, nor was information on successful projects generally disseminated or coordinated.

The record of the Congress has not been all that good either. We have consistently underfunded the program. This year we are actually considering an extension after the appropriations bills have already been considered. This, to me, does not represent much of a commitment to the ideal of environmental education.

On May 15 I testified before the Select Subcommittee on Education in favor of a bill which had initially been drafted by a group of some of the outstanding environmental educators in the midwest region. I cannot adequately explain this bill to this committee in 5 minutes, so I do not intend to introduce that as a substitute here. But, I am extremely hopeful that it will receive more than a cursory review in next year's hearings.

My bill is one attempt to overcome some of the known difficulties we have encountered, by making limited, but important changes. The committee bill, which I will support, has ignored known problems and while it will keep environmental education afloat, it will condemn our Federal environmental education program to continued mediocrity.

The primary purpose of my proposal would remain the same as the act the committee bill extends; to educate our citizens of all ages about environmental quality and substance. That purpose is great, but the committee bill, unfortunately, would not achieve it. My proposal will come closer to the achievement of these purposes.

The principal features of my proposal, as distinguished from the existing law are these:

First. The purposes and findings are only altered to stress local responsibility.

Second. Reorganization of the National Advisory Council.

Third. Decentralization of OEE by the creation of regional councils and offices.

Fourth. Allowing State input in grants and allocation of 90 percent of Federal grants at the regional level. This would free the central OEE for coordination, information, and financial assistance and give local people "the piece of the action" they need; and

Fifth. Providing for 1-year funding at $10 million to force annual program reevaluation.

My proposal will not make up for insufficient funding, but it will provide for more effective use of the funds now available.

I will support the committee bill, but I consider it a half-hearted effort, indicative of a congressional unwillingness to seek effective solutions to real problems.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it was 3 years ago, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, that the Congress first passed the Environmental Education Act, unanimously if my memory serves me. I was one of those, along with the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS),

the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER), who wrote the original Environmental Education Act. The reasons for its original enactment apply today with equal or greater force. I might note that while we did have strong expressions of support from those within the executive branch, who identified this as a high priority program their deeds have not measured up to their words. There has been something less than enthusiastic support, the kind of support that is needed to give the program a reasonable chance to achieve its purpose and to demonstrate its value.

Since we enacted the original law 3 years ago, however, there have been several changes in the country and the world that make it even more urgent that it be renewed and vigorously implemented. In recent months we have come face to face with some tough issues that require hard choices involving attitudes toward the environment and other high priority national needs. We are facing the question of utilization of our coal resources versus the problems of strip mining and air pollution from burning certain kinds of coal. We are faced with the need to license construction of nuclear plants, while at the same time being concerned with the effects of radiation and thermal pollution.

We want to have clean water. We passed a tough Clean Water Act some months ago, but there was a price tag on the measure necessary to achieve clean water. We want clean air.

We are now finding it necessary to pay the cost in terms of the investment in new technology and application of air-pollution-control devices to assure clean air.

We are finding that limitations on the use of chemicals, fertilizers, herbicides and insecticides conflict with the growing need to provide ample supplies of food at stable prices.

We are finding—and I would say particularly in the West—that our failure to make provision for the intelligent use of DDT under carefully controlled circumstances will deprive us of billions of board feet of lumber, because of tussock moth infestation, that we require to meet the housing requirements of the Nation. We are faced with these hard choices. The need, therefore, is to have some intelligent basis for making rational decisions, so that we can meet important national goals while transmitting to future generations a clean and wholesome environment.

The bill before us does not provide for conservation education; it provides for environmental education covering a whole spectrum of issues.

These include conservation but include also the economics that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) will call to the attention of the Members. It includes also the necessity of incorporating as a component in all of education the environmental considerations, and this includes, in addition to economics, the engineering, the scientific disciplines, the architectural studies and all the rest. There needs to create an awareness of the environmental concerns in making the decisions in all of these disciplines. For these reasons we cannot afford not to continue with the kinds of innovative programs such as this to help build this basis of knowledge and understanding on which the public and their representatives in government can make intelligent decisions.

Mr. Chairman, most Americans are aware of the deterioration of the quality of the environment and genuinely desire to reverse that trend. Three years ago when the original Environmental Education Act was passed unanimously by both House and Senate we recognized that our normal system of education had not adequately prepared us to meet current demands on the environment's fragile resources. Three years ago we were impressed with the necessity of providing a contingent education for sound resource management and environmental planning. It was clear that the education system needed to be revised and revitalized in this area if we were to cope effectively with the ecological crisis.

Environmental education of an adequate nature was not then envisioned as simply another name for conservation education or outdoor education. It was more far-reaching, embracing approaches and materials from the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities coordinated into a total view of man's relationship with his surroundings. Just adding courses dealing with environmental problems to existing curricula would fall far short of the need.

That need for understanding went beyond the reach of our public schools. The Environmental Education Act, signed into law October 30, 1970, was intended by the Congress to address the environmental needs of all citizens.

Congress took action on many environmental fronts, but the creation of an effective program to increase citizen awareness of the serious consequences of ecological mismanagement was considered essential.

President Nixon emphasized the point saying:

> The basic causes of our environmental troubles are deeply embedded. It should be obvious that we cannot correct such deep-rooted causes overnight. We must see nothing less than a basic reform in the way society looks at problems and makes decisions. Our educational system has a key role to play in bringing about this reform. It is also vital that our entire society develop a new understanding and new awareness of man's relation to his environment—what might be called environmental literacy. This will require the development and teaching of environmental concepts at every point in the education process.

That key idea referred to by the President in 1970 was reemphasized in testimony given by Tom Dustin, executive secretary of Izaak Walton League, before hearings on the Environmental Education Act in April. He said:

> It is essential for the well-being of our nation, and indeed of much of the rest of the world, that the confrontation between environmental imperatives and the developments of civilization be lowered. Our experience leads us absolutely to the conclusion that only through education is there the slightest hope of creating a public outlook capable of achieving this goal.

The work envisioned in the Environmental Education Act of 1970 has just begun. The Office of Environmental Education is beginning to overcome initial difficulties. It is becoming a visible and efficient beacon directing national attention toward new and imaginative environmental education.

After undergoing the trials and expenses of making this program operational, it is now proposed that we dismantle it, that its impetus be sifted back through other agencies into the system deemed inadequate in the first place.

But the need has not diminished and the goal has not been met. Provided initially with such a very modest budget for so momentous a task, appropriations never even approximated authorizations. Actual program funding totaled only $1.7 million in 1971 and $3 million in 1972. Three thousand five hundred applications were received but only 236 grants were awarded. Original provisions of the bill authorized $45 million over the 3 years.

The estimated program funding for fiscal 1973 is $3.1 million. Despite these limitations, public interest has remained high and fiscal 1973 applications are expected to reach earlier levels.

Because of cuts below the original intent of the act, there has not been a fair opportunity to see how well the program really can work. Even so, the act has served a tremendously valuable role in stimulating environmental programs all across the country.

The arguments presented against continuing the Environmental Education Act have been adequately answered in the Education and Labor Committee's report, accompanying H.R. 3927 which I introduced with the distinguished chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS of Indiana.

It is my pleasure to serve on that subcommittee and I wish to take this opportunity to commend the very able efforts of its chairman, Mr. BRADEMAS, and thank him for initiating the informative and worthwhile hearings on this measure. I recommend the record of those hearings, conducted in April and May of this year, as presenting strong support for continuation of the Environmental Education Act.

As an original sponsor of the 1970 act, I would also like to include portions of my statement during initial passage of the bill at the conclusion of my remarks today.

It is of upmost importance that this extension of the Environmental Education Act be adopted, that our sincere efforts of the Congress only 3 years ago will not have been in vain. In making this judgment there are two price tags to be considered. One in the very moderate cost of renewing this worthwhile program. The other, if we continue to live on borrowed time, will be the price we will someday have to pay for our ecological misunderstanding. I do not think we can afford to pay that price.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 3, 1970, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 20, pp. 26991–92]

EXCERPTS FROM A STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ORVAL HANSEN IN SUPPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1970

As we enter the decade of the 1970's, con-

cern about the quality of the environment has intensified. We see all around us disturbing signs of the ecological crisis and the steady deterioration of the environment. The danger we face in the degradation of the quality of the water, air, soil, and other elements necessary to sustain life should not be underestimated.

The President, Members of Congress, and the public have indicated their willingness and desire to allocate a greater share of this Nation's resources to counteract pollution and to provide expanded and improved recreational facilities for our citizens.

To help provide the assurances that these resources will be wisely and efficiently used we must build a base of knowledge and understanding to serve as a foundation for the comprehensive programs needed to awaken the Nation to the crisis and to stimulate an adequate response. There is need for a major educational effort directed at developing a better understanding and attitudes toward our environment in order that future generations will not be confronted with the same problems.

The problem is much deeper than the development of improved technology and better methods of pollution control. While we must continually strive to improve technology and to find better ways to dispose of our waste, the more basic need is to develop an awareness in all of the people of the dimensions of our environmental problems and to equip them with the knowledge and understanding needed to solve these problems.

There are real signs of hope for our country and for mankind. Throughout the country there is an awakening concern, especially on the part of young Americans, to the dangers to the environment which go far beyond protests against pollution of our land, water and air. The rapidly rising awareness of the environment reflects a deepening sensitivity to the fundamental values of human life.

To meet the ecological crisis we will need an informed citizenry that is educated about the whole spectrum of issues that are called environmental. There is also a need to change basic attitudes toward the environment and man's place in it. The Environmental Education Act that is before us today is a response to these needs.

Environmental education is defined in the bill as follows:

"The educational process dealing with man's relationship to his natural man-made surroundings, and includes the relation of population, resource allocation and depletion, conservation, technology, and urban and rural planning to the total human environment."

At the present time most environmental education in the school system is limited to education and conservation. Few textbooks or integrated courses of study are available which represent an adequate presentation of ecological principles, of the problems and responsibilities connected with environmental management or of the fundamental criteria needed to maintain an ecological balance.

The bill before us proposes to help remedy these deficiencies by:

Encouraging and supporting the development, demonstration and evaluation of innovative and improved curiculums in environmental studies;

Providing for the dissemination of significant materials for use in programs at preschool, elementary, secondary college, and adult education levels;

Initiating and maintaining programs in environmental education at the elementary and secondary school level;

Conducting preservice and inservice teacher training and training of other educational and public service personnel, community, business and professional leaders, and Government employees at local, State and Federal levels;

Operating adult and community education programs which would attract individual citizens and citizen groups in their communities;

Developing programs and materials for use by the mass media in dealing with the environment and ecology, and

Planning outdoor ecological study centers.

While there are encouraging signs that educational institutions throughout the country are developing programs of environmental education, witnesses before the committee emphasized the need for the kind of Federal leadership that this bill will provide.

It is anticipated that during the first operative year of the bill, priority will be given to the development of new and improved curriculums in environmental studies. This is a fundamental step in the establishment of an effective nationwide educational effort aimed at increasing environmental awareness on the part of young people and adult citizens alike.

The bill also provides a curriculum developed with Federal funds as well as other curriculums deemed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to have use in environmental education programs may be tested in pilot programs to determine their effectivenes. The bill allows for a more effective system of dissemination of the curriculum materials and other information regarding the environment and ecology which are developed under funds provided by the bill.

The bill provides that grants may be made for the preparation and distribution of materials and the development of programs suitable for use by mass media in dealing with the environment and ecology.

It is significant that the training programs provided for under the bill are not limited to the traditional formal classroom. A great deal of valuable environmental education can and does occur outside the classroom and outside the school itself. There are many noneducational institutions that can qualify for grants to provide training programs outside the ordinary classroom setting. Under one of the provisions of the bill the Secretary is authorized to make small grants—up to $10,000 annually—to citizens groups, volunteer organizations working in the environmental field, and other public and private organizations for conducting courses, workshops, seminars, symposiums, institutes and conferences especially for adult and community groups.

Mr. Speaker, while the amount of money authorized by this bill is relatively modest when measured against the magnitude of the challenge, it can provide a powerful stimulus to harness and mobilize the collective concerns, talents and energies of those within and outside the educational system in the development of programs that can help to turn the tide and give this generation an opportunity to leave the world we live in to future generations in better condition than we found it. In meeting this challenge the problem we face and the response we must make was eloquently summed up by an eminent theologian Prof. Joseph Sittler of the University of Chicago, who emphasized the importance of our own attitudes toward the world we live in and the need to develop a reverence for the earth. In his testimony before the subcommittee Professor Sittler said:

"If the world of not-self is felt as a mere resource to be used it will surely be used; if the world is regarded as a gift, a wonder, as a reality having an integrity of its own—it will be rightly used. That proposition is swiftly and powerfully true; and our present ecological crisis is a result of the denial of its truth. For nature, though often silent is not without power to condemn as well as power to bless man. And, when man so uses nature as to deny her integrity, defile her cleanliness, disrupt her order, ignore her needs—the reprisals of insulted nature taken an often slow but terribly certain form. Nature's protest against defilement is ecological reprisal."

The prompt passage and effective implication of this bill will reassure an anxious nation that the Congress is determined to rise to the challenge.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Idaho for yielding and I commend him for his remarks, and particularly for raising the point that it is essential for any environmental education program to deal in truth and in fact rather than in blind emotionalism.

Today this country is in serious trouble in many areas because too many persons claiming to be environmentalists, who are, in reality, only self-proclaimed experts are dealing exclusively in emotionalism rather than in fact. Thus we have a total banning of the use of DDT in our forests and we have almost a billion board feet of timber destroyed this year alone from the Tussock moth and the gypsy moth. We have what amounts to the complete ban on sulfur dioxide in our atmosphere because standards have been set that cannot be attained. As a result, 400 central power stations have been forced to burn oil rather than coal, which thus has helped precipitate the present energy crisis we face today.

We find situations in which the Environmental Protection Agency is setting unreachable standards for the amounts of heat that can be absorbed by some of our rivers and lakes, making it virtually impossible to build nuclear reactors or fossil fuel plants in many areas where they are required.

What we need is a discussion of fact with respect to the environment; not fancy and blind emotionalism that ties our hands. It is certainly my hope that any educational program dealing with the environment, while teaching the value of preserving the environment, will also teach us to deal in truth and in fact rather than in blind emotionalism.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESHLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, commend the gentleman for what he had to say as well as indicate my awareness of the importance of the point the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) just made and indicate my own intention to support the amendment the gentleman from Idaho has already indicated will be offered later by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) which will provide for taking into account in the educational programs the economic impact.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time merely to join with the other Members in support of this legislation.

One of the comments that has been raised by some who have questioned this legislation has been that this act was never intended to become a permanent act. While I think the extension of this act for another 3 years is in no way nec-

essarily making it permanent, I think the problems we have been facing with the environment and the beginnings we are now making in schools and in places where young people can be reached toward educating them to not only the problems but also how to live in our environment. I hope nobody is going to feel that the continuation of this act for the next 3 years is in any way overextending the interest that the Congress should have in the environmental problems facing this country.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 3927 to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years.

This act was conceived in 1970 after the Congress and the administration recognized the important need to provide solutions to the grave environmental problems which this Nation faces. The purpose of this act is to provide comprehensive environmental education activities and courses in schools and organizations throughout the United States so as to educate both children and adults to the environmental problems of the day.

Yet as important as the need is for this legislation, this administration has seen to it to provide the act with pitifully inadequate funding. In the 3 years in which this effort has been funded, the Office of Environmental Education has received over 4,700 applications from schools and organizations seeking $180 million. Unfortunately out of these requests only 286 requests have been able to be funded at a total appropriation of only $8.694 million. This represents a tragic situation, as many of the casualties represented extremely worthwhile and innovative programs which would have greatly aided this effort.

Yet despite these fiscal adversities and limitations, the Environmental Education Act can point with considerable pride to the significant accomplishments it has achieved in the stimulation of public concern and action on ecological issues.

It is because of my strong belief that education is a key to the solving of our environmental crises, that I urge this worthwhile program be extended for 3 years. It is only through this extension that a unified national effort to reach solutions to these real problems can be achieved.

To continue the present funding policies will only result in continued large-scale apathy of the public to these important problems.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay particular tribute to the Committee on Education and Labor and the distinguished sponsor of the bill, Mr. BRADEMAS, for reporting out this excellent legislation. I urge its immediate passage so as to indicate to the American people our concern with the preservation of our environment.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we consider the extension of the Environmental Education Act at a time when the ecology movement must be given strength by fully informing the American people as to the problem which confronts us. As Dr. Robert McCabe, president of the National Association for Environmental Education told the Education and Labor Committee:

> We are in the crucial transitional phase of moving from volunteerism to institutionalization.

Concern with the environment has lost much of the crusade-like glamor it had only 3 or 4 years ago, and our task is to replace that initial attractiveness with an educational foundation for a lasting commitment.

In three state of the Union messages and three special messages on the environment, President Nixon has spoken for the need for environmental literacy, new values and attitudes, and environmental awakening. The President tells us:

> The building of a better environment will require in the long term a citizenry that is both deeply concerned and fully informed. Thus, I believe that our educational system of all levels has a critical role to play.

Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has said that—

> Governmental action to protect the quality of life in California or anywhere can succeed only if the public understands and supports that action. Therefore, the first and most important role for government is in our schools.

I trust that these words were the product of genuine conviction and not uttered merely because it seemed the fashionable thing to do at the time. Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Education Act meets the very objectives of which the President and his HEW Secretary have spoken so enthusiastically, and it thus deserves the support of every member of this House.

The Environmental Education Act has already demonstrated its effectiveness. In my district, with its significant heavy industry and a large industrial labor force, the problems of pollution and working environment are of grave concern to all citizens. Last year the Office of Environmental Education indicated its willingness to work with union people by funding the Committee for Environmental Information in St. Louis. CEI has brought members of the United Auto Workers and the Teamsters Union together with environmental writers and scientists for the purpose of identifying special environmental information needs of industrial workers, and developing the educational material necessary to meet those needs. It is this type of educational structure that the Environmental Education Act has fostered, and we need more of the same.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this extension so that every sector of the American community can be informed of the real problems facing life on this planet.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, what began just 2 years ago as a demonstration effort to stimulate environmental education has predictably become a full-fledged permanent member of the categorical aid program club. Once an idea gets programed around here it turns into flypaper—you just cannot get rid of subsidizing it at the Federal level. That which is to be temporary will be permanent and self-justifying. It is a closed process that feeds on itself.

Through its seed money the Federal Government has moved what I think is a very good idea of environmental education off the ground and given it wings of its own. Widespread public support and enthusiasm for the concept should be adequate to asure that it will be incorporated in many school curricula and community programs.

State and local government are generally in much better financial shape these days than the Federal Government to carry the ball for environmental education. As a matter of fact, this coming week we will be asked to vote on another national debt limit increase. Washington cannot afford to pick up every idea that comes along and put money into it. Moreover, the U.S. Treasury nurses a whole host of narrow, categorical programs that are either outmoded or which could be spun off and picked up locally. This program is a good place to start.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(c)(1) of the Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1532) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Subject to section 448(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, the Advisory Council shall continue to exist until July 1, 1976.".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued by some of the wording in this bill, particularly in the majority report. I notice something new, the word "S-y-n-e-r-g-i-s-m."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee or someone conversant with this bill, if that means a sneeze or a cough? Just what does that mean?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I might say to my friend from Iowa that this phrase was employed, as the committee report indicates on page 10, not by the Committee, but was originally employed by the Office of Education for defending its proposition, which the Committee did not accept, that environmental education activities could be supported under other legislative authorities as distinguished from this one. It was used in that context.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it seldom fails in this place, when we have a first class boondoggle before us, that there is some fancy word put on display.

How did the gentleman pronounce that?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman from Indiana did not pronounce it, but the gentleman from Iowa did pronounce it correctly.

Mr. GROSS. I spelled it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Synergism.

Mr. GROSS. I have never seen a boondoggle that did not contain something like this. I wondered if this was a word of common usage down in the hills and hollows of Kentucky and the sand dunes of Indiana—synergism.

I thank the gentleman. He has explained something that I had never before seen, and I have been around a few years.

The committee report says that on October 8, 1971—and the gentleman understands I am reading from the majority report—"Dr. Rodney Brady—"

I do not know what kind of a doctor he is—on October 8, 1971, Dr. Rodney Brady of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare promised the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations a breakdown, totaling $11.2 million, of funds being spent on environmental education and other authorities.

Over 6 months later, on April 17, 1972, Dr. Don Davis, formerly with the Office of Education, was unable to give the House Select Subcommitte on Education such a breakdown, but instead provided the committee with a listing of only $4.6 million while promising that a listing of $11.4 million would be available in June 1972. Dr. Davis went on to claim that the Office of Education would be spending over $14 million in fiscal 1973 on environmental education.

The committee did not receive the 1972 listing until May 17, 1973—fully 18 months after the list had first been promised.

The committee still has not received the 1973 breakdown.

The committee goes on to say on page 11 of the report that—

The Committee, in light of the 18-month delay involved in producing this so-called "synergy"—

Or whatever it is—

list, as well as the changing contents of the listing, and the doubtful nature of many of the projects included, is not satisfied that the Office of Education did, in fact, spend over $11 million in 1973 under other legislative authorities, on environmental education.

Despite all of these doubts and the failure of these bureaucrats to give the committee the information it sought, the committee is going to provide $5 million in the current fiscal year, $15 million for fiscal year 1975, and $25 million, five times the amount this year, for fiscal 1976.

If we vote for this bill, we will be the biggest dupes on Earth.

What in the world is to be done under the terms of this bill? Educate people in what?

I believe one Member said that moths have destroyed a billion feet of lumber, or something to that effect. Is this $45 million for moth eradication?

What is it to be spent on? How much other money is being spent on the so-called environment? The record is silent.

This bill ought to be defeated out of hand.

Yesterday we had before the House a message from the President and a bill accompanying it, calling for delegated power to the President—untrammeled power—to spend $2.2 billion in financing his intervention in the war in the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Where is it proposed to get $2.2 billion for that purpose? And there is a forgiveness clause in the legislation that the administration sent up. The beneficiaries of that $2.2 billion need not pay back one single dime if the bill is enacted as the administration wants it.

When is it proposed to start saving some money around here to pay these bills? Or is the House going to go on irresponsibly piling up the national debt, increasing the deficit and inflation?

This unjustified request for $45 million in this bill ought to be defeated.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 548]

Anderson, Ill.	Fraser	Myers
Ashbrook	Gettys	Nichols
Aspin	Giaimo	Rangel
Barrett	Gray	Rees
Biaggi	Green, Oreg.	Reid
Blatnik	Grover	Rooney, N.Y.
Bolling	Gude	Ryan
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Wash.	St Germain
Brown, Ohio	Harrington	Sandman
Buchanan	Harvey	Saylor
Burke, Fla.	Hastings	Seiberling
Clark	Hébert	Shipley
Cleveland	Horton	Shriver
Corman	Hosmer	Steele
Coughlin	Johnson, Pa.	Steelman
Danielson	Ketchum	Steiger, Ariz.
Davis, Ga.	Leggett	Sullivan
Derwinski	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	McKay	Van Deerlin
Drinan	Macdonald	Veysey
Dulski	Mills, Ark.	Wiggins
Esch	Murphy, N.Y	Winn

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROUSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 3927, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 368 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7:

SEC. 2. Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "and" after "1972," and by inserting after "1973," the following: "$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976,".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHUSTER: at the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. 3. Section 2(b) of such Act is amended by inserting "while giving due consideration to the economic implications related thereto" following "maintain ecological balance."

SEC. 4. Section 3(2) of such Act is amended by inserting "and economic impact" following "technology."

SEC. 5. Section 3(c)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "economic" following "medical,".

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ALBERT was allowed to speak out of order.)

VISIT TO THE CHAMBER BY FORMER SPEAKER JOHN W. M'CORMACK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise my colleagues, if they have not already learned it, that one of the greatest Members ever to serve here, one of the greatest leaders this Congress ever produced, younger than ever, honors us with his presence today, Speaker McCormack.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, the thrust of my amendment provides that the economic implications of environmental decisions should be recognized as an inherent part of the environmental issue. My amendment provides that we give balance to the question of our environment. Specifically, my amendment does three things. First, it changes the purpose of the act to give due consideration to the economic implications of the environmental question; second, it changes the definition of the act which defines environmental education to include the economic impact as part of environmental education.

Third, it changes the knowledge and experience required for members of the Environmental Educational Council to include economic experience and education as part of the background which such members should possess.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we must concern ourselves with protecting the environment but at the same time we must face the reality of considering the very important economic implications relating thereto.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has discussed his amendment with us on this side of the aisle and we are prepared to accept it.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ESHLEMAN).

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman's amendment strengthens the bill and we accept it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for offering his amendment to this bill. It emphasizes one of the major purposes of the original bill and carries out the clear intent of the Congress as spelled out in the bill's legislative history. I support the amendment.

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER). Often we find ourselves embroiled in very heated rhetoric concerning any environmental issue and in our very forthright desire to clean up our environment we overlook the necessity for close scrutiny of the economic impact of our activities.

This legislation will provide us a very fine vehicle with which to insure adequate review of any economic environmental situation under consideration. I am firmly convinced that we must not allow ourselves to needlessly jeopardize one segment of our environment in our earnest quest for a more palatable place to live. At times we tend to overlook the "environmental impact" of the loss of jobs on a community and all its programs when a major industry of that city is forced to close its doors, because of stringent environmental regulations.

Mr. Chairman, please do not misunderstand what I am saying. I have spent most of my adult life involved in our environment. As a professional meteorologist I was harping on the need for cleaner industries and automobiles long before it became a popular pastime for many of our pseudoenvironmentalists. I have despaired as the atmosphere over my fine Dallas-Fort Worth midcities area has become increasingly polluted and have stood in amazement at the seeming lack of concern for our total environment.

The essence of what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we are now calling for a hard look at our "total environment" when we are making those much needed long-range planning decisions aimed at a better place to live and a cleaner environment in which to exist. I am saying that the economic portion of our "total environment" has been virtually ignored and that situation simply cannot be allowed to continue. A man is miserable if he breathes heavily polluted air or is angered by foam in the water he drinks—but, Mr. Chairman, I would proffer that he is equally disturbed if his job is taken from him by an environmental issue that has not given just consideration to his economic needs. I would suggest that his understanding of our aims for a cleaner environment are greatly curtailed if he is worried about how he is to feed his family. I would insist that his hope for a better tomorrow is greatly dimmed if he is sleepless at night, because he has no income with which to meet his mortgage payments. Mr. Chairman, we must consider every aspect of our environment if we are to be truly encouraged toward a better tomorrow, and I most earnestly submit that the economic impact on any activity is an integral part of that environment. Mr. SHUSTER's amendment will provide at least one vehicle with which we can review the "total environment" we are all so earnestly discussing.

I would again reiterate that my genuine concern for our environment predates our current "fad environmentalist" by at least 15 years. But, as a trained meteorologist, and as a former small businessman, I can see both sides of the fence. I would question where the income to clean the parks and streets is going to come from if we arbitrarily close those job-producing factories. I would wonder where the taxes to pay for the local and national "environmental councils" are to come from if our American worker is out pounding the pavement trying to simply find a way to feed his family. Mr. Chairman, my district has been, in the past, highly dependent upon Federal national defense expenditures. Many of my folks at home are aerospace workers and, because of the cutback in defense aviation production, are either working reduced hours or are simply out of work. I do not feel justified, Mr. Chairman, in adding to the burdens of these fine people by asking them to give up additional jobs without strong justification. We simply cannot say "close down this business because it is polluting"—but must diligently work toward finding that well balanced "compromise" for which our system of government is so famous. Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that Mr. SHUSTER's amendment is a step in that direction and I wholeheartedly urge its passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman. It is about time we start to concern ourselves with the environmental rulings that seriously affect our economy and which have helped to bring on the present energy crisis.

I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the amendment he has offered.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I support his amendment.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has called the attention of this House to the importance of coupling considerations of how to improve the quality of our environment with the economic implications thereof. Congressman SHUSTER serves with great distinction on the Public Works Committee, and there is no better place in the Congress to learn this fact.

One of our areas of jurisdiction is the economic development of disadvantaged areas in the United States. Another one of our jurisdictions is a matter of controlling water pollution. These considerations are often in head on and crushing conflict.

Mr. Chairman, it makes absolutely no sense in the world to improve the quality of our environment if there is nobody around with a decent job who can afford to enjoy it. This is not to say and I am sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania agrees with me that we must relax our efforts to improve the quality of our environment. This is simply to say that we have to do so in an intelligent manner and give our job producing industries fair opportunity to adjust to new requirements. We must also be mindful of the fact that they are sometimes competing with industries in other parts of the world where environmental requirements are not as strict as ours.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my colleagues may be interested in a recent poll of my constituents in which I addressed myself to the precise problem area which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania addresses. I asked my constituents, whether in view of the fact that major public projects of economic significance must undergo extensive assessment as to their environmental impact, should major environmental measures be subjected to similar scrutiny as to their economic impact. More than 75 percent of my constituents answered in the affirmative, which reveals a heartening public awareness of the need to give balance to the environmental issue.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this does not mean that we should relax our efforts to improve the environment, rather it means that we should make a common cause of commonsense, so that our battle can be more effectively waged.

Other questions in my poll revealed that my constituents consider improving the environment one of the major problems facing our country, that it is not receiving adequate attention by various levels of government, and even with the energy crisis facing us, environmental restrictions should not be relaxed. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his efforts to bring balance to the issue.

Mr. Chairman, on another note, I would like to state for the RECORD that I am not recorded as being present for the proceedings under the last quorum call. I was attending a meeting in the Rayburn Building cosponsored by the Public Relations Society of America, George Washington University, and International Management and Development Institute. My distinguished constituent, James Carter, who is chairman of the Nashua Corp. in Nashua, N.H., was with me at the meeting. We were not notified of the quorum call in a timely manner and although I reached the floor before the proceedings under the quorum call concluded, the Chair did not recognize my presence.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LANDGREBE

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANDGREBE moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I take note of the amendment that just passed that perhaps sugar-coats this bill a little bit and makes it perhaps more acceptable to some, but in my opinion it still leaves us dealing with an unnecessary bill and a bill which is, if nothing else, certainly fiscally unsound.

Mr. Chairman, before us today is a bill extending the Environmental Education Act for 3 years and authorizing expenditures over seven times as great as the amount spent during the past 3 years of its operation.

Apparently the sponsors and supporters believe that there has been not enough propaganda by the Federal Government for the express purpose of creating a nature ethic. On the contrary, the act has succeeded in achieving its stated goal of raising the national consciousness to a high level of environmental concern. During the past 3 years the country has been swept by hysterical movements seeking to enlighten us about the ecology crisis to the point where we are faced with a severe fuel shortage which may rapidly push our civilization in the direction the ecologists wish it to be pushed—back to nature.

The supporters of the 3-year extension of this act apparently believe insufficient damage has been done so far. They are determined to enlarge the propaganda machine which has contributed to the stoppage of the Alaskan pipeline, the cessation of offshore drilling, the banning of DDT, and the slowing down of the building of electric generating plants and oil refineries. The full consequences of these "achievements" have yet to come and might be felt by all of us this winter.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take a moment to read the first paragraph of the additional views for those Members who may have overlooked them; the additional views introduced by my colleagues, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. TOWELL:

> Quite often a Member of an authorizing committee finds himself in the awkward position of supporting the concept or program under his Committee's jurisdiction but opposing the specific piece of legislation authorizing it. Such is the case with H.R. 3927. While we agree with the intent of this bill, we feel that the time has come for responsible Members of Congress to critically evaluate each program as it is up for renewal and determine whether it should be continued as an individual categorical program or combine its purposes with programs having broader goals.

I would also like to read just a few lines of the minority views introduced by myself, Mr. ASHBROOK and Mr. HUBER:

> There is no valid reason for extending the Environmental Education Act.
>
> First of all, the Act was never intended to be permanent. Its purpose was to stimulate nationwide interest in environmental education—a goal which, as explained by Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Sidney P. Marland in his testimony before the Select Education Subcommittee, has been fulfilled.

My dear colleagues, I would remind the Members that the administration is opposed to this legislation. It is unnecessary legislation; it is fiscally unsound legislation.

The purposes of the original act have been achieved, which is in itself unfortunate. But some Members of Congress wish to see the program continue. The only reason I can fathom for their support of the extension is that they fear to be considered "antienvironmental." At the risk of being so considered, I advocate termination of this program, and defeat of H.R. 3927, for I am on the side of the human beings, and not, as Justice William O. Douglas once declared that he was, on the side of the fish. The 45 million dollars that this bill would authorize are dollars collected from the workingmen and women of this Nation and ought to be returned to them for their use as they see fit, and not as we see fit.

If this bill passes, specific instructions should accompany it, stating that its funds must be used to finance educational programs designed to explain why it is more important not to disturb the migratory pattern of reindeer than it is to have a warm home in the winter and the use of a private automobile. Perhaps the extended Act could also fund programs explaining why it was necessary that 10,000 people should die of malaria in Ceylon last year following the prohibtion of the use of DDT.

Once the American people understand that those deaths resulted because DDT allegedly weakened the shells of eggs laid by certain birds, they will be well on the way toward developing a "nature ethic."

In conclusion, I believe that passage of this bill will only serve to debase public understanding of man, nature, and the economy. Like all governmental programs that exceed the proper limitations of a government, this program is doing more harm than good. Its effects on the thinking of the American people are incalculable, but the effects of such thinking are becoming more obvious as winter approaches, and the energy crisis worsens.

I respectfully urge the acceptance of my motion.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana. I hope it will promptly be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SYMMS

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as folows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SYMMS: On page 2, line 10, strike the remaining portion of the bill following "1974."

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. My amendment, very simply, stops this bill from being a 3-year authorization and brings it back to a 1-year authorization.

I think after we have gone through a cold winter, we may have a little different outlook on some of the environmental hysteria that has swept this country in the past 10 years. I think it would be well advised for the House to save the $40 million my amendment would deauthorize and keep in mind next year in June, if we feel that this is a valuable program, and we could then extend the act at another time when it would be more appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, it was just last week in the House that we passed a mandatory fuel allocation rationing bill. Both proponents and opponents of the bill pointed out that we were not doing anything to produce any oil or petroleum products. I would think that this amendment would be very sensible, and both those who find themselves opposing and those who are for this concept, can support this amendment instead of authorizing millions and millions of dollars to be spent in the future. We could bring it back and authorize it for 1 year.

I would say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) in his amendment, does make the bill a little bit more palatable, but I believe as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE) has pointed out, we still have our same problem here; that is, what business is this of the Federal Government in the first place?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, by virtue of the evidence set forth in the debate earlier today and by virtue of the evidence adduced in the hearings and summarized in the committee report, it seems clear to me it is essential that this program be funded for at least another 3 years in order to carry out the purposes of the act.

I hope the gentleman's amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SYMMS) there were—ayes 58, noes 64.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 252, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—140

Abdnor	Bray	Clawson, Del
Archer	Breaux	Cochran
Arends	Broyhill, Va.	Cohen
Armstrong	Burgener	Collier
Ashbrook	Burleson, Tex.	Collins, Tex.
Bafalis	Butler	Conable
Baker	Byron	Conlan
Bauman	Camp	Crane
Beard	Cederberg	Daniel, Dan
Bevill	Chappell	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Blackburn	Clancy	

Davis, Wis.	Ichord	Rogers
de la Garza	Johnson, Colo.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Dennis	Jones, Ala.	Rose
Devine	Jones, N.C.	Rousselot
Dickinson	Kazen	Ruth
Dingell	Kuykendall	Satterfield
Dorn	Landgrebe	Scherle
Downing	Landrum	Schneebeli
Duncan	Latta	Sebelius
Edwards, Ala.	Lent	Shuster
Erlenborn	Lott	Skubitz
Eshleman	Lujan	Smith, N.Y.
Findley	McClory	Spence
Fisher	McEwen	Steiger, Ariz.
Flowers	Madigan	Stephens
Flynt	Maraziti	Stuckey
Fountain	Martin, Nebr.	Symms
Frelinghuysen	Mathias, Calif.	Taylor, Mo.
Frey	Mathis, Ga.	Teague, Tex.
Gilman	Michel	Thomson, Wis.
Goldwater	Milford	Treen
Gonzalez	Miller	Vander Jagt
Goodling	Montgomery	Vigorito
Gross	Moorhead, Calif.	Waggonner
Guyer	Nichols	Walsh
Hammer-schmidt	Parris	Wampler
Hanrahan	Pettis	Whitehurst
Harsha	Poage	Widnall
Heinz	Powell, Ohio	Wiggins
Henderson	Price, Tex.	Williams
Holt	Pritchard	Wilson, Bob
Huber	Quillen	Wydler
Hudnut	Railsback	Wylie
Hungate	Rarick	Young, Fla.
Hunt	Rhodes	Young, S.C.
Hutchinson	Robinson, Va.	Zion

NOES—252

Abzug	Dulski	Lehman
Adams	du Pont	Litton
Addabbo	Eckhardt	Long, La.
Alexander	Edwards, Calif.	Long, Md.
Anderson, Calif.	Eilberg	McCloskey
Andrews, N. Dak.	Evans, Colo.	McCollister
Annunzio	Evins, Tenn.	McCormack
Ashley	Fascell	McDade
Badillo	Fish	McFall
Barrett	Flood	McKinney
Bell	Foley	McSpadden
Bennett	Ford, Gerald R.	Madden
Bergland	Ford, William D.	Mahon
Biaggi	Forsythe	Mailliard
Biester	Fraser	Mallary
Bingham	Frenzel	Mann
Boggs	Froehlich	Martin, N.C.
Boland	Fulton	Matsunaga
Bowen	Fuqua	Mayne
Brademas	Gaydos	Mazzoli
Brasco	Giaimo	Meeds
Breckinridge	Gibbons	Melcher
Brinkley	Ginn	Metcalfe
Brooks	Grasso	Mezvinsky
Broomfield	Gray	Minish
Brotzman	Green, Pa.	Mink
Brown, Calif.	Griffiths	Minshall, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.	Gubser	Mitchell, Md.
Burke, Calif.	Gude	Mitchell, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Gunter	Mizell
Burlison, Mo.	Haley	Moakley
Burton	Hamilton	Mollohan
Carey, N.Y.	Hanley	Moorhead, Pa.
Carney, Ohio	Hanna	Morgan
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Mosher
Casey, Tex.	Hawkins	Moss
Chamberlain	Hays	Murphy, Ill.
Chisholm	Hechler, W. Va.	Murphy, N.Y.
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	Natcher
Clausen, Don H.	Helstoski	Nedzi
Clay	Hicks	Nelsen
Cleveland	Hillis	Nix
Collins, Ill.	Hinshaw	Obey
Conte	Hogan	O'Brien
Conyers	Holifield	O'Hara
Corman	Holtzman	O'Neill
Cotter	Horton	Owens
Cronin	Hosmer	Passman
Culver	Howard	Patman
Daniels, Dominick V.	Jarman	Patten
Danielson	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Okla.	Perkins
Delaney	Jones, Tenn.	Peyser
Dellenback	Jordan	Pickle
Dellums	Karth	Pike
Denholm	Kastenmeier	Podell
Dent	Keating	Preyer
Diggs	Kemp	Price, Ill.
Donohue	King	Quie
Drinan	Kluczynski	Randall
	Koch	Rangel
	Kyros	Regula
	Leggett	Reuss
		Riegle
		Rinaldo
		Roberts
		Robison, N.Y.
		Rodino
		Roe
		Roncalio, Wyo.
		Rooney, Pa.
		Rosenthal
		Rostenkowski
		Roush
		Roy
		Roybal
		Runnels
		Ruppe
		Sarasin
		Sarbanes
		Schroeder
		Seiberling
		Shoup
		Sikes
		Sisk
		Slack
		Smith, Iowa
		Snyder
		Staggers
		Stanton, J. William
		Stanton, James V.
		Stark
		Steed
		Steelman
		Steiger, Wis.
		Stokes
		Stratton
		Stubblefield
		Studds
		Symington
		Talcott
		Taylor, N.C.
		Teague, Calif.
		Thompson, N.J.
		Thone
		Thornton
		Tiernan
		Towell, Nev.
		Ullman
		Vanik
		Waldie
		Ware
		Whalen
		White
		Whitten
		Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
		Wilson, Charles, Tex.
		Winn
		Wolff
		Wright
		Wyatt
		Wyman
		Yates
		Yatron
		Young, Ga.
		Young, Ill.
		Young, Tex.
		Zablocki
		Zwach

NOT VOTING—42

Anderson, Ill.	Green, Oreg.	Reid
Andrews, N.C.	Grover	Rooney, N.Y.
Aspin	Hansen, Wash.	Ryan
Blatnik	Harrington	St Germain
Bolling	Harvey	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Saylor
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Shipley
Buchanan	Johnson, Pa.	Shriver
Burke, Fla.	Ketchum	Steele
Coughlin	McKay	Sullivan
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald	Udall
Derwinski	Mills, Ark.	Van Deerlin
Esch	Myers	Veysey
Gettys	Rees	Young, Alaska

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the amendment that just failed by a rather substantial margin. I do not know that it is all that important that the 1-year extension be defeated in favor of the 3-year, but the point I would like to make here is the difference between the appropriation level of the past several years and the authorizing level, and to point out here again that an authorizing level is no magic figure.

If we go back to when this act was initially authorized, it was at a $5 million level for 1971, and it moved to 15 in 1972 and 25 in 1973, and here we are in 1974, after taking another look at it, proposing to extend it right back at the authorizing level we initially thought we had to have 3 years ago. So it kind of proves to me, and to some of those of us who serve on the Committee on Appropriations, that we have been right all along in restraining ourselves when it came time to appropriate for this program. Maybe we ought not be criticized as severely as we are sometimes when we do not appropriate more than 25, 50, or 75 percent of the authorizing level for some of these pieces of legislation.

So it is only with a word of caution that I speak here today. I wonder whether or not we are still escalating this authorization figure too rapidly. Taking a look at the committee report, we find that in 1971 the program was authorized at $5 million and we only appropriated $2 million; in 1972 it was authorized at $15 million, and we saw fit to provide only $3½ million; and in fiscal year 1973 it was authorized at a level of $25 million and we appropriated $4 million. But then there was only $1.45 million actually spent in the fiscal year because of a contract problem in the Division of Contracts and Grants in the Office of Education.

So I am not altogether sure, depending upon what kind of arguments we get in the balance of the debate here, as to whether I will be supporting the bill on final passage or not, but I simply wish to issue the warning here that I am quite sure that our Committee on Appropriations, if it is passed at this level of funding, will not be inclined to appropriate the full amounts authorized in the legislation.

If I vote no on final passage it does not necessarily mean I am absolutely opposed to the legislation, but rather the excessive limits of the authorizing levels.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In reading the report, did the gentleman find any real justification for the program and the amounts of money that are here proposed, or any amount, for that matter? Did he find any real justification?

Mr. MICHEL. I cannot see the arguments at the level at which the authorization is pegged. I do not feel, however, that we ought to dismiss it out of hand. I am not yet to that point, but willing to give it a further chance, because some of these programs in the initial experimental stage have not had the opportunity to operate fully. I am willing to give it a chance to succeed, but I have not been overwhelmingly impressed with what has been done to date.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I wonder why the committee proposes to quintuple the appropriation of $5 million in this fiscal year to $25 million in 1976, and a 3-year total of $45 million when there is no real justification. Why we do not get figures in this report as to the total spending for all the environment programs?

Mr. MICHEL. The questions the gentleman from Iowa raises are very good ones, and they are, frankly, unanswered, unless the chairman of the committee can answer them.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think there are two points. First of all, as the gentleman will realize in reading the report, members of our committee were equally critical of the failure of the Office of Education to make available, after repeated requests on our part, the kind of information to which the gentleman from Iowa has alluded. We shall continue to badger the Office of Education to give us such information.

Second, with respect to the amount of money authorized and appropriated, as the gentleman from Illinois has indicated, the authorizing figure for fiscal year 1974 is $5 million, and the House has

already voted $4 million. In that respect I think there is a closer linkage between the authorization and appropriation figures than might first appear.

The gentleman from Indiana is sensitive to this kind of point the gentleman from Illinois has made. That indeed is one of the reasons several of us on the subcommittee reduced the overall authority in the bill from the $60 million as the bill was originally introduced to $45 million.

So I would say finally I support the point made by the gentleman from Illinois. I think certainly it is something we should have in mind. The authorizing committee tries to use its best judgment and the Appropriations Committee tries to use its best judgment, and the authorizing committee thinks the figures in the bill represent our best judgment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman from Indiana speaks of the original proposal as having been for $60 million, he is simply bearing out the usual action of that committee. They are never modest in asking for money in the Labor and Education Committee. I am not at all surprised that they settled for $45 million rather than $60 million, but I am concerned by the gentleman's admission that they sought information and could not get it, yet, without justification, the committee seeks to hike spending on this boondoggle up to $45 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROUSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3927) to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years, pursuant to House Resolution 600, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—yeas 335, nays 60, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

YEAS—335

Abdnor	Flood	Melcher
Abzug	Flowers	Metcalfe
Adams	Foley	Mezvinsky
Addabbo	Ford, Gerald R.	Milford
Alexander	Ford, William D.	Minish
Anderson, Calif.	Forsythe	Mink
Andrews, N.C.	Fountain	Minshall, Ohio
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fraser	Mitchell, Md.
Annunzio	Frelinghuysen	Mitchell, N.Y.
Arends	Frenzel	Mizell
Armstrong	Froehlich	Moakley
Ashley	Fulton	Mollohan
Badillo	Fuqua	Moorhead, Calif.
Bafalis	Gaydos	Moorhead, Pa.
Barrett	Giaimo	Morgan
Bell	Gibbons	Mosher
Bennett	Gilman	Moss
Bergland	Ginn	Murphy, Ill.
Bevill	Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.
Biaggi	Grasso	Natcher
Biester	Gray	Nedzi
Bingham	Green, Pa.	Nelsen
Blackburn	Griffiths	Nichols
Boggs	Gubser	Nix
Boland	Gude	Obey
Bowen	Gunter	O'Brien
Brademas	Guyer	O'Hara
Brasco	Haley	O'Neill
Bray	Hamilton	Owens
Breaux	Hammer-schmidt	Parris
Breckinridge	Hanley	Passman
Brinkley	Hanna	Patman
Brooks	Hanrahan	Patten
Broomfield	Hansen, Idaho	Pepper
Brotzman	Harsha	Perkins
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Pettis
Broyhill, N.C.	Hays	Peyser
Broyhill, Va.	Hébert	Pickle
Burgener	Hechler, W. Va.	Pike
Burke, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Podell
Burke, Mass.	Heinz	Preyer
Burton	Helstoski	Price, Ill.
Byron	Hicks	Price, Tex.
Carey, N.Y.	Hillis	Pritchard
Carney, Ohio	Hinshaw	Quie
Carter	Hogan	Quillen
Casey, Tex.	Holifield	Railsback
Cederberg	Holtzman	Randall
Chamberlain	Horton	Rangel
Chappell	Hosmer	Regula
Chisholm	Howard	Reuss
Clancy	Hudnut	Rhodes
Clark	Hungate	Riegle
Clausen, Don H.	Hunt	Rinaldo
Clay	Jarman	Roberts
Cleveland	Johnson, Calif.	Robison, N.Y.
Cohen	Johnson, Colo.	Rodino
Collins, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Roe
Conable	Jones, Okla.	Rogers
Conte	Jones, Tenn.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Conyers	Jordan	Roncallo, N.Y.
Corman	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Cotter	Kastenmeier	Rose
Coughlin	Kazen	Rosenthal
Cronin	Keating	Rostenkowski
Culver	Kemp	Roush
Daniels, Dominick V.	Kluczynski	Roy
Danielson	Koch	Roybal
Davis, Ga.	Kyros	Runnels
Davis, S.C.	Landrum	Sarasin
de la Garza	Latta	Sarbanes
Delaney	Leggett	Schroeder
Dellenback	Lehman	Sebelius
Dellums	Lent	Seiberling
Denholm	Litton	Shoup
Dent	Long, La.	Shuster
Diggs	Long, Md.	Sikes
Dingell	Lujan	Sisk
Donohue	McClory	Skubitz
Dorn	McCloskey	Slack
Downing	McCollister	Smith, Iowa
Drinan	McCormack	Smith, N.Y.
Dulski	McDade	Snyder
Duncan	McFall	Spence
du Pont	McKinney	Staggers
Eckhardt	McSpadden	Stanton, J. William
Edwards, Ala.	Madden	Stanton, James V.
Edwards, Calif.	Madigan	Stark
Eilberg	Mahon	Steed
Erlenborn	Mailliard	Steelman
Esch	Mallary	Steiger, Wis.
Eshleman	Mann	Stephens
Evans, Colo.	Maraziti	Stokes
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, N.C.	Stratton
Fascell	Mathias, Calif.	Stubblefield
Findley	Matsunaga	Stuckey
Fish	Mayne	Studds
	Mazzoli	Symington
	Meeds	Talcott
	Walsh	Wright
	Wampler	Wyatt
	Ware	Wydler
	Whalen	Wylie
	White	Wyman
	Whitehurst	Yates
	Williams	Yatron
	Wilson, Bob	Young, Fla.
	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.	Young, Ga.
	Wilson, Charles, Tex.	Young, Ill.
	Winn	Young, Tex.
	Wolff	Zablocki
		Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—60

Archer	Dickinson	Poage
Ashbrook	Fisher	Powell, Ohio
Baker	Flynt	Rarick
Bauman	Goldwater	Robinson, Va.
Beard	Goodling	Rousselot
Burleson, Tex.	Gross	Ruppe
Burlison, Mo.	Henderson	Ruth
Butler	Holt	Satterfield
Camp	Huber	Scherle
Clawson, Del	Hutchinson	Schneebeli
Cochran	Ichord	Steiger, Ariz.
Collier	Jones, N.C.	Symms
Collins, Tex.	King	Taylor, Mo.
Conlan	Landgrebe	Treen
Crane	Lott	Vander Jagt
Daniel, Dan	McEwen	Vigorito
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Martin, Nebr.	Whitten
Davis, Wis.	Mathis, Ga.	Wiggins
Dennis	Michel	Young, S.C.
Devine	Miller	
	Montgomery	

NOT VOTING—39

Anderson, Ill.	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Aspin	Harrington	Ryan
Blatnik	Harvey	St Germain
Bolling	Hastings	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Johnson, Pa.	Saylor
Brown, Ohio	Ketchum	Shipley
Buchanan	Kuykendall	Shriver
Burke, Fla.	McKay	Steele
Derwinski	Macdonald	Sullivan
Frey	Mills, Ark.	Van Deerlin
Gettys	Myers	Veysey
Green, Oreg.	Rees	Widnall
Grover	Reid	Young, Alaska

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Derwinski.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Burke of Florida.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Harvey.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Hastings.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Aspin with Mr. Myers.

Mr. McKay with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. Steele.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Young of Alaska with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, through some mistake, I am recorded as having voted "no" on rollcall No. 544, on yesterday, October 23, 1973. I did not intend to vote "no." I support the measure then under consideration and wish to make my support clear. If the rules allowed, I would ask unanimous consent that the printed recording of my vote in the permanent RECORD be changed.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION ACTS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9639) to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts for the purpose of providing additional Federal financial assistance to the school lunch and school breakfast programs, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment as follows:

Immediately after the matter to be inserted by the House amendment to the Senate amendment insert the following sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing two sentences, (1) for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, no special assistance factor under this section 11 shall, for any State, be less than the average reimbursement paid for each free lunch (in the case of the special assistance factor for free lunches), or for each reduced price lunch (in the case of the special assistance factor for reduced price lunches), in such State under this section in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972; and (2) adjustments required by the sentence immediately preceding this sentence shall be based on the special assistance factors for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, as determined without regard to any increase required by the application of this sentence.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERKINS moves to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, subsequent to our action on last Thursday rejecting a Senate amendment to the school lunch program, the Senate has adopted a further amendment which I believe is responsive to the House concerns.

As was indicated in our previous debate, the school free and reduced price lunch program in four States—New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Rhode Island—would be adversely affected by the provisions of H.R. 9639. The first Senate amendment which we rejected was designed to hold harmless these States from any loss in section 11 funds for free and reduced price lunches. That Senate amendment would have continued indefinitely a preferred reimbursement rate for these States, and I believe it was because of this indefinite continuation that the House rejected the Senate amendment.

Recognizing our concern, the Senate yesterday receded from its initial amendment with an amendment which in effect holds harmless these four States only for the current fiscal year. As my colleagues know, H.R. 9639 guarantees a minimum 45-cent reimbursement rate for free lunches and a minimum 35-cent reimbursement rate for reduced price lunches. The Secretary may set a higher rate. If the Secretary promulgates the minimum rate, however, under the Senate amendment the rate in New York will be 46.5 cents, in New Jersey 45.8 cents, in Rhode Island 45.5 cents, and in Maryland 45.4 cents instead of the 45-cent rate which will be paid elsewhere. These are the average rates paid in these four States last year.

The important and significant difference in the amendment before us now and that rejected last week is that the preferred rate is only guaranteed in the current fiscal year. It is a 1-year hold harmless provision which I believe in equity and justice we should adopt.

Unless we adopt this provision, there is a likelihood that these four States will receive less section 11 funds than they received last year.

Mr. Speaker, the States have incurred this indebtedness in good faith. They acted last year under the law. In terms of dollars the difference totals $2,400,000. Assuming the same number of lunches are served as last year, New York will receive $1,852,000; New Jersey, $260,000; Maryland, $182,000; and Rhode Island, $77,000—more than what they would receive without the amendment. After the fiscal year, I must repeat, these four States will be treated like all other States.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, join with the gentleman from Kentucky in urging that this body concur in the Senate amendment. As I had indicated in my comments the other day when we debated the Senate amendment, it would be acceptable to me for us to have the hold-harmless provision for this school year. We are already in the school year, and we have the budget problems right now. However I did not want such a provision to continue beyond this school year for special treatment for those States.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the language is written so that the adjustments that are needed because of increased cost of living will not be made on top of, say, in the case of New York, 46½ cents, but rather on top of 45 cents, just as all the other States, and so with the expected increase in the cost of living all States would be treated the same, or if we did not have an increased cost of living then they would all still be the same at 45 cents.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Minnesota is absolutely correct.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman again for yielding me this time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on rollcall No. 545 I was recorded not present. I was present and recorded myself present, but I was shown as not present in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE UNITED STATES STILL LIVES

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

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, the surprise decision by the President yesterday to abide by the lawful decisions of the court of appeals and the district court is a victory for the American people.

Bowing to unprecedented public outrage and pressure, the President was literally forced to do the right thing. This was not an exercise in leadership as much as an exercise in leadership as it is still a commendable first step to reestablishing confidence in the American institutions.

I hope the President in his speech tonight will again heed the people's voice and reestablish the Office of Special Prosecutor. In so doing, I urge the President to give both verbal and written assurances that he and his White House aides will not only give the special prosecutor full independence, but also full cooperation in his multifaceted investigation.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I can think of nothing that would help ease the cataclysmic events of last weekend than the reappointment of Elliot Richardson as Attorney General and Archibald Cox as special prosecutor.

Never in my political career have I witnessed the torrent of mail, telegrams, and telephone calls that followed the actions of the President this weekend. Of

the over 340 letters and telegrams and 120 telephone calls, there was only 1 letter and 7 telephone calls supporting the President. The rest overwhelmingly called for the immediate impeachment of the President, and calls I have been receiving today indicate a continuing support for the preliminary investigation being undertaken by the House Judiciary Committee.

I am hopeful that the President will act constructively in his speech tonight and move to reaffirm the people's faith in our institutions. However, I am confident that even if the President falls short in his own efforts to restore confidence in his Presidency, the American people are eminently capable of continuing their Government institution.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the United States lives—its strength is in its people and in its elected officials who heed the basic good instincts of our people.

TAX TREATMENT OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS

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

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today deals with the tax treatment of real estate investment trusts. The real estate investment trust—REIT—industry was accorded special tax treatment with the enactment in 1960 of the Federal tax amendments which, in general, provided real estate investment trusts with the same general conduit principle that had been applied to mutual funds; that is, substantially all of the income of the REIT must be passed through the REIT each year to its shareholders. This income will be taxed to them, and not to the REIT owners. In the case of REIT's this means that the income from equity and mortgage investments in real estate and other permitted income sources would be distributed to investors each year and taxed to them without being subjected to a tax at the REIT level.

The purpose of this special tax treatment for REIT's is to provide an opportunity for small investors to secure advantages from investing in real estate normally available only to those with larger resources. This allows these smaller investors to invest in real estate assets under professional management and allows them to spread the risk of loss by the greater diversification of investment which can be secured through the means of collectively financing projects which the investors could not undertake individually.

In order to qualify as a REIT under the present tax laws for purposes of the conduit treatment, the trust must satisfy three tests on a year-by-year basis: organizational structure, source of income, and nature of assets. These conditions are intended to allow the special tax treatment for REITs only if there really is a pooling arrangement which is evidenced by their organizational structure, if their investments are basically in the real estate field and if the income is clearly passive income from real estate investment, as contrasted to income from the active operation of businesses involving real estate.

With respect to the organizational structure, a REIT, in general, must be an unincorporated trust or association—which would be taxable as a corporation but for the REIT provisions—managed by one or more trustees, the beneficial ownership of which is evidenced by transferable shares or certificates of ownership held by 100 or more persons, and which would not be a personal holding company even if all its adjusted gross income constituted personal holding company income.

With respect to the income requirements, at least 75 percent of the income of the REIT must be from rents from real property, interest on obligations secured by real property, gain from the sale or other disposition of real property—or interest therein, including mortgages—distributions from other REIT's, and abatements or refunds of taxes on real property. An additional 15 percent of REIT income must come from these sources, or from other interest, dividends, or gains from the sale of securities. Income from stock or securities held less than 6 months, or real property held less than 4 years—except in the case of involuntary conversions—cannot equal as much as 30 percent of the REIT's income.

With respect to the asset requirements, a REIT must have at least 75 percent of its assets in real estate, cash and cash items, and government securities. However, not more than 5 percent of the assets can be in securities of any one nongovernment-non-REIT issuer, and such holdings may not exceed 10 percent of the outstanding voting securities of such issuer. In addition, no property of the REIT may be held primarily for sale to customers.

In addition, a REIT is required to distribute at least 90 percent of its income—other than capital gains income—to its shareholders during the taxable year, or declare it as a dividend by the due date for filing its tax return for the year—including any extension—and pay the dividend within 12 months from the close of the taxable year. If all of these conditions are met, then a REIT is qualified for the special conduit treatment which allows the income that is distributed to the shareholders to be taxed to them without being subjected to a tax at the trust level so that the REIT is only taxed on the undistributed income. Otherwise, a REIT that does not meet the requirements for qualification would be treated as a corporation, in which case all of its income would be taxed to the REIT first, not just the undistributed income.

Although the provisions have been amended from time to time, the basic rules with respect to REITs have remained the same since their enactment in 1960. Since that time, the REIT industry has grown enormously in size and is responsible for a large proportion of the investment in the real estate field in the United States today. There are, however, certain problems that have arisen with respect to the REIT provisions which could significantly affect the industry if they are not modified.

Basically, these problems relate to the fact that under present law if a REIT does not meet the various income, asset and distribution tests, the REIT will be disqualified from using the special tax provisions even in those cases where the failure to meet a requirement was unintentional. This would have the effect of not only changing the tax status of the REIT itself—which could result in substantial economic loss to the REIT since its income would be subject to tax at the corporate rates at a time when it has already been distributed to shareholders—but also would affect the interests of the public shareholders in the REIT. It appears to me that to totally disqualify a REIT where it unintentionally fails to meet one or more of the qualifying requirements is too harsh a penalty and that less drastic penalties should be provided, which will nevertheless maintain the original objectives in the REIT law provisions.

The bill that I have introduced is intended to alleviate this type of problem in those cases where a REIT inadvertently fails to meet a requirement for qualification and also deals with a limited number of other problems. The following is a brief summary of some of the major features of the bill:

First. Under present law, a real estate investment trust—REIT—is required to distribute 90 percent of its taxable income each year to its shareholders. If it does not meet this requirement, the trust will be disqualified as a REIT and must pay tax on its income as if it were a regular corporation. This could cause problems for a REIT which in good faith believed it met the 90-percent distribution requirements, but upon audit, did not meet the requirements—this could occur, for example, with an increase on audit of the taxable income of the REIT. The bill establishes a deficiency dividend procedure which would allow a REIT that fails to meet the income distribution requirements upon an audit by the Internal Revenue Service to make a late distribution to its shareholders, to avoid disqualification. This procedure would only be available if the REIT initially missed the 90-percent distribution requirement for reasonable cause. Furthermore, the REIT would be subject to interest and penalties on the amount of the adjustment under this procedure.

Second. Under present law, certain percentages of a REIT's income must be from designated sources, and if the source tests are not met it must pay taxes on its income as if it were a regular corporation. This could cause problems for a REIT which in good faith believed it met the income source tests, but upon audit, did not meet the tests—this could occur, that is, with an increase on audit of the REIT's gross income. The bill provides that a REIT that fails to meet the income source test upon audit by the Internal Revenue Service would not be disqualified but would be allowed to pay tax on the amount by which it failed to meet the source tests. This provision would be available only if the REIT initially had

reasonable ground to believe and did believe that it met the income source tests.

Third. A REIT also may inadvertently have difficulty under present law meeting the income source tests if it must foreclose on a mortgage that it owns. For example, the interest a REIT receives on a loan secured by a real estate mortgage may be qualified income, but the rents received from the same property acquired upon foreclosure may not qualify. The bill provides that a REIT would not be disqualified because of income which it receives from foreclosure property since, presumably, the REIT should not be held responsible for the type of lease or other transaction entered into by its mortgagee. At the election of the REIT, a 2-year grace period—generally subject to two 1-year extensions—would be afforded so that the REIT could liquidate the foreclosed property in an orderly manner.

However, during the grace period, the REIT would pay corporate tax on the nonqualified income received from property acquired on foreclosure.

Fourth. Present law prohibits a REIT from holding any property for sale to customers. This rule has been difficult to apply because of the absolute prohibition on holding such property and because of problems involved in determining when a REIT holds property for sale. The bill changes this rule to allow the REIT to have up to 1 percent of its gross income from such sources; this income however, would be subject to corporate tax. Any income from such sources in excess of 1 percent would be subject to an additional tax under the provisions discussed in paragraph (2) above, rather than disqualify the REIT, provided the REIT had reasonable ground to believe that the excess income would not be determined to be from such sources.

Fifth. Certain types of income which customarily are earned in the real estate business but which now do not qualify under the income source tests are treated as qualifying income under the bill. These include first, certain rents from property leased together with the real property; second, charges for services customarily furnished in connection with the rental of real property whether or not such charges are separately stated; and third, commitment fees received for entering into agreements to make loans secured by real property. Because these and the other amendments discussed above remove a significant portion of income from the category of unqualified income—which now may be 10 percent of a REIT's gross income—the income source requirements are increased by the bill so that unqualified income could be only 5 percent of gross income.

Sixth. Under the bill, REIT's would be permitted to operate in corporate form; under present law, REIT's must operate as a trust or association.

Seventh. Certain other changes are made concerning technical rules applicable to REIT's, such as, regarding income from sale of mortgages held for less than 4 years, and regarding options to purchase real property.

I would like to point out that prior to my introducing this bill the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation reviewed in detail the matters dealt with in the bill. On the basis of this initial study, the staff recognizes the need for corrective legislation in the areas covered by this bill and advises me that the solutions proposed probably are reasonable ones.

I have requested the staff to continue to review the bill to make sure that the solutions adopted, particularly in the more difficult problem areas, are the best ones.

Mr. Speaker, I am authorized to say that in the introduction of this bill today the gentleman from California (Mr. PETTIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE) also will appear as cosponsors of the bill.

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

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring the bill introduced by Mr. LANDRUM dealing with the tax treatment of real estate investment trusts. The special tax treatment of real estate investment trusts was provided in 1960 primarily to allow small investors to pool their resources for purposes of investing in the real estate field. In general, a real estate investment trust—REIT—is treated for tax purposes as a conduit in which case the income that is earned on its investments must be passed through to the investors and is taxed to them rather than being taxed at the REIT level, as long as the REIT meets certain qualifying requirements.

The real estate investment trust industry has grown at a rapid pace since the enactment of the special tax provisions in 1960. It has contributed significantly to the expansion in the real estate field by providing an additional source of investment money, especially during periods when other channels for mortgage loans and other real estate investment money has been tight.

Although the success of the REIT's since the enactment of the tax provisions has been considerable, certain problems have arisen with respect to some of the tax provisions applicable to REIT's which in certain cases have the effect of disqualifying a REIT if one of the conditions for REIT status is not met, even though it may have been inadvertent on the part of the REIT. Disqualification of a REIT could present significant problems, since the failure to meet a qualifying requirement may not be determined until a future year in which case the income has already been distributed by the REIT to its shareholders. This bill deals with these types of problems, as well as certain other problems, to allow a REIT to continue its special status when it has inadvertently failed to meet a requirement for qualification.

I understand that the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which initially reviewed this legislation, recognizes the need for corrective legislation in the areas covered by this bill and will continue to review the legislative proposals contained in the bill. I agree with Mr. LANDRUM that the staff should make sure in its further study that the solutions proposed are the best ones.

IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I believe the President's decision to release the tapes cannot divert us from pursuing an investigation of conduct which could lead to his impeachment.

The country's stubborn system of justice has begun its inexorable movement toward truth, and no act of the President, however desperate, can stop it.

Too much has occurred, much of it even before the incidents brought to light by Watergate. In my judgment, the President's prolonging of the Indochina war was, of itself, an impeachable offense.

The Watergate revelations, and the Agnew affair have revealed the Nixon administration as the most corrupt in the history of the Nation.

Reviewing incidents of the past several months is like reading a James Bond thriller, and the last chapters have yet to unfold. Recall with me, if you will, the paranoic yet effective political sabotage which corrupted our electoral processes, the conspiracy, bribery, burglaries, espionage, destruction of accusatory documents, wiretaps, land deals, economic favors, and all the rest involving the topmost political figures in the Nation, persons closest to the Chief Executive of the most powerful Nation in the world, his Cabinet officers, the Vice President, perhaps the President, himself.

We must find out exactly what happened. Why is the executive branch allowed to misuse its power to such an extent? What is the nature of the Presidency today? What business did the Deans and Ehrlichmans, and Haldemans have in the White House in the first place? Were they performing legitimate business of the country? Is it legitimate business to violate the rights of Americans to select a Presidential candidate? Is it a legitimate business which protects special interests and grants favors to friends of the President?

We must have answers to these and similar questions before the conscience of our democracy will be satisfied. Only the truth will preserve the continuity of our Government and the truth will prevail.

Despite this scandal, the worst in U.S. history, our standards are high and our institutions strong. Otherwise, unscrupulous conduct surrounding the Presidency might never have been exposed in the first place. It is this strength, our Republic, which will carry us through the present crisis and make us even stronger.

We need not fear the actions of one man, however powerful or dictatorial he seeks to be, so long as we maintain our freedom under the law of the land, our

freedoms to question, to expose, to seek and live the truth.

WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, the war in the Middle East is a tragic event for millions of Arabs and Jews caught up in the irrationality of armed conflict. It is also fraught with dangers for America.

We have a historic and traditional responsibility toward the security of Israel—a responsibility which cannot be abrogated. At the same time, however, we have an ever-growing dependence on the Arab nations of the Middle East for our energy needs. We can in no way equate these two exigencies, and I am certainly not suggesting that we negotiate the security of Israel for the sake of our energy needs. However, there have been statements in the national news media to suggest that the threat of an oil embargo by the Arab nations should not be taken too seriously. In order to put the so-called oil question of the Middle East conflict into focus, I would like to discuss with my colleagues the degree of our Nation's dependence on Middle East oil resources.

Most estimates agree that during the first half of this year, the United States imported an average of 807,000 barrels per day of crude oil from Saudi Arabia, Iran, Algeria, and Libya. Another 230,000 barrels per day comes from Egypt, Tunisia, and Kuwait. In addition, a considerable amount of Arab crude oil is sent to Canada, Europe, and the Caribbean to be refined into fuel oil, gasoline, and other distillates before it is shipped to the United States. We are currently purchasing about 336,000 barrels of refined product from Europe, of which about 80 percent originated in the Middle East. From the Caribbean, we are getting some 1.6 million barrels per day. Of this amount, about 16 percent, or 250,000 barrels per day, is refined from Middle East crude. Canada now exports about 1,056,000 barrels per day of crude oil to the United States from its western oil fields. In turn, Canada purchases Middle East oil for consumption in its eastern regions. Presumably, a Middle East embargo would force Canada to further limit its exports, and it is estimated that Canada would withhold about 400,000 barrels a day for its own use.

Therefore, the result of an embargo by the Arab oil producing nations would be a reduction of Arab oil imports to the United States of about 2 million barrels per day.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting, by any means, that our dependence on Middle East oil should be the determining factor in our policy in that region of the world. However, at the same time, we cannot ignore the energy-related consequences of our actions in the Middle East.

UNPARALLELED ARTISTRY

Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the death of Maestro Pablo Casals removed from the living Earth a musical genius and a human being whose great soul reached out to all mankind. Although the world is diminished by his passing, he left behind a legacy that will forever enrich the lives of all who heard him perform.

On the occasion, in 1969, of his last appearance in Washington, a performance of his oratorio "El Pesebre." I was moved as I listened to the magic sounds he produced to jot down what I was pleased to call a poem—an effort to express, however inadequately, the feeling aroused in me by his unparalleled artistry.

I was bold enough to send the maestro my effort, and shortly afterward I received a generous letter of acknowledgement from Senor Casals. He even invited me to visit him should I ever come to Puerto Rico, where he had made his home for many years, an invitation which I regret to say I never had the pleasure of accepting.

My poem, entitled simply "Pablo Casals," has never been published. I insert it here, not in pride of authorship, but as a heartfelt tribute to a man who, during his long life, brought beauty into the lives of a multitude of people:

PABLO CASALS

Music—Music, the word does no justice to the sound—
Sound—it's almost a sacrilege to call it sound—
Vibrations—it would seem vulgar—to speak so of his work—
What then, what then is this thing Casals creates?
The Universe in motion tempered by the soul,
The rhythm of the heavens,
The wind of light,
The sound of time,
The voice of God—
We should sample of his wonders with the utmost of delight,
For few will have the privilege of being in his presence—
And when he shall leave us, to grace the heavens with his soul—
We shall be jealous of the Lord,
And through an eternity and more
The angels will lay claim to him, but we on earth shall still exclaim:
"Though the beauty of his soul befits the heavens,
" 'Pao' nonetheless belongs to us."

—KIKA DE LA GARZA.

APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting for the consideration of the Congress a measure calling for the appointment of a special prosecutor to continue the investigation and prosecution of those responsible for the perpetration of gross crimes in connection with the 1972 election for the Presidency of the United States.

This measure calls for the Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to appoint such Special Prosecutor.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has broken faith with the American people and with the Congress in firing Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox. However, I do not believe that this particular action warrants impeachment proceedings. What he did was legal, but it certainly was with flagrant disregard of our understanding at the time of the appointment of Mr. Cox.

I think it critical to any such discussions to point out that the President has not directly flaunted a court order. That is a critical point in consideration of impeachment discussion.

Mr. Cox was appointed upon the confirmation of Elliot Richardson as Attorney General. It was our clear understanding that when such Special Prosecutor was named, he would be allowed to conduct an investigation wherever the trail might lead.

It was, therefore, astounding to find Mr. Cox was issued orders to cease and desist in his efforts to secure the Presidential tapes through lawful court proceedings. He was placed in a position where compliance was impossible and he was dismissed in an unprecedented act.

The incident was then followed by the resignation of the Attorney General and the firing of the Deputy Attorney General. They had no other choice, for to have done otherwise would have been to destroy the very reason they were nominated and confirmed—to bring respect back to the U.S. Department of Justice.

While my bill does not designate the individual to be named, that not being proper, it would certainly be my recommendation, if asked, that Mr. Cox be named to this new position.

Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult period when our institutions of Government have suffered losses of credibility, the like of which this Nation has seldom seen.

It is time that this administration stopped going on television with a plea to the American people to explain one crisis after another and get down to the business of governing. I cannot find in any of these speeches any comments that would have been as productive as allowing the special prosecutor to continue and complete his work.

In an effort to see that the circumstances we have seen this week do not happen again, one section of my bill would provide that the special prosecutor not be subject to the supervision or control of the President. He can be removed only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

I doubt that such a presumptive act as the removal of Mr. Cox would be attempted again. If it were, then we would have to make a judgment on those circumstances and proceed as a government of law and not of emotion or whim.

The President has now agreed to comply with the court order to turn over the tapes to Judge Sirica. Why did he have to put us through this crisis and add further to the doubt and suspicion surrounding us in this period? He could have done this last week and alleviated the devisiveness for which he must take a large share of the responsibility.

I want to add to these comments a very strong recommendation that the Congress move immediately with the consideration of a nomination of Congress-

man GERALD FORD to be the Vice President of the United States. His nomination should in no wise be a part of the controversy over the circumstances relating to the firing of Mr. Cox.

Congress can show the American people that we are not petty or partisan when such matters of grave importance are to be considered. His nomination should be considered on his fitness to serve as Vice President of the United States and on no other basis.

Personally, I have the highest possible regard for his ability and integrity.

Much is going to be said in the coming days about impeachment. It is a part of our system that those who feel such action is justified present their views. I ask only that the Judiciary Committee move with dispatch in its deliberations. I personally appreciate the statements made yesterday by Speaker ALBERT and Judiciary Committee Chairman RODINO. They are in the finest traditions of this institution and we are fortunate to have their leadership in this sensitive time.

My colleagues, the situation is grave and the hour is late.

We are faced with a loss of confidence in government which transcends the imagination. All public officials are going to be tarred with this brush and it is a heartrending situation.

Here we face another crisis in the Middle East and an energy crisis the like of which we have never experienced. The economy is of grave concern.

The Vice President has pled guilty to a grave offense and forced to resign in order not to be sentenced to prison.

It is in this atmosphere that I call for the appointment of another special prosecutor. Back in May I said that only with a complete and total disclosure would this matter be set to rest. I said at the time:

> I think it is just as important that the finger of suspicion be lifted from the innocent as it is to pinpoint the guilty.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I continue in that view.

The circumstances surrounding the firing of Mr. Cox can only add fuel to the flames of strife and discord. It is my considered judgment that the naming of another special prosecutor outside the province of the administration would be justified and warranted in these circumstances.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this measure.

NEW PROGRAM AFFECTING PEANUT FARMERS

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, just this morning the Secretary of Agriculture has announced a new program affecting all the peanut farmers in the country, most of which are in the South. The Secretary said he was going to cut off price support for peanuts found to contain aflatoxin; eliminate the transfers of allotments by lease or sale by the owner; increase the present charges from $15 to $17 per ton for storage, handling and inspection costs; permit no tolerance in acreage compliance; and transfer full field and supervisory functions from grower associations to the county and State ASC offices.

These actions by the Secretary would, in effect, wreak havoc with the entire peanut industry.

I asked the representative from the Department of Agriculture what these changes were supposed to say in the way of dollars and cents. The answer was $6.6 million.

Of course, this is a lot of money, but, Mr. Speaker, when we examine what is proposed here we see that the administration would wreck the entire economy of a section of the country to say $6.6 million in the interests of so-called economy, while at the same time the administration wants to give $1½ billion to Southeast Asia, $2.2 billion in aid to Israel, $200 million more to Cambodia, and ad infinitum.

Mr. Speaker, I say this is silly.

Apparently, certain high, heartless Agriculture officials have decided to single out the peanut-producing States of the South as whipping boys so we can give more foreign aid to countries to buy their friendship.

Today's announcement by the Agriculture Department concerning peanuts would, if implemented, severely damage the agricultural economy of my district, the Second District of Alabama—"Peanut Capital of the World."

Mr. Speaker, my district, with the possible exception of my distinguished colleague from Georgia's Second District, DAWSON MATHIS, produces more peanuts than any other district in the United States. Therefore, it is only natural that I vehemently condemn this unwarranted and callous action by a few unthinking, insipid "intellectuals" in the Agriculture Department.

I strongly urge the Secretary of Agriculture to reconsider these hasty actions. Furthermore, I promise that I will do all I can to fight the implementation of these discriminatory and possibly illegal actions.

WE MUST NOT RUSH INTO IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILFORD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, yesterday as I came back to my office from the House of Representatives, the cries of "impeach him" were still ringing in my ears. Many Members of Congress exercised their right to speak out on the President, Watergate, Archibald Cox, the Presidential tapes, the obstruction of justice, and all the rest.

To hear it all, you would believe that this great Nation of ours is going to come tumbling down, and the truth is we do face a real crisis.

Yesterday, Tuesday, was the first day that the House had been in session since the President proposed his compromise to the court concerning the tapes and since the firing of Special Prosecutor Cox and the resignations of Attorney General Elliot Richardson and Deputy Attorney General William Ruckelshaus.

The cries of impeachment are the end result of the frustration and bewilderment of the last 6 months as revelation after revelation of the whole sordid Watergate affair has been spread before the people. Telegrams and phone calls are coming in from all over the country now and, from what I have been told by many Members of Congress, I estimate that 99 percent of them are saying "get rid of the President."

And so there is almost a feeling of mob hysteria.

The impeachment resolutions that have already been hurriedly introduced have been referred to the House Judiciary Committee for hearings and investigation before the matter comes to the House for a vote.

Television crews have been in my office, the wire services have been ringing my phone off the wall, newspaper reporters come by or call, and everyone wants to know how I am going to vote. Everybody wants an instant comment and frankly many of them seem somewhat distressed that I will not join the crowd calling for "impeachment now."

Well, the truth is that I may well have to vote in the next few days or weeks on the question of impeaching the President, and I am not about to take a position "now" on that vote without having all the facts.

The impeachment of a President, any President, is almost too awesome to contemplate. It cannot, it must not be done in an air of frenzy and emotion. By the same token, it must not be done on the basis of partisan loyalty. In fact, if ever there was a time when a vote should be approached on a nonpartisan basis, it is in the case of impeachment.

It is true that the country has been thrown into a turmoil, and it is equally true that we must not allow that turmoil to drive us to impeaching the President unless it is clearly warranted.

The present crisis is all tied up in those blasted tapes. I urged the President months ago to release the tapes, because I felt there was such a crisis of confidence in our Government that the people desperately needed to know that the President had nothing to hide. I know that he feels very strongly about "executive privilege" and "separation of powers," but the need to come clean with the people, to me, is overriding. Fortunately, the President, at the 11th hour, has now advised the court and the Nation that he will turn over the tapes to the court. It is too early to assess the real effect of his last minute decision as far as impeachment is concerned. In the last few days, things have happened so fast that it has been extremely difficult to finish a speech before new events have changed the whole thing. At any rate, a new prosecutor must be named so this whole mess can be resolved just as soon as possible.

To those folks in my district who have urged me to move immediately for impeachment, I just have to say: "Go slow." Let us be sure what we are doing before we invoke this extraordinary remedy

which has been adopted only once in the history of this Nation. The cry for impeachment, however sincere, is one thing. But to actually cast that vote when the historic roll is called is something entirely different.

SOVIET MILITARY MIGHT: WESTERN MADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Korea, Hungary, Cuba, Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, the Middle East—the presence of the Soviet Union has been felt in all these and many other places. In none of these places has the Soviet Union been a promoter of peace. Soviet space shots, Soviet missiles, Soviet invasions, and Soviet aid to other aggressive countries have all depended on their ability to produce weapons of war—depended on their technology. But that is not quite true either. In a few words, there is no such thing as Soviet technology.

Perhaps as much as 90 to 95 percent of Soviet technology came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies. Now this may sound incredible, but the facts substantiate this claim. Soviet aggression is dependent upon American-made and Western-made technology.

In effect the United States and the NATO countries have built the Soviet Union—its industrial and its military capabilities. This massive construction job has taken 50 years. Since the revolution in 1917, it has been carried out through trade and the sale of plants, equipment, and technical assistance.

By listening to administration spokesmen—or some newspaper pundits—you get the impression that trade with the Soviet Union is some new miracle cure for the world's, and particularly America's, problems.

That is not quite accurate.

Peace through trade?

The idea that trade with the Soviets might bring peace goes back to 1917. The earliest proposal is dated December 1917—just a few weeks after the start of the Bolshevik revolution. It was implemented in 1920 while the Bolsheviks held power. They needed foreign supplies to survive.

Last year the Soviets needed wheat. They only had one place to purchase that wheat—the United States. Did our Government use that Soviet need to extract something for the United States in return? Our Government did not. Instead, the American taxpayers were forced to subsidize the Soviet wheat deal with several hundred million dollars of their tax money.

Seemingly not learning anything from the wheat deal, the administration has now asked for most-favored-nation status and other concessions for the Soviet Union. When some have suggested that the Soviets should also give something in return, the State Department's reply has been that we cannot get involved in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. There seems to be no similar prohibition about getting involved in the internal affairs of Rhodesia or other friendly countries.

The American financial newspapers give accounts of further credits from the Export-Import Bank, American governmental agencies, and American banks. First National City Bank of New York still has $40 million in unsettled claims against the Soviet Union. An estimated $200 million in validated claims is owed by the Kremlin to U.S. citizens.

The history of our construction of the Soviet Union has been blacked out—much of the key information is still classified—along with the other mistakes of the Washington bureaucracy.

Fifty years of dealing with the Soviets has been an economic success for the U.S.S.R. and a political and economic disaster for the United States. It has not stopped war, it has not given us peace. It has given the Soviets increased industrial and military power and the ability to accomplish its never ceasing goal of world domination.

The United States is spending billions of dollars a year on defense. A defense that is made necessary by the threat and aggression of the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. While we are spending billions on defense, we still help build that enemy we are defending against.

Let us take a look at a statement made by Stalin to Ambassador Averell Harriman. This is what Harriman told the State Department that Stalin said to him:

> About two-thirds of all the large industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union had been built with United States help or technical assistance.

That is right, in Stalin's own words, two-thirds of Soviet large industry was made with U.S. help. By the way, today Harriman is still in favor of trade with the Soviet Union. Much of the other third was built by firms from Germany, France, Britain, Italy, and so on.

Stalin could have said also that the explosive and ammunition plants originated in the United States.

From 1930 to 1945 only two major items—SK–B synthetic rubber and the Ramzin "once-through" boiler—and about a handful of lesser designs can accurately be considered the result of Soviet technology. Almost every other important technological advance and skill was transferred from the West.

At least 218 firms from the West were involved in the building of Soviet industry and military capability from 1930 to 1945. Of this number, 139 were American. The Western buildup of Soviet technology helped make possible Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe, the Berlin blockade, and Soviet aid to North Korea and Communist China while they were fighting the United States. The massive technical assistance continues right down to the present day.

Now the ability of the Soviet Union to create any kind of military machine, to ship missiles to Cuba, to supply arms to North Vietnam, to supply arms for use against Israel—all this depends on its domestic industry.

In the Soviet Union about three-quarters of the military budget goes on purchases from Soviet factories.

This expenditure in Soviet industry makes sense. No army has a machine that churns out tanks. Tanks are made from alloy steel, plastics, rubber, and so forth. The alloy steel, plastics, and rubber are made in Soviet factories to military specifications, just like in the United States.

Missiles are not produced on missile making machines. Missiles are fabricated from aluminum alloys, stainless steel, electrical wiring, pumps, and so forth. The aluminum, steel, copper wire, and pumps are also made in Soviet factories.

In other words, the Soviet military gets its component parts and materials from Soviet industry. There is a Soviet military-industrial complex just as in our country. The Soviet military base depends on the Soviet industrial base just as in our country. Steel can be used for consumer goods or weapons, just as in our country when we build their industrial capacity. We build their military capacity, just as in our country.

This kind of reasoning makes sense to the man in the street. The farmer in Ohio knows what I mean. The salesman in California knows what I mean. The taxi driver in New York knows what I mean. But the policymakers in Washington do not accept this kind of commonsense reasoning, and never have.

So let us take a look at the Soviet industry that provides the parts and the materials for Soviet armaments: The guns, tanks, aircraft.

SOVIET INDUSTRY—WESTERN MADE

Advanced weapon technology relies on sophisticated computers. Between 1959 and 1970, General Electric, through its European subsidiaries sold to the Soviet Union a number of medium capacity computers. Soviet computer technology has always been years behind that of the West. GE has been helping the Soviets progress. IBM and RCA through subsidiaries have also sold computers to the Soviets. Computers would be the main purchase in any Kissinger-promoted trade expansion with our enemy.

The Soviets have the largest iron and steel plant in the world. It was built by McKee Corp. It is a copy of the U.S. Steel plant in Gary, Ind.

All Soviet iron and steel technology comes from the United States and its allies. The Soviets use open hearths, American electric furnaces. American wide strip mills, Sendzimir mills and so on—all developed in the West and shipped in as peaceful trade.

The Soviets have the largest tube and pipe mill in Europe—1 million tons a year. The equipment is Fretz-Moon, Salem, Aetna Standard, Mannesman, and so forth. Those are not Russian names.

All Soviet tube and pipemaking technology comes from the United States and its allies. If you know anyone in the space business, ask them how many miles of tubes and pipes go into a missile.

The Soviets have the largest merchant marine in the world—about 6,000 ships. I have the specifications for each ship.

About two-thirds were built outside the Soviet Union.

About four-fifths of the engines for

these ships were also built outside the Soviet Union.

There are no ship engines of Soviet design. Those built inside the U.S.S.R. are built with foreign technical assistance. The Bryansk plant makes the largest marine diesels. In 1959, the Bryansk plant made a technical assistance agreement with Burmeister & Wain of Copenhagen, Denmark—a NATO ally—approved as peaceful trade by the State Department. The ships that carried Soviet missiles to Cuba 10 years ago used these same Burmeister & Wain engines. The ships were in the *Poltava* class. Some have Danish engines made in Denmark and some have Danish engines made at Bryansk in the Soviet Union.

About 100 Soviet ships were used on the Haiphong run to carry Soviet weapons and supplies for Hanoi's annual aggression. I was able to identify 84 of these ships. None of the main engines in these ships were designed and manufactured inside the U.S.S.R.

All the larger and faster vessels on the Haiphong run were built outside the U.S.S.R.

All shipbuilding technology in the U.S.S.R. comes directly or indirectly from the United States or its NATO allies.

If you think that is bad, let us take one industry in more detail: motor vehicles.

All Soviet automobile, truck, and engine technology comes from the West; chiefly the United States. Study each Soviet plant, its equipment, and who supplied the equipment. The Soviet military has over 300,000 trucks—all from these U.S.-built plants.

Up to 1960 the largest motor vehicle plant in the U.S.S.R. was at Gorki. Gorki produces many of the trucks American pilots used to see on the Ho Chi Minh Trail or would see now if they were flying there. Gorki produces the chassis for the GAZ–69 rocket launcher used against Israel. Gorki produces the Soviet jeep and half a dozen other military vehicles. These same vehicles were used this month in the Arab attack on Israel.

And Gorki was built by the Ford Motor Co.—as peaceful trade.

In 1968 while Gorki was building vehicles to be used in Vietnam and Israel, further equipment for Gorki was ordered and shipped from the United States.

Also, in 1968 we had the so-called "Fiat deal"—to build a plant at Volgograd three times bigger than Gorki. Dean Rusk and Walt Rostow told Congress and the American public this was peaceful trade—the Fiat plant could not produce military vehicles.

Let us not kid ourselves. Any automobile manufacturing plant can produce military vehicles. I can show anyone who is interested the technical specification of a proven military vehicle—with cross-country capability—using the same capacity engine as the Russian Fiat plant produces.

THE FIAT DEAL

The term "Fiat deal" is misleading. Fiat in Italy does not make automobile manufacturing equipment—Fiat plants in Italy have U.S. equipment. Fiat did send 1,000 men to Russia for erection of the plant—but over half, perhaps well over half, of the equipment came from the United States, from Gleason, TRW of Cleveland, and New Britain Machine Co.

So in the middle of a war that at that time had killed 46,000 Americans and countless Vietnamese with Soviet weapons and supplies, the Johnson administration doubled Soviet auto output. These are the uncontroverted facts. The Johnson administration also supplied false information to Congress and the American public.

In 1971, the Soviets received equipment and technology for the largest heavy truck plant in the world: Known as the Kama River plant. It will produce 100,000 heavy 10-ton trucks per year—that is more than all U.S. manufacturers put together.

This will also be the largest plant in the world. Period. It will occupy 36 square miles.

Will the Kama truck plant have military potential?

The Soviets themselves have answered this one. The Kama truck will be 50 percent more productive than the Zil–130 truck. Well that is nice, because the Zil–130 truck is a standard Soviet army truck. It is used in Vietnam and the Middle East.

Who built the Zil plant? It was built by the Arthur J. Brandt Co. of Detroit, Mich.

Who is building the Kama truck plant? That is classified "secret" by the Washington policymakers. I do not have to tell you why.

The Kama River plant will be only a small endeavor though if reported negotiations between General Motors and the Soviet Union are successful. GM is negotiating to build a mammoth heavy truck plant in Siberia which some reports say will be twice as large as the Kama River plant.

The Soviet T–54 tank is in Vietnam. It was in operation at Kontum, An Loc, and Hue. It is in use today in Vietnam. It is being used against Israel.

According to the tank handbooks, the T–54 has a Christie-type suspension. Christie was an American inventor, not a Russian.

Where did the Soviets get a Christie suspension? Did they steal it? No, why should they. They stole our atomic secrets, but get our technology through the front door.

They bought it. They bought it from the U.S. Wheel Track Layer Corp.

However, this administration is apparently slightly more honest than the previous administration.

In December 1971, I asked Assistant Secretary Kenneth Davis, of the Commerce Department—who is a mechanical engineer by training—whether the Kama trucks would have military capability. In fact, I quoted one of the Government's own interagency reports. Mr. Davis did not bother to answer, but I did get a letter from the Department and it was right to the point. Yes. We know the Kama truck plant has military capability; we take this into account when we issue export licenses.

These files are all classified. I cannot get them declassified. The Government will supply military technology to the Soviets, but gets a little uptight about the public finding out. I can understand that.

Of course, it takes a great deal of self-confidence to admit in writing that you are building factories to produce weapons and supplies for a country providing weapons and supplies to kill Americans, Israelis, and Vietnamese.

Many people—as individuals—have protested our suicidal policies. What happens? Well, if you are in Congress—you probably get the strong arm put on you—not me, but most. I have personally sued the Pentagon for release of the Penkovisky papers.

If you are in the liberal academic world—you soon find it is OK to protest U.S. assistance to the South Vietnamese but never, never protest U.S. assistance to the Soviets. Forget about the Russian academics being persecuted or the Jews who cannot emigrate—we must not say unkind things about the Soviets.

If you press for an explanation, what do they tell you?

First, you get the Fulbright line. This is peaceful trade. The Soviets are powerful. They have their own technology. It is a way to build friendship. It is a way to a new world order.

This is demonstrably false. The Soviet tanks in An Loc are not refugees from the Pasadena Rose Bowl parade. The Soviet ships that carry arms to Haiphong are not peaceful. They have weapons on board, not flower children or Russian tourists.

Second, if you do not buy that line you are told, "The Soviets are mellowing." This is equally false.

The killing in Israel and Vietnam with Soviet weapons does not suggest mellowing, it suggests premeditated aggression. Today—now—the Soviets are sending more arms to the Middle East. For what purpose? To put in a museum?

No one has ever presented evidence, hard evidence, that trade leads to peace. Why not? Because there is no such evidence. It is an illusion. Our trade in the 1930's with a war-bent Japan proved that.

It is true that peace leads to trade. But that is different than what is occurring today. You first need peace and then you can trade. That does not mean if you trade you will get peace.

But that seems too logical for the Washington policymakers and it is not what the politicians and their business backers want anyway.

Trade with Germany doubled before World War II. Did it stop World War II?

Trade with Japan increased before World War II. Did it stop World War II?

What was in this German and Japanese trade? The same means for war that we are now supplying the Soviets. The Japanese air force after 1934 depended on U.S. technology. And much of the pushing for Soviet trade today comes from the same groups that were pushing for trade with Hitler and Tojo 35 years ago.

The Russian Communist Party is not mellowing. Concentration camps are still there. The mental hospitals take the overload. Persecution of the Baptists and other Christians continues. Harassment of Jews continue. Persecution of dissidents continues.

The only mellowing is when a Harriman and a Rockefeller get together with the bosses in the Kremlin. Some think that is good for business, but it is not much help if you were a GI at the other end of a Soviet rocket in Vietnam.

There is even a question whether trade with the Soviets is good for business. In 1926 a leading Soviet spokesman had the following to say about East-West trade and Western concessions in the Soviet Union.

> On the one hand, we admit capitalist elements, we condescend to collaborate with them; on the other hand our objective is to eliminate completely, to conquer them, to squash them economically as well as socially. It is a furious battle, in which blood may necessarily be spilled.

Immediately preceding Brezhnev's recent visit to the United States, a leader of the Communist Party in Moscow stated:

> In politics you may conclude alliances with the Devil himself if you are certain that you can cheat the Devil.

The Soviets, like Hitler in his book "Mein Kampf," are telling us their plans, but too many in the West refuse to believe the Soviets just as in the 1930's many would not believe Hitler's own words.

I have learned something about our military assistance to the Soviets.

It is just not enough to have the facts—these are ignored by the policymakers.

It is just not enough to make a commonsense case—the answers you get defy reason.

Only one institution has been clearsighted on this question. From the early 1920's to the present day only one institution has spoken out. Not the chamber of commerce. Not the manufacturers association. Only the AFL–CIO has been consistently right.

From Samuel Gompers in 1920 down to George Meany today, the major unions have consistently protested the trade policies that built the Soviet Union. Because union members in Russia lost their freedom and union members in the United States have died in Korea and Vietnam, the unions know—and apparently care.

No one else cares. Not Washington. Not big business. Not the Republican Party. Not the Democratic Party. Few of us buck the tide to warn you.

And 100,000 Americans have been killed in Korea and Vietnam—by our own technology.

The only response from Washington and each administration is the effort to hush up the scandal.

These are things not to be talked about. The professional smokescreen about peaceful trade continues.

The plain fact is that irresponsible policies have built us an enemy and maintain that enemy in the business of totalitarian rule and world conquest. The tragedy is that intelligent people have bought the political double talk about world peace, a new world order and mellowing Soviets.

I suggest that the man in the street, the average taxpayer-voter thinks more or less as I do. You do not subsidize an enemy.

When this story gets out and about in the United States, it is going to translate into a shift of votes. I have not met one man in the street so far—from New York to California—who goes along with a policy of subsidizing the killing of his fellow Americans. People are usually stunned and disgusted.

It requires a peculiar kind of intellectual myopia to ship supplies and technology to the Soviets when they are instrumental in killing fellow citizens.

What about the argument that trade will lead to peace? Well, we have had United States-Soviet trade for over 50 years. The first and second 5-year plans were built by American companies. To continue a policy that is a total failure is to gamble with the lives of several million Americans and countless allies.

You can not stoke up the Soviet military machine at one end and then complain that the other end came back and bit you. Unfortunately, the human price for our immoral policies is not paid by the policymakers in Washington. The human price is paid by the farmers, the students, and working and middle classes of America—and our fighting men in Korea and Vietnam.

The citizen who pays the piper is not calling the tune—he does not even know the name of the tune.

Let me summarize my conclusions:

First. Trade with the U.S.S.R. was started over 50 years ago under President Woodrow Wilson with the declared intention of mellowing the Bolsheviks. The policy has been a total and costly failure. It has proven to be impractical—this is what I would expect from an immoral policy.

Second. We have built ourselves an enemy. We keep that self-declared enemy in business. This information has been blacked out by successive administrations. Misleading and untruthful statements have been made by the executive branch to Congress and the American people.

Third. Our policy of subsidizing self-declared enemies is neither rational nor moral. I have drawn attention to the intellectual myopia of the group that influences and draws up foreign policy.

Fourth. The annual attacks in Vietnam and the wars in the Middle East are made possible only by Russian armaments and our assistance to the Soviets.

Fifth. This worldwide Soviet activity is consistent with Communist theory. Mikhail Suslov, the party theoretician, recently stated that the current détente with the United States is temporary. The purpose of the détente, according to Suslov, is to give the Soviets sufficient strength for a renewed assault on the West. In other words, when you have finished building the Kama plant and the trucks come rolling off—watch out for another Vietnam.

Sixth. Internal Soviet repression continues—against Baptists, against Jews, against national groups, and against dissident academics.

Seventh. Soviet technical dependence is a powerful instrument for world peace if we want to use it. So far it has been used as an aid-to-dependent-Soviets welfare program. With about as much success as the domestic welfare program.

Why should they stop supplying Hanoi? The more they stoke up the war the more they get from the United States. Not only do the Soviets get more goods from the United States, they get them on credit. The U.S. Export-Import Bank is providing credits to the Soviet Union with an interest rate of 6 percent. It costs the Export-Import Bank 7¾ percent to raise that money it lends to the Soviet Union. The U.S. Government subsidizes the Export-Import Bank, which means, of course, the American taxpayer is picking up the bill. While interest on mortgages are 9½ percent in many parts of the United States, the Soviet Union gets loans at 6 percent on materials that they will use to defeat us. If they get most-favored-nation status which this administration foolishly pushes, they will get even lower interest rates.

Why did the war in Vietnam continue for over 4 long years under this administration before it finally was ended?

With 16,000 killed under the Nixon administration alone?

We can stop the Soviets and their friends in Hanoi, in the Middle East, in Cuba or anywhere, anytime we want to, without using a single gun or anything more dangerous than a piece of paper or a telephone call.

But that has not been done. Instead, the present administration seeks most-favored-nation status for the Soviet Union, extends credits to that totalitarian country, and concludes commercial agreements. All this some want to give to the Soviets while we receive precious little in return.

We have Soviet technical dependence as an instrument of world peace. The most humane weapon that can be conceived.

We have always had that option. We have never used it. Americans should wonder why.

Few people care. I have been telling this story for more than 10 years. Now it is even fashionable for Republicans to hold hands across the caviar with our bloody Communist enemies. The press is hopelessly pro-Soviet trade. Yet the American people must be alerted. One who has done that for decades is my good friend Anthony Sutton of the Hoover Institution. He has just published a book entitled "National Suicide"—Arlington House. It is a massively factual research into the suicidal policies I have outlined today. A true patriot, Mr. Sutton deserves to be listened to by every American. I gratefully acknowledge his research and help in the preparation of these remarks. His book is must reading for those who want to avert another Pearl Harbor.

MATTER OF EXTREME URGENCY AND IMPORTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about a matter of extreme urgency and importance. The activities of the President of the United States have brought our great Nation to the brink of what could be the most serious crisis in our history.

We have reached a point at which we can no longer turn on a television or pick up a newspaper without learning of still another charge of corruption and lawlessness related to the administration of Richard Nixon.

Mr. Nixon, in his tenure as President, has demonstrated a total disregard for the two most crucial elements of our democracy—our laws and our Constitution.

Since Mr. Nixon has taken office, we have seen top White House officials forced to resign because of their participation in and coverup of illegal actions; we have seen two Cabinet members—including an Attorney General—indicted on criminal charges; we have seen former White House aides plead guilty to criminal charges, and we have seen the Vice President of the United States resign his office and submit himself before the court to be convicted for criminally violating our Federal tax laws.

Further, we have watched as President Nixon has done everything in his power to subvert the judicial process and to prevent the gathering of evidence when legitimate attempts are made to seek out and convict persons who have broken our laws.

In light of the events which have occurred during this past weekend, there is little reason to doubt that the President himself has participated in the crimes of his administration—and as a result, the country is in an uproar.

In response to this, yesterday my friend and distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and I undertook three separate actions to restore order and justice to our troubled Nation.

First, we cosponsored legislation to reestablish the Office of the Special Prosecutor and safeguard the evidence compiled by the staff of the former special prosecutor, Mr. Archibald Cox.

Second, we cosponsored a House resolution instructing the Judiciary Committee to investigate the official conduct of the President to determine whether he has been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor.

Third, we took the extraordinary step of introducing a resolution of impeachment—and I might add, Mr. Speaker, we did so very reluctantly. In doing so, we charged President Nixon with committing acts which, in the contemplation of the Constitution, amount to bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors, and we set forth seven specific allegations.

One charge in our resolution was that Mr. Nixon refused to obey the mandates issued against him by the courts of the United States. This charge was specifically directed at the President's refusal to comply with the court's order to submit to it the White House tapes which were subpenaed by the special prosecutor. Shortly after introducing our resolution, we learned that the President's lawyer, in an abrupt turnabout, announced that President Nixon would comply with the court's mandate and would submit the tapes to the U.S. district court. But let us look, as this morning newspaper did, at what it took to make our President comply with the court's order.

It took the resignations, in protest, of the two top Justice Department officials; the firing of the Watergate special prosecutor and abolition of his office; the breaking of a solemn compact with the U.S. Senate; a call for the President's removal from office by leaders of the AFL–CIO unions representing 13.6 million workers; a virtual breakdown of the machinery of Western Union under the weight of an avalanche of telegrams to Members of Congress calling for Presidential impeachment; the formal beginnings of an impeachment process in the House; an outpouring of critical editorial opinion from around the country, and a raw warning from his own party's congressional leaders that they could not save him unless he changed course.

Now this evening, we are told, Mr. Nixon intends to address the Nation and tell us that all is well—that by handing over the tapes, the crisis is over.

Mr. Speaker, if the President feels that by handing over the tapes he has ended the crisis, he is dead wrong.

The tapes are merely a side issue. The major question is, whether in light of all the evidence, the President has committed any crimes for which he may be impeached. The real issue is whether or not the President is fit or deserving to hold that high office—and this issue is not resolved merely because the President has announced his decision to comply with a court order to hand over the tapes.

The issue of the tapes is only a part of one of several serious charges we have brought against Mr. Nixon. The others still remain.

Mr. Nixon must be called upon to answer the charge that he attempted to corrupt the judicial process by trying to influence a judge who was presiding over a case concerning prior illegal conduct of the President or his agents.

He must be called upon to answer the charge that he deliberately misled the American people by giving false and perjured testimony, through his official agents, to the U.S. Senate with respect to the bombing of Cambodia and other military action.

Mr. Nixon must be called upon to answer the charges of illegal bugging and wiretapping, of accepting illegal campaign donations, of bribery, and of removing the Attorney General solely because he was unwilling to carry out the President's dirty work.

Mr. Speaker, at no time in my 9 years of service in this body have my constituents been so united and vocal in their outrage over any given issue. They have completely lost faith in their President and they are frightened. The Constitution has specifically provided a mechanism to respond to the present situation, and that mechanism is impeachment.

Impeachment is a procedure by which this body makes a determination based on the evidence and facts before it as to whether or not there is sufficient evidence to justify bringing a Federal officer before the Senate to stand trial for a specific charge or charges.

The evidence is now mounting before us, and the people are waiting. The duty and responsibility is now ours alone, and we have an obligation to fulfill it. We can do so only by commencing with impeachment proceedings at once.

BLACK CAUCUS DEMANDS MOVE ON IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus I wish to share with my colleagues in the House a joint statement issued by members of the caucus.

This statement is in response to the large number of inquiries as to the position of our organization relative to the question of the impeachment of Richard Nixon. Today the Congressional Black Caucus issued the following news release:

CAUCUS DEMANDS HOUSE MOVE ON IMPEACHMENT

The Congressional Black Caucus, sharing an opinion held by millions of Americans, is dismayed and shocked by recent actions on the part of Richard M. Nixon. In the opinion of the Congressional Black Caucus, the decisions to discharge Archibald Cox and abolish the office of Special Prosecutor were both irresponsible and unconscionable. The totality of recent events culminating in the resignation of the two highest Justice Department officials unnecessarily precipitated a constitutional crisis. The end result represents not only an insult to the intelligence of American citizens but also an assault on established governmental institutions and more fundamentally the Constitution itself.

The call for impeachment of Richard Nixon is neither new nor unique. Members of the Congressional Black Caucus introduced impeachment resolutions as long as two years ago, based upon the strong contention that Nixon was carrying on an illegal war in Southeast Asia. Nixon's adventurism in Indochina was—and is—both illegal and impeachable, and the cascade of ensuing executive crimes—the ITT, Vesco, milk and wheat deals, Watergate and all its associated criminal activities, the shady campaign contributions and payoffs, and Nixon's bevy of illegal impoundments of critical social program funding—only further serve to strengthen the position that Richard Nixon should—and must—be removed from office.

The Congressional Black Caucus urges the leadership of the House of Representatives immediately to define and establish procedures and mechanics for dealing with consideration of the impeachment of Richard Nixon. We further urge that these procedures be made known to all members of the House and to the American people without delay.

The Members of the Congressional Black

Caucus oppose any consideration of Gerald Ford's nomination for Vice President of the United States. The consensus is that to do so before the question of impeachability of Richard Nixon is resolved constitutes utter misinterpretation of basic priorities. Therefore, the Congressional Black Caucus recommends that the Democratic Leadership of the House instruct the Judiciary Committee to hold in abeyance any consideration of Gerald Ford until a full and thorough determination has been made concerning the pending serious charges of high crimes and misdemeanors against the nation by Richard Nixon.

The Nixon agreement to comply with the order of the Court to release the tapes is a complete vindication of Mr. Cox's insistence that Nixon comply with the Court's order. The Congressional Black Caucus therefore insists that Richard Nixon now reestablish this independent Prosecutor's Office and that Mr. Cox be reappointed immediately. Only in this manner will the American people be assured of an honest, objective and vigorous pursual of all ramifications of Watergate in the original manner promised by Nixon when he promised an investigation which would be pursued "fully and fearlessly, wherever it may lead."

The Congressional Black Caucus strongly recommends that all citizens concerned about this current crisis make their concerns known to the leadership of the House immediately. Contact Carl Albert, Speaker; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Majority Leader; John J. McFall, Majority Whip and Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Chairman, Committee of the Judiciary.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY AT NLRB

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, we shall soon consider on the floor of this House proposals for creation of a Consumer Protection Agency which will advocate the interests of consumers in Federal decisionmaking. For this reason, I wish to continue my effort to avoid the confusion experienced in the last Congress when similar bills were considered.

A Government Operations Subcommittee, on which I serve, is now considering three CPA proposals. The bills are H.R. 14 by Congressman ROSENTHAL, H.R. 21 by Congressmen HOLIFIELD, HORTON, and others, and H.R. 564 by Congressman BROWN of Ohio and myself.

The major difference among the bills is that H.R. 14 and H.R. 21 would both allow the CPA to appeal the final decisions of other agencies to the courts while the Fuqua-Brown bill would not grant this nonregulatory agency so extraordinary a power.

As you know, I have asked those Federal agencies which would be subject to the CPA's advocacy rights to list their 1972 proceedings and activities which would be subject to CPA action and to delineate them by the several categories set forth in the bills.

I have been introducing their replies in the RECORD, and have already inserted material from six small agencies: the Defense Supply Agency, the Cost of Living Council, and four of the banking regulatory agencies.

Today I wish to call to your attention the proceedings and activities of another small, but important and highly visible, agency which would be subject to the CPA's power under the proposed bills, the National Labor Relations Board.

The NLRB, in 1972, held 2,900 unfair labor practice and representation proceedings. The chairman of the NLRB asserts that the agency "would not be classed as a consumer-oriented agency." However, in response to my request the AFL–CIO submitted a legal opinion to our subcommittee which stated that—

It is possible to imagine instances in which the CPA might wish to take a position contrary to the position of a union in NLRB proceedings.

It should be noted that, should the CPA participate in NLRB adjudications—as the AFL–CIO memorandum observes—it would join the general counsel of the NLRB as a second prosecutor against the union. The union would thus be faced with double prosecution. And, remember, the CPA has the right to carry its attack on the union into the courts by appealing an unfavorable NLRB final decision under two of these bills, but not the Fuqua-Brown bill.

The Rosenthal and Holifield-Horton bills would grant the CPA the right to appeal whenever anyone else had such a right. These bills would allow the CPA, whenever the CPA determined there was sufficient consumer interest, to intervene fully in an NLRB proceeding and then to have the unchallengeable right to appeal the resulting decision. Further, even where the CPA did not take part in the agency proceeding, the CPA could appeal the agency decision to the courts, except where the court makes certain unlikely special findings.

The Fuqua-Brown bill, however, would not allow the CPA to appeal any final decisions of its sister agencies to the courts. While the NLRB letter lists only 1,200 decisions in 1972 as appealable, it also lists new areas of jurisdiction for the NLRB, and consequently for the CPA: Horse racing, dog racing, and symphony orchestras.

While the CPA would not be likely to find a sufficient consumer interest in all or even most of the proceedings of the NLRB, the technical legal power to do so, and to appeal them, would be granted by some CPA bills. Only the Fuqua-Brown bill would withhold that power.

I might add that, for the six small agencies already reported, the number of actual 1972 decisions technically appealable by the CPA under all bills except the Fuqua-Brown bill is now approximately 1 million annually. I say "actual decisions" because under the other two bills, the CPA could appeal refusals to act as well as action. And, I repeat, we have only considered six tiny agencies.

Mr. Speaker, for these important reasons, I insert in the RECORD information from the National Labor Relations Board and the opinion letter of the associate general counsel of the AFL–CIO, which shows how the proceedings of the NLRB would be subject to the CPA advocacy powers as proposed in the various bills now in subcommittee.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1973.

Hon. DON FUQUA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FUQUA: Your letter of September 7, 1973, requesting responses to seven questions dealing with our Agency's operations and the impact if an independent Consumer Protection Agency (CPA) were created under H.R. 14, 21, and 564, has been carefully reviewed.

As you are undoubtedly aware, the National Labor Relations Board is a quasi-judicial Agency whose two principal functions are to investigate questions concerning employee representation and to resolve them through elections and to investigate and prosecute unfair labor practices brought against employers and unions. Except for rulemaking, the Board has no statutory authority to initiate proceeding *sua sponte*, and an unfair labor practice charge or election petition must be filed to invoke our jurisdiction. Any "person" may file a charge or petition. Representation proceedings under Section 9 of our Act are not subject to the adjudicatory provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act while unfair labor proceedings are so subject. Our rulemaking proceedings under Section 6 of the Act are subject to the APA and permits interested parties to participate through submission of written data, views or arguments, with or without oral argument.

With this background in mind, the following responses to your questions follows:

Question 1: Proposed Rule Making—1972.

Answer: (a) Exercise of jurisdiction over the Horseracing and Dogracing Industries (July 18, 1972).

(b) Offers of Reinstatement to Employees in the Armed Forces (August 4, 1972).

(c) Exercise of jurisdiction over Symphony Orchestras (August 19, 1972).

Question 2: Regulations, rules, etc., subject to APA Sec. 556, 557 proposed during 1972.

Answer: None.

Question 3: Administrative Adjudications subject to 556, 557.

Answer: All unfair labor practice proceedings numbering approximately 1200 in 1972.

Question 4: Adjudications imposing directly fines, penalty, etc.

Answer: None.

Question 5: Excluding proceedings subject to 5 U.S.C. 554, 556, 557, what proceedings on the record were held by the Agency in 1972.

Answer: All representation hearings, approximately 1700 in calendar year 1972.

Question 6: A list of representative public and non-public activities.

Answer: (a) Oral arguments monthly before the Board in actual cases (public).

(b) Budget hearings in House of Representatives and Senate (basically nonpublic).

(c) Administrative meetings of Board Members on administrative matter (nonpublic).

(d) Budget meetings of Chairman and budget officer (nonpublic).

(e) Rules Revision Committee Meetings (nonpublic).

(f) Panel of Board Members—on pending cases (nonpublic).

(g) Board agenda on pending cases (nonpublic).

(h) Selection Committee meetings on Regional Directors (nonpublic).

(i) Meetings with American Bar Associa-

tion Committees and Chambers of Commerce Committees (nonpublic).

(j) Hearings in unfair labor practice and representation proceedings approximately 2900 (public).

(k) Upon request, meetings with litigants by General Counsel or his representative to discuss merits of case in issue (nonpublic).

Question 7: What final actions could have been appealed in 1972.

Answer: All unfair labor practice decisions, approximately 1200 in number, are appealable to the United States Circuit Courts.

It should be kept in mind that being in the labor-management field, our Agency, unlike others, would not be classed as a consumer-oriented Agency. I trust the above information will be helpful.

Sincerely,

EDWARD B. MILLER,
Chairman.

JUNE 28, 1971.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention has been called to the colloquy between Congressman Fuqua and Mr. Kenneth Peterson during the Hearings on H.R. 14. The question was raised by Representative Fuqua whether cases could arise in which the Consumer Protection Agency might intervene under Section 204 in a proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board for the purpose of taking a position adverse to the interests of some union. Mr. Peterson stated that he would consult counsel on this matter and provide an answer for the record.

I think that it is possible to imagine instances in which the Consumer Protection Agency might wish to intervene in a proceeding before the NLRB to take a position contrary to the interests of a union. In order for the Agency to intervene, however, not only would the proceeding have to affect the interests of consumers but the Agency would have to find that these consumer interests might not be adequately protected unless the Agency intervened. It is rather unlikely that this second finding could be made, since in proceedings where unions are respondents under the National Labor Relations Act the adverse position is already represented by the General Counsel of the NLRB and by counsel for the employer.

Since the hearing Representative Fuqua, on June 23, wrote Mr. Peterson requesting that we not only supply an answer for the record, as Mr. Peterson had undertaken to do, but that we supply "a legal memorandum on what proceedings of the Department of Labor would be subject to intervention under the bill . . ." While we would like to accommodate Representative Fuqua we simply do not have the legal staff to do so.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS E. HARRIS,
Associate General Counsel.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY MUST DEAL WITH IMPEACHMENT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, President Nixon yesterday said he will comply with Judge Sirica's order, as modified by the Court of Appeals, to make the White House tapes available.

Notwithstanding that this proposed compliance comes 3 days after the court's deadline, I am gratified by the President's dilatory law and order position.

And notwithstanding that this proposed compliance comes—

Only after a blatant attempt to subvert Judge Sirica's order;

Only after the removal of Prosecutor Cox, Attorney General Richardson and Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus; and

Only after a bipartisan outpouring of outrage from the Congress and the American people;

Notwithstanding these facts, I appreciate the President's new-found spirit of cooperation.

But the President has missed the point—by turning over the tapes he will not stop the movement in the House of Representatives to inquire into impeachment. Of the eight charges contained in such a resolution introduced yesterday by my esteemed colleague Representative WILLIAM FORD of Michigan and me, only one deals with the White House tapes. This body must still deal with the remaining seven charges:

First. That the President may have committed acts which, in contemplation of the Constitution, amount to bribery, and high crimes and misdemeanors;

Second. That the President may have corrupted the judicial process through conversations with the deciding judge, in cases then pending in the U.S. Courts, concerning the appointment of the said judge to higher Federal office;

Third. That the President may have intentionally misled the American people, and, through his appointed spokesmen, given false, misleading, and perjured testimony to the U.S. Senate concerning his prior activities in connection with the bombing in Cambodia;

Fourth. That the President may have violated the Constitution and laws of the United States by engaging in illegal and unauthorized electronic surveillance of private citizens and into the proper and privileged activities of political opponents;

Fifth. That the President may have violated the laws of the United States by soliciting and accepting illegal donations for use in his political campaigns, and by conspiring with others to keep this illegal activity secret;

Sixth. That the President may have knowingly solicited, accepted, and concealed large cash emoluments and other things of value from private individuals to influence governmental decisions favorable to said donors;

Seventh. That the President may have violated the laws of the United States and a public pledge and promise made to the U.S. Senate, by removal of or forcing the resignation from the high office of the Attorney General of the United States, persons who were competent and faithful in the discharge of their public duties, and by appointing a person to said high office solely because he was willing to discharge a "special prosecutor" whose security and tenure was immunized by law from Presidential dismissal.

Indeed, with President Nixon's recent history for veracity and changing course, we cannot even now be confident that Judge Sirica's order will be complied with. And after compliance there remain the questions of the tape's contents and their electronic integrity.

In light of these matters, the Judiciary Committee must continue to develop procedures for handling impeachment resolutions and must begin the appropriate inquiries into the remaining charges set forth in those resolutions.

President Nixon cannot be permitted to trade nine tapes for complete immunity from criminal and congressional inquiry.

GEN. ALEXANDER HAIG: A CIVILIAN?

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing aspects of recent Nixon maneuvers on Watergate is the conduct of the White House Chief of Staff, Alexander Haig. It ill serves the national interest or mood to have a general in the White House whose actions and language are more appropriate to a military junta than a civilian government.

Many Americans were shocked by his "the Commander in Chief has given you an order" language to Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus and Haig's order to seal off the offices of the special prosecutor by the FBI. These may not have been significant moments when compared to the President's reckless actions over the weekend but they added to an apprehension of what was happening or might happen.

It seems the White House has no intention of abandoning the arrogant style that was the hallmark of H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman. The palace guard is now run by a general who forgets that the President and his staff are the public's servants not its masters.

It is a continuing disgrace to our democratic traditions that President Nixon has given such power to men so lacking in subtlety and so contemptuous of our traditions.

When I was in the Army, I had to learn how to do things in a military manner. Now that General Haig is a civilian, he should relearn how to do things in a civil manner.

TEAPOT DOME REVISITED?

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, many voices have been raised across the land in recent months decrying what has come to

be known as "the energy shortage." Foremost among those weeping copious tears and frightening the public have been the major oil companies whose policies have, in large part, been responsible for mismanagement of our vast energy resources. Obsessed with greed and oblivious to consequences of wasteful exploitation, the few companies dominating our oil and gas industries have squeezed consumers in a variety of illegal, cynical ways.

For years, the oil industry has been characterized by monopoly and combinations in restraint of trade. A recent 2-year study by the Federal Trade Commission shows beyond a shadow of doubt that power concentrations within this industry are worsening. Eight major corporations control most supplies of crude oil, refinery capacity, pipelines and marketing networks.

Not content with such domination, these few corporations have mounted a new compaign aimed at annihilating what remains of their competition, including independent refiners and marketers. Deliberately withholding existing supplies of raw materials, they have driven significant numbers of these independent business enterprises into bankruptcy, where they are easy prey for major oil companies seeking to acquire their resources and facilities.

On the retail level, gasoline station operators are caught between the rock and the hard place as oil companies owning their franchises raise tank wagon prices and government has not allowed them, up-to-now, to compensate for such hikes. No move is made to prevent continued price hikes by the majors as their profit figures indicate. To indicate how massive such profits are, I enclose a recent report on how much money they made and what percentage of increase their profits showed in the second quarter of this year.

2D QUARTER PROFITS OF THE NATION'S 10 LARGEST OIL COMPANIES[1]

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Company	Sales	Profits	Percent change from 1972
Exxon	$5,830.0	$510.0	+54
Mobil[2]	2,880.0	184.2	+41
Texaco[3]	2,727.0	267.5	+44
Gulf[2]	2,397.0	195.0	+82
Standard (California)	1,817.2	181.7	+42
Standard (Indiana)[2]	1,527.2	121.3	+37
Shell[3]	1,211.9	89.5	+54
Atlantic Richfield[4]	1,069.8	68.4	+50
Continental[2]	1,029.9	51.7	+24
Occidental	810.3	26.9	+566

[1] Ranking based on 2d quarter sales in dollars.
[2] Sales include excise taxes and other income.
[3] Sales include other income.
[4] Sales include excise taxes.

Source: Business Week; Aug. 11, 1973, p. 79.

This, however, is only an introduction. Not content with this kind of pillage at the expense of everyone in the Nation using gas and oil products, they have sought out every last advantage, seeking to exploit it at public expense. One such attempt involves the outcry over the "energy crisis," and how individual majors are seeking to exploit it, even down to exploiting naval petroleum reserves.

The President indicated in his second state of the Union address that he was going to ask that the Elk Hills, Calif., Naval Petroleum Reserve be opened up in the name of this energy crisis in order to alleviate predicted shortages. Apparently he was unaware at the time of certain circumstances surrounding this reserve, which I now take the liberty of bringing to his attention.

There are four such Navy oil reserves. One is the well-remembered Teapot Dome Reserve in Wyoming. Another is a vast tract in Alaska as large as Indiana. A third is Buena Vista Hills in California. The fourth is the one I address myself to here; Elk Hills, Calif.

Exploring the Elk Hills situation, I have discovered some rather unique facts which I believe the President, the Congress, the public and the press should know.

First, Standard Oil of California operates the field and has been extracting oil from it in significant quantities at given intervals with consent of the Navy. Payment for such withdrawals has been deferred for some time. Presently, SOCAL owes the Navy some $24 million.

Second, Shell Oil, largely foreign-owned, possesses a contract with the Navy allowing it to obtain such oil as may be pumped out of the ground at the reserve.

Third, the only pipelines leading out of the Elk Hills Reserve are owned by Atlantic Richfield and Standard Oil of California. If the reserve is opened as the President indicated and begins producing 160,000 barrels of oil daily for 1 year—which was the publicly announced production goal—then Shell will claim the oil, trade it off, and transfer title to it when it enters any other major's pipeline. Taxpayer's oil will be sold by the majors for what it will bring—an average of some $3.60 per barrel based on going market prices in the Elk Hills area, as of today.

Informed legal opinion notes that if the reserve is opened for other than a military emergency, SOCAL could take the Navy to court, stand a chance of abrogating the contract, and seek forgiveness of the $24 million owed the Navy in deferred payments.

Simultaneously, even if the contract remains in existence and production is expanded, SOCAL would be entitled to receive, under the agreement, some 22 percent of all production. Capital expenditures by the company could be deferred and a gross of $576,000 daily would be realized by sale of the 160,000 barrels daily at $3.60. SOCAL would, therefore, come into a windfall of some $115,000 daily, at public and Navy expense, profiting from the energy shortage SOCAL weeps so copiously about. This comes to a minimum of $42 million in pure profit for one company in 1 year alone, not counting what Arco and Shell would be making.

Another rather curious combination of circumstances came to light as I investigated the Elk Hills situation, mainly revolving around the rather intriguing activities of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

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.

This has resulted in significant drainage of oil pools under the Elk Hills Reserve, requiring the Navy to drill offsetting wells from which were extracted significant quantities of oil which then became available to the same company through Shell. SOCAL gains while its illegal drilling outside the reserve had caused the problem.

One question immediately arises. If SOCAL's illegal drilling near the Elk Hills boundary is forcing the Navy to drill offset wells, why are the Navy and the Justice Department not acting to obtain an injunction to restrain them? Surely they should be halted in their course until it can be ascertained whether or not their drilling is damaging the reserve. By granting of similar leases at Teapot Dome where drilling was performed to within 50 feet of the reserve boundary, the major oil pools there have also been partially drained.

This summary has only barely scratched the surface of what may end up as an offense against the public as blatant and unprincipled as the Teapot Dome imbroglio. What emerges is a cumulative attempt by several major oil corporations to loot a Government oil reserve with connivance or incompetence by Government authorities. If Elk Hills is opened to exploitation now, without built-in protections for the Navy and the taxpayer's interests, SOCAL will reap massive windfall profits, and so will other majors.

The country will be the loser, especially the Navy and oil consumers. Price-fixing also figures in this scandal, to be covered in another presentation I shall make. It is touched upon in a letter I have just sent to the President informing him of what I have ascertained. At a minimum, an excess profits tax should be imposed on any and all operations covering Elk Hills oil. Declaring private carriers to be common carriers when carrying Elk Hills oil is another useful alternative. Certainly, no one should benefit from a shortage which they have had a large part in creating. That was the useful, pertinent principle established in World War II, and it should apply today just as well.

Further, an investigation of the most intense sort is called for in regard to activities of the Bureau of Land Management and the manner in which it defied the law and the Navy in allowing this situation to develop around the Elk Hills and Teapot Dome Reserves. One year ago, in a Government Accounting Office report, this activity was reported. Yet, seemingly, it escaped congressional and Presidential attention. Today, hopefully, that situation is remedied and the people will find out how—in at least this one

way—major oil companies were seeking to use the energy crisis as a shield from behind which to loot the patrimony of our Nation.

At this point, I am including a copy of the letter I have sent to the President informing him of this situation and evidence I have unearthed. Copies of the Shell and Standard Oil of California contracts plus the GAO report are available in my office, if anyone should wish to examine them at length and in depth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1973.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I noted with interest your proposal to open up the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve in California because of the "energy shortage." Sharing your concern over oil shortfalls and wishing to ensure that neither our Navy's needs nor the taxpayer's interest should come to harm, I have delved into the Elk Hills situation, discovering factors worthy of your attention.

The question of naval oil reserves is fraught with danger to any government, particularly in light of the Teapot Dome Scandal and questions which would inevitably arise concerning opening up and exploitation of such resources. A recent report by the General Accounting Office entitled, "Capability of the Naval Petroleum & Oil Shale Reserves To Meet Emergency Oil Needs," estimates value of proven recoverable resources owned by the Navy in this reserve at a minimum of $2.6 billion.

It is publicly proposed to open up Elk Hills to production of at least 160,000 barrels of oil daily. Shell Oil Company, largely foreign-owned, possesses a five year contract to purchase all current and projected production from that Reserve at a price based on average current posted prices, largely set throughout California by Shell and Standard Oil of California. Under such a contract, which I have a copy of, if massive production is instituted, will Shell not benefit in the form of windfall profits? Unless any new production is let out for bids to independents under open bidding, what is to prevent Shell from claiming all new production? Further, who could or would compete with Shell in such a situation? There are no storage facilities at Elk Hills, so any production must be sold and moved immediately. What is to prevent an Alaska North Slope situation from developing, when a consortium of major oil companies joined together to offer bids? Suppose their bid is far below market prices?

This oil must be marketed upon extraction. Only a pipeline assures this. It is my understanding that the only pipeline leading out of Elk Hills and from the reserve to market are owned entirely by two major oil companies: Standard Oil of California and Atlantic Richfield. There is a strong possibility that Shell could take title to Elk Hills production, immediately transferring it to the majors owning existing pipelines, in exchange for a portion of their profits to be derived from its sale. Additionally, Shell could receive other payment in form of substantial, equal allocations of oil from any other majors involved, at Shell refineries in other locations. Such tradeoffs are common between major oil companies and have been consistently termed practices in restraint of trade.

When the Shell contract was advertised and the invitation for bid was put out, bidders were required to provide prior certification of assured transportability. The sole method of transport available at the time was through the Standard Oil of California or other private carrier lines. Was the Navy aware then there was a strong possibility of prior arrangement between Shell and Socal for use of the line? Could this not be termed collusion, especially because both Shell and Socal emerged as the prime bidders?

Use of a private carrier line means sale of oil to the carrier when it enters the pipeline. If Elk Hills is opened, Shell will be able to transfer the major share of Navy oil produced in any crisis to Socal. Socal will be able to sell it for what the market will bear, or to another private carrier yielding a substantial profit. Is this in the taxpayers interest?

Involvement of private carrier lines in such a context means a possibility of price arrangement between the majors in question. One small bidder, Pima Refining Co., was, I have discovered, rejected in bidding because of lack of transportation facilities. Certainly examination of the invitation for bid and the transcript of proceedings on bid-letting is in order. In light of the fact that the Justice Department was supposed to review such proceeding thoroughly, was there any concern with investigation of possible collusion and antitrust action? Inexplicably, no action has been taken. Now both companies are in line to profit immeasurably from a national emergency at taxpayer expense.

After Teapot Dome, a requirement was put through under President Roosevelt that all contracts respecting any Navy oil reserves must be reviewed by Justice before presentation to the President or Armed Services Committees of each House of Congress. Existing contracts and government concessions to industry have drastically altered the viability of several of the reserves, allowing private oil interests to drain away oil from the outside, while in some cases draining it from within a reserve. Why has Justice done nothing about what seems to be an obvious situation?

Pricing discrimination and artificially low prices for state-owned crude oil involving both these companies and their posted pricing are presently under investigation in California by the Joint Committee on Public Domain of the State Assembly, headed by J. Kenneth Corey (D.-Garden Grove). Dominance by Socal and Shell, plus questions surrounding such pricing make their position vis-a-vis Elk Hills more suspect. Compounding this compromising situation is the fact that companies involved in this investigation have largely refused to cooperate. Instead, they are attempting to enjoin the state legislature's investigation of their pricing procedures, refusing to surrender requested information.

Once any oil comes into possession of majors, another windfall profit could accrue through manipulation of posted prices. A bid price is based on prices posted in vicinity of an oil field. Nothing can prevent majors involved from merely posting prices far in excess of what is charged today. The ongoing California State Assembly investigation has discovered that free market prices established by open bidding were found to differ by $1.25 per barrel from what was being paid the state under a posted contract much like that Shell enjoys on Elk Hills, showing they have had experience in manipulation defrauding the state, which can now be applied to a massive defrauding of the Federal Government. To prevent unacceptable profits at public expense, the Federal Government should impose limitations in form of an excess profits tax on Elk Hills oil, as was done in World War II to prevent profiteering in an emergency. Another alternative open to government is to declare private carrier pipeline systems leading to Elk Hills directly to be common carriers all the way to final delivery points for the purpose of carrying Elk Hills oil during any emergency. I stand ready to sponsor any legislation you might seek to implement these objections.

Another windfall profit could be in order for Socal if Elk Hills is opened up for any other reason than national defense. A unit plan contract is presently in force between the Navy and Socal. Socal is both unit and nonunit operator of this field. At given intervals, Socal has been permitted to remove significant quantities of oil from Elk Hills under agreement with government. Through June 30, 1973, Socal owes the Navy and taxpayers approximately $24,000,000 in deferred payments for removals in production and cost balances related to maintenance and development of both Navy and Socal wells. These monies are owed under terms of an existing contract. Socal has been allowed to remove approximately 25 million barrels of oil from the field as payment for entering into the contract with the Navy. Socal may be able to claim the entire contract is ended if Elk Hills is opened up for any purpose other than military emergency. This would not only forgive the $24,000,000 and the obligation concerning the 25 million barrels, but would leave Socal free to drain U.S. Government oil from the reserve through adjoining wells at will.

Alternatively, even if the contract remains in existence, and should production be opened up, Socal, under the existing contract, would receive somewhere in the neighborhood of 22% of all production. Any capital expenditures by the company in that case would be deferred in terms of payments to the government at a later date. If production is set at 160,000 barrels daily, as has been publicly suggested and projected and the price per barrel is $3.60, based on today's going prices, the gross would come to $576,000 daily. At least $115,000 per day would go to Socal. This comes out to a minimum of some $42,000,000 in one year; hardly a pittance.

Another point concerning the Elk Hills Reserve revolves around curious actions of the Bureau of Land Management of the Interior Department. Federal regulations prohibit issuance of oil and gas leases by BLM within a mile of a petroleum reserve boundary, unless the land is being drained by private operators already or it is determined after consultation with the Navy that the Reserve could not be adversely affected. In the cases of Teapot Dome and Elk Hills, the BLM issued such leases. At Teapot Dome, BLM allowed an oil company to drill to within 50 feet of reserve boundaries, despite protests by the Navy and in violation of regulations. This policy, I am informed, began in the fifties, when BLM allowed the first encroachments. In the case of Elk Hills, the BLM has allowed such drillings by Socal up to ½ mile of the reserve boundary, where the company has made major oil strikes, draining off Navy oil through the law of capture, and significantly injuring the Reserve. In self-defense, as was the case in the Teapot Dome situation, Navy has been forced to undertake offset drilling, extracting large quantities of oil. Such extractions have made more oil available to Shell under its contract. Presumably, Shell must have marketed such oil through the Socal pipeline, the major artery leading to market from that reserve.

The other day, testimony by R. G. Rothwell, Deputy Director of the Logistics & Communications Division of the General Accounting Office confirmed what I had established by independent investigations; questionable and illegal granting of permission to drill for oil to private companies has damaged and depleted two of four Navy oil reserves. In the face of Navy protests in one case and Navy inertia and inaction in the other, the Bureau of Land Management has allowed Elk Hills and Teapot Dome to be harmed. It seems that Teapot Dome has been significantly affected, both in terms of being a naval oil reserve and for purposes of relieving any emergency situation involving a domestic energy crisis.

The far richer Elk Hills field is in the process of being drained by such illegal production, in this care carried out by Socal, which

would directly benefit as a result of opening of the reserve. In this case, the Bureau of Land Management is also the major culpable party. The Navy, in fact, is currently drilling two new wells at Elk Hills to offset recently initiated additional private production next to the reserve.

A major investigation of the Teapot Dome Reserve's status is in order. It is my understanding that wells there are not capable at this point of major production. If the reserve has been harmed, we have a second Teapot Dome scandal of serious proportions. An intense investigation should be made of illegal drilling presently being carried on in the buffer zone around Elk Hills by Standard Oil of California under BLM auspices. We can no longer ignore what the General Accounting Office revealed about this state of affairs last year.

Before Elk Hills is opened to exploitation and drainage, BLM, oil company activities surrounding the reserve and the Teapot Dome situation should and must be carefully investigated and the results be made publicly known. If windfall profits have already accrued to major oil companies and more such are in the offing, we should know before further steps are taken. I assure you, sir, of my willingness to cooperate with you in protecting the public interest.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

In addition, it is my understanding that boundary drilling in violation of existing Federal regulations and allowed by the Bureau of Land Management has significantly harmed the Teapot Dome Reserve, creating, if proven to be true, a second scandal. I have asked the President for a complete investigation of this state of affairs, as well.

CONGRESSMAN BILL GUNTER PROPOSES TOTAL FINANCING OF FEDERAL ELECTIONS

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Florida, the Honorable BILL GUNTER of the Fifth Congressional District, recently introduced H.R. 10889, which proposes total financing of federal elections, to include primary as well as general elections.

BILL outlined his proposal in a recent speech to the Kansas City Rotary Club where he was a guest speaker. Given the timeliness of this proposal in light of recent events in politics with which we are all aware, I thought our colleagues would want to familiarize themselves with BILL'S proposal as he outlined it in his speech.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN BILL GUNTER

Nine years ago, Americans opposed public financing of presidential elections by the convincing margin of seventy-one to eleven percent.

Now, the latest Gallup Poll reveals an incredible turn-around—nearly two-thirds of those polled recently favored public financing of congressional as well as presidential campaigns.

A lot of water has spilled over the gate in nine short years.

Mr. Agnew may not have intended it, but his speech to the Nation contained the essential elements that make a strong and compelling case for public financing.

In stepping down, the former Vice President appeared as stunned by events as those he supported and those who supported him. The charges of accepting cash contributions from contractors were based, after all, he said, on common practices in politics as he knew them to be.

And there is more truth to what Mr. Agnew had to say than many would care to admit.

The fact is that as long as candidates for public office are dependent upon private contributions for the financing of their campaigns, there will continue to be influence peddling and favors to the few at the expense of the general public.

Indeed, it is evident that the most convincing argument to be made for public financing is the desirability of removing both the undue influence of monied interests, and the extortion of contributions or gifts by the politicians from the business interests of this country.

The man-bites-dog analogy occurs when the tough political fund raiser shakes down the reluctant contributor. We saw it aplenty last year. The setting of $100,000 quotas by the Committee to Reelect the President on a number of firms which had legal and business matters pending before various Federal regulatory agencies.

The assessment of individuals at one percent of net worth for campaign donations.

The outright pressuring and shake-down of American Airlines and other businesses . . . the laundering of money through Mexico . . . the suitcases brimming with cash . . . the tax loopholes which permit big donors to avoid gift taxes by breaking down large contributions into smaller donations and distributing them to various committees supporting the same candidate.

Last year, the president and his supporters spent $60 million to stay in office. Senator McGovern and his supporters spent nearly $24 million in a losing effort to unseat the president. Both of the amounts are staggering . . . and both carry the same unsatisfactory and unsavory implications.

A senatorial campaign in many states can cost upward of $2 million per candidate and $200,000 spent in a race for the House of Representatives is not uncommon at all.

But these are only the obvious costs . . . there are other costs as well.

Disregarding the likelihood that much more than the $145 million that was reported for Federal campaigning in 1972 was actually spent, the American citizen is becoming increasingly and painfully aware of significant "hidden expenses."

Hidden expenses are the increases you pay for milk at the grocery store and for oil at the gas pump because wealthy interests gave major contributions to a politician in a position to grant favors.

There was the matter of the $400,000 in campaign contributions by milk producers to the President's reelection efforts, followed closely in time by a healthy boost in Federal price supports for milk.

Today, this is costing consumers . . . the public, if you will . . . between $500 and $700 million a year in higher prices. I might add that this sum alone would provide three to five the times the cost of financing all Federal elections from President down to the fifth congressional district in the state of Florida . . . in which I have some interest.

Then there was the half-million dollars donated in 1968 and tripled to $1.5 million in 1972 by the oil lobby to the Nixon campaigns for President. There are those who argue that there is a cause and effect relationship between that donation and the fact that despite a recommendation of his own cabinet task force, the President has resisted lifting oil import quotas.

This cost to consumers is estimated at $5 billion a year—30 times the most expensive estimate of the biennial cost of public campaign financing of all Federal elections.

"Should we publicly finance our election campaigns?" asked Jerry Landauer in the Wall Street Journal. "Don't kid yourself," he wrote, "We already do."

These are some examples of the hidden costs of financing elections under the present system. I hope you will agree with me that it is too much of a price to pay.

But there are other problems as well with our present system . . . a system which allocates money to incumbents, to the sure winners, to those who cozy up to, and become the handmaidens of the rich and the super rich.

Most Americans would agree that we should have vigorously competitive elections. The truth is that most elections are decided virtually by default. The incumbent has the advantage of office and more ready access to the donors.

If, however, through public financing each candidate has equal access to campaign financing, and incumbent and challenger alike are beholden to the voters in the purest meaning of the phrase . . . then, we just might revitalize politics in the United States of America.

You might see more of your elected representative. And he, in turn, might pay a little more attention to what the ordinary voter has to say.

There are five major proposals pending before the U.S. Senate and a sixth in the House of Representatives which advocate some form of public financing. I recently submitted a bill which proposed total public financing for all federal elections to include primary as well as general elections campaigns.

My bill differs from the others in certain key respects. Most importantly, it precludes private contributions to individual candidates . . . this, in my opinion, is vital if public financing is to succeed. The bill does allow private contributions up to $100.00 to the National party of the individual's choice.

It authorizes a unique petition procedure for a candidate to qualify for federal office . . . which also serves as a safeguard to prevent persons from receiving public funds who do not have or cannot generate a substantial base of support.

In the case of a primary election for the U.S. House of Representatives, for example, the signatures of 3,000 individuals who are eligible to vote would be necessary to qualify a candidate for disbursements from the public fund.

The sum per qualified candidate in this particular race would be $40,000. In the event of a runoff election, each candidate would receive $20,000 and the winner an additional $60,000 for the general election. Similar petition procedures involving greater numbers of eligible voters are provided for campaigns for the U.S. Senate and for the office of President and Vice President.

Suffice it to say that the petition procedure serves two very useful purposes.

First, it insures that persons who qualify have significant public support and, secondly, it entices incumbent officeholders as well as challengers to get out and campaign vigorously among their constituencies.

In closing, a word about cost.

Those who think I've come up with a scheme to bankrupt the U.S. Treasury are quite mistaken. Under the most generous cost analysis, which imagines three times the number of qualified candidates as ran in 1972 . . . an unlikely event . . . the total expenditure would be $174 million a year for all federal races or less than one-tenth of one percent of the annual federal budget. To break it down another way, the cost would be $1.25 per year per eligible voter.

If the number of candidates is, more realistically, twice the number as in 1972, the cost

would be $150 million per year or $1.06 per voter per year. But the real question is not whether we can afford to publicly finance elections, but whether we can afford not to. How else can we get ourselves out of the political morass we are in today?

How else can we realize an ideal we all learned not so long ago in school:

That in America, one man's vote is worth the same as any other man's.

DALLAS-FORT WORTH TO OPEN WORLD'S LARGEST AIRPORT THIS MONTH

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

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, an article concerning the mammoth engineering undertaking of the world's largest airport appeared in the September issue of Consulting Engineer.

With interest being so widespread in the Dallas/Fort Worth Regional Airport since its dedication last month, I would like to include the articles by Stanley Cohen, senior editor, for the RECORD:

DALLAS/FORT WORTH TO OPEN WORLD'S LARGEST AIRPORT THIS MONTH

(By Stanley Cohen)

Dallas/Fort Worth Airport, the largest airport in the world, is scheduled to open this month on a plot of ground that is larger than Manhattan Island. The opening will mark the completion of only the first phase of construction. The entire project is being earmarked for the year 2001, making Dallas/Fort Worth the first jumbo jetport of the 21st century.

The $700 million airport, which sprawls across the North Texas Plains midway between Dallas and Fort Worth, covers some 17,500 acres, or more than 27 square miles. Its area is large enough to contain New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport, Chicago's O'Hare, and Los Angeles' International Airports combined. Size, however, is only the most apparent distinction. Its planners contend it will be the world's most sophisticated airport in providing passenger comfort and airline operating efficiency.

When Dallas/Fort Worth opens, this is what the passenger will find:

Four half-loop terminal superstructures with a total of 66 passenger gates. This capacity will serve some 8 million passengers expected to enplane during the first year of operation. Ultimately, 260 passenger aircraft gates will be available in 13 half-loops, accommodating an estimated 100,000 passengers a day by the year 2001.

A series of modular "mini-terminals" within each terminal loop. Each independent module will serve passengers for one group of airplanes with air traveler able to park his auto directly opposite his flight gate. Walking distances, thus, will be minimal.

Spacious runways, taxiways, and apron areas, allowing jumbo jets plenty of room to maneuver. Planes will be able to land and move quickly through taxiways into terminal areas. Movement from terminal to runway for takeoff also will be unrestricted.

An automated AIRTRANS people-mover system, with electrically-powered and guided vehicles whisking passengers and baggage throughout the airport complex. AIRTRANS will provide the link between the four terminal half-loops, remote long-term parking areas, an on-site 450-room hotel, and the Federal Aviation Administration control facility. Average riding time between any two points will be eight to 12 minutes.

On the whole the project has been planned to meet virtually every problem known to the aviation industry, ranging from noise to saturated airways and penned-in runways, as well as a variety of environmental considerations.

A LONG HISTORY

The decision to build the world's largest airport is not made at a whim. In fact, the first suggestion of a regional airport for Dallas/Fort Worth can be traced as far back as 1927, the year that Charles A. Lindbergh flew the first solo flight across the Atlantic.

Fort Worth moved into commercial aviation in 1927 with the construction of Meacham Field on the city's far north side. That same year, the two cities held brief discussions on the possibility of a regional field. However, the talks proved fruitless, and Dallas struck out on its own with the purchase of the Army airport known as Love Field in 1928.

Both airfields were improved and expanded during the 1930s, but as larger aircraft, such as the four-engine airliners began operation, more expensive improvements were necessary. The airlines also became reluctant to operate from two fields as close together (the two cities are only 34 miles apart) as those of Dallas and Fort Worth because of the costs involved.

The question of a regional airport was raised again in 1940 when both cities requested Federal help for expansion of their airports. In 1941 the Army asked the Civil Aeronautics Administration (forerunner of the Civil Aeronautics Board) to help locate an airfield for its use midway between Dallas and Fort Worth. The CAA turned to Arlington, then a city of only 4000 people and ideally located between the two larger cities. Plans were made for a 1000-acre facility called Midway Airport to be located in Arlington (at the present site of Greater Southwest International Airport) and governed by a seven-member board drawn from all three cities. Once again, difficulties developed, this time with respect to the location of the terminal buildings, and in 1943 Arlington took over the operation of the airport at the request of the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones.

Dallas, in the meantime, decided to proceed with further development of Love Field to make it a major aviation center. Fort Worth acquired Midway from Arlington in 1947 and continued to expand it in the early 1950s into what is now Greater Southwest International Airport.

The Federal Government continued to press for a single facility, and following years of hearings, negotiations, amendments to the State constitution, and voter referendums, the Dallas/Fort Worth Regional Airport Board was formed in 1965. The New York City-based consulting firm of Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton was engaged to prepare the site selection report, which was completed and submitted by the end of 1965. By 1968, TAMS also completed the airport master plan report and the highway development program and was retained as general consultant responsible for overall management and coordination of the project as well as planning, design, and construction management of the entire project except for the terminal complexes and the AIRTRANS system. The terminals were to be designed by a joint venture of two firms: Hellmuth Obata and Kassabum, of St. Louis; and Brodsky, Hopf & Adler, of New York City. The AIRTRANS system was developed by the Ground Transportation Division of the LTV Aerospace Corp., of Dallas.

THE AIRPORT CRISIS

In the sweep of its size and the detail of its design, Dallas/Fort Worth is a response to the airport tangle that has been enveloping the country. Air traffic has been growing at a staggering rate. Total U.S. airline enplanements reached 170 million in fiscal 1971 and 183 million in fiscal 1972. It is expected to hit 524 million by 1984. Many airports already are close to saturation. Los Angeles International, Moissant in New Orleans, O'Hare in Chicago, and both LaGuardia and Kennedy International in New York are running out of room. Kansas City International is the only new facility to be opened since the age of the jumbo jet. Dallas/Fort Worth will be the second and, very likely, the last for the foreseeable future.

The airport crisis has been compounded by the passage of the Airport and Airways Development & Revenue Act of 1970, in which Congress confined airport development projects to those that "shall provide for the protection and enhancement of the national resources and the quality of the environment of the nation." Since it is virtually impossible to build a major airport without matching Federal funds, many authorities believe that no new airports will be built until the act is revised.

THE NOISE FACTOR

Although Dallas/Fort Worth was begun prior to the passage of the 1970 airport act, environmental considerations, particularly noise levels, played a major part in the design and, in fact, were the principal factors in determining its Texas-size dimensions. A computer study was used by TAMS to simulate the noisiest airplane in existence, operating at full capacity and on a hot day—conditions that cause planes to make the most noise. An acceptable noise level was agreed upon—one that already has won court approval—and these tests established the boundaries of the airport. Even when fully developed to meet air traffic demands of the year 2001, the airport's northern and southern boundaries will be more than three miles from the ends of the primary runways, and crosswind runways will end two miles from the airport limits.

The sound analysis took into consideration an estimate of the number, type, and operating characteristics of aircraft expected to be in service by 2001. This information was supplemented by the findings in the Federal Aviation Administration's 1966 air traffic computer simulation study. The results confirmed that 144 peak hour operations could be accommodated.

Aircraft noise is mainly a function of engine characteristics, power setting during takeoff and landing operations, the frequency of these operations, the time of day, and the distance from aircraft. Other factors that affect noise levels, but are relatively unpredictable, are wind direction, temperature, and cloud cover at the moment of observation. All of these were taken into account in making the study.

Also significant in the noise study were projections of aircraft conversion to all-jet operations up to 1985, when it is expected that all airlines using the airport will have converted to jet aircraft. Shortly after 1985, the commercial fleet is expected to retire all turbojet equipment, replacing it with turbofan equipment. The increase in the proportion of these aircraft—including the McDonnell Douglas DC–10, Boeing 747, Lockheed L–1011 and L–500, and Boeing 2707 Supersonic—also was considered in the computer simulation, as many international flights are diverted from traditional seacoast points of entry.

ECOLOGICAL CONCERNS

Ecology also was considered before the site of the airport was chosen. Prior to land acquisition, approximately 12,000 acres of the site were devoted to agricultural uses. Part of the present land management program includes leasing some 2000 of these acres to a resident farmer for agricultural purposes. There are no significant bodies of water, forests, fish, or wildlife species that will be endangered, nor any recreational areas, wildlife refuges, or areas of scenic beauty that will be disturbed by the development and operation of the airport. Neighboring municipalities are rezoning land adjacent to the airport to discourage the con-

struction of such incompatible buildings as schools, hospitals, or residences.

Concern for the ecology has made the airport the site of one of the largest landscaping projects in the country. During the early stages of its design, ecology-conscious planners determined that D/FW's miles of steel and concrete should be in harmony with nature. The result was a master plan calling for greenbelts along airport roadways and in infield areas of the terminal buildings. More than 1.4 million ground cover plants, 10,000 trees, and 3600 shrubs are being used in the project at a cost of $1.5 million.

THREE STAGE PLANNING

The overall plan for Dallas/Fort Worth Airport calls for three developmental stages, the opening to be followed by target dates in 1985 and 2001. The first stage will consist of a 3-million-square-yard runway, taxiway, and apron pavement system; taxiway bridges designed for 1¼ million-pound aircraft; a 10-lane spine highway system; all utilities and communications; four terminal buildings; and 66 passenger gates. The FAA is providing the control tower complex and navaids for the airport. Highways and interchanges at the north and south entrances are being constructed by the Texas Highway Department in accordance with the highway program recommended by TAMS.

The Dallas/Fort Worth facility is the first new airport conceived and planned using the Computer Simulation Facility of the FAA's National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center. In 1968, computer simulation studies by TAMS and the D/FW Airport planning staff on air-space saturation beyond 1985 and subsequent projections indicated that the new regional airport and its 80 nautical-mile air-space could sustain an ultimate annual enplanement demand of more than 50 million passengers.

EXPANDABLE RUNWAYS

Initially, the airport will provide three commercial runways capable of simultaneous aircraft operations, with 66 passenger and 12 cargo gates. The master plan calls for three more runways for commercial use and a ground capacity of 230 passenger aircraft gates and 200 all-cargo gates. In addition, a 5000′ runway will be built later to service general aviation, and two small landing areas are earmarked for STOL (Short Take-Off and Landing) aircraft. Runways will be sufficiently long and thick to handle any plane now in service, and they will be readily expandable to service the rocket-powered aircraft envisioned for future commercial use.

The Phase I layout will include two main north-south runways—one on each side and parallel to the terminal/spine road complex—and a single northwest-southeast crosswind runway. The main runways will be 11,400′ long and 200′ wide, each serviced by two, 100′-wide, full-length, parallel taxiways. The cross-wind runway will be 9000′ by 200′, with a single parallel taxiway.

The possibility of expansion was built into the runway system. The main runways can be extended to 13,400′, and future parallel main runways extending 20,000′ can be added. Additional main runways also would have single parallel taxiways. The present crosswind runway could be extended to 11,000′, and another crosswind runway of similar length could be located on the west side of the airfield.

A time-oriented computer simulation was developed by TAMS to evaluate the performance of the runway, taxiway, and apron layout under various operating environments. This was used to test design and control modifications for improving the efficiency of aircraft ground operations. The program traced the entire series of operations that each aircraft performs between arrival and departure, including runway selection, landing and take-off runway occupancy, turn-off selection, taxiway routing, runway crossings, taxiing delays, parking, apron routing, and gate assignment. Movements to and from cargo and maintenance facilities also were monitored. Operating conditions were varied to test different wind directions, weather conditions, and the effects of flow control. Airline assignments also were varied to determine maximum efficiency of operation.

The computer simulation was coordinated with the FAA and the airlines. The FAA developed the operating rules and procedures to control ground traffic at D/FW, and the airlines provided their projections of future service, including the number of flights, types of aircraft, and gate service times. The simulation concentrated on three time periods—1975, 1985, and the saturation period, probably around the year 2000. The studies showed that certain taxiways could be deleted from the ultimate plan and the construction of others could be deferred from Phase I without impairing operating efficiency.

LOOP SYSTEM OF TERMINALS

The original plan for Dallas/Fort Worth called for a standard terminal design, with long fingers, or corridors, connecting the gates to the main terminal. Parking facilities were to be located directly over the passenger terminal area, with access provided by elevators and escalators. However, horizontal walking distances would have varied from a minimum of 350′ to as much as 1000′, about a fifth of a mile.

In 1968, Thomas M. Sullivan, who was the chief airport planner for the Port of New York Authority and directed the development of Kennedy, LaGuardia, and Newark Airports, was appointed executive director of D/FW. He opted for a drive-to-the-gate concept, which allows the passenger to drive to an entrance opposite his aircraft, thus reducing walking distances to a minimum. As a result, the central plan is replaced with a loop system, which consists of a series of modular mini-terminals. In addition to permitting the traveler to drive directly to his own departure gate, the loop systems provide for modular expansion as airline needs grow.

The drive-to-gate concept is similar to that used at local airports in some of the nation's smallest cities. There one might find a small parking lot fronting a single terminal building which has one ticket counter, one gate, and one plane waiting to be boarded. The D/FW plan, in use since last November at the new Kansas City International Airport, enables the traveler to park his auto in front of the terminal gate serving his flight. Here again, computer simulations were used to program passenger flows and the location of the various functions within the terminal.

LONG-RANGE OUTLOOK

The mini-terminals are contained in four half-loop, crescent-shaped terminal buildings. The mini-terminals will serve a small group of airplanes, and modules can be added as more planes are used. The master plan calls for a total of 13 terminal crescents, increasing the number of gates from 66 to as many as 260, all capable of handling jumbo jets.

Ticketing, check-in services, and baggage check, as well as facilities such as newsstands, lunch counters, and rest rooms will be located near the check-in areas. From front building door to plane door, the passenger may walk as little as 120′ after parking his car in front of the terminal building opposite his aircraft gate. Terminal space below the passenger level will be used for airline offices, a utility road for service equipment, and the airport's intra-airport transportation system.

A modular concept, using precast concrete members, was employed in building the terminal structures. The precast members were factory-formed off-site and trucked in for building assembly. The precast columns and beams were assembled into small modular structural units, permitting maximum flexibility in the size of the facilities to meet the requirements of the individual airlines. The use of structural wedges made the semicircular shapes possible and allowed for the expansion of the terminal buildings. Each of the terminals can be expanded from a length of several hundred feet to a maximum of 3600′. The flexibility of design enabled the buildings to be constructed initially with a minimum cross section of 45′, providing a corridor with small hold rooms, and enlarging where necessary to encompass baggage handling, baggage claim equipment, ticketing areas, holding rooms, amenities, and other areas that may be required by future types of aircraft. Holding the modules to a workable size will make it easy to modify the buildings with minimum interference to the normal function of the operating airport.

ACCESS TO AIRPORT

D/FW has been designed for ease of access to and from the airport, which is accessible from both the north and south. The passenger arriving in his own car will drive along International Parkway, a multilane, high-speed roadway. Passenger traffic will use a separate roadway from trucks and other service vehicles to eliminate confusion and keep traffic flowing.

Concise, easy-to-read signs provide the necessary information on the use of the airport. Large pylons, bearing logos of the various airlines, will be mounted in the median areas of International Parkway adjacent to the terminals serving those airlines. Further signs will indicate which airline terminals are coming up so that drivers will have ample time to turn off into the terminal areas. Signs on the roadways will direct the passenger to the enplaning area, where he will be able to leave his bag with a skycap and drive to a convenient parking location. Boarding areas will be denoted by graphics at the entrances to the terminals.

The terminal roadway system has two road levels. The lower level allows enplaning passengers to drive close to the aircraft gate. The elevated level permits deplaning passengers to get into departing transportation also adjacent to their aircraft gate.

AIRTRANS PEOPLE-MOVERS

Movement within the airport will be as fluid as travel to and from. The decentralized design of Dallas/Fort Worth created the need for a mobile link among its various parts. The solution was found in AIRTRANS, a people-mover system that uses electrically-powered and guided vehicles to move passengers, baggage, mail, and refuse throughout the airport complex.

Basically, two factors were involved in designing the AIRTRANS system: some passengers will come in on one airline and leave on another; and some will leave from one terminal and return to another while their automobile remains at the first terminal.

Initially, the system will use a total of 68 vehicles. Fifty-one of these will be passenger models with a capacity of 40 persons. Seventeen utility vehicles—similar in appearance to a railroad flat-car—will carry baggage, mail, supplies, and trash. The cars are rubber-wheeled and constructed of a fiberglass shell mounted on a chassis equipped with commercially available components. Traveling mainly in pairs, they will move through 13 miles of U-shaped, concrete guideways, connecting terminals with remote parking areas, the on-site hotel, FAA control facilities, and a support area containing an airmail facility and three commissaries. There will be 53 stations.

A central control console system will monitor AIRTRANS movements. There will be 13 predetermined routes and the routing of each car will be controlled by on-board logic. This, however, will be subject to modification by inputs from the central controller to change vehicle routing. Route flexibility is made possible by advance switch design, which allows

cars to branch off and reenter the main guideway path, bringing service where it is needed without breaking the flow of straight-through traffic. With a maximum speed of 17 miles an hour, AIRTRANS will have an average ride time of 10 minutes from any one point in the airport to any other. The cars could be adapted for higher-speed operations outside the airport. The system will have a total handling capacity of 9,000 passengers, 6,000 pieces of luggage, and 70,000 pounds of mail and supplies each hour.

CARGO HANDLING

When Dallas/Fort Worth is completed, it will likely be handling more freight than a seaport. Manufacturers in the area already use air freight service extensively. Forty percent of these firms now ship at least a portion of their products by air. Hundreds more, within easy driving time of the airport, could make use of air freight.

Projections indicate that air cargo traffic will total some 100,000 tons in 1975, increase to 160,000 tons by 1980, and rise to 410,000 tons by 1985. Initially, the freight will be channeled through facilities the airlines have constructed in, or in close proximity to, terminal areas. However, D/FW has in its master plan the eventual development of two cargo cities, one at the north and one at the south end of the airport. Each area could be developed to hold up to 100 gates, with each gate large enough to facilitate loading and unloading jumbo jet aircraft. Full development of the facilities could make D/FW the rival of any seaport.

A NEW AIR AGE

The impact of Dallas/Fort Worth Airport on North Texas is expected to be staggering. Projections call for the employment of 18,000 people on-site by 1975, with a like number of jobs being created off-site because of the airport's existence. Daily population figures, including passengers, employees, and visitors, will skyrocket from just under 90,000 in the first year of operation to nearly 220,000 by 1985. Every community in the area will see tremendous growth. Estimates are that 100,000 people will be moving into the area annually for at least 10 years. Economically, the facility is expected to contribute almost $267 million in direct purchases of goods and services in North Central Texas in its first year of operation. An additional $360 million will be spent indirectly in support of airport operations in the area.

Dallas/Fort Worth will be America's first jumbo jetport built for the 21st century. It might also be more than that. In time, it will provide North Texas with direct air links to all parts of the world. It could do for that section of the country what the intersection of railroad lines did for Chicago in the early 1900s. It could, in effect, be the first step in rearrangement of the country's geographic pivots. A new Air Age may be upon us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ULLMAN), for October 22 through October 30, on account of church convention.

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from September 18, on account of official business as U.S. Delegate to the United Nations.

Mr. MOSHER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through November 5, 1973, on account of Ditchley Foundation Conference on World Energy Resources and Requirements and Their Effect on International Relations.

Mr. KETCHUM, for the balance of the week, 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 Members (at the request of Mr. SARASIN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STOKES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FUQUA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PERKINS, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GROSS, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, for his remarks to appear immediately following rollcall No. 544, in the House, on Tuesday, October 23, 1973, in permanent RECORD.

Mr. MILFORD, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $470.25.

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

Mr. HANRAHAN.
Mr. ROBISON of New York.
Mr. DICKINSON in two instances.
Mr. ERLENBORN.
Mr. SHUSTER.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. HEINZ in two instances.
Mrs. HOLT.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. HOGAN.
Mr. ROUSSELOT.
Mr. HOSMER in four instances.
Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. ASHBROOK in four instances.
Mr. WIDNALL.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. BAUMAN in three instances.
Mr. KEMP.

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

Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.
Mr. LEHMAN in three instances.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. ALEXANDER in 10 instances.
Mr. FISHER in three instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. BENNETT.
Mr. REES in two instances.
Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.
Mr. REID.
Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. DORN in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5943. An act to amend the law authorizing the President to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 23, 1973, present to the President, for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6691. Making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 25, 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:

1476. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a work plan for the Nutwood Watershed project, Illinois, which involves no single structure providing more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1477. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on disbursements made from the appropriation for "Contingencies, Defense" during fiscal year 1973, pursuant to Public Law 92-570; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1478. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of a facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Marine Corps Reserve, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1479. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the first annual report on arms, ammuntion, and implements of war exported under license to all foreign countries and international organizations, covering fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 657 (a) (3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1480. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 93-60 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Com-

mission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 655. Resolution providing for the consideration of HR 10956. A bill, Emergency Medical Services Systems Act of 1973 (Rept. No. 93–606). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 656. Resolution providing for the consideration of HR 9456. A bill to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for 3 years (Rept. No. 93–607). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 657. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10710. A bill to promote the development of an open, nondiscriminatory, and fair world economic system, to stimulate the economic growth of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–608). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. NIX, Mr. STARK, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 11074. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 to provide for the regulation of the export of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BIESTER (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. HEINZ):

H.R. 11075. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Special Prosecutor to investigate and prosecute any offense arising out of campaign activities with respect to the election in 1972 for the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. PODELL, Mr. GINN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 11076. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, coordinated 5-year research program to determine the causes of and cure for cancer, to develop cancer preventative vaccines or other preventatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11077. A bill to provide for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating and cooling; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 11078. A bill to protect trade and commerce against the unlawful restraints and monopoly of organized baseball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 11079. A bill to authorize an independent study of the civil nuclear power functions and special industrial operations of the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FROEHLICH:

H.R. 11080. A bill to establish an Office of Rural Health within the Department of Health Education, and Welfare, and to assist in the development and demonstration of rural health care delivery models and components; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 11081. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Special Prosecutor to investigate and prosecute any offense with respect to the election in 1972 for the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 11082. A bill to establish a loan program to assist industry and businesses in areas of substantial unemployment to meet pollution control requirements; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDRUM (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 11083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of real estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 11084. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to guarantee the constitutional right to vote and to provide uniform procedures for absentee voting in Federal elections in the case of citizens who are residing or domiciled outside the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 11085. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to dietary supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11086. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for regular physical examinations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 11087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide a comprehensive program of health care for the 1970's by strengthening the organization and delivery of health care nationwide and by making comprehensive health care insurance available to all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN (by request):

H.R. 11088. A bill to provide emergency security assistance authorizations for Israel and Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Ms. HOLTZMAN):

H.R. 11089. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for drug abuse therapy programs in schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 11090. A bill to provide a tax credit for expenditures made in the exploration and development of new reserves of oil and gas in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11091. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require the use of forms and documents printed in languages other than English, in appropriate cases, under the various Federal-State public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 11092. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to grant additional authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding conglomerate holding companies involving carriers subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission and noncarriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 11093. A bill to regulate Federal election campaign financing by establishing a Federal Election Campaign Bank and by establishing a Board of Elections and Ethics; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STUCKEY (for himself and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 11094. A bill to extend the protection of the mechanic's lien law of the District of Columbia to subcontractors beyond the first tier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 11095. A bill to establish an Office of Rural Health within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to assist in the development and demonstration of rural health care delivery models and components; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 11096. A bill authorizing the extension of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic $5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California (for himself and Mr. VEYSEY):

H.R. 11098. A bill to clear title to certain real property located in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Imperial County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ROSE, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. HUBER):

H.R. 11099. A bill to provide for the control of imported fire ants by permitting the judicious use of Mirex in coastal counties; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZWACH (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 11100. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to maintain and extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.R. 11101. A bill establishing an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 791. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.J. Res. 792. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. WALDIE):

H. Con. Res. 366. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should reappoint Archibald Cox as special prosecutor, and renominate Elliot Richardson as Attorney General, and renominate William Ruckelshaus as Deputy At-

torney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H. Res. 650. Resolution impeaching Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H. Res. 651. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into and investigate whether grounds exist for the impeachment of Richard M. Nixon; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. MINK:

H. Res. 652. Resolution impeaching Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, of high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. BADILLO):

H. Res. 653. Resolution to express the sense of the House that there will be no action on the nomination for Vice President until such time as the President has complied with the final decision of the court system as it relates to the White House tapes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Res. 654. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into and investigate whether grounds exist for the impeachment of Richard M. Nixon; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BURKE of California:

H.R. 11102. A bill for the relief of Tze Tsun Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 11103. A bill for the relief of Leila M. Eitz (Dieu Thi Minh Nguyet); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WALTER HARNISCHFEGER: A GREAT AMERICAN PASSES

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, 1973, the United States lost one of its most distinguished citizens with the death in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, of Walter Harnischfeger at the age 77. Free men everywhere are poorer for his passing.

Walter Harnischfeger's long and distinguished career as one of this country's most enterprising industrialists spanned a period of more than 60 years from the time he began work as an apprentice at 10 cents an hour until his retirement as chairman of the board of the Harnischfeger Corp., one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of construction equipment.

It was my pleasure and privilege to have known this great American over a period of years and I can say without hesitation that his friendship was one of my most valued possessions.

He was tireless in his advocacy of the sound principle that fiscal sanity must be practiced by government, just as it must be practiced by prudent individuals everywhere.

For those whose lives were not directly enriched by Walter Harnischfeger, I include for insertion in the RECORD at this point a brief biography:

BIOGRAPHY OF WALTER HARNISCHFEGER

Walter Harnischfeger was born in 1895, the son of Henry Harnischfeger, one of the two co-founders of the Harnischfeger Corporation.

He began his business career in his father's firm as a ten-cent-an-hour apprentice at the age of 16. After serving several years as an apprentice in the shop, engineering, estimating, and service departments, he became a salesman and began a series of assignments requiring extensive travel throughout the United States and abroad. From that time on, Walter Harnischfeger was a ceaseless world traveler and a perceptive student of industry and politics in many quarters of the globe.

Largely self-educated, Harnischfeger acquired some formal education by attending night school during his apprentice years. This led to an interest in "learn-while-working" educational institutions, such as the Milwaukee School of Engineering. Harnischfeger took a deep interest in this school and eventually became Chairman of its Board of Regents. For many years his generosity and enthusiasm were keystones in the school's steady growth.

Upon the death of his father in 1930, Walter Harnischfeger became President of the firm and in 1959 became Chairman of the Board.

For many years, Harnischfeger conducted a tireless campaign seeking to encourage a sound fiscal operation in the government. He argued that the public pocket was not bottomless and that even the government had to conduct its affairs in a business-like manner within its income. He decried "give-away" programs, yet he encouraged aid to the underprivileged countries of the world through sound investment programs which enabled the people in those countries to help themselves. As a result of this attitude, the Harnischfeger Corporation became international in operation with eight overseas manufacturing plants making substantial contributions to the economies and welfare of communities in Germany, Japan, Canada, Australia, Chile and Brazil.

Mr. Harnischfeger has long been recognized for his intense interest in people, places and current events. He was a world traveler and an avid champion and believer in the rights and dignity of the individual.

HIS ACTIVITIES INCLUDED

Member of the Board of Trustees of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C.

Member of the Board of Directors of the American Institute for Foreign Trade, Phoenix, Arizona.

Member of the Board of the Milwaukee Chapter of the American Red Cross.

Tustee of America's Future, Inc., New Rochelle, New York.

Member of the Board of Directors of the Boys' Clubs of America, New York, New York.

Former National Chairman and Honorary Chairman of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, Washington, D.C.

Member of the Advisory Board of the Committee for Constitutional Government, New York, New York.

Member of the Federal Finance Committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Formerly Chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government, New York, New York.

Member of the Federal Finance Committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Formerly Chairman of the Committee on Federal Expenditures.

Member of the Board of Directors of the Far East-America Council of Commerce and Industry, Inc., New York, New York.

Member of the Greater Milwaukee Committee for Community Development.

Member of the Board of Trustees and Executive Committee of the Herbert Hoover Birthplace Foundation, Inc., West Branch, Iowa.

Member of the Advisory Board of Leader Dogs for the Blind, Rochester, Michigan.

Member of the Board of Trustees and Governors of the Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas.

Honorary Chairman of the Board of Regents of the Milwaukee School of Engineering. Formerly Chairman of the Board of Regents.

Member of the Finance Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. Former Director.

Director of National Economic Council, Inc,. New York, New York.

Member of the Executive Committee of the International Section of the New York Board of Trade, Formerly Vice Chairman.

Member of the New York Chamber of Commerce.

Member of Omicron Delta Alpha.

Trustee of the Pestalozzi Foundation of America, Inc., New York, New York.

Trustee of the United States Inter-American Council and Member of the Executive Committee, New York, New York.

Former Member of the Advisory Committee of the Federal Reserve Bank—7th District, Chicago, Illinois.

Former Director and Chairman of the National Affairs Committee of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

Former member of the National Defense Committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Former Director of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. Harnischfeger served as a Delegate to the Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce at Lisbon, Portugal; Vienna, Austria; Naples, Italy; and Copenhagen, Denmark.

Mr. Speaker, one who knew him well, Mr. Eugene F. Rinta, executive director of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, wrote as follows to members of the Council on Mr. Harnischfeger's death:

STATEMENT OF MR. EUGENE F. RINTA

Many of you knew "W. H." as an active member of the Council's Federal Finance Committee and a regular attendee at the Council's annual meetings until just a few years ago when his health began to fail. A few of you know that he was the first Chairman of our Federal Expenditures Subcommittee and that, ever since the Council became active in national affairs after World War II, he was one of the most active and loyal participants and supporters that the Council has ever had.

I, personally, have had the privilege of association and friendship with Walter Harnischefeger for almost 25 years, not only

during our committee meetings but more so during innumerable luncheons and dinners with only a few, if any, others present. To me he was much more than an eminently successful industrialist, of which this nation has many. He was the most public-spirited citizen I have known. He did not favor causes commonly characterized as the "do-gooder" approach. Instead, he was a vigorous advocate of government fiscal policies and other measures designed to produce sound economic growth with stable prices to the benefit of all.

Through his extensive travels on all continents, he many years ago became aware of the futility and waste of our foreign aid programs. Typically, he let his views be known and he testified on numerous occasions before Senate and House committees responsible for the annual foreign aid bills. Similarly, he has consistently called for elimination of wastes in defense and domestic nondefense spending and for better overall spending control.

A tribute that well describes W. H. was expressed in January 1960 by his good friend, the late former President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover said:

"I have enjoyed the friendship of Walter Harnischfeger over many years.

"He is one of the most sturdy of Americans. He has built up a large enterprise from the grass roots in true American fashion. He has a great knowledge of our foreign relations from frequent study on the ground in nations abroad. He has devoted a large part of his fortune to charity and the promotion of public welfare.

"In sum, Walter Harnischfeger is the Uncommon Man which the American way of life creates."

Truly the nation has lost a great citizen and the Council has lost a great friend.

Mr. Speaker, to me the most fitting epitaph to Walter Harnischfeger is one he might well have written himself. It goes like this:

Life did not pass me by.
I passed by it.
Fully aware that my place only filled the space left by someone before me, and that it would be filled by another after I was gone.
My purpose, while here, was to take the place given me, to fill it with what I could to help my family, my friends, my country and my company.
To you who might fill my space when I am gone I say . . . do what your conscience dictates, say what your mind believes, influence favorably those whom you meet, and accept the fact that you are mortal. Mourn my passing only to the extent that my passing by influenced you. And, after you have briefly mourned, move on.

REQUEST FOR COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the United States during the course of history has been proud of its achievements of producing the highest level of educational excellence among its citizenry. The reason for this is partially due to the high caliber of our institutions of higher education. One of the foremost leaders in this field has been Hunter College of New York.

Hunter College has submitted a request to the Citizens Stamp Advisory Council to have a commemorative stamp issued to honor the college. I feel this request is worthy of favorable consideration in light of the following facts.

Hunter College was the first institute to offer free higher education for women. In addition, it was the first public institution to establish a free kindergarten in the United States.

Hunter College throughout its long and illustrious history has always been in the forefront of civic, community, and even international life. Without a doubt, Hunter College's single most distinguished honor was its being chosen as the first seat of the United Nations during the first days of the world body's existence. Hunter College has made its influence felt in the community as well as with the establishment, by their alumni association of the Lenox Hill Neighborhood Settlement House and Northrop Camp for underprivileged children.

Hunter College also points with pride to her distinguished list of alumni. Included on this impressive list is my colleague from New York, Ms. BELLA ABZUG, as well as Bess Myerson, former consumer affairs commissioner for the city of New York. The alumni list of Hunter College reads like a veritable "Who's Who" of prominent individuals in all major professions.

In light of these significant credentials, I recommend that they write to the Citizens Stamp Advisory Council and urge them to issue this commemorative stamp. Hunter College has provided quality education for over 100 years, and the issuance of this stamp would be a fitting tribute to the unique contributions and historic firsts this institution has made to the educational history of the United States.

VETERANS DAY CELEBRATION IN BIRMINGHAM

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, at America's largest Veterans Day celebration in Birmingham, Ala., on Monday, Gen. Creighton W. Abrams gave a speech that captured the feelings of the American public toward the country's role in preserving world peace.

General Abrams, long recognized as one of the finest members of our military service, supported the feelings of détente that the Government has established with other world powers. He did not stop here though but further explained that to keep a lasting peace we must keep a strong military to protect us from coercive threats.

I submit General Abrams' speech to the RECORD for I feel the remarks merit the reading of all Members of Congress:

ADDRESS BY GEN. CREIGHTON W. ABRAMS, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY, WORLD PEACE LUNCHEON, BIRMINGHAM, ALA., MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1973

It is a pleasure for me to be here, among so many people who have come together to honor our veterans. It is especially gratifying at a time when it sometimes seems that in the heat of debate and discussion about our policies, the sacrifices of those who fought for their country are forgotten. It is a rare opportunity indeed, for me—or for any officer in the United States Army—to be able to talk directly with so many people about their Army—our Army. I appreciate this chance to tell you how I see the Army today, and how it fits into the world picture.

The environment today is a difficult one for the country's security. The word "détente" has gained some currency.

"Détente" is expressed by some as a fact.

It is applauded by others as a policy.

It is saluted by still others as a new era.

And it provides the basis—at least the semantic basis—for some who would reduce military capabilities to what I believe would be a dangerous level, some who desire that we withdraw out of hand large numbers of troops deployed in Europe against very real and very capable opposing forces, and some whose philosophies discourage young men and women from serving their country in its Armed Forces.

I think it's fair to say that we may be enjoying the beginnings of détente—but we do not have world peace. For some people, the fact that we, ourselves, are not at war may be peace enough. But unless we can lessen the threat of war everywhere in the world, we cannot have a stable, durable peace in which we can depend.

Détente is an idea, a perception of intentions among countries. As such, it is not an objective fact. It can change as quickly as perceptions change. But we must deal in facts—in the reality of power, of capability, of strength—when we are addressing the Nation's security. We should not cast off the dream of peace—God help us if we lost that vision. We should not ignore the hope that possible détente offers, and all the benefits it could bring to mankind. But neither should we lose sight of the real threats and the real dangers where they exist, and of our need to be prepared for them.

We do not have world peace. We do not have peace in any Utopian sense. Nor do we have peace in the down-to-earth sense of a greatly lessened need for our military forces. Yet, today, less than a year after the last U.S. ground combat forces were brought home from Southeast Asia, our Army is less than half the size it was at the peak of our effort there. We are many divisions smaller, and we have fewer weapons. These are in the facts and realities of our capability.

It is also interesting to observe that we are the only major power to have reduced our forces in Europe in the past decade. The Warsaw Pact nations, and the Soviet Union itself, have not reduced their forces. The fact is, in past years, the Warsaw Pact forces have grown steadily and at a rather impressive rate. Again, possible détente—but not assured peace. And again, the delicate balance between hope—human hope—and reality.

In my period of service, which includes the span of three wars, I can tell you that I don't need or want any more war—but then I could have made the same statement a month after I arrived in Europe in 1944. Nobody in his right mind welcomes war, especially those who have seen it. The carnage, the destruction, the pain are beyond telling. But the less prepared we are, the more wishful our thinking, the greater the costs of war when it comes.

I came into the Army in 1936. Where I was, we were a horseback and rifle Army in a country that was still largely convinced that we couldn't have another World War. The idea that we had ended the possibility of war at Versailles blinded many of us to reality. We had heard that there was a German Army, but we ignored the facts in our desire for peace—until we were forced into action. And you know what happened. We did not prepare. When we could no longer avoid it, we got thrown into a huge war in Europe—unready, ill-trained in many respects, saved only by distance and the time bought by our Allies' efforts. In the Pacific, we have Pearl Harbor

and Bataan to remember for our complacent outlook. The cost was dreadful. In Europe, in Africa, in the Pacific we paid and paid and paid again—in lives and in blood—for our unpreparedness; we paid for our insistence that because our shores were not under direct attack, we were at peace.

When that war ended, we erased history again.

When the Korean War broke out, our situation was not much different than it had been in the opening days of the Second World War. We were not prepared. We were not adequately trained. We were not adequately equipped. But we entered the war rapidly, throwing half-ready units in to buy time for the Army to get ready. And again, during those early days in Korea, we paid dearly for our unpreparedness with our most precious asset: the lives of men.

The monuments we raised to heroism and sacrifice in each of these wars are really surrogates for the monuments we owe ourselves; monuments for our blindness to reality, for our indifference to real threats to our security, for our determination to deal in intentions and perceptions, and for our wishful thinking about how war could not come.

In this period of possible détente—not real peace, but possible détente—we are opposed by formidable strength. We face, at various places around the world, strong and capable adversaries, becoming stronger all the time. These are facts. As our relations throughout the world improve, we should consider that we have more and more to gain by preventing another war, and there is only one way I know of to do that. The only way that really ever has worked is for us to maintain our own strength, our capability and our own resolve to defend our security, our freedom, and those of our Allies.

And so for the Army today, this means we must be ready, prepared to stand for our country. Insuring that the Army is prepared is my most fundamental duty, and it is the Army's mission today, as always.

For the Army to be prepared, we must look beyond the countable, measurable indicators of preparedness. We must look to a spirit of preparedness. A "ready" spirit is a precious commodity for our Army: it gives credibility to our strength. And by our credible strength we assure our friends and deter our enemies in the interests of peace.

We hold and nurture and support this precious spirit everywhere in the Army—and we anxiously look for it elsewhere in the country. For this spirit of readiness cannot be sustained by the Army alone. It must have its roots in the rest of the country, or it cannot survive. There must be clear evidence throughout the country that we, as a Nation, are prepared, that we have the spirit and will do what is necessary to defend the country, and to insure its well-being. We must hear the people express their determination:

To support the efforts of their Army,

To meet the needs of the country,

And to avoid the terrible costs of being prepared too late or not at all.

The spirit of preparedness must resound so that any potential enemy can discern it, and can see that he cannot set out on a cheap adventure at our expense.

We cannot do this from the reclining position. We cannot say, "If you start something with us, we will spring to arms," for there will be too little time to begin to get ready. We must be far more committed, far more dedicated, far more prepared than that.

Each time we have faced major war unprepared, we have barely gotten ready in time, and the costs have been atrocious and a disgrace to this Nation. With the support of the people of this Nation, we should not have to pay that price again.

I have faith in this country, and its people. And of course, I have faith in our Army. We have met challenge upon challenge, at home and overseas, in ways that only a Nation of great spirit could have met them. If we set ourselves to the task of preparing for war if it comes, of being ready to meet the challenge of war before it is upon us, we shall be achieving the real peace that men everywhere can understand, and that nations everywhere can respect. Other men have given greatly of themselves for this peace. We cannot let them down.

GIVING THE COMPUTER A CONSCIENCE

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the mushrooming data banks that will store law enforcement information on over 50 million Americans pose an obvious threat to their civil liberties. Doubtless, we are beginning to see evidence that data banks, unguarded and uncontrolled, can cause embarrassment or even severe economic hardship to individuals in this country.

The current issue of Harper's magazine carries a provocative article on the dangers of data banks by J. Taylor DeWeese. A native of my own Pittsburgh and a distinguished young attorney now working in Philadelphia, he is also a member of the Federal Advisory Committee on Data Banks. "Tate," who has been helpful in answering a number of my questions on this subject, suggests that we control the computer and give it a conscience in order to protect the rights of our citizens who become involved with law enforcement agencies. I respectfully insert the reprinting of the article, which follows:

GIVING THE COMPUTER A CONSCIENCE

(By J. Taylor DeWeese)

Two of every five American males will be arrested on a nontraffic charge at some time in their lives. For urban residents, it's three out of five; for blacks, four out of five. A Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement estimates that at this rate some 50 million Americans will have criminal arrest records by the end of the decade.

When they are arrested, their names will be sent to a local data center, then forwarded to the FBI computer at the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) in Washington. There, the record will be encoded on magnetic tape and fed into a data bank that can be instantaneously accessible to employers, police, courts, and credit bureaus at the push of a button on any of some 40,000 remote-access terminals scattered across the country. A "criminal" record for each person remains in the system forever—even if the charges are dismissed, or the matter is referred to the juvenile courts, or the convicted offender is fully rehabilitated.

The Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has spent nearly $90 million to create more than one hundred local data banks. The FBI began feeding criminal histories into its computer last year, and hopes to have the entire national network of local data centers operational by 1975.

The mushrooming data banks that will store law-enforcement information on over 50 million Americans pose an obvious threat to civil liberties. For, despite the presumption of innocence written into the Constitution and the Judeo-Christian doctrine of redemption, a person once accused of a crime is permanently relegated to second-class citizenship. His chances of gaining lawful employment, credit, insurance, education, and community acceptance are greatly diminished. For the person once convicted, these opportunities are often extinguished altogether.

The potential for injury is magnified by the very real possibility that a person's record will be inaccurate or misleading. One-third of the FBI's records are incomplete because local courts and police agencies have failed to submit the final disposition of the charge. Why the FBI continues to broadcast records it knows are inaccurate remains a mystery.

Even more disturbing, many people who have never been associated with a crime will find their names on record. The local crime computer in Kansas City, Missouri, for example, contains the following questionable categories of information: local and national intelligence subjects, college students known to have participated in disturbances, persons with a history of mental illness, persons suspected of shoplifting, persons who have confronted or opposed government officials. Thus, an individual who has merely sought medical treatment or appeared "suspicious" may find himself in files labeled "criminal justice information." The slipshod standards in Kansas City are especially disturbing, because the system was built up during the tenure of police chief Clarence M. Kelley—who is now director of the FBI.

In the past, the inefficiencies of traditional record-keeping gave individuals at least some hope of escaping their past and starting a fresh life. Records scattered across the geographic landscape were lost, buried, or simply inaccessible. A person had a second chance—if only by default.

Today, the growing network of computer record repositories guarantees the immortality of past charges, offenses, and suspicions. The data banks will become a kind of prison—a "record prison"—as the computer with its indefatigable memory and its instantaneous recall locks many into their status as criminal offenders and walls them off from the rest of society. For the record prisoner there is no possibility of parole or time off for good behavior, and no hope of release.

To avoid this scenario, we cannot and need not pull the plug on the computers. Ironically, the same technology that magnifies the potential for abuse offers some opportunities to safeguard individual rights. Computers can be programmed to forget as well as to remember. Complex schemes for expunging names that would have taken hundreds of clerks thousands of man-hours to accomplish can easily be programmed into the computer and performed automatically in a matter of seconds. Codes and passwords can be built into modern data systems to prevent unauthorized access. The computer's memory can be compartmentalized so that users with the right password can get certain information but not other portions of the data. In short, the National Crime Information Center can be programmed to police itself.

Effective controls on the computer must address the threshold issue. Namely, certain classes of personal information—because of their questionable value to law enforcement, their private nature, and their potential for harmful misuse—should be excluded outright from data banks. Legislation should prohibit the inclusion of political surveillance data in the NCIC or its federally funded counterparts at the state and local levels. The retention of such information has a chilling effect on the full expression of First Amendment political rights.

The data banks should be permitted to collect and disseminate only information of an official nature. Raw, unverified intelligence data and informant reports should be excluded. Similarly, all medical information, including records of mental health treatment and narcotics rehabilitation, should be prohibited.

Official criminal justice information should exclude all data on youth arrests and juvenile court proceedings as well as lower-level

brushes with the law, such as vagrancy, drunkenness, traffic violations, and disorderly conduct.

All information that is retained should be carefully screened for accuracy and periodically "cleansed" to remove stale data. The precise provisions of any scheme will generate considerable controversy and will be the product of debate and compromise. Therefore, the following suggestions are designed merely to illustrate the principles at work in striking a balance between the interests of law enforcement and those of the individual.

In determining the length of time data should be stored, it would be helpful to differentiate between the two categories of users: "insiders" and "outsiders." "Insiders" are law-enforcement officials using the system for strictly law-enforcement purposes—the solution of a specified crime. setting bail, determining a sentence. "Outsiders" are licensing agencies, employers, credit bureaus, insurance companies—those who are interested in a person's past as a predictor of present character.

When an individual suspected of a crime is apprehended by the police, a record of his arrest would be entered in the data system. However, it should be sealed to "outsiders" and disseminated only to law-enforcement users.

If the individual has no previous convictions and is acquitted of the present charge, the arrest record should be sealed to *all* users after a probationary period of two years. If the individual is convicted of a new crime during the probation period, his previous arrest would become a permanent part of his record for law-enforcement use. However, only the conviction portion of his record would be disseminated to outsiders.

Likewise, if the individual had a previous conviction, the record of his arrest would be permanently retained for law-enforcement use, but the nonconviction portion of his criminal history would be sealed to outsiders.

In short, all arrests not resulting in conviction would be sealed to employers, licensing agencies, and other outsiders. If an individual had no previous convictions and had a clean record for two years following his arrest, his arrest record would be sealed to all users. If his record was clean for four years, the arrest record would be expunged altogether.

In response to such schemes, law-enforcement officials may contend that the retention of an arrest record serves the legitimate needs of law enforcement even when the individual has no previous conviction. There is some support for this contention. Acquittal means only that the defendant was not proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. It can result from the death of a single witness or the illegal seizure of evidence. With this in mind, the drafters of remedial legislation should consider including a provision allowing the police to make application to a federal court for an order authorizing the continued maintenance of an arrest record for law-enforcement purposes. This relief should be exceptional and should be granted only in those cases in which the petition has substantially shown the existence of special circumstances. In the case of the individual who has never been convicted of a crime, the possibility that arrest data will be leaked to outsiders warrants the sealing and ultimate destruction of nonconviction records in the absence of exceptional circumstances.

Arrest records are only one dimension of the problem. Programs should also be designed for expunging the records of convicted first offenders and of offenders with multiple convictions, although the probationary periods should be must longer.

The thoughtful application of computer technology will also help preserve distinctions between authorized and unauthorized use. Manual record-keeping often made efforts to regulate use meaningless. Files marked "sealed" or "for official use only" afford the individual little real protection. Computers offer new safeguards. Think of the data base of a computer's memory as a tree with data leaves on its various branches. Data of varying sensitivities can be stored in different leaves. As a user passes through the hierarchy of memory, the computer can run an automatic check on the user's security clearance to determine if he is authorized to proceed into that area of the memory bank. For instance, the computer could be programmed to grant outsiders access to conviction data while denying them arrest information.

To help ensure observance of the insider-outsider distinction, all criminal data systems should be under the control of a disinterested agency that is neither an inside nor an outside user of criminal records.

The FBI is definitely not a disinterested agency, and its indiscriminate data collection has received so much detailed criticism that one state—Massachusetts—refused to become part of the National Crime Information Center. This decision cost Massachusetts dearly in lost federal funds, but state officials nevertheless resolved not to participate in a system with such a loose regard for individual rights. They recognized a principle that should apply to all computer crime networks—that unproven accusations, ancient transgressions long since expiated by responsible conduct, and inaccurate and misleading information should not be indiscriminately broadcast under governmental auspices.

The reality of the modern computer closely resembles the heartless nature of Omar Khayyám's Moving Finger which, "having writ,/Moves on: nor all thy Piety nor Wit/ Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line, / Nor all thy Tears wash out a word of it." Like the Moving Finger, computers lack the inherent ability to forget, to forgive, to understand.

By giving the computer a conscience, we can give many more Americans a chance for a fresh start and a new life.

ARE POSTAL CHANGES FOR THE BETTER?

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, no example better illustrates the truth of the saying that not all changes are for the good than the actions of our Postal Service. I would like to share with my colleagues at this point a letter from two of my constituents commenting on the mail service between their city in eastern Arkansas and the State university in the extreme western portion of the State:

HELENA, ARK.,
October 17, 1973.

Hon. WILLIAM ALEXANDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are writing to inform you of the poor mail service from Helena to other points in Arkansas. Our son is a student at the Univ. of Ark. at Fayetteville and it takes two days for a letter to reach him from Helena. The reason for this is that all mail leaving Helena is sent to Memphis where it is resorted and then sent to points in Arkansas. We do not have direct mail service from Helena to Little Rock which we did have up until a few months ago.

We wish that something could be done to improve all mail service.

Sincerely,

BARTON G. WELLBORN,
ELIZABETH WELLBORN.

IS THE DOOR CLOSED?

HON. E. G. SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of the Vice President has evoked criticism and shock, sympathy and disillusionment, from every strata of our society. Indeed, such emotions are justified, but the real tragedy may not yet be uncovered.

The real tragedy may be those young, talented, and aspiring public servants who may choose to drop out of public life rather than be subjected to constant pressures by their financial supporters. The real tragedy may be those candidates who cannot afford to finance a campaign and who have to rely on the contributions of their supporters, for such contributions may dwindle quickly rather than undergo constant and threatening scrutiny.

Our political system has suffered a jolt. But we cannot allow the quality of government to suffer as a result. Steps must be taken to insure that each and every qualified candidate for public office be given the same opportunity, the same chance to be elected.

Mr. Speaker, the Altoona Mirror, a daily newspaper in my congressional district with a circulation of approximately 36,000, has recognized this manifestation of the Vice President's tragedy, and had an excellent editorial in the October 20, 1973, issue. I insert at this time the editorial in the RECORD, so that all may share in the remarks of this enlightened newspaper:

IS THE DOOR CLOSED?

Is the door to high public office now closed to the sons and daughters of the poor, the middle class and even the moderately well-to-do citizens of the United States? Is the lock to that door contrived so that only the golden key of the multimillionaire will open it? Has the party that has always claimed to be most interested in the poor, the working people, the minority groups now adopted the theory that only the very, very rich have the right to select from their own group those who are to head this nation?

The persecution as well as the prosecution of Spiro T. Agnew as vice president of these United States raises these serious questions. Are those who proclaim themselves as liberals really liberal in the ordinary sense of the word? Or are they more interested in building an autocracy in this nation than in preserving it as a democracy? How long can they fool so many people into thinking that those who possess great material wealth are the only ones fitted for high office?

The son of the hard-working but poor Greek immigrant possessed a real political talent. It might have been buried forever if some of his friends had not encouraged him with gifts of money and influence, for even the smaller political offices are won by campaigns, and campaigns need money. Not all political contributions are made in the expectation of getting favors in return for the donations. Sometimes friends and neighbors

just like to see a young politician get ahead in his chosen profession.

As the young politician rises in stature and the jobs become larger, the costs of getting elected also rise. Corporations are forbidden to give campaign contributions, but organized labor groups are not. Neither are those millionaires to whom the big political contribution is merely "pocket money." Fund-raising for candidates is usually turned over to people who have the ability to raise funds, and candidates are not always aware of the ways by which such funds are raised.

"The new morality" seems to suggest that the candidate is responsible for everything that happens in his campaign. They seem to forget that most candidates spend all their strength and thought in the campaign itself. They exhaust their physical energy shaking hands, making speeches, rushing hither and yon to "meet the people," but somehow they are supposed to also know all that is going on in the other campaign to raise funds for them and for their party.

"The new morality" can forgive a man whose companion drowns while he escapes from the same car and "forgets" to report the accident until all hope for the trapped companion is gone. He can escape questions at an inquest. He can escape questions when he is reelected to high public office. His family has money.

We do not condone the buying of political favors. Neither do we think a government expenditure of tax money to finance elections would be a safe way to insure fair elections. We do not believe that big unions should contribute great sums of money to buy influence at all levels of government from dues extracted from the working people. We do believe that all those who cherish real democracy, who want the door open for men of talent, should reexamine their own capacity to give money and effort toward the election of those in whom they believe.

Isn't it about time our two great political parties quit name-calling, mud-slinging and character assassination and get back to clear-cut political objectives that define the party stand on leading questions?

Keep the door open for those whose talents for political leadership outweigh the circumstances of their birth.

MADRIGAL SINGERS

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, in these times of international tensions, it is encouraging to hear of efforts to dispel the image of the "ugly American" and promote good will.

Sixteen boys and girls from my district, calling themselves the Madrigal Singers of LaSalle Senior High School, toured Romania for 3 weeks this summer. Recently, the supervisor of music for Niagara Falls public schools, James E. Buffan, received a letter from Charles Abdoo, president of American Youth Performs, Inc., sponsors of the tour.

It is obvious that the small group of Madrigal Singers from Niagara Falls has won the hearts of the Romanian people.

Mr. Abdoo said:

And, this tour probably did more to cement better relations between the United States and Romania than anything that has happened to date.

We were glad to sing for anyone who asked us.

The youngsters say they sang not only in scheduled concerts, but in restaurants and hotel lobbies and even while walking down the street during their sightseeing tours.

Their joy and enthusiasm were contagious to the Romanian people.

Mrs. Margaret C. Bowen, LaSalle music teacher, says of her group:

Wherever we went people stopped to watch or join in our activities.

The Madrigal Singers were born about 3 years ago as an extracurricular, after-school activity. The students raised funds for their trip through donations from area corporations and individuals, community concerts, sales of bumper stickers and buttons, raffles, and a dinner dance.

I applaud and thank the Madrigal Singers: Marlisa Bach, Sherry Brothers, Cynthia Conmy, Robert Crouch, Susan Fallon, Barbara Gruver, Hillard Harris, Wayne Heck, Majorie Horne, Mary Ellen Illig, Matthew Keller, William Potter, Suzanne Ranchil, Linda Reisig, Lois Stipp, and William Woods.

Also, those who accompanied them deserve praise:

Mrs. Bowen, Miss Judith Ottaviani, the Rev. Vincent Verrastro, Terence Brown, and Bonnie Milburn.

ISRAEL IS NOT VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has requested that the Congress authorize emergency security assistance for Israel.

There are many reasons for American support for Israel and for the judgment that Israel is different from South Vietnam.

South Vietnam is a military dictatorship where opposition politicians and religious leaders are jailed and newspapers critical of the government are suppressed. Israel is a democracy with strong opposition parties and freedom of speech.

In Southeast Asia, the fighting was Vietnamese versus Vietnamese. Israel is the victim of attacks across recognized cease-fire lines by military forces of other nations and other peoples.

The South Vietnamese Government asked for U.S. troops from the beginning of their war and Americans did most of the heavy fighting there for a number of years. In four wars, Israel has never asked for American troops. It has proven it is willing and able to fight its own wars.

Our effort in the Middle East is limited to counterbalancing Soviet arms sent to the area. In Vietnam, the mistake was sending American troops, in addition to equipment, while the Soviets and the Chinese were supplying only equipment.

In Vietnam, American psychological warfare experts felt it was necessary to launch special campaigns to win "the hearts and minds" of the South Vietnamese people to the cause of their government. There is no such problem in Israel.

The United States spent years trying to force the South Vietnamese to sit down at the conference table with their adversaries. Additional months were spent quarreling over the shape of the table. For years Israel has been actively seeking to sit down and negotiate all differences with its adversaries.

It is no secret that South Vietnamese officials pocketed millions of dollars in U.S. economic aid. Aid to the Israelis has meant the draining of swamps, the building of factories and the resettling of refugees in desert areas which were barren for a thousand years.

There is one last reason why Americans know that Israel is different from Vietnam. They know a Vietnamese nation will survive regardless of the outcome of the war in Southeast Asia. If Israel loses its war, it would be the end of the Israeli nation.

ACTION ON THE GEOTHERMAL FRONT

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago Congress passed and the President signed the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970. This act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to identify and lease Federal lands with a known or potential geothermal promise. It was an important first step in the development of this resource.

Tuesday a second important step was taken in this regard: The Department of the Interior released a massive final environmental impact statement, as required by section 102(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act. The thrust of the impact statement is that the development of geothermal energy is not without some environmental consequences, but that these impacts are not intolerable and in some cases far less severe than those of competing energy sources.

I think it is important to note that the Department took a full 3 years to draw up implementation plans and to study the environmental ramifications involved in the exploratory development of this vital new resource. This was longer than I had thought it should take. But in a very real sense, this time-consuming yet necessary process shows us that the Department and the administration are firmly committed to the idea that we can, must, and will meet the energy demands of the years ahead with a balanced concern for the many environmental equities involved. The many departmental officials who took part in this effort deserve thanks and respect for their diligent efforts.

It is now time to proceed with a measured and considered program to develop what could eventually be a vital cornerstone of the energy sector. Geothermal energy offers much to those with the vision and wherewithal to grasp its implications.

FINEST EAGLE SCOUT IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, John S. Jordan, 17, a resident of my congressional district, has been chosen as the best of the best by the National Activities Committee of the Boy Scouts of America in Chicago. John reached the finals by being judged the outstanding Explorer Eagle Scout in the Northeastern part of the country and Europe in mid-September.

I had the distinct pleasure of meeting this young man not too long ago when he visited a Masonic lodge. Contrary to what many think about the youth of today, John Jordan, I feel, typifies what is right with the youth of America and what is right about our great country. He is completely dedicated to his God, his family and his country.

Nothing could please me more than to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Eagle Scout John S. Jordan of Oaklyn, N.J.

I submit the enclosed article from the Courier-Post so that my colleagues might share his accomplishments.

The article follows:

SINGLED OUT AS FINEST EAGLE SCOUT IN UNITED STATES—OAKLYN YOUTH IS CHOSEN BEST OF THE BEST

(By Pete Finley)

In between serving as the current Boy's State governor of New Jersey, winning the outstanding biology student award at Collingswood High School, being elected to the National Honor Society, being the drum major of his high school band, playing first solo trombone for the dance band at the same school and lots of other things too numerous to mention, John Jordan has just been chosen THE Eagle Scout of the entire United States.

The 17-year-old high school senior was picked as the best of the best by the National Activities Committee of the Boy Scouts of America in Chicago earlier this week. He reached the finals by being judged the outstanding Explorer Eagle Scout in the Northeastern part of the country and Europe in mid-September.

LOCAL START

John and other finalists began the quest for the impossible dream by first winning the nod of their local activities committee which, in John's case, was the Camden County unit. According to John, almost all Eagle Scouts and Eagle Explorer Scouts were eligible which meant that literally thousands of candidates were in contention.

The finalists represented the best from six geographical areas of the country. There were 12 finalists, six Explorer Scouts and six Scouts.

In February the two winners will get the red carpet treatment which includes a Congressional breakfast on Capitol Hill in Washington, followed by a personal interview with President Richard M. Nixon.

John, who lives at 119 Woodland Terrace, Oaklyn, with his mother and maternal grandparents, hopes to study medicine "in some top university like Dartmouth." He wants to "serve his fellow man" and considers the role of a physician "as a very special way to serve." "If I find that I don't like medicine, I'll enter some other form of social work," he said.

A member of Explorer Post 335 of the Camden County Council, John started as a Cub Scout at age eight, advancing to Scout which, he said, is geared to age groups from 11 to 15. At 15, he became an Explorer Scout, an activity which includes coeducational programs up to age 21.

John said the academic discipline and personal motivation which helped get him where he is "was due in a large measure to the many trying and demanding experiences of scouting which developed character and leadership qualities that might have lain dormant."

A member of the First United Methodist Church of Collingswood where he is song leader for Sunday School and youth organist, John finds relaxation in music and swimming "in whatever spare moments I have."

He said he will remain in Scouting "probably for the rest of my life" in one capacity or another. The program has "too much to offer to others for me not to stay interested in it," he said.

BENNETT ACTS ON AGNEW GRAFT

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: The recent disclosures surrounding the resignation of Vice President Agnew have led me to believe that legislation is very much needed which would require that all U.S. Government contracts for services and materials be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder. I have prepared such legislation, the wording of which is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all contracts by the United States Government for services and materials shall be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder, including contracts for architectural and engineering work. Further, that all contracts financed in whole or in part by Federal funds shall be awarded only to the lowest qualified bidder, including contracts for architectural and engineering work.

This legislation includes Government contracts for architectural and engineering work now passed out generously without bids to interested firms. The bill would also provide that all contracts financed in whole or in part by Federal funds would be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder.

The 40-page statement compiled against the former Vice President reveals in the State of Maryland what is apparently a longtime pattern there of political corruption through the noncompetitive awarding of contracts. I believe that Congress should do everything it can right now to see that this is no longer allowed on the Federal level.

I am currently seeking cosponsors for this legislation.

SPECIAL NIXON-COURT-CONGRESS CRISIS QUESTIONNAIRE BEING SENT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past week surrounding the Watergate investigation threaten government with a confrontation that may only be resolved by action in the Congress. Because I value the opinions of my constituents and want their advice, I am mailing the following questionnaire to each household in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

My constituents are asked about their recent and prospective voting habits, how they view themselves politically, whether they feel the office of the President is above the law under any circumstances, and their opinion of impeachment proceedings against the President should he refuse a court order to turn over relevant tapes and documents regarding the Watergate.

Moreover, the poll attempts to gage the level of trust people have in their elected public officials. It seems to me that restoring eroded confidence is of vital importance to all elected officials. I am hopeful this questionnaire will reveal the extent of the work ahead for all of us in public life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the full text of the questionnaire be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The text follows:

1. Did you vote in the 1972 Presidential election?

2. Would you vote if a national election were held right now?

3. Do you intend to vote in the 1974 General Election for a governor, U.S. Senator, and U.S. Representative?

4. What is your political registration? (Republican, Democrat, not registered, other)

5. Which of the following best describes your political views? (Check one)

Conservative
Moderate
Liberal

6. Do you feel that the office of the President is above the law under any circumstances?

7. With the abolition of the office of the Special Prosecutor, would you favor action by Congress to establish a Special Prosecutor's Office to pursue the Watergate grand jury investigation?

8. Which of the following best expresses your feelings about the President's actions to dismiss Special Watergate Prosecutor Cox and force the resignations of Attorney General Richardson and Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus? (Check one)

Strongly approve
Mostly approve
Mostly disapprove
Strongly disapprove
No opinion

9. How would you feel about impeachment proceedings if the President refuses to obey a court order to turn over Watergate tapes, telephone logs and other relevant documents?

Strongly favor
Mostly favor
Mostly opposed

Strongly opposed
No opinion
10. How would you describe your attitude toward elected public officials (Check one).
Trust all
Trust most
Trust some
Trust none

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a new, compromise bill on child abuse and neglect, H.R. 10968. I think it is now pertinent to make clear in some detail the features of this compromise of the several bills, including my own, currently before the Select Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee.

The bill has three titles. Title I establishes a clearinghouse in the newly created Office of Human Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The purpose is to centralize information concerning the many and various efforts that are currently being made on the question of abuse and neglect. This is similar to my data bank proposal and the clearinghouse proposal of other bills; $1 million annually is authorized for this title.

Title II is the crucial provision. It authorizes $20 million annually to States which submit appropriate child abuse and neglect plans to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The rationale is that certain minimum facilities and procedures are necessary in the community if money spent is to be of any value.

I wish to emphasize the plan requirements in the bill represent minimum standards for State action, and are not meant to mandate a detailed blueprint for child services. The States are left free—as they should be—to write the details of their own programs on child abuse and neglect.

Specifically, the State plans must include an effectively enforced child abuse reporting law, mandatory reporting requirements, immunity from prosecution for reporting—should there be any difficulties with a mistaken report—and a provision for misdeameanor penalty for those who fail to report.

The State plan must also provide for prompt investigation of complaints of abuse and neglect, and contain minimum procedures for handling the broad problems of prevention and treatment. Additionally, it must provide for emergency custody of the child in appropriate cases.

Finally, the State agency is mandated to enter into cooperative arrangements with private, nonprofit groups to insure all the resources of the community are utilized.

Title III authorizes $5 million annually for demonstration grants for research, training, and innovative projects. This meets the special needs in this area not served by a State program, and assists the funding of existing private programs already doing useful work in these areas.

H.R. 10968 is a compromise between my previous bill, which relied exclusively on funding State agencies with State plans, and those bills concentrating on demonstration grants and further studies.

My bill adds demonstration programs to the State agency mechanism, but drops the study commission called for in the demonstration grant approach.

It is my conviction that existing studies and research programs cover the need in this area. Moreover, I am concerned that a bill which concentrates on further study—through the creation of a National Commission—will delay a commitment to a broad based program. We have sufficient information to proceed with the beginings of such a program, while continuing to study the program through the mechanisms associated with both the State programs and the demonstration grants.

Finally, I have altered the definition of abuse to include neglect, a much larger and tougher problem in the long run. This area, touching on matters such as exploitation of the child, and severe detriments to his psychological health—is so closely related to the problem of abuse that I feel it should be treated as an integral part of the problem.

MININUKES AND DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AND OTHER THINGS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, I spoke at a Navy dinner sponsored by the Armed Services Committee of the city of Long Beach. The remarks covered such subjects as resupply in the Mideast, the advisability of disestablishing the Department of the Air Force, possibilities for using small, clean, discrete nuclear weapons, called mininukes, and their implications to NATO and to the Navy, whose 198th birthday the occasion was celebrating, and other things. The text of these remarks follows:

U.S. NAVY BIRTHDAY, 1973

This evening we have gathered to celebrate the 198th birthday of the United States Navy—an institution described by Herman Wouk as a thing "conceived by geniuses for operation by idiots."

But whatever its origin and whoever may have been its creator, the United States Navy stands today—in ships—in men—in tradition—in spirit—and in its unparalleled record of victories at sea—as indisputably the greatest Navy that history has ever known.

And, we rededicate ourselves to keeping it that way.

I am proud and grateful for my 33 years service as an enlisted man and officer in that Navy's Reserve Forces. I know each of you is proud and grateful for your own particular association with this unparalleled organization.

In this audience tonight are many who have been shipmates with the great naval persons of our times such as: Chester Nimitz, Ed Spruance, Bull Halsey, Arleigh Burke, Jack McCain, Tom Moorer, Bud Zumwalt, Hyman Rickover and a host of others who—in hot war and cold—have protected their country with courage and brilliance.

And behind shining leaders such as these—and as it always has been from our Navy's beginning in 1775 to this very moment—active duty personnel, reservists, civilian employees, dependents and retirees have combined forces to forge a proud naval tradition of commitment and service to our Nation.

These people, and people like yourselves who support this Navy so loyally, constitute our naval family. This family, through nearly two centuries of peace and war, has continued to affirm the truth of President John Adams' words that "naval power is the natural defense of the United States."

From sail to steam to nuclear power—from cutlass and cannon to guided missiles—from the open seas to outer space—the unfailing skill, selfless sacrifice and wholehearted devotion of the Navy family have remained ever constant to place and to maintain our Navy at its historic pinnacle of preeminence.

By this ceremony today we rededicate ourselves to maintaining this Navy's dominance of the world's oceans during the indefinite future. For, it is only by control of the seas that an island nation such as ours can, for long, control its own destiny.

This each of you knows as surely as you know that day follows the night. And, what each of you also suspects, is that it will be no easy task to keep control of the seas and maintain that preeminence of the United States Navy in the years ahead. That is the prospect as I see it, too. That is what I want to speak with you about this evening.

It is said that those who fail to remember the lessons of history are doomed to relearn them. In the recent period of relaxation of tensions between the world's two superpowers some people in very high places have already forgotten those lessons. Ignoring the ceaseless stream of battles and conflict that have characterized the relations of people and nations throughout history, the House of Representatives, within just the past few weeks, dealt a stunning blow to the defense of this nation by adopting the Aspin amendment imposing a blanket reduction in this year's defense authorization of almost a billion dollars. Then the United States Senate came within two votes of killing the TRIDENT submarine program which is so essential to the deterrence of a nuclear attack on this Nation. On vote-after-vote other measures were adopted, one-by-one, each dealing some further blow to the capability of the armed forces of the United States to defend the United States.

All this was done by those who quickly forgot the existence of an inexorable ebb and flow in hostility between nations which was only recently reaffirmed at an awful cost in American lives by the Vietnam War. To such naive legislators the Russians seem friendly; therefore they are friendly. Things are what they seem. That is the fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, and any nation which embraces such a delusion must embrace it as a hari-kari knife.

An essay under my name in the August issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings warns that no nation can fall for long below a certain minimum level of defense effort without arousing the instincts of predators. Fortunately some of the House and Sen-

ate blows to the Armed Services Authorization bill were eased because the outbreak of the renewed fighting in the Arab-Israeli war served to remind some of my Congressional colleagues of the existence of such predatory instincts.

But even so, the long range trend in this country is definitely anti-military and that means that those of us who do remember History's lessons are going to be hard pressed to garner appropriations from the Congress year-after-year which will support the minimum necessary national defense.

Even today, in real terms of constant value dollars, 1974 Defense Department resources will be almost 14% below those of 1964, that year being the last peacetime year before Vietnam. Our military investment in ships, research and construction will be almost a third lower in 1974 than it was 10 years ago in 1964. This means that this year the U.S. defense effort will be lower than during any year of the 1950's—a decade when things were relatively placid.

But the truth is that things generally around the world and things particularly between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are just not that much better than they were then.

In my Naval Institute article I pointed out that the current detente between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and the Peoples Republic of China occurs not because we all suddenly love each other. Communist dogma decrees that all other systems must be destroyed; and that until they are, the world is not safe for communism; and that communist military power is the ultimate instrument by which the world is to be made safe for communism. Now, dogma does not say when all this is to be done or exactly how, and it warns against doing it in some reckless or adventurous way that risks ultimate defeat. Dogma also is a little unclear about many other things and the Soviets and the Chinese interpretations of them are quite at odds. In fact, they have fallen into a serious dialectical dispute with each other about it all.

And, even more relevant to the situation at hand, those two countries also have fallen into a much more basic kind of a dispute. Each is a growing, vital, expanding society. Each knows that achieving its ultimate destiny requires expansion into the vast Siberian heartland of Asia. Moreover, both know that, as enormous as the vacant real estate is, there is room enough there for just one of them, not for both of them. Thus they recognize and acknowledge themselves to be in a bitter conflict for ultimate survival.

Detente simply means that while those two are fighting their intramural Communist battle—which might well turn into a hot war, even employing nuclear weapons—the rest of us may be able to relax somewhat for a little while. But it certainly does not mean that we can pound our swords into plowshares. It does not even mean that the United States can assume that the P.R.C. and the U.S.S.R. will not call a truce in their own dispute if an opportunity arises whereby they can temporarily join forces to eliminate the United States as the next largest threat to either of them.

That is one reason why the current war in the mideast poses such dangers to us. I do not believe the Soviets at this point want that war to get out of hand. I believe they want to deal with their China problem first and for that reason they will try reasonably hard to keep alive the spirit of detente with the West.

But should the United States move too decisively in the mideast—move too far toward developing circumstances there inimical to the basic interests of the Soviet Union—then there is a possibility that Moscow can come to believe that its self-interest can only be forwarded by a direct confrontation with the United States. I hope we are smart enough—and patient enough—to avoid precipitating that kind of a confrontation. I believe we are. I pray we are.

Despite the caution I have just expressed, I think the United States and Russia can get away with replenishing the material losses their respective client states are suffering as the fighting goes on. I believe that each will carefully look the other way as this is discreetly done. But neither had better try any augmentation—and they both know it.

But, there are other players in the mideast tragedy and therefore other dangers.

There are rumors that Israel has nuclear bombs and would use them as a last resort if pressed too hard.

There are rumors that Red China might clandestinely give a few nuclear weapons to either or both sides, hoping to trigger an escalation of warfare in the mideast which would envelope the superpowers in mushroom clouds that simultaneously consume both of China's superpower enemies.

In addition to these nuclear threats, there is the volatile, unpredictable psychology of the Arabs to consider. This might lead to an effort by them to pressure and distress the United States through denial of petroleum which we are coming to rely upon in ever increasing measure. Such a move would likely disturb Western Europe and Japan as much or more than the United States.

Nothing of what I have said in this recital of the perils and dangers our country faces in just one region of the world can be anything but deeply disturbing to each of us. I only ask that you try to visualize how much more hazardous the situation might become—and how much deeper in harm's way we might be—if today in the Mediterranean there were no United States Sixth Fleet.

Today's crisis is another vivid current history lesson pointing to the absolute indispensability of U.S. naval forces to the security of our nation.

Think about it—and then try to give me one good reason why we should allow those to succeed who want to scuttle the United States Navy in the name of economy, or under the banner of "social needs", or alleged "human priorities", or any other soft-headed slogan. This Navy is not only our life-line, it is basic to our national life itself.

Yet this is the Navy that is steadily being debilitated by reductions in dollar support from the Congress and by the steady erosion of the buying power of the dollars it does manage to lay hold of. A moment ago I mentioned that we are living through a bleak period of anti-militarism which is likely for the indefinite future to severely restrict the allocation of public resources to defense. Therefore we must examine ways by which the reduced number of dollars likely to be available can suffice to buy the bare minimum defense effort which experience in our hostile world tells us we cannot safely be without.

At this point I am going to take a brief stroll through the political minefields by examining two of those possible ways. One has to do with the Air Force and the other with nuclear weapons of a new type which are clean and discrete in their effects. A few months ago I coined for them the name "mininuks" and that is how they are known in the Pentagon, NATO and elsewhere.

First, as to the Air Force, born in 1947, during post-WWII enthusiasm for the wild blue yonder. Today, 26 years later, there exists a very legitimate question—and it is a hot one—whether reconsolidating airpower functions back into the Army and the Navy from whence they came might lead to considerably improved effectiveness in the expenditure of limited defense dollars. As it is we tend to think of the defense appropriation as a pie to be sliced up annually in three roughly equal pieces. Yet the burden of defense necessities in the post Vietnam world do no fall equally at all. They fall heaviest on the Navy which must function worldwide, next on the Army, and last on the Air Force. I'm not going to delve any further into the subject of disestablishing the Air Force. I just light the fuse and toss it, realizing the thing is likely to be back in my face by the time it is ready to go off.

And, the same is probably true for the subject of mininuks to which I now proceed. Let me introduce it by recalling that the essence of military power is the ability to destroy, which we conventionally think of in terms of 100, 500, 1000, 5000 and 10,000 pound bombs and warheads. Paradoxically, if we possess such a capability for destruction of military forces and the ability to project it wherever and whenever it is needed, we are unlikely ever to use it, simply because others are deterred by this potential from challenging us.

Unfortunately, of late the cost of lugging that power around and projecting it when and where needed has escalated considerably and there is no end to this economic phenomenon in sight. If we are going to continue to adequately defend our interests and our independence with fewer dollars that buy less, then we are going to have to explore less costly ways of going about it.

I'll return to the Navy situation in a minute, but the thought I have in mind is most easily projected by reference to its application in a land war situation. Let's think for the moment of the defense of Europe by NATO forces from an invasion by Soviet forces, or, put another way, NATO's ability to deter such an invasion by maintaining an obvious capability to repel it. Now, think of a map of that area with a lot of red dots on the Soviet side of it representing tanks and soldiers and airplanes. Think of a lot of blue dots on our side of the map representing American and other NATO forces.

At this point, if you are thinking realistically, you are seeing a lot more of their red dots than you are seeing of our blue dots—and the disparity in numbers and strength is growing. One reason it is growing is that a Soviet tank costs maybe $100,000, while the NATO tank we need to neutralize it costs maybe $1,000,000. At those prices our side can soon get tilted out of the game. We need an equalizer. We need an equalizer which we can afford to buy in quantity and project against those tanks and destroy them if they come after us.

To accomplish that kind of destruction with 1000 pound bombs requires a lot of $2 million airplanes operating from several $200 million bases backed up by a $2000 million logistics supply train. In contrast, a clean and discriminate mininuk might pack the effect of 1000 pounds of TNT in less than a 100 pound package. This small, clean package of destruction might be accurately delivered at a rather modest cost by a relatively small piece of artillery or a guided rocket. Even on a tight budget one could afford to buy enough of this kind of blue dots to stand off a very large number of their kind of red dots.

Now let us return to the naval arena and test out what the potential is there for this anti-red dot mininuk thing.

As prices now stand, in capital costs alone, projecting naval destruction from a patrol frigate costs $50 million per frigate and $90 million per each new 963 Spruance class destroyer. From a 92,000 ton nuclear carrier the cost runs about a billion dollars for the ship and a half billion more for an air wing. The new 10,000-ton nuclear guided missile destroyers cost a quarter of a billion dollars each, without their missiles.

But for a 1,000-ton, 80-mile-an-hour surface effect ship, the cost is $2½ million.

Yes, that's right—not $50 or $90 or $250 or a thousand million dollars, but only $2½

million for a ship that could carry enough light, mininuk-tipped guided rockets to equal the firepower of a modern DD. You could buy 36 of them for the cost of one single 963 class destroyer. The potentiality of this new and infinitely cheaper kind of naval hardware, if and when combined with the clean, sharp destructive potential of mini-weight mininuks, is truly startling. The combination offers an equalizer at a price we can afford to pay which can put us efficiently back into the business of controlling the seas and defending this country's vital national interests.

The barrier to utilizing it is simply the fact that mininuks bear the stigmatized nuclear name.

The truth is that, though based on nuclear principles, the nature and destructive power of this warhead will be much closer to that of gunpowder than it is to an atomic bomb. The general public must be brought to understand this so we can get over the anti-nuclear psychological hurdle that prevents mininuk additions to the defense arsenal of the United States. This roadblock constitutes a particularly severe handicape to development of the less costly naval hardware our Navy must have if it is to acquire the quantity of naval surface units required to assure freedom of the seas in the face of rapidly expanding hostile forces.

As indicated, the two propositions I have spoken of tonight are highly controversial—so controversial that neither of them has had the informed public discussion they deserve. I hope tonight may help serve to break the ice.

But whether it does so or not, I am confident that our unique naval heritage and the spirit of Navy Birthday 1973 which we have been privileged to share together this evening will continue to guide our Navy's growth in the year ahead as we rededicate ourselves with pride, professionalism and patriotism to the tasks that lie before us.

WEST VIRGINIA REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION CITES CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF REHABILITATION LEGISLATION

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, during an oversight hearing on the Rehabilitation Services Administration, conducted by the Select Subcommittee on Education, so ably chaired by our colleague from Indiana, Mr. BRADEMAS, it was revealed that a memorandum, written by William A. Morrill, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, called for the dissolution of the highly successful, 53-year-old program of vocational rehabilitation.

Knowledge of the existence of this memorandum, Mr. Speaker, has led to strong and heated reaction throughout the country.

Evidence of that reaction is a resolution, unanimously approved by the West Virginia Rehabilitation Association during its annual meeting on September 5 which commends Congressman BRADEMAS and the Select Subcommittee on Education for their diligence in protecting handicapped Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

WEST VIRGINIA REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION,

Charlestown, W. Va., September 10, 1973.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,

Chairman, Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Enclosed is a Resolution passed unanimously by the West Virginia Rehabilitation Association during its annual meeting on September 5, 1973, expressing strong support for you and members of the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor in the oversight hearings on the State-Federal Vocation Rehabilitation program. The Association, made up of 1,020 members, recognizes your efforts to protect the Vocational Rehabilitation program against any moves to dismantle and destroy it.

I am sending copies of the Resolution to other members of the Subcommittee and to Congressmen from West Virginia.

Sincerely yours,

EDDIE MICKEL, *President.*

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Congressman John Brademas and the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor conducted oversight hearings on the State-Federal Vocational Rehabilitation program; and

Whereas, Congressman Brademas and the Subcommittee were alert to a move by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to dismantle the Vocational Rehabilitation program; and

Whereas, Congressman Brademas and the Subcommittee took prompt and decisive action to protect the Vocational Rehabilitation program against any moves to destroy it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the West Virginia Rehabilitation Association and its 1,020 members commend Congressman Brademas and the Subcommittee for their diligence, scrutiny, and concern in the oversight hearings toward protecting handicapped people against Administration moves to dismantle and destroy the program they so desperately need; and be it

Resolved further, That this resolution be sent to Congressman Brademas and each member of the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

EDDIE MICKEL, *President.*

WE NEED A NEW MINIMUM WAGE BILL

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, there are chairmen who watch things happen; chairmen who complain about what has happened; and chairmen who make things happen.

The chairman of our General Subcommittee on Labor (Mr. DENT) watched while the minimum-wage bill headed toward a veto. Then he complained when it was vetoed.

He can still rank among chairmen who make things happen by bringing a new minimum-wage bill to the floor. If he tries hard enough, he could make the new year start right for millions of people.

THREE ARTICLES ON EVENTS OF RECENT DAYS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, three items appear in today's Washington Star-News that shed important light on events of recent days. One is a news story by James Polk; the other two are editorial page columns, one by James Reston, and the other by Charles Bartlett.

I include these three items for the interest of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Star-News, Oct. 24, 1973]

LETTER REVEALS MILK LOBBY OFFER

(By James Polk)

The milk lobby, while seeking White House favors, promised President Nixon $2 million in campaign contributions in a letter written by a former Nixon aide and congressman.

Patrick J. Hillings of California, the former aide who had won Nixon's old seat in The House, sent the letter to the President telling him of the offer of campaign money from the milk lobby a few months before the Nixon administration raised price supports for the dairy industry.

The milk lobby eventually gave $422,500 for the Nixon campaign, starting the week of the price increase.

Hillings, then a Washington attorney for the milk lobby, wrote to Nixon on Dec. 16, 1970, asking the President to approve import quotas on ice cream and other dairy products. Nixon granted them.

The Hillings letter, now in the possession of the Senate Watergate committee, is considered a major piece of evidence in the probe of the controversial Nixon dairy donations.

The letter is the first indication that Nixon personally knew about the forthcoming flow of money from the milk lobby while the favorable decisions were being granted to the dairy industry.

Witnesses from both the campaign organization and the milk lobby had testified previously in a federal court case that no money had been promised before the prices were raised.

Records show the campaign checks started arriving in March 1971 during the same week that the Nixon administration reversed itself and increased price supports in a move estimated to be worth $700 million to the dairy industry.

Two days before that turnabout, Nixon had met with dairymen in the Cabinet Room as they asked for the price intervention. According to testimony, the farm leaders gathered with Hillings in his nearby law offices before walking over to that White House meeting.

The three major milk groups in the Midwest, including the giant Associated Milk Producers, Inc. (AMPI), based in Texas, were clients of Hillings' law firm.

Hillings opened his December 1970 letter to Nixon on quotas by saying "This letter discusses a matter of some delicacy . . ."

Then, before making his argument for import protection, Hillings mentioned that the milk lobby had made about $135,000 in campaign contributions to GOP candidates in the 1970 Senate and House elections. He added:

"We are now working with Tom Evans and Herb Kalmbach in setting up appropriate channels for AMPI to contribute $2 million for your re-election. AMPI also is funding a special project."

Herbert W. Kalmbach, the President's personal attorney in Los Angeles, and Thomas W. Evans, a former Nixon law partner in New York, were key fund-raising officials for the 1972 campaign.

The "special project" mentioned by Hillings remains a mystery. The milk lobby did furnish a $5,000 campaign check in September 1971 that was used to pay the costs of the White House plumbers' break-in in the Daniel Ellsberg case, but there is nothing to tie that with Hillings' 1970 letter.

Hillings was urging the President to approve import quotas on dairy products already recommended by the U.S. Tariff Commission. Nixon put them into effect on Dec. 31, 1970.

Hillings' association with Nixon goes back a quarter-century, to when he was an assistant to Nixon as a congressman. When Nixon won a Senate seat in 1950, Hillings was elected to succeed him in the House district east of Los Angeles. He served four terms.

As a Washington lawyer, Hillings practiced in the same firm that another longtime Nixon loyalist, Murray Chotiner, joined upon leaving the White House in March 1971, two weeks before the milk price increase.

Chotiner has testified he went back to talk with his White House colleagues that month and warned them, "If you don't help the farmer, you don't get his support." But he said he was referring to votes, not money.

Consumer advocate Ralph Nader has charged the price boost was a favor granted in return for the campaign donations and has sued in federal court to have the increase rolled back. Chotiner and other witnesses have denied Nader's allegation in the suit, which is still pending.

Hillings, now 50, returned to California in 1970. He could not be reached last night for comment.

Copies of both the Hillings letter and a White House memo in 1972 that cited the $2 million commitment have been obtained by the Star-News.

Even though the contribution promise was never completely fulfilled, the milk lobby did become one of the five largest donors for the Nixon campaign last year.

Most of its money was contributed in a $327,500 outpouring in 1971, made through several dummy committees in Washington. But after news stories uncovered the milk money and coupled it to the price increase, the contributions stopped. The final $95,000 did not come until the last weeks before the 1972 election.

Only a few days after the Nader suit was filed, former White House aide Gordon R. Strachan told Nixon chief-of-staff H. R. Haldeman in a Feb. 1, 1972, memo that Kalmbach was "very concerned."

Strachan noted Kalmbach might be subpoenaed and suggested that he not be used any more "in the milk project because of the risk of disclosure." Haldeman replied he would discuss the problem with then Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell.

That memo mentions an aide to former Treasury Secretary John Connally.

The aide, Jake Jacobsen, was mentioned as one of two men handling the milk pledge. Strachan quoted Kalmbach as predicting that Jacobsen and the other person "will deliver, though they have cut the original 2,000 commitment back to 1,000."

In political shorthand the figures referred to $2 million and $1 million. But the tap on the milk money was actually closed a few days later.

Testimony in the Nader suit shows Kalmbach met in February 1972 with the new head of AMPI and when that official said all further donations would be made on public record, Kalmbach informed him a short time later that he was "terminating" his request for AMPI money.

THE TAPES BUY TIME

(James Reston)

The one thing you have to say for Richard Nixon is that he knows when he is licked. Almost everything he always said he would never do—compromise with Moscow, recognize Peking, accept deficit financing, or be unfaithful to his promises—he has done. And he has done it again by releasing the Watergate tapes, which he said he would never release.

It was a clever move. He has retreated from one mess to another, but he has gained time. It will take weeks to get the tapes down on paper and to get a new team to take over the prosecution at the Justice Department, but meanwhile, he has gotten rid of Archibald Cox, the "independent" prosecutor, which was probably his objective, and he has postponed—though he has not avoided—a critical battle with both the courts and the Congress.

The President, was in terrible trouble before he switched and agreed to let the tapes go to the courts. He judged Archibald Cox well enough. He gave Cox a dishonorable order he knew Cox wouldn't accept, and he was right.

But the President misjudged Atty. Gen. Richardson, and Deputy Atty. Gen. Ruckelshaus. He appealed to Richardson to concentrate on the Middle East crisis, and stay on even if Cox disappeared.

The White House didn't even give Richardson time to respond to the President's order to fire Cox. Gen. Alexander Haig called Richardson at 7 o'clock last Saturday night and told him the President was sending him a message, which seemed to call for an answer from Richardson, but while the attorney general was trying to draft a reply, the White House put out its announcement that Cox was fired.

Then the White House turned to Ruckelshaus to fire Cox, and Haig not only told him this was an order from "the commander in chief" but appealed to him on patriotic grounds to carry out the order. Ruckelshaus, according to his associates, replied that patriotism was not the same as obedience, that in his mind it was sometimes the opposite, and that he would not comply. So he was fired.

Meanwhile, Richardson appealed to the President's aides and lawyers to consider what the reaction would be in Congress and in the country if they fired Cox for carrying out the independent prosecution he was promised by the President and the attorney general, but his appeals were rejected.

It is interesting and significant that during those critical five days when Richardson was negotiating with the White House staff, and warning them not to fire Cox or force his own resignation, the President never discussed the problem personally with his own attorney general, until the very end when it was clear that the President was determined to get rid of Cox. Only then, when Richardson said he would resign if Cox was fired, did the President agree to see him.

It was a typical, bold, and desperate Nixon play, but this time it didn't work. Public reaction went against the President.

Accordingly, the President was confronted with precisely the power struggle he had sought to avoid. The Congress was proceeding toward impeachment proceedings in the House. The unions were demanding his dismissal from the presidency. More important, the old Republican establishment, led by the leaders of the bar, was denouncing the dismissal of Cox and the resignation of Richardson.

Facing all this, and the prospect that the controversy would go back into the streets if he defied the courts and the Congress, the President agreed to hand over the tapes. This will avoid the clash for a time but not for long.

For once he has admitted the tapes to evidence in the courts, it will be hard for him to exclude other relevant documents, or to argue against another special prosecutor. He is rid of Cox for the moment, but not of prosecution. He has saved his skin, but not his honor.

Ironically, he chose to challenge in this latest of his political crises three men—Cox, Richardson and Ruckelshaus—who had become the most attractive and articulate symbols of objectivity and probity in his administration. And in the process, he lost all three.

This has shocked Washington more than anything since the Watergate burglary, and while he now has time to try to sort things out, he has affronted his own most loyal supporters and even his own Cabinet, and raised the most serious questions about his moral authority to govern over the next three years.

THE AX THAT FELL ON COX

(Charles Bartlett)

With yesterday's release to Judge Sirica of the Watergate tapes, the dust has settled enough to discover that President Nixon fired Archibald Cox because he ran out of tolerance for a pack of Ivy League lawyers who seemed bent on running him to the ground.

On May 22 the President described Cox as a symbol of his determination "to see the truth brought out." However, by late summer he became convinced, mainly by the anguish of ex-associates who were being investigated, that the special prosecutor posed a running affront to the presidency. Cox would have been fired earlier if the President had not needed to wait out the Spiro Agnew drama.

Temperament more than tactics seems to have forced the denouncement. Cox was viewed with emotion from the White House as a swollen-headed professor propelled by partisan malice into an anti-Nixon crusade. While wholly at odds with this observer's, the White House view gained substance from the "highly motivated" demeanor of some of the young lawyers he recruited.

Two factors make it appear that the President did not force the hounds out of the hunt because they were getting close to his heels. First, according to an objective source who should know, Cox's sleuths have not acquired evidence that involves Nixon in criminal activities. Second, the elimination of Cox makes it almost certain that another special prosecutor, named by Congress or the grand jury, will take up the inquiry, perhaps at an even hotter pace.

The negotiations over the tapes were carried on last week against the growing awareness of insiders that Nixon meant to dump Cox at his earliest opportunity. His use of the tapes issue was a tricky, clever gambit. It is obvious that he could have sought acceptance of his compromise from the Court of Appeals without disturbing his arrangement with the special prosecutor.

The gambit fooled the three senators—John Stennis, Sam Ervin and Howard Baker—who were apparently not told that they were being offered no more or less access to the tapes than the grand jury was to have. They gratefully took what they

were offered without realizing that they had undermined the special prosecutor. If members of Congress had been quicker to grasp what was going on, they might have saved Cox with their protests.

The President will pay a high price for relief from his antipathy towards Cox. In losing Elliot Richardson and William Ruckelshaus, he draws further upon his dwindling reservoir of trust. Richardson was the honest broker, the public-interest mediator between the President's narrow concept of the Cox mandate and the wide horizons of the Watergate scandal. Nixon is now without a broker, even without an attorney general.

He has nettled his skeptics once again with a show of arrogant disregard for an earlier commitment. He added chill to the drama by deploying the FBI in a Gestapo-type flourish on Saturday night. With the surrender of the tapes, he is no closer to losing his office than he was before, but he has pulled further away from the hearts of his countrymen.

Nixon has virtually insured that the onus of Watergate prosecutions will no longer be left to the control of his administration. He has provoked a vacuum which Congress or the grand jury will fill. He can at least take one comfort—his next tormentor will probably not be Archibald Cox, a man too modest to be drawn by fate into a serialized contention with the President.

NATIONAL SECURITY—NO. 1 PRIORITY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee I have long been concerned over the state of our national security and military readiness, especially in view of the readiness of some groups to slash deeply into our military budget without regard for consequences.

Therefore, I was especially pleased to learn that the 1973 National Convention of the Military Order of the World Wars set the tone of its deliberations by declaring without equivocation that our national security must be accorded priority above all other programs. Following is the text of the first day resolution which sets forth the position that we should fund and implement without delay those military programs necessary to maintain our preeminent military posture in the world.

The resolution follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY—NO. 1 PRIORITY

Whereas, military strength second to none and the will to use it in defense of our national interests is the surest path to peace; and

Whereas, our national posture in current and projected negotiations for military detente and arms control is vitally dependent upon our present and projected military strength; and

Whereas, serious efforts are being made to erode this goal which at this time has been projected to a twenty year low; and

Whereas, other national programs can flourish only when our national security is assured.

Therefore be it resolved, that The Military Order of the World Wars in National Convention assembled, affirms that national security should have first priority among all national programs and calls upon the Congress to expand, as necessary, the military funding needed to continue our country as a first rate power in the world.

MRS. HELEN "CHILDS" BOYDEN

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I come with a profound sadness in my heart today to inform my colleagues of the death of a fine and gentle woman, Mrs. Helen "Childs" Boyden, wife of the late, renowned headmaster of Deerfield Academy in Deerfield, Mass., Frank L. Boyden.

Lest you think Helen Boyden will be remembered only as the wife of a great man, I would point out that this woman stood in no man's shadow. She was helpmate, soulmate, companion, and colleague to the headmaster. Her dedicated work at Deerfield Academy as an accomplished teacher of mathematics and science complemented that of her husband.

A native of Deerfield and a graduate of Smith College, Helen Childs came home to Deerfield Academy as a science teacher in 1905. Headmaster Boyden warned her then:

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

From the beginning, she was on the boys' side, too.

In 1907, the headmaster and Helen Childs were married. Years later, the headmaster was to write this tribute to his wife:

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

It would be hard to imagine a woman more respected by more people. She was held in high regard by the academic community and was awarded honorary degrees by a number of institutions including her own alma mater, Smith College; St. Lawrence University; Trinity College; and Mount Holyoke College. She left an indelible impression on her students and her passing will be noted with sorrow by all of them, many of whom have labored in this Chamber.

I was privileged to call Helen Boyden my good friend. Although she was buried on Monday, her memory, like that of her husband, will live on in the hearts of all of those who have been members of the Deerfield "family" throughout the years. At this time, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me and my wife, Corinne, in expressing our deepest sympathy to her children John, Theodore, and Elizabeth, and her grandchildren.

SANTA ANA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL HELP REQUESTED

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a serious and threatening condition exists in Orange County, Calif., with respect to the flood potential of the Santa Ana River. A large number of my constituents in California's 32d Congressional District could be adversely affected. The nature and extent of the problem as well as the key to its solution is contained in my letter of October 17 to Gov. Ronald Reagan requesting his help and the help of California's Legislature in establishing a unified flood control authority for both upper and lower reaches of this river. The letter follows:

OCTOBER 17, 1973.

Re Santa Ana River Basin flood control problem.

DEAR GOVERNOR REAGAN: For some months I have been seeking a solution to the multi-billion dollar flood threat posed in Orange County by the Santa Ana River. If this river ever goes out of control, thousands of my constituents in California's 32nd Congressional District as well as many other citizens of the County would be disastrously affected.

This letter requests your help and that of the California Legislature to forestall such a tragedy.

Various data and reports on the problem originated by the Los Angeles District of the U.S. Corps of Engineers reveal that in Orange County what is known for planning purposes by the Engineers as a Standard Project Flood could result in over $2 billion in damages to homes, businesses, industries, transportation, local governments, other entities and from work lost.

I have an overlay map indicating that such a flood could inundate as many as 100,000 acres of Orange County, including part or all of the communities of Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, Seal Beach, Surfside, Sunset Beach, Costa Mesa, Los Alamitos, Garden Grove, Westminster, Santa Ana, Tustin, Midway City, Orange, Anaheim, Cypress, Stanton, La Palma, Buena Park, Fullerton and Yorba Linda.

Even what is known as a 100-year flood (one which records suggest could occur about once a century) could cause an estimated half-a-billion dollars in damages in Orange County's coastal plain, with depths of water rising up to 7 feet over 35,000 acres of homes, businesses and public properties.

The Engineers have devised several alternate plans for the control of these and lesser floods of the Santa Ana River which, with its tributaries, runs through Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. They have calculated their costs to range from about $300 million to some $450 million. Orange and San Bernardino Counties have passed resolutions supporting Alternate Plan #6. Riverside County appears to favor something like #6. This degree of consensus among the counties appears to be based less on the merits of Alternate Plan #6 as an effective flood control instrumentality than it does a belief that this plan is the one least offensive to Riverside and San Bernardino interests.

Alternate Plan #6 contemplates a very large dam in the Mentone area which would be located astride the San Andreas Fault. A board of experts is being convened by the U.S. Corps of Engineers to evaluate the wisdom of such a location. It will probably take some time to act and I gather that extensive drilling and other geologic work would have to follow before any final technical decision could be expected. If it is negative, things must start from scratch again. Meanwhile, the clock ticks toward the inevitable time when actual flood conditions could materialize.

The root of our difficulty in coming up with a really effective plan to protect Orange County citizens from flooding lies in the disparity between physical benefits and financial burdens any plan will impose among the three affected counties. Although a major fraction of the costs of any of the various alternative flood control plans suggested would be borne by the Federal government, depending on the alternative selected, *direct* local costs could range from a few million dollars in the case of some alternatives to many millions in the case of others. Additionally, numerous *indirect* local costs, such as removing land from the tax rolls, relocating homes, farms and industries and the like, will result from any flood control project.

Whereas most of the beneficiaries of flood control will be Orange County taxpayers it can be assumed that most of the local costs will fall primarily on taxpayers living at the River's upper reaches in Riverside and San Bernardino counties where most of the actual flood control works would be located. This is partly because there are different flood control districts for each county, each with its separate financial structure. Upstream areas hardly can be expected to jump with joy at the prospect of assuming substantial costs which benefit them less than others. Nor, can they be expected to embrace an alternative which provides the most technically effective flood control but at a far higher price to them than some cheap but less adequate alternative.

I respectfully suggest to you, and by copy of this letter to the state legislators and county governments of the affected area, that for the purpose of overall Santa Ana River Basin flood control the existing control districts of each of the counties be consolidated by law into one unity with the power, insofar as possible, to allocate the direct and indirect local costs of flood control in the Basin up and down the River in some reasonable relationship to local benefits. Or, if there are more simple ways to achieve the same end, that they be adopted quickly so that we can get on with the necessary flood control construction in a timely fashion, in a fair fashion, and in an adequate fashion.

My point is, that if this situation is to be met, if disastrous flooding sometime in the near or intermediate future is to be avoided, then responsible officials of the State of California must initiate the required measures for speeding the achievement of a local consensus on a safe and adequate project. Until this is done, progress is stymied because the Federal government cannot, will not and should not attempt to impose its will in this local matter upon local people and local interests.

Some reasonable agreement among them is an absolute condition precedent to getting on with further major flood control work in the Santa Ana River Basin.

It is impossible for the U.S. Corps of Engineers to ask Congress for Federal millions for any project unless and until there is general agreement along the River on a carefully planned and technically sound project. As soon as, but not until, that is done, I and others of California's delegation in the Congress can bear our weight in Washington to enact the necessary major Federal appropriations.

Obviously, even if the help I ask you for is swift to come, the inherent delay in organizing and funding a project of the magnitude involved, and the lead time required for building it, will aggregate a period of several years. Thus, even if all goes smoothly, the odds for the occurrence in Orange County of a 100-year flood sometime during the next 10 years are 1 in 10. The odds for the occurrence of the larger and more devastating Standard Project Flood are 1 in 20 or 30. Consequently, the prospects are far from negligible that the Santa Ana River Basin will experience serious flooding before a project can be completed to protect it.

For that reason I strongly urge homeowners and businessmen in the area to avail themselves of Federally subsidized flood insurance available through regular brokers. Presently, the limits on this insurance are $17,500 for a house, $5,000 for its contents and $30,000 for commercial buildings. Legislation which has passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate will raise these limits to $35,000, $10,000 and $100,000, respectively.

The potential value of this insurance in relation to the flood risks present in the communities listed earlier in this letter should not be lightly regarded. Pending completion of an adequate Santa Ana River Basin Flood Control Project, I hope that public officials of the affected area will join me in publicizing the availability of this insurance to residents and property owners in the Basin.

I also believe that cities, counties and flood control districts in the area should explore the feasibility of obtaining blanket flood control insurance for all interests within their political boundaries, and financing the premiums by a special local flood control tax to be enacted for that specific purpose.

Thank you and the other responsible officials for all you will do to straighten this matter out.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 37

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting an article on a murder-suicide that has destroyed the lives of a husband and wife.

Gun control legislation is the only way to help stop these "easy" killings.

The Washington Post article from October 16 is included below:

MURDER-SUICIDE RULING IN DEATHS

A D.C. medical examiner ruled yesterday that the shooting death of a 26-year-old man and his 25-year-old wife in Anacostia Sunday night were murder and suicide.

Deputy Medical Examiner Dr. William J. Brownlee said Steven Michael Greene, of Oakland, Calif., had apparently killed his estranged wife, Carolyn Hill Greene, 3035 Massachusetts Ave. SE, in a wooded area near her home here, and then taken his own life by shooting himself in the head.

Police said they believed Greene had arrived here from Oakland sometime Saturday. But they said they did not know when he met his wife, who has been working here as a secretary.

Charles Crocker, who has been living in the red brick apartment building where Mrs. Greene had been living, said the woman arrived in the District one or two months ago. He said he did not know her and had only seen her in passing.

Neither police nor any neighbors could give any reason for the incident.

The bodies were found about 9 p.m. Saturday near the bottom of a hill at Minnesota and Anacostia Avenues, SE, about two blocks from the woman's home.

WELFARE MYTHS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about our welfare system. The picture of hundreds of thousands of free-loading welfare cheaters getting rich off the American taxpayer is pure myth.

While there are certain areas of the system which need correction, the facts show that welfare goes largely to those groups in our Nation which are unable to help themselves—the aged, blind, disabled, children, and mothers who must stay home to care for young children.

Ann Landers has recently printed a letter from a youngster whose family was forced by tragedy to go on welfare. The letter seeks to dispel some of the more popular welfare myths.

The letter follows:

DEAR ANN: I am 15 years old. Dad died four years ago of cancer. There are five children in the family younger than I. My dad didn't belong to a union, he was self-employed, had no social security, and his insurance just barely covered his medical bills. Three years ago Mom had to go on welfare.

When we buy groceries with stamps some folks in the store look at us as if we are taking money out of their pockets. Sure, people on welfare cost taxpayers money, but Dad paid his taxes when he was alive and Mom can't feed us kids on what she makes working in a bakery.

I read some facts about welfare in an article put out by the Committee on Political Education. Every American should see it. You run the biggest billboard in America, Ann. Please print them.

Fact No. 1: People wind up on welfare not because they are cheats or loafers but because they are poor. They are poor not only in money, but in everything. They have had poor education, poor health care, a poor chance at decent employment and poor prospects for anything better.

Fact No. 2: Of the 15 million people on welfare, two million are aged, permanently disabled or blind. Three million are mothers.

Fact No. 3: Nobody is getting rich on welfare. At best, it allows barebone living. Maximum payment for a family of four ranges from $700 a year in Mississippi to $3,600 in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut.

Fact No. 4: Cheating on welfare is not rampant, but minimal. No program involving 15 million people can be completely free of fakers. Probably less lying and cheating goes on in the Welfare Department than in the Internal Revenue Department.

Fact No. 5: Welfare mothers are not having babies just to collect extra money. Nearly 70 per cent of all children on welfare are legitimate, according to HEW.

Fact No. 6: The welfare rolls are not made up mostly of blacks. More than 48 per cent of the welfare families are white, 43 per

cent are black, the remaining are Orientals, American Indians and other ethnic groups.

I hope this will help to reduce the bigotry and clear up some misunderstanding.

—You Might Be Next

Thank you for helping educate millions of people today. I checked your facts with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and they are correct.

U.S.A. IS NOT SO BAD, A CANADIAN REPORTS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, with so many bad things being said about our country these days, it is refreshing to have some contrary viewpoints, particularly from a friendly Canadian named Gordon Sinclair. His remarks, which should be read by everyone, are contained in an editorial which appeared in the October 8 issue of the San Antonio Light, which follows:

GOOD NEIGHBORS

Gordon Sinclair, a Canadian commentator and author of several books, wrote the following article several weeks ago. We reprint it from the Anchorage Daily Times as a refreshing view at a time when Canadian-American relations are somewhat strained—partly, to be sure, because of controversies involving the trans-Alaska pipeline project. The article is as follows:

"The United States dollar took another pounding on German, French and British exchanges . . . It has declined there by 41 per cent since 1971, and this Canadian thinks it is time to speak up for the Americans as the most-generous and possibly the least-appreciated people in all the Earth.

"As long as 60 years ago, when I first started to read newspapers, I read of floods on the Yellow River and the Yangtze. Who rushed in with men and money to help? The Americans did.

"They have helped control floods on the Nile, the Amazon, the Ganges and the Niger.

"As the rich bottomland of the Mississippi is under water, no foreign land has sent a dollar to help.

"Germany, Japan and, to a lesser extent, Britain and Italy, were lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans, who poured in billions of dollars and forgave other billions of debts.

"None of those countries is today paying even the interest on its remaining debts to the United States.

"When the franc was in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the Americans who propped it up and their reward was to be insulted and swindled on the streets of Paris.

"I was there; I saw it.

"When distant cities are hit by earthquake, it is the United States that hurries in to help . . . Managua, Nicaragua, is one of the most-recent examples. This year, 59 American communities have been flattened by tornadoes. Nobody has helped.

"The Marshall Plan, the Truman policy, all pumped billions upon billions of dollars into discouraged countries. Now newspapers in those countries are writing about the decadent, warmongering Americans.

"I'd like to see just one of those countries that is gloating over the erosion of the United States dollar build its own airplanes.

"Come on, let's hear it!

"Does any other country in the world have a plane to equal the Boeing jumbo jet, the Lockheed Tristar or the Douglas 10? If so, why don't they fly them? Why do all international lines except Russia fly American planes?

"Why does no other land on Earth even consider putting a man or woman on the Moon?

"You talk about Japanese technocracy and get radios. You talk about German technocracy and you get automobiles. You talk about American technocracy and you find men on the Moon, not once, but several times . . . and safely home again.

"You talk about scandals and the Americans put theirs right in the store window for everybody to look at.

"Even their draft dodgers are not pursued and hounded. They are here on our streets. Most of them . . . unless they are breaking Canadian laws, are getting American dollars from Ma and Pa at home to spend here.

"When the Americans get out of this bind . . . as they will . . . who could blame them if they said 'the hell with the rest of the world. Let someone else buy the Israel bonds. Let someone else build or repair foreign dams or design foreign buildings that won't shake apart in earthquakes.'

"When the railways of France, Germany and India were breaking down through age, it was the Americans who rebuilt them. When the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central went broke, nobody loaned them an old caboose. Both are still broke.

"I can name you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble.

"Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to the Americans in trouble?

"Our neighbors have faced it alone and I'm one Canadian who is tired of hearing them kicked around. They will come out of this thing with their flag high. And when they do, they are entitled to thumb their noses at the lands that are gloating over their present troubles.

"But there are many smug, self-righteous Canadians.

"And finally, the American Red Cross was told at its 48th annual meeting in New Orleans that it was broke. This year's disasters . . . with the year half over . . . had taken it all and nobody has helped."

WHY IS NACOA MEETING IN A CLOSET?

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the public meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere this Friday and Saturday is to be held in room 6802 of the U.S. Department of Commerce Building, and NACOA has announced that the public will be admitted "to the extent of the very limited seating available on a first-come-first-served basis."

Now, a completely public meeting of NACOA is something of a novelty, so no one knows how many people will turn out to witness the proceedings. I am curious, however, why this advisory committee of 25 members will be meeting in dinky room 6802—which is little more than a closet—when the Commerce Department auditorium is available, at least for the Saturday session.

I cannot help thinking that NACOA, which has large-scale responsibilities, prefers a small-scale audience.

UNITED NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, United Nations Week is an appropriate time to take a good look at that international organization. It has been popular to refer to its as "man's best hope" for so long that we rarely take a good hard look at the work of that body. Is it really man's best hope for peace. In all honesty, I answer "no." Man's best hope for peace, I am certain, still rests in a strong and vital United States of America. Despite the hopes and aspirations of founders, the U.N. gives little indication it will be able to cope with serious international problems.

It was founded in the hope that the victorious allies in World War II would continue their "commitment" to peace. However, even then the Communists were not committed to peace and 28 years later are even less committed. If the past 28 years have shown anything, it is that it is difficult if not impossible to have general rules of behavior acceptable to Communist and free states. By their very nature, Communist states utilize an entirely different rule. If the U.N. were limited to nations which have open and free societies, it could come closer to achieving its purpose.

Having followed the United Nations closely through the years, I can safely make two categorical statements: First, the United Nations should in no way be given any of our basic American sovereignty nor should we trust its decisions for important peacekeeping operations. Second, none of its actions should be implemented in any way or form in this country without a specific vote of Congress. There are too many inconsistencies and errors in its operation.

A case in point is a recent resolution adopted by the Committee on Colonialism regarding the status of Puerto Rico. By a vote of 12 to 2, the U.N. committee affirmed Puerto Rico's right to independence. The resolution requests that the United States "refrain from taking any measures which might obstruct the full and free exercise by the people of Puerto Rico of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence." It also keeps the Puerto Rican question under the Colonialism Committee's "continuous review."

John Scali, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has rightfully labeled this resolution "ludicrous." In a free and open election held last year, 51 percent of the Puerto Rican people voted for the Popular Democratic Party, a party which advocates maintenance of the current commonwealth status. Another 43 percent voted for the New Progressive Party, which is pressing for statehood in the United States. Only 5 percent of the electorate cast ballots in favor of the Independence Party.

The Committee on Colonialism is, therefore, pushing a plan that has been rejected by 95 percent of the voters. Perhaps, as Mr. Scali indicates:

It may be some consolation to the people of Puerto Rico, who undoubtedly will be as outraged as I am by this blatant interference in their internal affairs, to realize that many of the nations which took the lead in supporting the resolution do not permit their citizens freely to express their views on who will govern them and for how long.

If Americans watched the day-to-day actions and votes in the U.N., they would not be calling it man's best hope for peace. In my observations, it is interesting that the loudest critics of the United States here at home are more often than not the same ones who want some basic American sovereignty transferred to the U.N.

"MR. BUCK" OUTSTANDING AS COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have dedicated a large portion of my energies and time to legislation and programs designed to assist the development of nonmetropolitan communities. However, programs and legislation do little good if the citizens themselves are not interested and concerned over the future of their cities.

I would like to share with my colleagues an article on one man from my hometown who has contributed greatly to the development of Osceola. Mr. J. C. Buchanan has exhibited endless energy in working with the civic organizations and the people of Osceola to improve and expand the economy and general welfare of the people who live there. Knowing such men gives me continued enthusiasm for the future of nonmetropolitan America and our Nation:

"MR. BUCK" OUTSTANDING AS COMMUNITY LEADER

(By Phil Mullen)

Since 1946, J. C. Buchanan has contributed as much or more to the expansion of the local economy, and to the general welfare of the community, as any other citizen.

"Mr. Buck" has received recognition in these columns before but what has made this writer think of him lately has been his great good sense about other people and his relationship with them.

He is a master salesman but he goes further than that. For instance, he has never been chincy in delegating authority to his son-in-law, Dewey Neely, who is vice president of the firm and then he gets along so very well with all of his help, because of his sincere interest in their personal welfare and he has a very low turnover of personnel at Buchanan Chevrolet & Olds.

One salesman came back a couple of years ago from 20 years of service in the Air Force and said that he had planned all of those years to "come back one day and sell cars for Buck."

He was one of the organizers of the Osceola Chamber of Commerce in 1947 and served on the board of directors almost continuously until about three years ago when he said, "It's time for a younger man to take over." More demonstration of good sense.

Mr. Buchanan is one of the four local leaders given most of the credit for the record industrialization of this small city. When the Chamber of Commerce was organized, those 36 years ago, members dug down in their pockets and put up their own money to encourage more housing and to afford more job opportunities for the community.

The other three who engaged in that long drive for industry were late Mayor Ben F. Butler, Faber White and Harold Ohlendorf.

When things looked bleak, Mr. Buchanan never lost his drive, never stopped working, and there is no telling how much those four gentlemen spent out of their own pockets to finance the trips that had to be made "up north" to contact the industrial headquarters and make the sales presentation about the attraction of Osceola.

Some 2,000 people now employed on the Industrial Park, their families, and the entire community well know and appreciate this work.

"Mr. Buck" never quit, until a few years ago, and he can register more enthusiasm than anyone in the State of Arkansas about his home town and how it is still due growth and economic expansion.

Mr. Buchanan began his association with the Chevrolet Motor Co. in 1925. He is a native of Nebooville, Tenn. and began "coming across The River to Blytheville to sell automobiles when he was in knee britches." He spent 20 years in Blytheville before being able to acquire the operation of the agency in Osceola. Since that time, he has, with his valued associates, made the Osceola agency one of the most successful in the nation and he has been highly recognized by his fellow dealers on district and regional levels and by General Motors, several times.

As a widower, Mr. Buchanan married the former Miss June Armintrout in 1937 and this is one fine lady. The daughter, Helen, and her husband, Dewey Neely, say, "June has been everything a mother could be to us." The grandchildren, Kerri, Jay Lynn and Fanny, echo those sentiments.

"Mrs. Buck" was an expert insurance agency secretary for years then she joined the automobile firm and for years she has been a perfect complement to her husband. To everyone who comes calling, she has a friendly smile and a cheerful greeting, but she never intrudes herself.

In recent years, Mr. and Mrs. Buchanan have been taking long vacations, in Arizona, and at other noted spots but they seem to have been around home much lately.

"Buck" has been a member of the Osceola Rotary Club for many years, and he always seems to have a happy good time at the luncheons but here, also, he doesn't try to occupy the spotlight.

His great business knowhow has resulted in the establishment of two other Chevrolet agencies, the Bill Childers place in Poplar Bluff, Mo. and the Charles Cannon place in Ponca City, Okla.

What prompted this piece about Mr. Buchanan this week were the thoughts of this writer about our own personal relationship.

We've had some rugged political differences but they never became personal. He made it plain always that such differences had nothing with our doing business with each other and using each others products and services where such would be of benefit.

And you'll have to give him credit. He stands up for what he believes, for the good of the community, and he'll speak out plainly. Perhaps that's the best test of all of a good citizen—his activity in local politics, his drive, sometimes controversial, in community affairs, have never cost him a dime's worth of business.

Seeing him active around the auto agency you'd never accuse him of being one of the Elder Businessmen of the City but he does take it much easier than he used to.

Because he has built an organization that will take care of the business, if need be, and he has built a reputation that will last.

PRESIDENCY SHOULD BE FORD TEST

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in view of the latest evidence of President Nixon's unfitness to continue in office, it is most important that the Congress entertain second thoughts about confirming his nomination for the Vice Presidency. Regardless of the particular nominee's virtues, anyone handpicked by a man so committed to trampling the Constitution and laws of this democracy, must be thoroughly and rigorously examined to determine just what kind of President he will be.

Only the day before the firing of Archibald Cox and the abolition of the special prosecutor's office, Mr. William C. Barnard, chief editorial writer of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, wrote:

One year ago it was unthinkable that President Nixon might be impeached or forced to resign because of scandals in his administration. It is no longer unthinkable. . . . Because of these political uncertainties, Congress must not look at Ford in light of his vice presidential qualifications, but instead must determine whether he is capable of being president.

Bill Barnard displayed sharp foresight. But how could even he have known that just 24 hours after publishing that statement, the whole of the American people would suddenly cry out for the President's impeachment?

I wish to share with my colleagues the well-considered admonition Mr. Barnard has addressed to us:

PRESIDENCY SHOULD BE FORD TEST

There is a growing possibility that Richard M. Nixon may not serve out the final three years of his presidency.

This is a harsh observation, but it is one borne out by the incredible events of the past year. The reputations of President Nixon and his administration have been under constant assault for political treachery and immorality. There appears no letup to the barrage of accusations and evidence.

The following circumstances should be kept in mind when Congress considers the nomination of Gerald R. Ford to fill the vacancy in the office of vice president:

For the first time in the history of the United States a vice president has been forced to resign his office because of criminal wrongdoing.

Two former Nixon cabinet members, former Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell and former Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans, await trial on felony charges. They are under indictment for perjury. Former White House counsel John W. Dean III has been named a coconspirator with them.

Several lesser personages in the Nixon administration are under investigation or have been indicted for activities connected with the Watergate break-in or the President's re-election campaign.

And still the bottom is not in sight. Both the Senate committee and the U.S. attorney general are continuing their separate investigations. Special prosecutor Archibald Cox last week won a U.S. appellate court decision that ordered Nixon to turn over to a district judge presidential tape recordings related to Watergate. These are crucial and could exonerate or implicate the President.

Still another committee of Congress is investigating the use of government funds at President Nixon's private estates. The chairman of that committee has said evidence has been turned up that raises "serious questions of propriety."

Never has the presidency been so besmirched. Public opinion polls have never before recorded such low trust in the presidency. Seldom has Congress regarded the presidency so suspiciously.

One year ago it was unthinkable that the vice president and other top members of government might be forced to resign and face criminal prosecution. It is no longer unthinkable, it is now fact.

One year ago it was unthinkable that President Nixon might be impeached or forced to resign because of scandals in his administration. It is no longer unthinkable. The Watergate investigations have an uncontrolled momentum and no one can predict what their outcome will be.

It is in this atmosphere that Congress is considering the vice presidential nomination of Ford. Because of these political uncertainties. Congress must not look at Ford in light of his vice presidential qualifications, but instead must determine whether he is capable of being president.

President Nixon's removal from office is a possibility that is not relished, but it is a possibility that exists.

STATEMENT REGARDING WATERGATE TAPES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the degree of confidentiality with which a U.S. President, as the head of a separate and independent branch of the Government, shall conduct his business has been in steady dispute with the Congress and the courts since the inception of the Republic.

President Nixon's position in this regard in connection with the Watergate tapes is neither more nor less than a part of this historic issue.

I thought that the compromise worked out to satisfy the court's order by furnishing verified summaries of the tapes was an intelligent approach which respected both public and Presidential interests. I believe Special Prosecutor Cox properly could have agreed to it. When he chose not to do so, his logical course was to resign in disagreement, as did the Attorney General.

Since this matter is one involving disagreement among legal experts on an ambiguous question of constitutional law, I do not regard impeachment of the President as a logical response to the situation.

Moreover, it appears to me that the President's subsequent action in releasing these tapes may set an unhappy precedent. How skillfully Judge Sirica handles them will have a lot to do with that. Advisers to Presidents could become reluctant to speak frankly knowing that their words might be freely publicized. Representatives of other nations might be inhibited unduly in discussing grave matters of state with American Presidents for the same reason.

In short, the real question here is not, as Cox said, whether we will have government by law rather than government by men, but whether we shall have government or whether we shall have a public mess.

AFL–CIO CALLS FOR RICHARD NIXON TO RESIGN OR BE IMPEACHED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the public outcry over the President's actions this past weekend has been amazing. On October 22, at the 10th Constitutional Convention of the AFL–CIO, the executive council adopted a resolution asking for the resignation of President Nixon, and in the event of his failure to resign, his impeachment. I have taken the liberty of placing this resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON PRESIDENT NIXON TO THE 10TH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, BAL HARBOR, FLA., OCTOBER 22, 1973

The Constitutional crisis that began with what the White House once described as a "third-rate burglary" has now been brought to a head by the absolutely unprecedented and shocking actions of President Nixon within the last 48 hours.

In rapid succession, these events have taken place:

The President demanded that Attorney General Elliot Richardson fire special Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox. Richardson refused and resigned. The President demanded that Deputy Attorney General William D. Ruckelshaus fire Cox. Ruckelshaus refused and was fired. The President ordered his Solicitor General, Robert H. Bork, to fire Cox, and Bork, now Acting Attorney General, complied. The President ordered the FBI to seal off the offices of the special prosecutor, the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General—thereby, in effect, taking possession of the Watergate evidence.

These incredible actions have revealed the extent to which Mr. Nixon is prepared to go to prevent the full disclosure of evidence relating to the Watergate cover-up and other charges of criminal conduct by high government officials. He had already refused the orders of two courts to turn nine of his tapes bearing on the Watergate matters over to Judge John Sirica.

The President seems determined not to discharge the chief obligation of his office. Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution states that, "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." But Mr. Nixon seems utterly determined to frustrate the full and impartial administration of the law.

When the Senate Judiciary Committee confirmed the appointment of Cox, it acted with the understanding, spelled out in the guidelines drawn up by the Attorney General, on May 19, that he would have: "full authority with respect to . . . determining whether or not to contest the assertion of 'executive privilege' or any other testimonial privilege. . . . The attorney general will not countermand or interfere with the special prosecutor's decisions or actions. . . . The special prosecutor will not be removed from his duties except for extraordinary improprieties on his part."

The special prosecutor's decision to press forward on the legal front to obtain the President's tapes hardly constitutes an "extraordinary impropriety." On the contrary, it constitutes the fulfillment of his mandate to "review all documentary evidence available from any source, as to which he shall have full access."

Similarly, the refusal of Attorney General Richardson to fire Cox was in accordance with the understanding between him and the special prosecutor, which understanding was also at the basis of the Senate's confirmation of Mr. Richardson as Attorney General.

Mr. Nixon's determination to prevent judicial examination of his tapes, no matter what the cost to our constitutional system, can only further erode public confidence in him. When the President appears fearful of facing a Supreme Court composed in large measure of his own appointees, the public can scarcely resist the darkest speculations.

We believe that the American people have had enough. More than enough.

We therefore call upon Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to resign.

We ask him to resign in the interest of preserving our democratic system of government, which requires a relationship of trust and candor between the people and their political leaders.

We ask him to resign in the interest of restoring a fully functioning government, which his Administration is too deeply in disarray to provide.

We ask him to resign in the interest of national security.

If Mr. Nixon does not resign, we call upon the House of Representatives forthwith to initiate impeachment proceedings against him.

We also call upon the Congress to hold up further consideration of the President's Vice President-designate, Mr. Ford. Clearly, a President who has placed himself on the brink of impeachment should not be allowed to name his successor until the charges against him have been disposed of satisfactorily.

We concur completely with Archibald Cox, who said at the time of his dismissal: "Whether we shall continue to be a government of laws and not of men is now for Congress and ultimately the American people to decide."

Impeachment is not a prospect we contemplate with pleasure. No decent American can derive any partisan satisfaction whatever from the misfortune of his nation. And surely the American labor movement is not interested in aiding any reckless attacks on the Presidency. We are especially concerned about the office of the Presidency in these times of grave danger on the international front.

But the cause of peace and freedom in the world cannot be served by a discredited Presidency at home. Our allies' best hope—mankind's best hope—lies in the strength of our democratic institutions.

Justice may be done, the risks of not doing it being more than a democracy can safely bear.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JAMES DAVIS

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I would like to share with you the accomplishment of a constituent of mine, James Calvin Davis of Studio City, Calif. Jim has been approved as an Eagle

Scout and will receive the award at the Court of Honor of Troop No. 139 on November 3, 1973.

This young man has been very active in the Scouting program for several years. He recently exemplified the spirit of Scouting by building friendships with Scouts he met at the National Boy Scout Jamboree in August of this year, and by acting as host to two Japanese Scouts on their first visit to the United States. Jim still maintains a sincere correspondence with his former Japanese guests.

I am sure my colleagues will join with me in extending hearty congratulations to James Davis. He represents the large segment of our youth who constructively contribute to their communities and to whom our Nation will turn for guidance in the years to come.

UNITED NATIONS CELEBRATES ITS 28TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 28th annual celebration of United Nations Day throughout the world. It is a time when we should reflect on the history and accomplishments of this important institution, over the 28 tumultuous years of its existence.

It is particularly appropriate that as we celebrate United Nations Day 1973, we find it actively working toward the achievement of a durable cease fire to quell the raging warfare in the Middle East. The successful accomplishment of this will serve to silence the critics of the United Nations who feel that it no longer represents a viable institution for the solving of major world problems.

The United Nations can point to other significant achievements in the year 1973. The most significant action taken by the United Nations was the admittance of East and West Germany. This important action was interpreted by many international observers as a real breakthrough in solving the East-West tensions over the thorny questions of Germany.

It has been claimed by many international experts that the basis under which the United Nations was formed is no longer applicable today. Yet I contend that an international policy based on collective security is more viable today than at any other time in the 28 years of the United Nations' existence. With the emerging détente between the two super-powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, the emphasis will now shift to other major world powers such as China, Japan, and Germany, thus transferring our former bipolar world into a multipolar one. It is in this format that the United Nations can serve its most useful function.

It is in light of these facts that this year's celebration of United Nations Day is truly a significant event. I look forward to its continued growth and hope its influence is felt more in 1974 as we aim for the establishment for a generation of peace in the world.

IMPORTANCE OF A STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 16, I was happy to invite a group of about 40 of our colleagues to meet informally with the distinguished Representative from Florida, Mr. LOUIS FREY, JR., who had just returned from a week in Israel. His acute observations, drawn from contact with Israeli civilian and military leaders all over the country, offered us a stark and chilling lesson in the need for defense preparedness. Let me give some examples:

First, the Israeli reserve forces were mobilized and committed to battle in 3 days. Some reserve units were in combat on the first day. Although the Arab forces apparently achieved considerable surprise, they were stopped without decisive military gains soon after the outset, by the very quick arrival of Israeli reservists. This is not to say that decisive psychological gains were not made.

There is a lesson for America here—an echo of 1776: We must have the desire to be and stay free. We have got to get behind our own Reserves and "get with it." The Reserve components, adequately trained and prepared, constitute an economical and essential insurance against threats to the United States.

Second, both sides in the Mid-East have been inflicting heavy damage with an assortment of very advanced antitank and antiaircraft systems. In fact, some are more sophisticated than any in our own arsenal. Arab effort centers around the sophisticated and highly mobile SA–6 and SA–7 antiaircraft missiles, and the Snapper antitank missile, all of which can deploy forward with armored units.

The SA–7 or Strella missile is manportable, has a heat-sensing guidance system, and has been particularly effective against Israeli tank-fighter bomber teams. Press reports indicate that the Israelis have countered with the Shrike antiradiation missile, the Sparrow and Sidewinder air-to-air missiles, and a variety of electro-optical guided bombs.

Here is another lesson for thoughtful men: The combat environment of the future will be more uncertain than ever, as new technology is brought to bear. Supremacy in a future contest will depend greatly on current research and development, a field in which I would remind you that the Soviets are moving ahead with great speed. Obviously, we must mind our own progress here, and not fall asleep over the past success of American technology.

Third, there has been considerable surprise both in Israel and in this country that the Arab forces did not dissolve like a $2 suit in a heavy rain once the battle was fully joined. They have performed very creditably. Some Arab units have performed valorously. There is no question that rigorous training, improved leadership, and a sense of purpose have inspired both sides to do better. It is all a matter of attitude.

We, in America, should thereby recognize that a vigorous and spirited defense begins with a vigorous and spirited defense attitude. We cannot permit woolyheaded thinkers and flatulent critics to "rip off" the American military casually and destructively. Too much is at stake. We should instead nourish and invigorate the all-volunteer force by fostering constructive criticism when it is due, balanced praise when it has been earned, and by infusing the armed services with a keen sense of national responsibility and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, in an era of détente, when hopes are high for a structure of lasting peace, the Mid East war reminds us brutally that any such structure will be fragile, uncertain, and filled with latent danger.

It is not militarism to understand this; it is not warmongering to prepare against such hazards. It is, rather, basic to our discharge of citizenship. And the thoughtful, patriotic citizen should be in the forefront of such understanding. He will turn away from it at his peril and to the peril of all.

EXTENSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT NOT NEEDED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, when the Environmental Education Act was enacted in 1970, it was not envisioned as a permanent piece of legislation. Its purpose was to encourage State and local school authorities to develop and support environmental education programs.

This purpose has certainly been achieved. Public awareness of environmental issues has probably never been at a higher level. Hundreds of environmental programs have been instituted, many of them initiated by students, teachers, and communities without any money from the Federal Government.

Today, however, we are asked to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years at a cost of $45 million. Despite the fact that the goals of the program have been achieved, many Congressmen seem intent on expending another $45 million for this bill rather than risk being labeled antienvironment.

This program should be terminated. We should not extend the act for an additional 3 years simply because it has the word "environment" in its title.

The following minority views on this legislation were joined in by Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. HUBER, and myself:

MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 3927

There is no valid reason for extending the Environmental Education Act.

First of all, the Act was never intended to be permanent. Its purpose was to stimulate nationwide interest in environmental education—a goal which, as explained by Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Sidney P. Marland in his testimony before the Select Education Subcommittee, has been fulfilled.

There is, we trust, no doubt that environmental and ecological issues have been brought to the "height of public consciousness." If there is any other issue presently more "sacred" to the public, we are not aware of it. As evidence, one need only note that Congress, never an institution to be out of step with the "public interest," has passed a virtual tidal wave of legislation designed to "protect the environment." As further evidence, one need only observe the extreme reluctance of many Members of Congress to oppose H.R. 3927, even though they agree that the program has served its purpose; apparently the fear of being labeled "anti-environment" is just too much to cope with.

Secondly, extension of the Environmental Education Act is inconsistent not only with the President's budget request but with his government reform strategy as well. The Act represents the sort of unduly narrow, categorical program which the Administration is in the process of phasing out in favor of broader categories of assistance which leave more decision making in the hands of State and local school officials. Since there is an automatic one-year extension of this Act, we have until June 30, 1974, to phase out funding under this authority and intergrate environmental educational efforts into the various broader authorities for Federal aid to education if we do so choose.

Let us acknowledge that this program has fulfilled its intended goal. Let us not waste the taxpayers money by extending an act simply because it has the word "environment" in its title.

EARL F. LANDGREBE,
JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
ROBERT J. HUBER.

WILLIAM McPHERSON McGILL

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week William McPherson McGill, one of Frederick County's most distinguished citizens, passed away. Mr. McGill, a Frederick County schoolteacher for 48 years, was the last teacher in the county to teach in a one-room school.

William McGill is remembered as a "Gentleman of the Old School" who kept his pupils on a strict schedule timed by his gold watch, who taught the three R's, plenty of geography and the flora and fauna of the woods and fields around his schools. He gave up a principal's job at Foxville to keep alive Phillips Delight, a one-room elementary school on the mountain near Catoctin Hollow.

Mr. McGill began teaching in 1910 at the Catoctin Furnace School. He served at Creagerstown Elementary, Ijamsville, the Deerfield School, Graceham, Bloomfield, Phillips Delight, and Foxville. He retired in 1955. William McPherson McGill will be sorely missed by his family and friends and his many ex-students. His many contributions to education and his community will be long remembered.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY IN KENTUCKY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the assistant attorney general of Kentucky, Mr. Robert V. Bullock, has informed me that a telephone solicitation act will be presented to the Kentucky Legislature in January 1974, for its consideration.

I have sponsored in the House for the past 2 years a telephone privacy bill which will allow individuals to place a no-trespassing sign on their telephone. Individual telephone subscribers will be able to indicate that they do not wish to be solicited over the phone for commercial reasons.

Kentucky's proposal goes much further and makes it unlawful for any person to solicit the sale of merchandise or services by telephoning a prospective purchaser at his home.

Similar legislation has also been introduced in the Virginia Senate and public hearings have been held.

Telephone privacy, I believe, is the right of every citizen. I am hopeful that through either Federal legislation or actions by individual States that telephone subscribers will be able to halt the relentless attempts of telephone salesmen to hawk their wares over the phone.

A copy of the proposed Kentucky statute follows:

CONSUMERS' ADVISORY COUNCIL, DEPARTMENT OF LAW: AN ACT RELATING TO TELEPHONE SOLICITATION

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

Section 1. A new section of Chapter 367 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes is created to read as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any person to solicit the sale of merchandise, goods or services primarily to be used for personal, family or household purposes by telephoning a prospective purchaser in his home.

Section 2. A new section of Chapter 367 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes is created to read as follows:

Section one of this act shall not apply to any telephone solicitation of a prospective purchaser who has an established charge account, or an established course of sales transactions between the prospective purchaser and the seller or company causing the solicitation.

Section 3. A new section of Chapter 367 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes is created to read as follows:

Section 1 of this Act shall not apply to non-profit charitable organizations who solicit for funds or charitable donations only, and who do not offer an accompanying sale of merchandise, goods or services, whose sales price does not exceed $3.00.

Section 4. A new section of Chapter 367 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes is created to read as follows:

Any person who conducts telephone solicitations to prospective purchasers in violation of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be fined not less than $500 nor more than $1,000 or confined for 6 months or both, and for the second offense shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $1,000 and shall be confined for not less than 30 days nor more than 90 days, and for conviction of a third offense shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $1,000 and confined for not less than 90 days nor more than 10 months, and the Attorney General or a Commonwealth Attorney or a County Attorney may prosecute for a violation of this Act.

SPACE TECHNOLOGY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Lincoln Star by Dick Holman, Friday, September 14, 1973, discusses several innovations which were directly derived from our national space program. I include Mr. Holman's article in the RECORD as an example of the many and continuing contributions that our national space program is making to the daily lives of every American:

SPACE TECHNOLOGY OFFERS BETTER CHUCK-HOLE FILLER

(By Dick Holman)

Lincoln's chuck-hole problem—the bane of winter and spring motorists—could be solved with the technology that helped send man into space.

Louis Mogavero of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) explained Thursday that the chuck-hole remedy is one of many spin-offs—new techniques and materials developed in the space effort—that NASA is offering the public.

"We try to return to the taxpayer some of his investment in the space and aeronautics program," said Mogavero, deputy director of NASA's technology utilization office.

He told newsmen that NASA wants to transfer technology to supply the needs of users—and let the free enterprise system take over."

For example, Mogavero said NASA learned municipalities are looking for a better chuck-hole filler that won't sink or crack. NASA took a thermoplastic used chemically to bind solid rocket propellants, adapted its technology and tested it.

"From preliminary observations," he said, "it seems a better mix" than what's available now.

Another NASA space spin-off has become available only in recent weeks: the rechargeable heart pacemaker.

NASA adapted a long-term battery developed for satellite power systems. The agency applied the same reliable miniaturized circuitry to the pacemaker.

NO OPERATION

"All the patient does now is put on a vest, plug it in and recharge the battery through induction." The innovation precludes expensive and hazardous operations required to recharge earlier pacemakers, he said.

NASA offers the spin-offs to municipalities, industry, business and entrepreneurs for free, Mogavero said; yet he said "we have trouble" convincing them to commercialize the technology for public use.

However, great numbers of spin-offs have already been put to practical applications.

Mogavero explained that a woman paralyzed from the neck down now operates her arm with very fine movements using a tongue switch. "For the first time in 18 years, she wrote a letter to her daughter," he said.

The switch was adapted from NASA's remote control devices.

EYE SWITCH

Because of tremendous G-forces that pinned astronauts to their seats, NASA developed a light sensor that reflects into the the astronauts' eyes and allows them to manipulate controls by mere eye movement.

That same technology, Mogavero said, has been adapted to allow an invalid to guide his wheel chair.

In nonmedical advances, he said, one spin-off allows inexpensive extraction of pure costly metals from abandoned cars. Another rapidly detects drug use through urinalysis, a technique "so finely tuned that it can pick up the casual user—once a week," he explained.

For the refrigerator in the home or the refrigerated boxcar, he showed a tiny IWI, an irreversible warning indicator, which indicates by color change if frozen goods have thawed.

The IWI costs two cents in large quantities and six cents in smaller quantities, and can prevent food poisoning, for example, if the power went out while a family was out of town.

BEGAN IN 1962

In an address to the Professional Engineers of Nebraska Thursday evening, Mogavero said the technology utilization program began in 1962.

He explained how NASA teams all over the U.S. "seek out technical problems that might lend themselves to solution by adaptations of existing space technology."

When a technology can be applied for commercial use, the information can be extracted from NASA's data bank or NASA puts the party in direct contact with the NASA inventor or innovator, he said.

"One of the problems we are working on is to effect changes in the NASA patent policy that ought to encourage more businessmen to use technology which is patented," he said. "NASA is now able to accelerate commercial use (of spin-offs) by granting exclusive licenses much earlier than was allowed under the old regulations."

Mogavero emphasized that "all this is not NASA hornblowing. It represents long hours of work and promotion of the idea that the taxpayers are entitled to maximum mileage for their hard-earned space dollars."

LOTTERIES: VICE AND VIRTUE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time in the city of Chicago, there are many who advocate a city lottery. Their argument is that since criminal lotteries take in $100 million a year and benefit only those who illegally operate them, and since a legal lottery would benefit the city, that it be instituted.

In fact, a report by the chairman of the license commission was given to the city council which declared that a legal city lottery would gross at least $150 million.

A number of States have entered the gambling business. The arguments for doing so are similar to those now being heard in Chicago. Too often, the arguments against doing so are not given the hearing they deserve.

We have all heard the argument that since people gamble anyway, why not benefit the State. George Will, writing in the Washington Post, expresses the view that this is no reason for Government to enter a self-destruction business on a grand scale.

Irving Kristol, writing in the Wall Street Journal, declares that—

The case for legalized gambling is, at bottom, simply an argument in favor of the government raising revenues by swindling its citizens rather than taxing them.

When we speak of legalized gambling, Kristol notes, we are not speaking of simply rescinding the laws which make gambling illegal. He notes that—

We are, in most cases, talking about legalizing it in a very special way—i.e., either as socialized industry or a regulated and monopolistic (or oligopolistic) "public utility." And we are inclined to think, these days, that such an extension of the public sector represents a natural increment to the "welfare state."

When government gets into the gambling business, according to Mr. Kristol:

It necessarily assumes the responsibilities for seeing that this business grows and prospers. In effect, it proclaims that gambling is not a necessary evil but an inherently good thing. And it does this while telling its citizens that, if they are to be good Americans, they should work hard, save their money, shun all get-rich schemes. Is this not ridiculous?

If we believe that gambling should be legalized, then the thing to do is simply to repeal the laws prohibiting it. Gambling then would become a free and open part of the marketplace.

What those who seek State and city run lotteries are asking for, however, is something far different, it is not the legalization of gambling, but its socialization.

Concluding his article, Mr. Kristol writes that—

If we legalize gambling in principle and then socialize it to boot, we have declared that it is in no way a blameworthy activity. That's going too far.

I wish to share this important article by Irving Kristol, which appeared in the September 13, 1973, Wall Street Journal, with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

VICE AND VIRTUE IN LAS VEGAS

(By Irving Kristol)

LAS VEGAS, NEV.—They smiled indulgently when I said I was going to visit my sister and brother-in-law in Las Vegas. Oddly enough, I was telling the truth—well, half the truth anyway. The other half of the truth, of course, was that I was going to Las Vegas to indulge in the vice of gambling.

I use the word "vice" advisedly. The kind of gambling one does in Las Vegas is a vice. We are not, after all, talking about a friendly and convivial game of poker or canasta. That is more in the nature of "gaming" than of gambling. There is nothing friendly or convivial about Las Vegas. It is all impersonal and solitary—one abandons oneself to fantasies of omniscience, omnipotence, and of getting something for nothing. It most definitely undermines the classical virtues (moderation, self-reliance, self-discipline, thrift, diligence, etc.) while nourishing the classical vices (extravagance, avarice, the lack of social responsibility, etc.). Moralists and psychiatrists agree that this kind of gambling is altogether a bad thing; which is, I suppose, why it is so intensely pleasurable.

I have always been rather fond of Las Vegas because it candidly is an utterly vicious place (i.e., a place for vice). Despite the big-name entertainment and the lavish decor, everyone knows what the business of Las Vegas is, and everyone knows what transactions he has come to participate in. Set in the midst of a barren desert, with no industry of any kind, no pretty scenery or natural charms, Las Vegas exists for sinning and nothing else.

Or at least it used to. For Las Vegas is changing. Not only are more and more people coming every year—they are a different kind of people. Las Vegas now boasts a Holiday Inn and a Howard Johnson's. And it is attracting, in ever greater numbers, a Holiday Inn and Howard Johnson's crowd—cluttered station wagons, yelping dogs, whining children and all. The Chamber of Commerce is very proud of the fact that so many "middle Americans" are now casually stopping off here for a few days of fun and games. I am appalled. It is not only that they will ruin Las Vegas as an authentic city of occasional sin; these are people who are helping to obliterate the distinction between vice and innocent entertainment—a distinction crucial to a self-governing polity, in which (to borrow a phrase from "America the Beautiful") we propose to "confirm our soul in self control."

DANGER AHEAD

Las Vegas inverts the normal moral situation: here, vice is public and only virtue is a private affair. Such inversion is tolerable so long as one realizes how abnormal it is. But once Las Vegas comes to be regarded as just another vacation resort, to which one takes the family without a qualm, we are in danger of losing our moral bearings. Las Vegas may end up more virtuous—but only by de-moralizing the rest of the country.

The significance of the changes under way in American manners and morals is highlighted by the latest issue of Forbes to reach the Las Vegas newsstands. Its lead story, "Gambling: the Hottest Growth Industry?" predicts—with a confidence not to be challenged—the growing legalization of gambling in state after state. The cover is graced with a photograph of the late W. C. Fields peering from behind a "hand" of cards. Only four cards are visible; the fifth is presumably up his sleeve.

Now, I yield to no man in my admiration of W. C. Fields. A world without such deviants and eccentrics and rebels against morality would be a tedious place. But for a W. C. Fields to emerge in full splendor, he needs a "straight" millieu. One can envisage him easily enough at a typical Holiday Inn, selling snake oil or running a crooked game of bingo. In Las Vegas, he'd be trampled to death by the rush of housewives to the slot machines.

Do we really want to go the way of legalized gambling? There are important issues involved, which no one seems to be seriously discussing. In part, this is because serious discussion of moral issues—e.g., drugs, pornography, sexual promiscuity—goes against the spirit of the age, which would have trouble recognizing a moral issue if it ran over one on Main Street, in broad daylight. But in the case of gambling there is another reason why the moral aspect of the matter is so vigilantly ignored. This is because, when we are talking about legalizing gambling, we are in most cases talking about legalizing it in a very special way—i.e., either as socialized industry or a regulated and monopolistic (or at least oligopolistic) "public utility." And we are inclined to think, these days, that such an extension of the public sector represents a natural increment to the "welfare state."

The most common argument in favor of legalizing gambling is that a lot of people gamble anyway, so why make it a criminal activity? Let's "de-criminalize" it and thereby reduce the crime statistics. Despite its superficial plausibility, this argument makes little sense. If it is to be applied to gambling, it can be applied with equal cogency to faith-healing, "pyramid" sales schemes, and all such activities, now illegel, where the victim is a willing participant in the crime. The SEC does not sanction stock market swindles, even where the odds against the investor are scrupulously spelled out somewhere in a prospectus. And gambling—as distinct from what I have called "gambling"—is, technically, a

swindle; the payoffs on bets must be less than fair, and the overwhelming majority of the "investors" must eventually lose their money, if the gambling enterprise is to survive and prosper.

Besides being unconvincing, this argument in favor of legalized gambling is disingenuous. Just how disingenuous may be discovered by asking the question: If we wish to legalize gambling, why not simply erase the prohibitions from the law books and leave the rest to private enterprise? The rejoinder will be either (a) that gambling under private enterprise will cheat the ordinary more than the state will (which is not always true, as every horse-better in New York City knows), or (b) that profits from such a sinful activity as gambling ought not to line private pockets but should rather be directed into the public purse. That last proposition is clearly absurd in its moral logic; as George Will has pointed out in The Washington Post, the fact that government cannot prevent people from being self-destructive is no reason for government to go on a grand scale. But morally absurd or not, this is the argument that counts. The case for legalized gambling is, at bottom, simply an argument in favor of the government raising revenues by swindling its citizens rather than by taxing them.

The article in Forbes makes it quite clear that the impetus for legalized gambling comes from the promise it holds of raising substantial revenues in a "painless" way. When the idea of legalized gambling began to take shape some years back, our state budgets were indeed in bad shape. But today that is no longer the case. For various reasons—revenue sharing, the declining birth rate, general prosperity—most states are now running budgetary surpluses, and tax cuts are becoming more common than tax increases. Nevertheless, there are a great many people in our society whose notion of "progressive" politics is always to be thinking of new ways for the government to spend money for the welfare of its citizens. And since taxation is unpopular, these people have persuaded themselves that it is in the public interest for the government to swindle its citizens so that it can then launch programs that would improve their lives, materially and spiritually.

As a result, various forms of legalized gambling are already in existence in several states while other states are contemplating the inaugurating of them. And we have learned something very interesting from our experience so far. This is that legalized gambling, if it is to "work" (i.e., raise revenues), must be run like any other business selling any other commodity. It has to be advertised and promoted: non-gamblers have to be *persuaded* to gamble. It has to be attractively packaged: there must be various forms of gambling to suit pocketbooks large and small, and to satisfy diverse tastes for a speculative fling. It must be innovative: new modes of gambling have to be devised and introduced, lest people become bored with losing their money. It must be deceptive: the odds against winning are emphatically *not* printed on your betting ticket. And both the stakes and the bets have constantly to be increased, so people can ignore their continuing losses while dreaming of an ultimate "killing."

DOES IT MAKE SENSE?

In short, when government gets into the gambling business it necessarily assumes the responsibilities for seeing that this business grows and prospers. In effect, it proclaims that gambling is not a necessary evil but an inherently good thing. And it does this while telling its citizens that, if they are to be good Americans, they should work hard, save their money, shun all get-rich-quick schemes. Is this not ridiculous? Does it really make sense for the government to insist that no one has a legal right to work for a penny less than the minimum wage and for the government then to encourage us all to blow our week's wages at the betting cage? Does it really make sense for the government to enact a mountain of legislation—from SEC registration to the labeling of consumer products—which protects people from unwise expenditures while urging them to make the unwisest expenditure of all, i.e., a gambling bet?

Of course it is ridiculous. And dishonest. And corrupting, both of people and government. But the urge to spend the people's money for the people's welfare is so powerful (and so mindless) that it actually comes to seem proper to cheat the people in order to get this money to spend on their welfare. This is paternalism run amok.

I have no doubt that there are some silly anti-gaming laws on the books—petty laws. ineffectual laws, which ought simply to be repealed. And if we really are tired and bored with enforcing the laws against *gambling*, then the honest thing to do is to repeal them as well. Gambling will then be the free folly of an individual.

But if we legalize gambling in principle, and then socialize it to boot, we have declared that it is in no way a blameworthy activity. That's going too far. One Las Vegas, far away and only sometimes visited, we can easily tolerate—even benignly tolerate. But one is quite enough.

MR. NIXON TAKES A WHITEWASH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, despite the President's recent action in complying with the U.S. District Court of Appeals' decision that he hand the disputed tapes over to Judge Sirica, serious questions still remain as to whether the investigation into his administration's activities will be able to continue unimpeded. It is, I think, most important that Congress immediately act to reestablish, by statute, the office of the special prosecutor, thereby insuring its independence from the President and the Executive Branch.

I am taking the liberty of inserting Mr. Tom Wicker's article on this subject which appeared in the October 23 edition of the New York Times. I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Wicker's remarks on the need for an independent investigation into the Nixon administration's activities:

MR. NIXON TAKES A WHITEWASH

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—Richard Nixon has ordered his own whitewash. He has put an end to an investigation of his Administration's activities that he had promised would be independent, unhindered and complete, and he has reasserted his political direction of the Department of Justice.

In so doing, Mr. Nixon has made it impossible that any Justice Department continuation of the Cox investigation could be credible, conclusive or acceptable to the American people, much less effective in uncovering wrongdoing. If Mr. Nixon had wanted a no-holds-barred inquiry, he would not have fired Special Prosecutor Cox; if the Justice Department now attempts to provide such an investigation anyway, Mr. Nixon has left no doubt that he will stop that, too, by firing the next crop of investigators.

That the Watergate investigation has been quashed by the man being investigated should not be obscured by all the diversions this devious politician has prepared to disguise it. White House lawyers apparently are going into court to argue that Mr. Nixon's unilateral proposal of a self-serving means of resolving the tapes controversy met the court requirement that he turn the tapes over to Judge Sirica. They will argue further that this proposal was indeed a "compromise," although it takes two sides to a controversy to make a compromise, and although, on its face, Mr. Nixon's proposal was more nearly a flat accompanied by a peremptory order to Mr. Cox not to return to the courts in further pursuit of the tapes.

It also is being argued that this Nixon power play is a compromise because it was accepted, more or less, by Senator Ervin, whose flabby inadequacy as an investigator was finally made clear, and by Senator Baker, who is a Republican Presidential possibility, on behalf of a committee that had no say in their decision. In fact, the committee already had been denied the tapes by the courts, so that the two Senators were not compromising but swallowing a Nixonian handout of sucker-bait. At that, they did not then know that their acceptance would be used to make Mr. Cox appear intransigent; although they presumably did know, as Mr. Nixon surely did, that whether or not they accepted on behalf of the Senate committee had no bearing on what the special prosecutor had to do on behalf of the grand jury for which he originally had sought the tapes.

As for Mr. Nixon's selection of John Stennis as auditor of the tapes—a political master-stroke—it is no reflection on Mr. Stennis' undoubted veracity to inquire why he, but not a Federal judge in his chambers, should pass on the accuracy of the "summaries" Mr. Nixon proposed to provide; or to point out that the proposal would set aside the normal judicial process, by Nixonian decree, in favor of an ad hoc arrangement with nothing to recommend it but the reputation of one elderly and infirm man. As Mr. Cox explained, moreover, however John Stennis might vouch for them, no court would or should accept "summaries" rather than the tapes themselves as evidence for either the prosecution or any defendant—which may be something Mr. Nixon had in mind all along.

All of these matters are diversionary and are being advanced by White House double-talk artists in order to hide from the public the snuffing out of Archibald Cox's special investigation, and the reassertion of the same kind of political control of the Justice Department that made Mr. Cox's appointment necessary in the first place.

That appointment was forced upon Mr. Nixon by Congress because the Senate would not have confirmed Elliot Richardson as Attorney General without the promise that a special prosecutor would be named and given independent powers to investigate; and Mr. Richardson's resignation was in recognition of that promise and of its violation by Richard Nixon. Therefore, Congress has no choice, if it is not to see its expressed will thwarted by Mr. Nixon's perfidy, but to reestablish a special and independent investigation in such a manner that Mr. Nixon cannot nullify it by whatever new tricks he may devise.

How this may be done, as to a general investigation into all the alleged offenses, is not clear, but as to Mr. Nixon himself, there is ready at hand a resolution by Representative B. F. Sisk of California that the House of Representatives establish a select committee to inquire into the question of impeachment. To impeach, which only the House can do, is not to remove Mr. Nixon from office but to indict him in specified charges, which then would be turned over to the Senate for a fair trial on the merits of the case.

Mr. Nixon could not quash such a constitutionally based House inquiry. He could not contend that it violated the separation of powers. If he refused to respond to its subpoena, the committee of inquiry could draw its own conclusions, and make its own recommendations. By thwarting the legal process, Mr. Nixon has asked for precisely such political judgment.

TAPIRS, TAKINS, KINODO DRAGONS—ONLY AT THE BRONX ZOO, AND SOON A MONORAIL, TOO

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Bronx Zoological Park, no doubt the finest institution of its kind, plans a most exciting new endeavor—a 40-acre Asiatic wildlife complex for such exotic creatures as kinodo dragons, Siberian tigers, giant bats, mouse deer, takins, gaurs, clouded leopards, and tapirs. And to protect the animals and the viewers from each other, there are plans to build a ground level monorail that can be halted at the command of the guide any time something unusual happens among the animals.

This project exemplifies the best efforts of zoo planners to provide the excitement and wildness of a first-class zoo in an urban setting. It would be regrettable if the money needed to realize these plans were not forthcoming. The museum services bill (H.R. 10596) designed to provide project grants and technical assistance would, if enacted, help to insure the success of endeavors such as that planned for the Bronx Zoo.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the New York Times on October 19:

ASIA IS COMING TO THE BRONX ZOO

(By Murray Schumach)

A monorail with expert lecturers, will be the style in which visitors to the Bronx Zoo's projected 40-acre Asiatic wildlife complex will watch kinodo dragons, Siberian tigers, elephants, rhinocerous, giant bats, mouse deer, the largest wild cattle in the world and other exotic creatures from the Arabian Peninsula to Java.

Moreover, the ground-level monorail will be built in such fashion that although it will run alongside the Bronx River Parkway for a stretch, as well as across the Bronx River, the rider will at all times, be turned from views of traffic and other unpleasant reminders of urban civilization.

This, and other aspects of the Asian exhibition that will be mostly outdoors, were disclosed yesterday by William G. Conway, director of the Bronx Zoo, after he appeared before the City Planning Commission, at City Hall, to urge inclusion of $5.5-million by the city for this development.

"The complex will be the most exciting thing of its kind ever built," Mr. Conway said. He said that the monorail will be able to be halted at the command of the guide any time he sees anything unusual happening among the animals.

NO NUTS, PLEASE

After leaving the hearing, he said that the New York Zoological Society has already committed itself to $6.5-million and that the work has started on the plans that the city has looked upon favorably in the past.

"The smallest section of this Asiatic wildlife complex," he said, "will be bigger than our present African plains for the lions." The plains cover about three acres and is now the zoo's largest display.

Mr. Conway, when asked if youngsters would be able to give peanuts to the elephants as they roam the outdoor Asian area, replied:

"No. We want to stop this custom of giving peanuts to elephants. The peanuts are no better for elephants than they are for people."

Included in the new exhibition area will be a building that will contain slithering pythons, treetop-swinging orangutans, and the komoto dragons.

SCHOOL IS PLANNED

One of the major outdoor features will be the Siberian tigers, of which the zoo now has a breeding group that has enabled the institution to raise between four and seven cubs a year. This work is particularly important because Mr. Conway said that there are now believed to be less than 180 Siberian tigers in their natural state left in the world.

Once the Asiatic exhibition is open, the zoo's old lion house will be phased out and be replaced by a school to teach conservation. Live animals will be part of the courses at this school.

The designer of the new exhibition is Morris Ketchum and Associates, of 919 Third Avenue, architects for the widely acclaimed World of Birds and World of Darkness at the Bronx Zoo.

Among other creatures in the new Asian exhibition, Mr. Conway continued, will be cranes, tapirs, takins (relatives of the musk ox, which are from Boreno), gaur, or giant wild cattle, that stand six feet at the shoulder; clouded leopards and flying foxes, which are bats with five-foot wingspreads.

Mr. Conway said that very few trees would have to be cut down for the new exhibition and that the natural beauty of the area would be protected since the building will be partly underground and be almost concealed by trees and other greenery.

Mr. Conway said that the New York Zoological Society began planning the project in 1969 and is hopeful that the first stage—the outdoor phase—will be open by 1975 and that the indoor section will be completed a year later.

The area for evoking Asia in the Bronx will run from the zoo's southern boundary at 180th Street north almost to the Pelham Parkway, and east from the Bronx River to the Bronx River Parkway. It is an underdeveloped tract within the zoo's 252 acres.

SECRETARY OF ARMY CALLAWAY DISCUSSES VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke on the floor of the House regarding the concept of an All-Volunteer Army and the fact that more support ought to be given to this effort.

Last Monday the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Howard H. Callaway, addressed the Association of the U.S. Army convention here in Washington on this same subject. The Secretary's remarks should be of interest to other Members of the Congress and I, therefore, am inserting them in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

Ladies and Gentlemen, distinguished guests:

I'm delighted to have this opportunity to be with you this afternoon. We in the Army are aware of your long-standing support for a strong National defense and we feel that the Nation owes you a debt of gratitude.

It is an exciting time for me to be Secretary of the Army. We are entering a historic time, a time of basic change, as we try to do what has never been done before. The Army has set out to provide security for this great country, to keep our global commitments, to stand ready to face an aggressor on a moment's notice—and to do all this with an Army of volunteers. No nation in history has tried to meet such massive and complex commitments without compelling people to serve, through one form of conscription or another. It is a challenge—a great challenge, one which I assure you we are doing our utmost to meet. Today I want to address this question with you—this question of meeting the need for an Army with a volunteer force.

Unfortunately, discussions of the volunteer Army are usually accompanied by emotional considerations about the value of the draft or of Universal Military Training. There are many, both in the military and out, who genuinely feel that the maintenance of a draft is important to our country, and so the debate continues. But the debate is on the wrong subject.

Those who continue to hold out the false hope that the Army can or ought to simply dodge the problems of the volunteer environment by quick return to the draft are not facing up to today's realities. The country doesn't want a draft today. The Congress doesn't want a draft today. The alternative then is a successful volunteer Army or failure for the Army. The US Army has never failed this country. It has always turned the hard challenges of history into success. So today, the challenge for all of us who support the Army is clear. We must set our minds to making the volunteer Army work.

And the volunteer Army is working! It is working because there are still young men and women in America who want to serve their country—this is "an idea whose time remains" for all Americans, young and old, of every race, color, and creed. And it is working because the Army offers to young men and women a satisfying life and solid benefits in conjunction with their service. There are those who feel we are trying to buy an Army. This is not the case. We are giving young men and women who serve in the Army a standard of living that is roughly comparable to the standard of living they might get in the civilian community for doing a similar job. This means higher pay; paid annual leave; complete, superb medical and dental care; life in much improved barracks, and more.

All of these measures are necessary. I support them wholeheartedly. But let me emphasize that we are not trying to buy an Army! We will get the Army that the Nation needs only by appeal to sacrifice and service.

And this brings me to the second, most important way that we are making the volunteer Army work, by insuring that service to the country is a meaningful part of the young man or woman's life. We are making Army service a step forward in their lives, not an interruption. And to do this we are putting a great emphasis on education and training, and on insuring that our soldiers' jobs are important and useful.

We are doing this by making each soldier's job relate to the Army's mission, because this makes Army service mean something. Our young people want value from their

lives. They want a job that matters and we've got that job. We are also working to eliminate unnecessary irritants. We think this will make the Army more attractive, and our surveys have borne this out.

We have developed a very attractive package of education and training. To the high school dropout who has the ability and motivation, we offer work toward a high school diploma, as an adjunct to training. To the high school graduate, an opportunity for college training, part of which may be as an adjunct to training. To junior college and college students, the possibility of further training, and even this may be as an adjunct to training. And to all of them, the Army offers vocational training that will be useful when the soldier returns to civilian life.

With a meaningful job, a decent standard of living, and real opportunity for continued education and training, young men and women can look upon a period of service to the country as a genuine step forward in their lives. And when they leave the Service, they will realize other very important advantages. For one thing, under the GI Bill, they are entitled to more education, provided by the government to its veterans. And they are more mature. The Army has trained them, given them each a mission, and then held them responsible for professional results. This responsibility develops maturity. Thus, both the education and experience of military service prepare them for better jobs when they leave the Army for civilian careers.

All of these benefits are pointed toward the first term volunteer. For those who choose to reenlist for the volunteer Army, however, more opportunities for education, maturity, and service accrue.

We have, today, the finest noncommissioned officer leadership training we have ever had, with progressive career steps going from the recruit right on through our top command sergeant major. Our men and women enjoy the benefits of our new Noncommissioned Officer Education System, a system which offers to the noncommissioned officer a progressive, professional military education roughly comparable to the superb system of schooling we have always offered to our officers. The system trains, educates, and motivates our NCO leaders for the progressive challenges of an Army career.

Some of our strongest supporters don't fully understand today's Army. They think the Army lost something important when we initiated, for example, the idea of hiring civilian help—KPs—to work in the kitchens and dining rooms. They think that eliminating such irritants as KP has made the Army soft. But the Army's mission is not to peel potatoes; its mission is to fight. Peeling potatoes does not improve discipline or combat efficiency. So changes to some things held traditional in the past are in the wind, but if you look at them, you will see that each turns harder than ever on mission. We are not retreating from the Army's real business. The volunteer Army is ready to fight.

We do not have and we shall not have a permissive Army. We have and we shall have a disciplined Army, responsive to authority, and able to perform its mission in the service of the country. You expect it; the country deserves it; and I'm going to do my level best to see that it happens.

In brief, that's the program we have undertaken to attract young people, to encourage them to enter the Army. And once they're in, I know that many of them will choose to stay beyond their initial commitment, because they will see that the Army has a very fine career progression system.

I believe Americans will agree, then, that we have a package that is appealing to today's young people, appealing not only in terms of benefits, but in the opportunity for service to country. And the beauty of this is that it appeals to everyone in America. Service to country appeals equally to rich and poor, Northerner and Southerner, educated and uneducated. Pride in America and willingness to sacrifice for her is an ideal which knows no cultural or economic boundaries. In this fact lies the very strength of the Nation. I count on this appeal to give us an Army which mirrors America. It's not going to be a mercenary Army, it's going to be an all-American Army.

This then is our plan. It is not only our plan for the future, it is also a description of today's Army. For practical purposes, the draft ended for us on December 29, 1972, when the last draftee entered the Army. (Although a few deferred draftees entered later.) So we have had about 10 months' experience now in a volunteer environment, and I think it is appropriate that we review some of the results.

Because each month we openly discuss our goals and quotas, many have a distorted picture of our progress. They feel we are hopelessly short of recruiting goals, trying to make up the gap by lowering quality, and as a consequence, ending up with nothing worthwhile whatever. It is true that we have missed our goals during the past 10 months. But it is important to remember that our goals are akin to the salesman's goals—realistic, but difficult to meet.

What are the facts? During these past months, we have recruited into the volunteer Army some 124,000 young men and women; further, over 34,000 men and women have reenlisted during this period. In fact we have been running about 84 percent of our recruiting objective ever since December 29, 1972, when we abandoned the draft. And those who have come into the Army are of high quality. We have had a higher percentage of high school graduates entering the Army since the draft ended—about 10 percent higher—than we had in the 6 months before the end of the draft. As a result, we now have an Active Army of over 794,000 and this is 97 percent of our programed strength. Total accessions, then, have fallen somewhat short of our goals, but we are still filled far above any level of concern, and quality is high.

And we have many encouraging signs. Last year we decided to reactivate the 9th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Washington, but the manpower was not at hand. So we told the commander, General Fulton, that if he wanted a division, to take his cadre, the Division colors, and go out and recruit a division. General Fulton and his recruiters did just that. They began a vigorous recruiting campaign and today that Division stands at 102 percent strength, essentially filled with enlisted volunteer soldiers. Now, this is a real success story, a living example which illustrates concretely that the volunteer Army program is not an impossible dream, but a workable idea, and it is typical of many other units with similar successes.

We do not minimize our recruiting problems; we spend our time and energy working on them. We are trying many news approaches to recruiting, which stress quality together with quantity—such as increasing the number of recruiters, expanding our unit-of-choice and station-of-choice options, screening out poor soldiers in our reenlistments, administering new entrance tests, and even weeding out misfits in basic training. These efforts will continue.

Some also have expressed concern that the volunteer Army was doomed to failure because it would bring a decline in discipline. That has not been the case. If we compare discipline trends for FY 72 with FY 73, a period which includes both draft and volunteer Army experience, we find that rates for AWOL, desertion, crimes of violence, crimes against property, courts-martial, and separations under less than honorable conditions, are down.

Virtually every major indicator of discipline except drug offense has, in fact, remained or turned positive in the volunteer Army. Whatever factors contribute to this picture, it is clear that today's volunteer soldier is not causing an increase in disciplinary problems.

Many also had expected the volunteer Army to herald the demise of our National Guard and Army Reserve as viable outfits. No such demise is in sight, although we do face problems here. We have seen modest reductions in the strengths of both our Reserve Components from the December 1972 levels, a trend in fact dating from mid-1971. But current indications give us some encouragement that we may be able to restrain this decline. We have in the past several months, for example, been successful in recruiting trained, experienced, prior-service personnel into our Reserve Components to offset some of our shortfall. As you know, Reserve Component strength remains critically important, so we are very much concerned that it continue to receive close attention. Under the total force policy any future emergency buildup will have to rely upon the National Guard and Reserve rather than a draft for initial and primary augmentation of our Active forces. I expect the improving image of the volunteer Army to have the positive effect on the health of our Reserve Component recruitment that is needed.

Finally, combat readiness, which is the heart of our business, has shown significant improvement. When the draft ended, we had 13 divisions on the books, but only 10 fully formed. Of the 13 divisions, only 4 met the Army's stringent readiness standards and were considered ready for combat. By contrast, we now have all 13 divisions fully operational and 10 ready for combat. Thus, our divisions today, judged by the stringent standards reported to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, much more nearly meet their goals in terms of authorized strength, personnel job qualification, unit training, equipment on hand, and equipment serviceability than they did at the end of the draft. Six months to a year from now, I believe our readiness posture will be even better.

These simple facts and figures point to one conclusion—The Army is better today than it was at the end of the draft. But the figures are not nearly so meaningful as the subjective feel of those in the Army. I certainly don't pretend to be an expect on this, but by the end of this month I will have visited all 13 of the Army's active divisions, as well as many other posts and stations. During every visit I have talked with new soldiers, with senior noncommissioned officers, with junior officers, with senior officers and commanders. I can tell you that without any question, today's Army is a far better Army, far more prepared for combat than it was at the end of the draft. I can just feel it everywhere I go. It's in the air. Discipline is better, morale is better, training is better, and equipment is better. The Army's future is indeed now.

And, what is more important, all of our vital trends, with the possible exception of drug abuse (and we are working hard and effectively on that one), are in the right direction today. Let me emphasize—your Army is good now, ready to fight, and getting better with the passage of time. I foresee no doom ahead. Six months from today we will be better, and after that, better still.

This picture that I give you of today's Army is enthusiastic and optimistic, and purposely so. I am extremely proud of today's Army and what has been done to make it work in the volunteer atmosphere. But I recognize our challenges. Benjamin Franklin once said that, "the man who expects nothing . . . shall never be disappointed." I believe he would share my belief that men who do expect something worthwhile and are willing to work hard for it, are apt to achieve it, even if the task is difficult and unfamiliar.

We are daily working on new, innovative,

and exciting ideas to insure that we get the right number of qualified men and women to man our Army. It will not be easy. It will perhaps be the toughest job that the U.S. Army has ever been called upon to do, but I am certain that today's Army will be equal to the challenge.

We in the Army have always needed the active support of the American people. Today, we need it even more than ever before. Even our strongest critics have recognized that the one vital element necessary for the success of the volunteer Army lies beyond the Army itself. I'm talking about the public support. We need your help as we plow new ground, as we steer an uncharted course to give the country the best Army it has ever had. Without your help, we cannot succeed; with it, we cannot fail. Together, we can meet the challenges and prove worthy of the Nation's trust.

Thank you.

LEGAL SERVICES OUTRAGE

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, this House will be taking up consideration of the Legal Services Corporation bill once again. The bill drawn up by the Senate differs considerably from the version passed by the House, and would, in my opinion, have disastrous effects on the country. No one knows better the vast potential for abuse in an independent Legal Services Corporation than the former Director of OEO, Howard Phillips. In a front page article in a recent issue of Human Events, the conservative Washington weekly, Mr. Phillips details the twisted road the bill has taken here on the Hill, and offers a warning about the consequences of enacting legislation without the minimal safeguards provided in a number of amendments passed here in the House in June.

Mr. Phillips also details the role which the White House could play, if it were of such a mind. I sincerely hope that the President takes note of the entreaty of the man he appointed to oversee the phasing out of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and I present Mr. Phillips' article here for the Members' consideration:

SENATE VOTE NEARS—WILL NIXON SWALLOW LEGAL SERVICES OUTRAGE?

(By Howard Phillips)

The moment of truth is close at hand in which will be resolved one of the most critical, yet least debated, domestic policy issues of the past decade: Legal Services. To a very great extent the outcome will be shaped by the attitude of Richard Nixon and those he has named to man his White House staff.

No activity of the federal government in the modern political era has had a more revolutionary impact on our society than legal services. In terms of leftist organizational success, high-impact radical propagandizing, pervasive administrative and legislative lobbying, landmark test case litigation, provision of patronage to the McGovern Democratic left, and countless other ways, the legal services program has become the state-subsidized theocracy of America's Liberal Establishment. It *is* the "establishment of religion," albeit a secular religion, against which James Madison and other libertarians warned us in the context of an earlier era. It is the extra-procedural instrument by which a militant left-wing political minority wields power, subsidized by the taxes of the American people.

While Nixon spokesmen irrelevantly denounce "acid, amnesty and abortion," legal services attorneys are quietly at work using Nixon Administration funds to promote liberalized drug policies, abortion on demand, and assistance to military dissenters.

While the President's legislative representatives lobby for the Alaska pipeline, legal services activists have played a leading role in delaying it. While Nixon opposes forced busing, legal services promotes it. While the President lectures about the work ethic and workfare, legal services leads the legislative strategy and grass-roots lobby for "welfare rights."

With funds, not just from the Office of Economic Opportunity, but the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and other agencies as well, they have made their presence felt at San Quentin, in the front line of the anti-war movement, in Cesar Chevez' strategy meetings, in organizing for the American Indian Movement, in rent strikes, in underground newspapers, in marches against the President; they have become the vanguard of the "proletariat" which they have helped create.

Now the issue is coming to a head.

Operating in closed meetings, without yet having afforded any opportunity for public hearings, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare rushed this past week to mark up and send to the floor a heavily liberalized version of the proposal for a non-accountable Legal Services Corporation.

If the Senate committee has its way, the present legal services program would be locked into place without any of the procedural safeguards adopted by the House of Representatives in June, and minus the organizational accountability to the Congress and the President which are now available to curb abuses.

Critics of the OEO legal services program have pointed out that, under a centralized national corporation, with virtually all decisions made in Washington, rather than in the localities where the program operates, it has been relatively easy for a small clique to exercise undue influence over legal services policies and funding decisions.

Furthermore, legal services attorneys, compensated by salary, rather than fee, have found themselves much freer than attorneys in private practice to devote their energies to personal political priorities, rather than simply to respond to client needs. As a consequence of the monopoly staff system, which excludes reliance on private practitioners, clients are unable to be assured of assistance, let alone the choice of their own attorney. It is the salaried attorney who decides which clients and what causes shall gain attention.

Because current legal services policies have encouraged group representation, political organizing, legislative lobbying, propagandizing of the poor with radical social doctrines, and related activities, the House on June 21, adopted more than a score of amendments to limit such misdirection of resources. Without these restrictions, which are by no means comprehensive or fully adequate, present program outrages would be locked in and exacerbated, beyond the reach of accountability to elected officials.

Now, according to Senate insiders, the liberal committee has determined not only to emasculate the safeguards adopted by the House, but also to make the bill even weaker than the watered-down compromise introduced by the Administration in May.

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which is dominated by such prominent liberal senators, as Edward M. Kennedy (D.-Mass.), Walter Mondale (D.-Minn.), Thomas Eagleton (D.-Mo.), Gaylord Nelson (D.-Wis.), and William Hathaway (D.-Maine), relies for its GOP leadership on ranking Republican Jacob Javits—who, more often than not, is merely an extension of the Democratic leadership. Giving support to Javits on the Republican side are J. Glenn Beall (Md.), (brother of Vice President Agnew's prosecutor. Maryland U.S. Attorney George Beall), Richard Schweiker (Pa.), Robert Stafford (Vt.) and Robert Taft (Ohio).

Other liberal Democrats on the committee includes Chairman Harrison Williams (N.J.), Harold Hughes (Iowa), Alan Cranston (Calif.) and Claiborne Pell (R.I.).

Subcommittee action on the corporation bill was completed on October 2 and 3. Prodded by Senators Javits and Kennedy, ratification by the full committee and subsequent referral to the Senate floor was expected to have been completed within a few days thereafter.

Contrary to the assumption of those observers who have relied on Washington newspaper accounts for information about the legal services controversy, the Labor and Public Welfare Committe has not acted on the legal services bill which was adopted by the House on June 21. That bill has been sidetracked by the Democratic leadership of the Senate which has been heavily lobbied by politically oriented legal services grantees to start "from scratch" with a more permissive bill, free of restrictions on their actiivties.

It has been the equally significant objective of the program's attorney beneficiaries to deny jurisdiction over the proposed corporation to the relatively moderate Senate Judiciary Committee, which would normally have jurisdiction over legal services legislation and power of review over presidential appointments to the prospective corporation's Board of Directors.

The Standing Rules of the Senate state that the committee on the Judiciary shall have referred to it *"all* proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials and other matters related to . . . judicial proceedings, civil and criminal. . . ." (emphasis added.) Nothing in the rules would even seem to suggest Labor and Public Welfare's claim to authority over the legal services program, once it is separated from OEO.

But the legal services lobby has so far succeeded on both fronts, blocking the House bill *and* Judiciary jurisdiction.

When the House-passed bill reached the Senate, an attempt was made by liberals to refer it inconspicuously to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This tactic failed when Michigan Sen. Robert Griffin questioned it, inquiring whether the Judiciary Committee might not more properly receive the referral. Fearing an adverse parliamentary ruling, liberal senators decided to let the House bill "be held at the desk of the Senate," a procedural move to avoid a clear showdown on the Judiciary issue at this time. This left them free to proceed with a "clean" bill in Labor and Public Welfare.

In a related action, when the Brock-Helms proposal for a client-oriented, decentralized legal services program was referred to Judiciary, liberal staffers arranged to keep it bottled up, without hearings, in a new subcommittee headed by California Sen. John V. Tunney, the former roommate of Ted Kennedy, who received strong support from legal services employes when he defeated George Murphy in 1970.

The importance of the jurisdictional question is particularly evident given the history of recent months: In order to gain Labor and Public Welfare Committee approval of his appointment as OEO director, Alvin Arnett, who had been my principal administrative officer during the period in which I headed OEO, found it necessary to repudiate all his previous activities, not just iterms of rhet-

oric, but with respect to specific policy and funding decisions. He, in effect, surrendered control over the agency's management to the super-liberal committee, in return for a $42,500 salary and a chauffeured limousine.

Even if the President appoints men and women of stronger character than Arnett to the board of the corporation, they will become subject to persistent pressures from Javits and his colleagues to surrender key principles as a condition of Senate approval. Although Judiciary jurisdiction would not, of itself, assure immunity from prosecution, it would go a long way toward removing the legal services program from the clutches of an exclusive liberal clique and enhancing the prospect of independent governance for the new corporation.

Leading the fight for a radicalized version of the corporation proposal has been the rabidly anti-Nixon American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), whose leaders have been plotting the impeachment of Richard Nixon in close cooperation with legal services activists. In fact, one of OEO's legal services back-up centers was founded by Father Robert Drinan, the congressman from Massachusetts who introduced the first impeachment resolution against Nixon. While dean of the Boston College Law School, Drinan played a key role in organizing the OEO-funded National Consumer Law Center, which bears the mark of his influence even today.

Despite ACLU's activities, ironically, the present advantage which Senate liberals enjoy in their legal services strategy and negotiations with the White House derives in large part from the fact that President Nixon now seems more interested in getting the corporation quickly passed and operational than do the radical forces which will benefit most from its enactment. As a consequence, Senate liberals feel encouraged to hold out for the best deal they can get on the corporation bill's provisions.

Liberal staff members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee also reportedly plan to delay confirmation of corporation board members until they get appointees from the White House who will, for the most part, serve the present program's policies and grantees intact.

A major consideration in taking the pressure for a corporation off the liberals is their present control of the legal services program at OEO. The office has not had a designated director since early July. Day-to-day direction is now under the guidance of Dan Bradley, a protege of Watergate Committee Assistant Counsel Terry Lenzner. As a special assistant to Arnett, Bradley runs the show, with Frank Duggan, a left-wing Texas Democrat serving as operation chief. An ally of former Sen. Ralph Yarborough, Duggan was a bitter foe of both John Connally and John Tower while working with the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE). Bradley and Duggin are busy "staffing up" their offices with like-minded colleagues, preparing for the corporation.

With Arnett's concurrence, legal services program guidelines and administration have reverted to the kind of permissive disregard of the law which characterized earlier periods of liberal program domination. Program funds are once again disbursed "among friends" at the whim of the leftist clique which dominates the program nationwide. In the short run, at least, program attorneys could hardly do better under a corporation. So they've decided to "up the ante" and see how many more concessions will be granted by eager White House staffers.

As senate liberals negotiate with Jim Cavanaugh, assistant director of the Domestic Council, the legal services lobby is helped by an incredibly foolish White House strategy which seeks a corporation at any cost.

Led by Office of Management and Budget Assistant Director Paul O'Neil, management-budget officials have been hard at work since November 1972 to "protect" President Nixon from his original determination to eliminate, not merely cover up, destructive and unproductive OEO activities.

Instead of cutting out bad grants and changing unwise policies, their objective has been to reduce "political flak" by shifting OEO components, unchanged, to new bureaucratic homes. They hoped to appease conservatives with the appearance of change, while keeping liberals happy with increased funding levels and the "institutionalization" elsewhere of OEO-initiated activities.

It is O'Neil's current tactic, adopted by Arnett and Cavanaugh, to whom Arnett reports, to insist that unless corporation legislation is swiftly passed and a board of directors is promptly confirmed, OEO, against the President's wishes, would have to continue. This isn't true, and the argument better serves the goals of the ACLU—which hopes to rush a legal services program into existence—than it does Richard Nixon. Despite O'Neil, OEO can be eliminated as an operational institution whenever the White House decides to veto further appropriations for its activities.

No matter what the President does, ACLU will still dislike him. His policies should be accountable not to legal services liberals, but to those who supported his re-election. Conservatives are tired of the cosmetic rhetoric reflected in the "corporation at any cost" strategy and anxious to see if real reform of anti-poverty programs is on the President's agenda.

Another flaw in the present Administration thinking can be seen in the notion that specific provisions in the legal services bill are unimportant, so long as the President has sole power to appoint its national board of directors. This OMB-promoted view is arrogant, ignorant and short-sighted, Even if Richard Nixon's leadership were provably infallible, it must be borne in mind that he will not always be President. Congress was created by the founding fathers to help assure that we would have a government of laws, to transcend the sway of any individual. Congress writes laws to provide us with safeguards against human imperfection in circumstances we cannot always foresee. These safeguards are especially needed in a corporation removed from both presidential and congressional control, with board members little more accountable than justices of the Supreme Court. Because legislated safeguards are absent from the present program and because the White House has sought to avoid criticism from the left through a policy of administrative neglect, legal services is presently excessively characterized by abuse.

If it is bad now, without safeguards, while theoretically accountable to the President directly, might things not get worse under an independent corporation? Would not responsible governance in the absence of statutory safeguards be even less likely under boards named by a President Mondale or President Kennedy?

ACLU has taken notice of the White House's apparent retreat from earlier positions and interpreted this as a sign of continuing decline in President Nixon's political strength.

In a Septemer 21 Legislative Memorandum ACLU urged its allies to raise their demands: ". . . [W]e have every right to insist on Senate passage of an uncompromisingly strong bill. Ironically, the Watergate scandal seems to be helping this effort . . . there should be far less negative pressure coming from the White House than there was last spring. And it is all the more possible for the Senate to pass a strong bill."

ACLU is being joined in its effort to prove the emasculation of Richard Nixon by a wide range of liberals who support the "Action for Legal Rights" legal services lobby. These include Clinton Bamburger, John W. Douglas, Jacob Fuchsberg, Roswell Gilpatric, Arthur J. Goldberg, Terry Lenzner, Sargent Shriver and Cyrus Vance. With a staff operation led by California Rural Legal Assistance veteran Mickey Bennett and former OEO Migrant chief Noel Klores, they have received important covert assistance from White House Counsel Leonard Garment and HEW Under Secretary Frank Carlucci.

If they win, it will only be a result of Richard Nixon's acquiescence. The simple fact is that, through his power of veto, President Nixon can insist on legislation that meets high standards.

Solid commitments and solemn promises were made last spring that the President would veto any bill which was the slightest degree to the left of the compromise version he sent to Congress in May—a draft already dangerously weakened by liberal pressures before it was sent to the Hill.

As part of those commitments and promises, conservatives were encouraged to advance strengthening amendments. The clear, oft-repeated message was "We welcome and will stand by such amendments."

On June 21, the House, though by no means doing a perfect job, did tighten some loopholes.

Now, as is evident to the opposition, White House spokesmen are waffling. The commitments are being conveniently fudged. It is said that the President is tired of the issue and wants to "get it off his back."

A lot of people still have faith that the President, in the final analysis, will use the power of his office to achieve a result consistent with his promises to conservatives. Others believe that Mr. Nixon simply wants to survive in office for the balance of his term and has concluded that, to do so, he must abandon domestic policy-setting to his liberal adversaries, in Congress, and in his own bureaucracy.

For a great many of us, this will be the moment of truth.

NERVE GAS TESTING PLANNED

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, we are now facing the prospect of open-air testing of deadly nerve gas. Jack Anderson's column of October 22 reports that the Pentagon has not yet decided whether it is necessary but would request permission before testing. I urge my colleagues to refresh their memories on this issue and refuse such permission.

Recently the Pentagon planned to transport this lethal gas by rail from Colorado to Utah. Because of the concern of Representative WAYNE OWENS, hearings were held and the plan was dropped. The Army also announced that a small portion of its Colorado stockpile would be destroyed—a portion already obsolete.

This does not solve the problem of dangerous weapons stored at some seven other points around the country; nor of the dangers ahead in testing the new "binary" weapons. Unfortunately, however, the Army's announcement ended the hearings and conveyed the impression that the problem of chemical weapons was solved. On the contrary, the Pentagon has simply found newer and "better" ways to make and stockpile chemical weapons, which should be totally outlawed.

I was privileged to present this point of view to the House Armed Services

Committee hearings and would like to include that testimony in the RECORD, along with the relevant portion of Jack Anderson's column.

The material follows:

ARMY WEIGHS OPEN-AIR GAS TESTS

(By Jack Anderson)

The Army is considering open-air tests of a deadly new nerve gas, presumably at Utah's Dugway Proving Ground where 6,400 sheep were killed five years ago in similar field tests.

The Army is trying to develop a nerve gas that would be safe to handle. The gas is produced by mixing two chemicals, which can be stored separately with complete safety. They are loaded into a shell, which is exploded over the target. This creates a chemical reaction that causes the deadly gas.

This binary system, as it is called, requires extensive testing. So far, the Army has confined its research to simulated tests. But an Army report states that, if permission can be arranged, "a limited number of open-air tests will be performed."

Alarmed over the possibility these tests may be conducted on the Utah range, Rep. Wayne Owens (D-Utah) has fired off a private letter to Army Secretary Howard Callaway.

"How soon is open-air testing of binaries to begin?" demands Owens. "When will congressional and EPA approval be sought?"

The Army Secretary hasn't replied to Owens, but a Pentagon spokesman told us: "No decision has been made as to whether it will be necessary to do open-air testing. If the decision were made, we would request permission."

The experts agree, however, that final development of the binary system nerve gas would be difficult without open-air tests.

Footnote: President Nixon has outlawed the production of biological but not chemical weapons. Critics of the binary system fear that the terrible nerve gas formula would be easy for small nations to produce. The two elements in the gas are fairly simple to make.

STATEMENT OF BELLA S. ABZUG

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views on the urgent question of chemical weapons.

I welcome the announcement made yesterday by Army Secretary Callaway, that some 500,000 gallons of nerve gas stored at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal will be destroyed. I believe the Secretary is sincere in his wish to dispose of this menace, for he has earlier indicated that he saw no justification for keeping it. Let us hope that he will proceed with dispatch—since for four years now, the Army has promised to dispose of this lethal gas. For all those years, 4600 *tons* of poisonous gases have been stored within a mile of one of the nation's busiest airports, just outside of Denver. The citizens of the area have been immensely disturbed, as they should be—a plane crash at that location would be catastrophic.

We have lived so long with lethal weapons that we almost take them for granted; yet this situation is truly incredible.

There is enough nerve gas at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal to wipe out every human being on this earth, several times over. A drop of GB the size of a pin-head can kill a person in ten minutes. Yet the stuff is stored in steel containers, above ground, a mile from an airport.

Recently the Army proposed to move some of it to another depot in Utah (where a huge amount of chemical agents is already stored. This proposal too was frought with danger. In the last few years we have seen many instances of citizens evacuated from their homes because of derailments or explosions of ammunition trains. In 1968 there were over 8000 railroad accidents in the United States. The Army has no right, now or ever, to subject citizens to such hazards.

I confess that I am skeptical about the content of the Secretary's announcement, however. There are eight locations in the country at which nerve gas is stored. Apparently it is not to be destroyed. Further, the attitude of the Department of Defense and the Administration is elusive.

You have heard the testimony of Rep. Wayne Owens, whose bill is being considered here. When he attempted to get information on the need for chemical weapons in modern defense strategy, he received full cooperation from the CIA and the Arms Control Agency; but from the Department of Defense he met "an absolute refusal to discuss the issue at all—even to allow lower level staff people to brief me." Such was the reception accorded the Representative whose District is vitally affected by these weapons.

As you are well aware, the United States has not yet signed the Geneva Protocol of 1925, outlawing poisonous or asphyxiating gases and bacteriological warfare. During the war in Vietnam, the Administration wanted to continue using chemical herbicides. Now that the hated war is ended, that rationale is removed, and the nation should move at once to join over 100 other countries, including all the big powers, who have ratified the Protocol. But the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not yet received a reply from Mr. Nixon, to his letter of April 15, 1971, raising questions about the Protocol.

Mr. Owens' bill, H.R. 9745, calls for a reevaluation of the United States policy of stockpiling chemical nerve agents. I believe that this must be done—but that the Congress and not the Administration must make such a review.

The Army's announcement does not obviate the need for legislation to control the manufacture, use, storage and disposition of chemical weapons. I commend the intent of Mr. Owens' bill, but I fear that in actuality it would permit, rather than prevent, transportation of nerve gas. Its stated purpose is "to insure that no public funds be used for the purpose of transporting chemical nerve agents to or from any military installation in the United States for storage or stockpiling purposes unless it is the sense of the Congress to do so," but three conditions would nullify this effect. Transportation is prohibited *unless*

(1) the President has made known to Congress his position on the status of herbicides and tear gas under the Geneva Protocol of 1925;

(2) the President has provided Congress with a reevaluation of the necessity for the US policy of stockpiling chemical nerve agents and

(3) the President has certified to the Armed Services Committee of Congress that such transportation is necessary in the interest of national security and that its disposal by detoxification would be seriously detrimental to the chemical weapon deterrent capability of the United States.

"National security" as we have recently discovered, can cover a multitude of sins. The President could easily certify to the necessity of moving and storing gas for "national security" reasons, and no one could verify his statement.

It seems to me that we must provide a broader legislative mandate. Senator Floyd Haskell has called for a nine-month study to determine the best and safest method of eliminating *all* existing supplies of chemical warfare agents, the cost and time necessary to carry out such a program and the manner in which such a program should proceed. He believes, as I do, that our entire stockpile of chemical agents should be destroyed.

It is terrifying enough that our nuclear over-kill is in the nature of 10 to one: that is, we are able to kill every person on earth ten times over. Must we cling to this stockpile of chemical overkill also? In the nuclear age it is obsolete since it cannot be safely transported. Representative Frank Evans of Colorado has correctly stated that "the supreme irony of our chemical nerve agents is that they pose the greatest danger to our own people."

There is no justification to continue to store this horrendous materiel anywhere in this country or in the world. We have already rejected a first-use of it; and the thought that its existence would deter nuclear attack is illogical on its face. The danger, again, is to our own people.

Further, as Mr. Owens has pointed out, our refusal to destroy this stockpile encourages smaller nations to develop and maintain chemical weapons, which are so much easier to develop than a nuclear capability. Certainly it does nothing to promote a climate of international trust.

I am not reassured by the Army's announcement that it now plans binary munitions production—in which two ingredients are stored separately and not combined until the munition is ready for firing. The proliferation of such techniques would make it easier for small countries—even for terrorist and dissident groups—to obtain life-obliterating weapons. It would still leave the problem of open-air testing, already scheduled for the Dugway Proving Ground. A few years ago, open air testing at Dugway resulted in the death of 6400 sheep; next time, it could be people.

Apparently the Department of Defense is trying to take back with one hand what it gives with the other. If under public pressure it is compelled to destroy existing stockpiles of chemical weapons, it will start their immediate replacement with binary weapons. Meanwhile, we retain an offensive chemical capacity, and continue research on new toxic agents.

It is time—indeed it is already past time—that the Congress review the entire function of chemical warfare. I am convinced that it will be found useless, costly and so hazardous that no more time must be lost in deactivating such weapons.

AIDING GRADUATE STUDENTS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation very properly gives its attention to the worsening energy crisis, a medical educator from Buffalo, N.Y., has issued a terse warning that our resources of "mind power" also are not endless.

During a Buffalo town meeting last week, Dr. M. J. Smith, assistant director of education at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, expressed concern for the national policy phasing out training of biomedical personnel.

Dr. Smith explains carefully why she feels it is a mistake to replace fellowships and training grants as the basic system of supporting research students.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the text of Dr. Smith's presentation:

REMARKS OF DR. M. J. SMITH

Today, we are all well aware of the potential damage to our nation that develops when our natural resources are taken for granted.

However, it would appear that we do not learn from our mistakes.

We are here this afternoon not to remind you that our resources are in jeopardy but to speak of the imminent stifling of our most precious resource—"our mind power". It has to become clear that "a mind is a terrible thing to waste".

We need these minds to solve the energy crisis we are facing as well as a human crisis in terms of biomedical research with which we at Roswell Park Memorial Institute are so absorbingly involved.

The Federal administration has taken the position that the "need for greater numbers of biomedical personnel has passed", and that the supply of researchers will soon exceed the demand. Furthermore, they argue that this oversupply will lead to a situation of unemployment.

DISPUTE ON FEDERAL FACTS

These arguments are not consistent with the projections of the NIH reports that state that by 1983 we will need 112,360 biomedical scientists as compared to 66,800 in 1961. Accordingly, we question the justification for phasing out of training program at all levels and particularly for our young, gifted, potential biomedical personnel.

Also, this has been questioned rigorously by other representatives of the biomedical community to the point of causing the administration to revise its decision by promising a token $30 million for only restoring a training program that will be predominantly for post doctorates.

HEW promised that by October 1 the new rules governing the $30 million post doctoral fellowship program would be forthcoming. However, today is October 15 and we are still waiting to see these new guidelines which are being held up because of lack of agreement on pay-back provision and the manner of selecting participants.

BIOMED SURPLUS QUESTIONED

The President's Science Advisory Committee has stated that "the implication that we are training a surplus of biomedical Ph. D.'s appears unfounded. All but 1.3% of those Ph. D.'s graduated in 1968–69 found positions in which they are expertly utilizing their graduate education."

Furthermore, we must realize that with every new advance made, a broad range of research opportunities is created expanding the potential job market. The new proposed system of supporting students through investigators with research contracts and grants as an alternative to fellowships and training grants has been described.

We consider this system inadequate first because it tends to restrict students to specific projects and forces students to work only with professors having such money. An organization could not develop a dependable, identifiable training program of excellence using a research project grant technique.

BREAKDOWN OF TRAINING AIMS

We have had experience with this approach and it leads to a breakdown of training objectives. Moreover, it perpetuates the training of individuals in those departments rich in research grants and therefore does not assure training in critical areas of professional and supportive personnel needs in research areas, be it in cancer or in the area of supplying energy.

The objectives of a training grant and that of a research project grant are different. The trainee is forced to limit his thinking to the objectives of the investigator's grant rather than training himself to being an excellent researcher. He is forced to play the role of a technician.

INCREASE COSTS OF GRANTS

Secondly, this would increase the costs of a research grant inasmuch as we would have to pay salaries which are higher than stipends. If you did this, staff members or departments could only support a small number of employees at the expense of ongoing research effort.

We would recommend that:

1. NIH training grants be continued and even expended to meet shortages in personnel in the pre and post doctoral basic and clinical disciplines that provide research and service.

2. NIH training grants be continued and expanded for supportive personnel that provide service and research in areas where there are identifiable shortages.

3. Such training functions be conducted primarily at centers that are equipped to train professional and supportive personnel in basic and clinical areas.

4. NIH make a strong defense against using research project grants to support trainees because it is not reliable fiscally and does not assure excellence in training since it would not be consistent with the objectives of the research project grant and would not assure the training of personnel in critical areas.

RISK OF OVER-EXPECTATIONS

One of our greatest concerns is the risk of inordinately high expectations on the part of the Congress and the public. We must not think of this program as comparable to a moon shot or an atom bomb program. It cannot be regarded as a crash program for the accelerated implementation of known basic science.

Instead, this is a program in basic science matched with the endeavor to bring the best of today's science to solve crucial problems. We are not in search of a magic bullet, but rather are attempting to mobilize the best brains available in this nation and the world to insure that they have an opportunity to make their maximum contribution to the cause of solving problems and of minimizing the time required for the solutions to benefit the people of the world.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and disappointed to see a recent statement by the former Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the present chairman of the board of the Hewlett Co., Mr. David Packard, in which he called for a curtailment of corporate support for higher education. Mr. Packard, at a luncheon sponsored by the Committee for Corporate Support of American Universities, not only called upon corporations to withhold their support from American colleges and universities, but also asked these same corporations to restrict any money that they do give to specific projects.

I am frankly amazed that someone with the background and long-term involvement in national affairs that Mr. Packard has would call for corporations to curtail contributions at a time of financial crisis for colleges and universities.

Anyone who has had an involvement with the problems of higher educational institutions knows the financial problems which these institutions now face. They also know the problems that restricted gifts necessarily create, although they are better than no contribution at all.

My belief, which has been shared by corporations for a good many years, is that corporations have a moral obligation to help colleges and universities when it is economically possible. At this time, the Government recognizing the financial plight of colleges and universities is seeking ways, not only to increase aid for needy students, but to give institutional aid to institutions of higher education throughout the country.

Mr. Packard's statements are clearly insensitive to the needs of our young people and to our colleges and universities across the country. His proposal runs counter to our governmental efforts in this area, and if adopted by the corporate community, could effectively reduce all forms of individual and corporate contributions. If we were to follow his theory through, I can see where perhaps only five or six major universities would receive aid. For instance, a great many corporations would believe that their money would yield the greatest benefit to them by investing it in specific programs at Harvard, MIT, Stanford, and the like, and then recruiting those program graduates for their corporations.

While I have nothing but respect for these universities, smaller and less well known schools also contribute greatly to the country and to the corporate community. They should in no way be ignored. They supply corporate leaders, and community leaders who interrelate to corporations.

It is estimated that at the present time, corporations give less than 1 percent of their pre-tax earnings to colleges and universities. Surely this is not a level that should be reduced. In recent years, many corporations have developed a program of raising dollar for dollar any gifts made to colleges and universities by their employees. The Packard proposal could place this program, which is proving to be very successful, in great jeopardy.

The Packard proposal would academically and financially brankrupt our colleges. He has obviously flunked his course in corporate responsibility for academic institutions, and I urge the corporate community to reject his suggestions.

USA IN MINIATURE

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. John R. Kanline, of Alexandria, Va., has been diligently attempting for some time to gain the approval and assistance of the Federal Government, U.S. industry, and the general public for a project entitled "U.S.A. in Miniature," to be completed in time for the 1976 Bicentennial celebration.

On August 3, 1973, I included Mr. Kanline's letter to the editor of the Washington Star-News in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a follow-up on this subject, Mr. Kanline has provided me, in letter form, with an "action outline" for the implementation of this proposal. At this time, under my leave to revise

and extend my remarks, I include that letter in the RECORD:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PARRIS: I appreciate your remarks on the proposal inserted in the August 3, 1973, Congressional Record and would like to add this to your "thoughts on the Bicentennial." The idea, you recall, is to create a small park in the National Capital area depicting the major sights of the U.S.A. in miniature as a major feature of the Bicentennial in 1976, and patterned after a similar park in the Netherlands called "Modurodam."

Modurodam is four acres in size with walkways interspersing the miniaturization of historical and modern features of the Netherlands with 44,000 lights, 2 miles of miniature operating railroad, shipping ports, windmills, oil refineries, manufacturing plants, etc. This park has operated for fifteen years at a profit.

To create a similar U.S. feature in time for the 1976 Bicentennial would require the interest and support of a number of segments of the U.S. such as government, general public, industry, agriculture and most of all the Bicentennial Commission and the media. I therefore suggest the following action outline for consideration of those who may see this:

(1) Government support in promoting and checking the feasibility of the proposal, including the Smithsonian, the Bicentennial Commission, the Park Service, the tourist section of the Department of Commerce, etc.;

(2) Individual and collective action of the Congress in suggesting to the Commission special features and sights from their constituencies for inclusion in this unique national park;

(3) The most necessary support of industry to participate in the technical creation of manufacturing plants in miniature such as steel mills, refineries, railroads, shipping ports, etc., and to help also by having certain segments of industry help finance parts of the project. This would constitute an excellent form of advertising:

(4) Historians, architectual designers and the Smithsonian to suggest historical topics for inclusion and to insure authenticity with financial help from philanthropic organizations;

(5) News media interest and support to editorialize the foregoing and help in its promotion in order to build up general public support. Their articles could be based on the letters to the Editor in both local papers and your article in the August 3, 1973, Congressional Record;

(6) The needed support of local citizens for the proposal and to make such support known to the Bicentenial Commission so this project can become a reality;

(7) Local government interest in a suitable location.

Since my earlier letter I have learned that several parties alerady have designs and cost estimates in hand for consideration.

I have also contacted steel companies, automobile manufacturers, insurance companies, refining companies, food manufacturers, camera and film producers, national associations of soft drink and beverage companies, and for the most part the response was enthusiastic after local representatives had passed the contents of your "Thoughts on the Bicentennial" on to their home offices.

My interest in this is non-monetary and stems from a visit my wife and I took to Modurodam several years ago.

With the vast resources of this nation, I cannot see why "U.S.A. in Miniature" cannot be created for the Bicentennial and its 40 million visitors to this area, as well as for the local children and adults who would find it both entertaining and educational.

JOHN R. KANLINE.

CHARLES T. BUSH, PATUXENT NAVY MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these days of volunteer military service it is well for the Congress to recognize those who are willing to work in their capacity as members of the military and the naval forces. It has come to my attention that PNI Charles T. Bush has been chosen by the Navy League to be the Patuxent Navy Man of the Year. Chief Bush's reputation at the Patuxent Naval Air Test Center, Md., where he is stationed, is one of the highest order. He has not only been very active in his own profession achieving an excellent rating, but he has also been a model member of the community in which he lives as well as a leading layman in his church.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of men who our Armed Forces need, and I am happy to bring to the attention of the House the outstanding record of this young man. I include at this point in my remarks an article from the Guardian of Lexington Park, Md., regarding PNI Charles T. Bush:

PATUXENT NAVY MAN OF THE YEAR

A dynamic young petty officer in Oceanographic Development Squadron Eight has been named Patuxent Navy Man of the Year for 1973. He is PN1 Charles T. Bush, 28 career counselor and personnel office supervisor in VXN–8.

PN1 Bush was selected from five nominees by a panel of representatives from the Naval Air Test Center, Naval Air Station and Fleet.

He will be presented a plaque and cash award by Mr. R. F. Gabrelcik, president of the Patuxent River Council of the Navy League, in ceremonies commemorating the Navy's 198th birthday on Oct. 13 at the Petty Officers Club. Witnessing the presentation will be RAdm. Roy M. Isaman, NATC commander; Capt. T. J. Kilcline, NAS commanding officer; and Cdr. R. L. Barr, VXN–8 commanding officer.

Honored as Navy Man of the year in his squadron in 1972 and 1973, PN1 Bush was a runner-up for the Patuxent River award last year. He also was nominated for the Navy League's Admiral Claude V. Ricketts Award in 1972.

PN1 Bush has been assigned to VXN–8 almost four of his seven years in the Navy.

He gained attention up the Navy chain of command earlier this year when he conceived and organized a coast-to-coast recruiting flight for a project airplane assigned to the squadron.

During one weekend between deployments, the Project Magnet visited Modesto, Calif.; St. Louis, Mo.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; and Groton, Conn. Advance contact with Navy recriting offiecrs in those cities resulted in 2,500 persons being exposed to the Navy and its unique project to measure the earth's magnetic field.

PN1 Bush organized a career development program which has boosted VXN–8's retention of first-term reenlistments to an average of 49 per cent. This figure compares to the Fleet norm of about 18 per cent.

PN1 Bush also created a Personnel Quality Control Board which aids division officers by identifying individuals who require specific training. The board also screens marginal performers.

The Patuxent Navy Man of the Year is active in the church, serving as an Eucharistic Minister, the highest rank a layman can attain. He has served as vice president and as chairman of the Liturgy Committee of the Patuxent River Catholic Parish Council.

PN1 Bush is a native of Baltimore.

He and his wife Joyce and three children, Tommy, 4; Gregory, 2; and Jennifer, two months, live aboard the station.

THE URGENT NEED TO DEVELOP SOLAR ENERGY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, with the outbreak of yet another Middle East war our domestic energy crisis has been thrown into the chaotic turmoil of international politics. On Wednesday of last week ministers from 11 Arab oil states agreed to restrict exports to the United States. This restriction is to be progressive: Five percent reductions each month until the pre-1967 boundaries are reestablished and "the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people are restored."

On Sunday it was announced that the Arab States had rejected this plan as too moderate and decided instead on a total boycott of American markets. Whatever the scheme, the intent is clear: It is political blackmail, clear and simple.

We will undoubtedly weather this crisis. Only about 10 percent of our total crude oil consumption of 17 million barrels a day comes from the Middle Eastern sources. Deputy Secretary of Treasury William Simon has already outlined steps that consumers and industry can take to cut our consumption by as much as 3 million barrels a day. There is good reason to believe that these conservation strategies—such as turning down thermostats and cold water clothes washing—can be successful in limiting our immediate dependence on Arab oil.

The major failing of these proposals is that they are highly individual actions. They depend for their success on the almost instantaneous development of a "conservation ethic" among consumers and industry. I am confident that Americans can meet this challenge. But I am concerned that we may be shortsighted in not understanding the vast dimensions of our oil shortage problem. The fact is that with present consumption trends, we will become increasingly dependent on Arab oil. The small conservation steps Mr. Simon suggests we take today will be no insurance for our security tomorrow.

We are all aware that the equation of declining domestic production and booming consumer demand adds up to our further dependence on foreign sources of petroleum. The National Petroleum Council, in projecting petroleum imports from all sources, estimates that by 1985, 57 percent of our total petroleum demand will be made up by imports.

The Middle East States are in the best position to supply this need. They are sitting on the largest known pools of oil in the world—over 67 percent of proven crude oil resources.

In today's unstable world, this overwhelming dependence on outside sources for petroleum imposes on our national security a serious vulnerability. Quoting from a study of the Senate Interior Committee:

> The growing proportion of total U.S. energy supply coming from foreign sources, or from particular regions, blocs or countries magnifies the potential impact on the U.S. economy from a variety of contingencies including wars or international political confrontations and insurrection or sabotage in producing regions.

An equally serious eventuality—because it is certain to occur—is the net outflow of capital from the United States to oil producers. In this development there are two impacts that must be considered. The first is the ability of the U.S. economy to support this massive outflow of capital. Estimates of the impact of this outflow vary widely, but it is certain to reach the neighborhood of $10 billion annually by 1980. While there is good reason to hope that the economy will support an outflow of this size without seriously threatening the dollar by expanding our own exports, there is little reason for optimism.

Most of the dollars flowing out of the United States will end up in the treasuries of small countries with a narrow economic base. Ordinarily, we could expect revenues from international trade to find their way to more populous countries with diverse economies. In this situation the dollars would be absorbed in the economic system without serious disruptions to world monetary flows. Unfortunately, the Arab countries are undiversified economies; there is oil production and little else. There are no wide-scale social programs and little incentive to develop other sectors of their economies. As the result, the governments of these countries have been able to accumulate enormous liquid monetary balances.

To quote again from the Senate Interior Committee report:

> By the 1980s the total incomes of the Middle Eastern and North African producing nations will reach many billions of dollars per year and their balances could cumulate to hundreds of billions.

Last winter, we had a brief look into the chaos these large sums of dollars can bring. By dumping these reserves on the world market Arab governments not only can aggravate the instability of international money markets but also can actually precipitate a crisis in the shaky system of international currency flows. In short, the Arab nations hold much more than oil. With these cash reserves they are in a position to gain an unparalleled position of power in the international economic system.

The conclusion of these ominous projections is that the United States must take steps now—today—to insure our future security by:

First, initiating immediately a Manhattan project for energy research and development, and

Second, limit our overdependence on petroleum by increasing the efficiency with which we consume it.

What is the Nixon administration doing to meet this challenge? After months of procrastination the administration's energy message was a remarkably low voltage document. The apparent Presidential strategy is to press for increased domestic production through the construction of the Alaskan pipeline, expanded leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf and increased tax incentives for drilling—while promoting a blind faith in nuclear power development. Quite simply, the President's program is narrow and shortsighted. There is no significant mention of energy conservation. There is no significant mention of solar energy. There is no consideration whatsoever of the environmental consequences of increased domestic energy consumption and production. And what is perhaps most worrisome of all, there is no evidence that the President comprehends the immense hazards—to the public health and the national security—of a headlong plunge to nuclear energy.

Planning for our energy future involves sophisticated and complex matters of policy. We cannot expect an administration which took 5 months to decide on a mandatory allocation plan to have much foresight in projecting our Nation's future energy needs. To provide another approach, I have introduced legislation to establish a massive, national program of energy research and development. This research will be funded by a $4 billion trust fund created through a tax on energy usage. An independent Commission will develop an overall energy strategy and fund research into technologies which offer the hope of clean, safe, and secure energy sources for the future. I would like to turn now to one of these alternatives—solar energy—in order to illustrate more completely the shallow, parochial nature of the Nixon energy program.

The President has announced—with apparent pride—that the National Science Foundation budget for solar research has been increased from a little over $3 million in fiscal year 1973 to over $12 million in fiscal year 1974. This is not so much a glorious victory for the advocates of solar energy as an admission of serious underfunding in past budgets.

The primary responsibility for solar research exists with the National Science Foundation, although some work is being done by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the National Bureau of Standards of the Commerce Department. This diffusion of responsibility is largely a product of the low priority that has been assessed historically to solar research. There has been no established national priorities or goals. As a result, research has been geared to solve specific technical problems with little comprehension of the overall potential of solar research. By injecting more money into this research network, the Nixon administration has done little to solve the organizational and administrative obstacles to wide-scale adoption of realistic solar energy technology.

Basically, solar energy has three potential applications. The first is meeting the heating and cooling demands of residential and commercial buildings. The second is the generation of electricity. The third is the production of "clean" fuels such as methane through the conversion of organic solids. Because solar energy is a diffuse source of energy, conversion of the sun's radiation—to thermal, electrical, or chemical energy—suffers from unusually low efficiency levels. But in the heating and cooling of buildings, solar energy has found a perfect application. In fact, the technology for accomplishing this task is already at hand. What is needed is a coherent, national program to bring this technology out of the laboratory and to the stage of commercial development.

Significant strides have been taken already to this goal. Aside from numerous residential homes which depend on the sun for a significant portion of their energy requirements, a number of office buildings are now being designed and built to include solar space conditioning. The General Services Administration is planning two such buildings: One in Manchester, N.H.; the second in Saginaw, Mich. In addition the Massachusetts Audubon Society will build a solar office building in Lincoln, Mass., soon. Undoubtedly solar buildings will become increasingly popular as people begin to realize the long-run economic advantages of this design.

What is lacking in these efforts is a sense of urgency and national commitment. As we have seen, we can continue our reckless consumption of petroleum only at the peril of our national security. We must begin to move along a number of fronts to restrict our reliance on petroleum. Solar energy presents an obvious starting place.

Accordingly, I have introduced legislation—the Solar Energy Development Act—to publicize and unify the drive toward solar heating and cooling of buildings. This proposal has been sponsored by 39 of my colleagues. By establishing three distinct but interrelated programs, this legislation will move the solar equipment industry off economic dead center. By 1985, 10 percent of all new buildings should be built with solar equipment. In 40 years, 85 percent would be equipped.

Clearly, solar energy is not the only answer to our energy shortages. But there is not going to be any one answer. Any comprehensive energy strategy for the future will be multi-faceted and diverse. In this regard, solar heating and cooling must be considered as one of the most realistic potential alternatives for the future.

Equally as certain is the fact that we as a nation will no longer be able to consume wastefully enormous amounts of energy. The Nixon administration in its energy pronouncements seems to assume our enormous demand for energy is inevitable. Just a cursory examination of our energy consumption pattern reveals clear evidence of widescale inefficiencies. To withstand the trauma of declining domestic production without generating an unstable dependence on foreign sources, we must begin now to "tighten our belts." The obvious place to start is with the gas guzzling American automobiles.

The United States, which contains 5.7

percent of the world's population, owns 46.1 percent of the world's automobiles. There are 97.65 millions cars circulating around our country consuming 73.5 billion gallons of gasoline each year. Seen in this perspective of our total energy budget, the automobile claims 14.3 percent of our energy consumed.

In terms of inefficiency, the automobile is perhaps the most inefficient machine invented by man—and that efficiency has been declining steadily in recent years. Blame for this decline has been shoved on the emission control devices mandated under the Clean Air Act. This blame is misplaced. A much more significant factor is the increased weight of American automobiles, the greater use of optional equipment, and, simply, the reluctance of management in Detroit to design energy efficiency into their automobiles.

To insure that efficiency becomes a serious consideration in the automaker's future plans, I have introduced, with Senator FRANK MOSS, the Fuel Economy Act of 1973. Beginning in model year 1977, this proposal establishes a graduated excise tax on all new cars based on the fuel economy of the vehicle. A car which achieves over 20 miles per gallon pays no tax. As the car's efficiency declines, the tax increases.

Through this tax the consumers of America will be insured of efficient automobiles in the future. In addition this provision will insure a one million barrel a day savings in our Nation's consumption of crude oil.

In the sweep of history, the "Petroleum Age" will be but a small episode in the events of man. It is the moral responsibility of the Federal Government to prepare the American people for the inevitable adjustments ahead. In this critical area, as in many others, the Nixon administration has revealed a bankruptcy of spirit and ideas. Congress must now assume the responsibility and the leadership to guide our Nation to a new and safe energy age.

PABLO CASALS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the death this week of Pablo Casals has taken from the world a great musician and a great humanitarian.

Throughout his long life, Pablo Casals used his great talents to defend the principles of liberty and freedom, unwilling to deny his conscience. Pablo Casals adopted Puerto Rico as his home for the last years of his life, bringing honor to the people of Puerto Rico and the United States.

I am inserting this tribute from the New York Times by Alden Whitman to Pablo Casals into the RECORD to pay homage to a great human being, whose life represents a standard of excellence to all humanitarians and all lovers of music.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 23, 1973]

CASALS, THE MASTER CELLIST, WON WIDE ACCLAIM IN CAREER THAT SPANNED 75 YEARS

(By Alden Whitman)

"I think it goes like this," a cello student struggling with a Johann Sebastian Bach suite once told Pablo Casals.

"Don't think," the master cellist replied. "It is better to feel."

With this emphasis on an inner sensitivity to a composer's intentions, Casals was able to demonstrate what luminescent and human music could be drawn from the strings of a rather awkward instrument. In concerts and recordings over some 75 years, he provoked awe and applause for the profundity of his insights, the felicity of his playing and, above all, the soaring purity of his interpretations of baroque and classical composers. Bach was his specialty, but he was also at home with Boccherini, Mozart, Brahms, Beethoven, Schumann and Dvorak.

At the same time Casals (he pronounced the name KaaSAALS) won much admiration and acclaim as a man of probity and principle for his humanitarianism, his personal musical "crusade for peace" and his one-man stand against the regime of Francisco Franco in his native Spain. Few musicians achieved in their own time the international renown accumulated by Casals.

Part of this fame in the United States at least, came very late in life and rested on Casal's talents in conducting, which he fancied as his real métier and which he had practiced, mainly in Europe, since 1920. Conducting gave him a sense of fulfillment, he said, because orchestras, with their human teamwork, are "the greatest of all instruments."

Early in his career, on his first American tour in 1901, a falling rock crushed the fingers of his left hand. His first thought, as Casals recalled it, was, "Thank God, I won't have to play the cello any more." He associated that reaction with his desire to conduct.

After a period of semiactivity in Europe starting in 1945, Casals went to Puerto Rico to live in 1956. He was then 79 years old and seemed spent. The next year, however, he started the Festival Casals, which became an annual springtime program of concerts. He had a heart attack just before the opening of the first festival, but he recovered buoyantly in the following years, using an orchestra brought together by Alexander Schneider, the violinist and an old friend. The concerts drew thousands of mainlanders to the island and introduced the post-World War II generation of music lovers to Casals.

Then in 1961 he joined Rudolf Serkin's Marlboro Music Festival in Vermont, where each July he conducted the orchestra and gave master classes in the cello. And, beginning in 1962, he conducted a choral work in New York every year. His first presentation was his own oratorio, "El Pesebre" ("The Manger"), a lengthy composition dedicated "to those who have struggled and are still struggling for the cause of peace and democracy."

WHITE HOUSE CONCERT

In this period of resurgence, Casals gave a widely publicized cello recital at the United Nations in New York in 1958 to mark that organization's 13th anniversary. Three years later he played to a distinguished gathering at the White House on the invitation of President John F. Kennedy.

The public attention that Casals generated in those years helped also to swell sales of his cello recordings, and this, in turn, created new esteem for his wizardry with the bow. Thousands who never saw him nonetheless came to know him intimately.

Another element of his appeal to the public was his apparent refusal to age or grow stale. "Sometimes I feel like a boy," he told an interviewer in 1964. "Music does that. I can never play the same piece twice in the same way. Each time it is new."

Watching him rehearse an orchestra when he was 89, an astonished student exclaimed: "When the maestro came onto the stage he looked 75. When he stepped on the podium he seemed even 10 years younger. And when he began to conduct he could have been a youngster ready to chase Easter eggs."

INNOVATIONS IN PLAYING

In the musical world, Casals's enduring reputation was associated with two accomplishments: his single-handed restoration to the repertory of Bach's cello music, especially the six magnificent unaccompanied suites; and his innovations in bowing and fingering that gave the cello a new and striking personality in orchestral and solo works.

He greatly lightened the work of the left hand, for example, by changes of finger positions, thus adding to its mobility. He also showed that it was possible to attain fresh subtleties in tone by freer bowing.

His own style was aristocratic. He made the most difficult passages seem simple yet luscious, all the while shunning pyrotechnics and gimmicks.

Casals came upon the Bach suites by accident when he was 13 years old and browsing with his father in a Barcelona music shop.

"I forgot entirely the reason of my visit to the shop and could only stare at this music which nobody had told me about," he said years afterward. "Sometimes even now, when I look at the covers of that old music, I see again the interior of that old and musty shop with its faint smell of the sea.

"I took the suites home and read and reread them. For 12 years after that I studied and worked every day at them. I was nearly 25 before I had the courage to play one of them in public."

When he did play them, the suites were disclosed as a transcendent musical experience, not the abstract exercises they had previously been believed to be.

"For me, Bach is like Shakespeare. He has known all and felt all," Casals told Bernard Taper in a Profile published in The New Yorker in 1961. "He is everything. Everything except a professor. Professor Bach I do not know. When people ask me how I play Bach, I say, 'I play him as the pianist plays Chopin.' There is such fantasy in Bach—but fantasy with order."

Casals was of medium stature—not much taller than his Groffriller cello—and not heavily built. The top of his head had been bald since his early 20's. In repose, his face and his blue-gray eyes (behind round glasses) tended to be somber, but a smile imparted radiance and geniality to his face.

He was direct in his speech, exceedingly polite, a careful dresser (youthful photographs show him to have been quite a dandy in a romantic sort of way) and quietly dignified. He relaxed by reading, playing tennis, chatting with friends, smoking a pipe (he was rarely without one) and, in his late years, by watching Westerns on television.

To hear Casals was a moving and memorable experience. He sat with his eyes closed, his head turned sidewise and a little lifted, as though he were communing with some secret muse. His fingering and his bowing were so flawless that they seemed automatic, yet it was evident that they resulted from concentration.

He had superb savoir-faire. Once when a loose cuff bothered him, he stopped playing, slowly took off the cuff, put it on the floor and resumed playing where he had left off. When a string broke he would retire from the stage, replace it and, returning to his chair, start the solo from the beginning, such was his drive for perfection.

When Casals played a chamber music program at Perpignan, France, in July, 1951,

Howard Taubman, then music critic of The New York Times, wrote:

"As a musician Casals is all of a piece. Whether he conducts as he did in the second orchestral program of the Bach-Mozart-Beethoven festival . . . or plays the cello, there is a fine-grained consistency running through all his musical labors . . .

"His work at the cello . . . was remarkable for its modesty and restraint, and if one listened closely one could hear innumerable felicities of technical mastery. As an admiring violinist observed, 'Do you note the four shades of color he got in one bow?'"

Casals was an ardent supporter of the Spanish Republican Government. He never reconciled himself to the Franco regime, which he considered tyrannical. With the Franco victory in 1939 he went into self-imposed exile, living until 1956 in Prades, France, some 40 miles from the Spanish frontier.

Up until 1958 he refused to visit the United States because it recognized Franco. "I have great affection for the United States," he said when he moved to Puerto Rico, "but as a refugee from Franco Spain I cannot condone America's support of a dictator who sided with America's enemies, Hitler and Mussolini. Franco's power would surely collapse without American help."

But Casals bent his attitude sufficiently to play at the United Nations in 1958 because of "the great and perhaps mortal danger [of nuclear war] threatening all humanity."

Then in 1961 he relented further and played at the White House. In subsequent years he came to this country for regular yearly visits.

Pablo Carlos Salvador Defillo de Casals was born in the Catalan town of Vendrell, 40 miles from Barcelona, on Dec. 29, 1876, the second of 11 children of Carles and Pilar Defillo de Casals. His father was the town organist.

"From my earliest days," Casals recalled, "music was for me a natural element, an activity as natural as breathing." He could sing in tune before he would talk clearly, and at the age of 5 he was a soprano in the church choir. His father taught him the piano, violin and organ, and when he was 8 he began substituting for his father as church organist.

Shortly after Pablo's 10th birthday he heard a cello for the first time when José Garcia performed in Vendrell. After some coaxing, the elder Casals bought his son a cello and gave him a few lessons. Pablo was fascinated by the instrument and proved so adept at it that he quickly exhausted his father's pedagogical abilities.

ENROLLED IN MUSIC SCHOOL

With his mother's backing and against the wishes of his father (who wanted the boy to become a carpenter), Pablo—not quite 12—went with his mother to Barcelona, where he enrolled in the Barcelona Municipal School of Music. To earn his living he played evenings for dances with a trio at the Cafe Tost, and later he persuaded the owner to devote one night a week to classical music.

That night attracted serious musicians to the bistro, including Isaac Albéniz, the composer and pianist. When Casals was graduated from music school at the age of 17 with first prizes for cello, piano and composition, Albéniz gave him a letter of introduction to Count Guillermo de Morphy, a music patron who was an adviser to Queen Mother Maria Christina in Madrid.

The Count, taken with the young cellist, introduced him to Maria Christina, who was also charmed and who granted him a monthly stipend of 250 pesetas (about $50) for his studies.

Casals lived in Madrid from 1894 to 1897, going to school at the Royal Conservatory of Music, playing duets with the Queen Mother (she was a fair pianist), chatting with the child who was to become Alfonso XIII and being guided in his general education by the Count de Morphy.

From Madrid, Casals and his mother went to Brussels, but, miffed by an unfriendly reception at an audition there, he went to Paris, where he played at the Folies-Marigny at a wage barely sufficient to keep him and his mother from starvation. After a short time they returned to Barcelona, where Casals got a job teaching at the music school. For two years he taught cello, played it in the Barcelona Opera orchestra, gave concerts in churches and formed a string quartet, all the while saving money for a return to Paris.

In the fall of 1899, just before his 23d birthday, he arrived in that city again, carrying a letter of introduction to Charles Lamoureux, the eminent conductor, from the Count de Morphy. When Casals presented himself for an audition, the conductor was annoyed by the intrusion. Nonetheless, the cellist sat down and began to play parts of the Lalo Cello Concerto. With the first notes, Lamoureux hoisted himself up from his desk and stood facing Casals until he finished playing, whereupon he embraced the young man and said, "My boy, you are one of the elect!"

SENSATIONAL DEBUT

Lamoureux immediately engaged him to play the Lalo concerto with his orchestra, and Casals made his Paris debut Nov. 12, 1899. He created a sensation there, as he did in London shortly afterward. In Britain he also played for Queen Victoria.

From then on his career was made, and he never lacked for engagements or for an audience. He commanded top fees, but lived economically.

For the next 20 years, until 1919, Casals, using Paris as his base, played in the principal cities of Europe and the Americas. He made his New York debut in 1904, playing the Saint-Saëns Cello Concerto with the orchestra of the Metropolitan Opera and winning a chorus of critical bravos. Later that season he was the cello soloist here in Richard Strauss's "Don Quixote," with the composer conducting his own tone poem.

Many of Casals's performances in those years were chamber music, which he played with Jacques Thibaud, the violinist, and Alfred Cortot, the pianist. In the United States he also gave chamber music recitals with Harold Bauer, the pianist, and Fritz Kreisler, the violinist, and with Kreisler and Ignace Paderewski, the pianist.

In that period Casals formed intimate friendships with such musicians as Georges Enesco, Maurice Ravel, Camille Saint-Saëns, Sergei Rachmanioff, Gregor Piatigorsky, Emanuel Feuermann, Artur Schnabel, Eugene Ysaye and Paul Hindemith.

In 1914 Casals married Susan Metcalfe, the American lieder singer. It was his second marriage, the first, to Guilhemina Suggia, a Portuguese cellist, in 1906, had ended in divorce six years later. For several years Casals was the piano accompanist for Miss Metcalfe, a soprano, and at one point he considered dropping his career to further hers. However, the couple parted in 1920.

After World War I and with the breakup of his marriage, the cellist turned his energies to Barcelona, where, in 1920, he founded the Orquestra Pau (Catalan for Pablo) Casals and subsidized it for seven years at a total cost of $320,000 until it became self-supporting. In these years (and afterward) he was its principal conductor.

Early in the nineteen-twenties Casals also founded the Workingmen's Concert Association in Barcelona, which gave its members, in return for nominal dues, an opportunity to attend Sunday morning concerts of his orchestra and to set up their own musical groups.

As busy as Casals was in Barcelona, he also found time to give concerts in the United States and in Europe and to appear in what seemed increasingly to be his favorite role, that of a conductor. He led the London Symphony, the New York Symphony and the Vienna Philharmonic.

When the Spanish Republic was proclaimed in 1931, Casals became one of its eager and hard-working supporters, all the more because the Republic restored many of his native Catalonia's ancient rights and granted the area a good deal of autonomy. He was president of Catalonia's music council the Junta de Musica, and, during the Civil War, he gave hundreds of benefit concerts abroad for the Republic and put a large part of his personal savings at its disposal. The Government, in turn, named streets and squares for him and encouraged his exertions to bring great music to the common people.

Casals was in Barcelona in January, 1939, when the Franco forces burst into the city, but he made good an escape to France, vowing never to return to Spain while Franco was in power. (Apart from a fleeting trip to Spain in 1955 to attend the funeral of his long-time close friend and housekeeper, Mrs. Francesca Vidal de Capdevila, he never did.)

After several demoralizing weeks of despondency in Paris, during which he grieved for his country, he went to live in Prades among the thousands of Spanish exiles. There he helped to organize the care of the Catalans held in French camps and solicited funds for them from his friends all over the world. He continued to live in Prades in World War II.

Toward the end of the war he went on tour again. In the autumn of 1945, however, he cut short a concert trip in Britain and retired to Prades.

In explanation, he said he had assumed that an Allied victory would doom not only Hitler and Missolini but also Franco. The democracies, he went on, had disillusioned him by not acting to topple Franco. He was therefore suspending his concert career until Spain was freed. He had, he pointed out, ceased playing in Germany with the rise of Hitler, had not played in Italy in the thirties, nor had he appeared in Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution. He said he could not separate his beliefs as a human being from his conduct as an artist.

Casals lived quietly and simply in Prades for close to 12 years. In 1950, however, he was prevailed upon to soften somewhat his vow of musical silence and take part in a Bach bicentenary festival. The event, which attracted hundreds of music lovers from many parts of the world, was held in the big Church of St. Pierre in Prades. The critics found that Casal's bow had lost none of its magic.

In that and subsequent Prades festivals Casals appeared in a triple role—as soloist, as chamber music ensemble player and as conductor. In these concerts he was joined by many internationally famous musicians, including Dame Myra Hess, Rudolf Serkin, Joseph Szigeti and Isaac Stern.

Some indication of a further shift in Casal's thinking came in 1951 in a colloquy with Albert Schweitzer, the humanitarian and philosopher. "It is better to create than to protest," Dr. Schweitzer said in urging the cellist to return to the concert stage. "Why not do both—why not create and protest both?", Casals replied. And he seemed to follow that course in his last years.

After a period of self-examination, Casals went to Mexico in 1956 for his first concert date outside the Prades area. It was there, in 1960, that "El Pesebre" had its premiere. The oratorio became the banner of his peace mission, which he carried to many major cities in the Western world. Discussing this crusade, he said in 1962:

"As a man, my first obligation is toward the welfare of my fellow men. I will endeavor to meet that obligation through music, the means which God has given me, since it

transcends language, politics and national boundaries."

In August, 1957, when he was 80, he married Marta Montañez, one of his cello students, who was then 21. They lived in a cheerful modern house on the beach at Santurce, P.R., where Casals liked to take an early morning stroll before beginning his day by playing a Bach work on the piano. "It is like a benediction on the house," he said.

Casals had the unstinted admiration of his fellow artists. And one of them, Mr. Stern, put their feelings this way:

"He has enabled us to realize that a musician can play in a way that is honest, beautiful, masculine, gentle, fierce and tender—all these together, and all with unequivocal respect for the music being played and faith in it."

Appearing in New York last summer for a free Central Park concert with Mr. Stern—it was cut short by rain before the cellist could perform—Casals pronounced what could stand as his epitaph.

"What can I say to you?" he asked the assemblage. "I am perhaps the oldest musician in the world. I am an old man, but in many senses a very young man. And this is what I want to be, young, young all your life, and to say things to the world that are true."

TRIBUTE TO CALIFORNIA HOSPITAL WOMEN'S AUXILIARY

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Women's Auxiliary of California Hospital who will, on Friday, November 2, celebrate 50 years of volunteer service to the greater Los Angeles community. I am happy to join in this expression of appreciation and gratitude to the many members of the women's auxiliary who have, over the past half century, given generous support and tireless effort to help provide for the health care needs in the Los Angeles area. The California Hospital is a member of the Lutheran Hospital Society of Southern California, and the president, Samuel J. Tibbitts, is a constituent of my 24th Congressional District, residing in San Marino, Calif. A great many of my constituents have participated in a meaningful way to contribute to the beneficial works of the auxiliary, and I would like to submit to my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives a brief review of the activities of California Hospital's Women's Auxiliary over the past 50 years:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION, WOMEN'S AUXILIARY OF CALIFORNIA HOSPITAL

Founded on November 21, 1923, the Women's Auxiliary of California Hospital is entering its second half-century of volunteer service—proud of its venerable history and young enough in spirit to adapt to changing times and fresh perspectives.

The Auxiliary, one of the first hospital-affiliated women's groups to be organized in California, now has more than 600 members. They provide a wealth of services and fund-raising support to California Hospital Medical Center, a major 325-bed non-profit institution encompassing acute and out-patient care, educational programs and research activities.

Launched in 1887 as the third health care facility in Los Angeles, CHMC now includes the following divisions: the California Hospital School of Nursing, the California Pediatric Center and the Southern California Cancer Center.

In addition to staging periodic benefit events, Auxiliary members are involved in supplying tray favors; hostessing expectant mothers at "Stork Socials"; allocating scholarships for nursing students, and assisting at their capping and graduation exercises; operating the hospital's Gift Shop; overseeing baby photos and supplying substantial financial aid to the maternity and gynecology clinics.

Over the years, Auxiliary volunteers have donated more than one million volunteer hours and contributed nearly $700,000.00, earmarked for the medical center's growth and expansion.

Substantial donated sums have been used to help finance new physical medicine and emergency units, the prayer chapel, the pediatric wing, a remodeled medical-surgical unit, and the ultra-modern new Diagnostic and Treatment Center.

The Auxiliary was formed at the suggestion of G. W. Olson, then superintendent at California Hospital, who assembled women from several Lutheran churches. He asked them to organize an auxiliary—to work together to provide a "free bed" for impoverished patients. The call to organize was met enthusiastically, with 66 women signing the charter.

During the first ten years of its existence, the Auxiliary underwrote costs for 142 "free bed" patients, in addition to donating $7000.00 to the hospital. The Depression years put a temporary damper on fund-raising efforts, but the interest and enthusiasm of this dedicated band has remained undaunted to date.

JOHN C. CREAN

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, John C. Crean, one of the leading industrialists in the United States and founder and chairman of the board of Fleetwood Enterprises, is an individual whose dedication to the basic principles of American citizenship is worthy of the attention and commendation of this body.

Despite the great demands he must meet as the head of a large business organization, Mr. Crean has for many years given freely of his time and his resources for many philanthropic endeavors—all aimed toward giving a helping hand to his fellow man.

John C. Crean is indeed America's modern-day Horatio Alger. A native of Compton, Calif., Mr. Crean, an ex-paperboy and printer's devil, started from scratch a mere 20 years ago and built Fleetwood Enterprises into a dominant position in the design and manufacture of mobile homes and trailers.

And in the best tradition of good citizenship he is doing something to give back to the country and to his fellow Americans some of the benefits of his astounding success.

John Crean, and his gracious wife, Donna—parents to two sons and two daughters—best express their interest in their multi-varied philanthropic activities:

We are happy to be able to share our success with others. Sharing and giving away some of our surplus helps keep our values straight.

While the Creans' philanthropic contributions are many and varied—including their gift of $1 million toward the construction of a YMCA in Anaheim, Calif.—the unselfish use they make of their historic 93-acre Rancho Capistrano is worthy of particular attention.

The Creans have made available the beauty and facilities of this great California ranch to civic, philanthropic, and religious groups representing the entire spectrum of American life—and on an entirely free basis.

Practically every week in the year some of these groups are utilizing the ranch and enjoying its manifold facilities—particularly large encampments of Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts. These facilities include a historic ranchhouse, horse riding trails, picnic grounds, a municipal-sized swimming pool, and a private lake, stocked with fish.

Many thousands of people—young and old—have had and will continue to have the opportunity of enjoying and experiencing the beauty and the natural environment of this great California ranch—due to the generosity and the spirit of sharing as expressed by Mr. Crean.

I am proud to have John C. Crean as a citizen of my State, and I believe that the example that he has set should be an inspiration to citizens of our business community and most deserving of the highest commendation of this legislative body.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE FORD SHOULD BE CONFIRMED

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed at attempts presently being made by some Members of the majority party to tie the confirmation of Representative GERALD FORD as Vice President to the continuing battle over Watergate-related matters, and to his position on one political issue or another. I think most Americans will find this shameful opposition unacceptable. I am happy to note that both of the daily newspapers in Baltimore, neither of which is particularly fond of the Republican administration these days, have stated editorially their wishes for speedy hearings and confirmation of Representative FORD, free of any extraneous conditions imposed on the basis of partisan considerations. I believe that their positions are correct, and I share them at this time with the membership:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 23, 1973]

A VICE PRESIDENT NEEDED

Congress has a duty under the Twenty-fifth Amendment to proceed with the filling

of the vice presidency regardless of the latest escalation in the Watergate crisis. Indeed, the case for giving the nation a second-in-command is more compelling than ever because of the weakness of the first-in-command. This is not a plea for the confirmation of Gerald R. Ford, *per se*, because Congress must look thoroughly into Mr. Ford's background and qualifications. But it is a plea that Mr. Ford not be held hostage to the erratic behavior of President Nixon—behavior that has led to crises for impeachment from some respected figures on Capitol Hill.

Senator Kennedy, among others, has argued that Mr. Nixon's selection of Mr. Ford should not be accepted so long as Mr. Ford supports the President's stand in the Watergate tapes controversy. We disagree. We disagree not because we in any way condone the President's intolerable attempts to put himself above the law. We disagree because in important matters a Vice President-designate (like a Vice President in office) must be expected to give the President his loyalty. The alternative would be a kind of stress that could be dangerous or disruptive to the country, as the Agnew affair proved in its final stages.

The very fact for the first time impeachment of the President is attracting serious attention lends a special importance to the selection of a new Vice President. Whether he is to be Mr. Ford or another nominee must remain beside the point pending the congressional inquiry of Mr. Ford. What is not beside the point, however, is the unsavory political situation that would develop if the Democratic majority in Congress sits tight and does nothing while Mr. Nixon's future is in doubt. In such a case, Speaker Carl Albert, a Democrat, would stand as next in line of succession to the Republican incumbent in the White House. And the partisan strife inherent in these circumstances would be such that Congress could never handle the impeachment process with the judicial detachment envisaged by the Constitution. Democrats would be subject to accusations of trying to gain the White House for narrow party interests. Those Republicans appalled by Mr. Nixon's conduct would be under terrible pressures not to reverse the voters' selection of a GOP President last November.

We have no faith in schemes whereby Mr. Albert would become President, select a competent Republican as Vice President and then—maybe—resign. The Twenty-fifth Amendment dealing with the presidential succession was framed seven years ago to meet some of the problems stemming from the relative inflexibility of our system. To manipulate its provisions would be an affront to the Constitution at a time when the spirit and language of that doctrine are our last refuge.

[From the Baltimore News American, Oct. 23, 1973]

WHAT'S GOING ON HERE?

The confirmation of Gerald Ford as vice president seems to be running into a Democratic roadblock that is as politically motivated as it is unwarranted. The Democrats in Congress are trying to link the Watergate tapes to Ford's confirmation, when one really has absolutely nothing to do with the other.

It is curious that the loudest advocates of delay are Senator Kennedy and Representative Thomas O'Neill Jr., both Democrats from Massachusetts which is the only state out of 50 that President Nixon failed to win in 1972. And it is curious that, without a vice president, the next heart beat to the White House belongs to the Speaker of the House, Carl Albert, a Democrat from Oklahoma.

Sen. Kennedy and his clique may be hoping for a confrontation between the President and the Supreme Court that will lead to impeachment proceedings against Mr. Nixon. The odds against this taking place are large; even if impeachment proceedings were held, it remains unlikely that the President would be drummed out of office by Congress.

Then, why make such an issue over the vice presidency with so many ifs, buts and maybes strewing the road to a Democratic takeover of the White House? Why demand that Mr. Ford, who for 25 years in the House has never opposed the constitution, never urged an unconstitutional act, now give proof that he believes in the constitution? His quarter-century of service speaks eloquently to that point.

What's going on here is partisan politics as usual, at a time in this nation's history when the federal government is enduring a unique sequence of events.

The constitution requires a vice president. Congress should confirm Mr. Ford with deliberate speed. It is the one congressional action that can be taken right now to regularize the government.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat saddened by comments I have seen in the press and other news media in the last 18 or 20 hours indicating that those who would defend the recent actions of the President seem satisfied to suggest that now that the President of the United States has acknowledged that he, like other Americans, should obey the orders a court which are not under appeal but final in their nature, that this is sufficient unto the moment, and we should get on about other business and disregard the events that outraged the American public this last weekend.

The essential elements still missing from this country are public confidence in its President, in its government, and in its government's institutions. Until the President reassures the American people by reappointing the special prosecutor, Mr. Cox, or by appointing someone with the same mandate that the special prosecutor was given in the assurances that were made to the American people and Congress earlier this year by the President himself. That is, that these matters would be clearly and openly examined, and the public would be informed. I am afraid that the great outpouring of concern that was understandibly demonstrated over this past weekend by the American people will not subside.

Simply turning over some of the tapes under duress of court orders will not and should not satisfy the peoples' demand for a full and honest investigation.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's firing of the special prosecutor, Archibald Cox, and the subsequent abolishment of his office, shocked the nation, and he has grossly misled the American people and the United States Congress in his previous support of the special prosecutor's office.

It appears that the President took it upon himself to break a solemn compact when he was confronted with honest men who would not bend to his will. After urging that Watergate be "left to the courts," the President denied Mr. Cox the authority to return to the courts to obtain a judicial ruling on criminal evidence needed for prosecution. Mr. Cox had no choice—he was to forgo the notes and memoranda which were also covered by the subpenas, and he was to forgo any attempt to obtain any similar evidence relating to the other aspects of his investigation—or be fired. We now know what happened.

The public outrage will not subside until the people are satisfied that the Watergate and related investigations will continue with some assurance of honesty and integrity. Mr. Nixon, and those who blindly support his actions, seem to be satisfied that he has shrewdly and effectively stopped the investigations of Watergate and related criminal activities by firing the special prosecutor when he thought the trail of lawlessness pursued by Mr. Cox was leading the prosecutors to the President and his cronies.

The Senate had proceeded in good faith with the appointment of Elliot Richardson as Attorney General. This was based largely on Mr. Nixon's solemn promise to the Senate concerning the provisions for an appointment of a special prosecutor.

The special prosecutor had received full authority to investigate and prosecute all offenses arising out of the 1972 presidential election. He had received full authority to conduct proceedings before grand juries and to review all documentary evidence available from any source. He had received full authority to determine whether or not to contest the assertion of "executive privilege" or any other testimonial privilege. He had received assurances that the Attorney General would not countermand or interfere with his decisions or actions. Finally, he had received assurances that he would not be removed from his duties except for extraordinary improprieties on his part.

Clearly, Mr. Nixon has vigorously shaken the confidence of the American people, its existing institutions and the Congress in the firing of the special prosecutor and the abolishment of his office. There is no reason for confidence in further prosecutions without the Office of the Special Prosecutor. How could a Justice Department continuation of the Cox investigation be credible when the President has demonstrated that enthusiastic investigation of criminal activity will threaten the prosecutor with being fired or forced out.

Chesterfield H. Smith, president of the American Bar Association, justified the creation of a special prosecutor's office in saying:

> It would be improper for an investigation of the President himself, of the Office of the President, or of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government to be conducted by a prosecutor subject to the direction and control of the President.

The President told us he understood this and agreed to it.

Nixon's own appointee, William Ruckelshaus, former Deputy Attorney Gen-

eral, had expressed doubt that the Justice Department could conduct an independent investigation. He said:

For one thing, the department will be under such pressure after the events of the weekend that it might find it difficult "not to prosecute" when the evidence might be too slim to risk prosecution. He stressed that the investigation should be "done on an independent basis."

Former Attorney General Elliot Richardson, said just yesterday, that the administration should appoint a new prosecutor. He said that a "completely independent" special prosecutor "is an important guarantee of the integrity of any investigation." Mr. Richardson was the one gentleman who had restored our confidence in the honor and courage of men in public office when he resigned rather than compromise or succumb to pressure.

Mr. Speaker, it is my strong feeling that the President should reappoint Mr. Cox and his staff or appoint some other able and trustworthy prosecutor who will have the same privileges and rights of independence which the Senate and the President had agreed upon last spring.

Congress must not fail to insist that the President allow that these investigations be continued in the same honest and independent manner to which Mr. Cox and his staff had worked.

If the President fails to do this, it is up to the Congress to preserve the integrity of these investigations by reestablishing the Office of the Special Prosecutor.

A STATEMENT OF CONCERN

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the dramatic events of the past few weeks, people throughout the Nation have begun to question the fundamental values of this society and the future of the American political system. It is within this context that I want to share with you and my colleagues something that has come to my attention.

Recently, a statement of concern, focusing on moral and ethical principles in public life, was unanimously adopted by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs. The committee, which adopted the resolution October 3, is a denominational agency in the Nation's Capital maintained by eight national Baptist bodies in the United States.

This statement, I believe, is noteworthy for two reasons. Primarily, the group has succeeded in offering perceptive insight into some of our national problems. In addition, however, I think this statement is a good example of the kind of forceful leadership groups such as the Baptist Joint Committee can provide in a time of crisis. Mr. Speaker, the statement follows:

A STATEMENT OF CONCERN

Believing that separation of church and state does not mean separation of religion from government or politics, nor should it imply the divorce of religion's basic moral and ethical principles from the conduct of public affairs, we voice our concern over some recent developments in public life and reaffirm our commitment to the fundamental principles of democracy.

At a time when there is widespread distrust of government resulting from the abuse of political power, we need to be reminded of the premises upon which our government was constituted. We are gratified that there is today a widespread reaction against this abuse. Indeed, we view this reaction as evidence of the intrinsic strength of our American tradition.

The times call for an affirmation of trust in the basic principles of the American system of democracy. These include: (1) government's powers are derived from the consent of the governed; (2) the harmful potential in any concentration of governmental power makes necessary the distribution of powers among those who make, execute, and interpret law; (3) government is to protect the rights and liberties, and to promote the well-being of all people; and (4) all public officials must be subject to law in both public and private conduct.

In affirming these principles, we express our faith in the ultimate triumph of the right and of the truth in a nation whose citizens are dedicated to justice and righteousness in every aspect of life. In this confidence, we urge our people to exemplify and to require character and integrity in both public and private life, and to discharge responsibly their duties as citizens. Moreover, we encourage our Christian young people to seek for themselves a vocation through which they may make their contribution to government and to society in general.

OKTOBERFEST

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Oktoberfest celebrations held during the month of October is one of many ways which the German people illustrate their festive mood and their appreciation for all mankind.

I wish to insert into the RECORD a poem written by Otto H. Kappus, in 1966, entitled, "Amerika." I recommend this poem to all my colleagues as it portrays the feeling of the many German-Americans and of their concern for the protection of the civil and political rights of citizens in this country.

I insert both the German version and the English translation.

Both versions of the poem follows:

AMERICA

You, America, Freedom's land,
Best of all upon this earth,
To you will I devote my strength
Till life's last hour comes to me.

You have our highest dreams fulfilled
Of justice and equality,
And have fraternal hatred stilled
And freed us from all class dispute.

The weight from troubled soul you took,
The weight of vain and haughty pride,
Again restoring mankind's worth
And built for us an epoch new.

Whether Christian, Jew, German, Slav,
Whether black or white, rich or poor,
No matter what our ancestry,
All of us are equal here.

Millions have in you found keep,
Those oppressed in their own land
Here now in peace and quiet dwell
Where now new generations stand.

So let us thank our Mighty Father,
That we are freemen of this land,
And let us not relax or waver
Till all men know this fortune too.

OTTO H. KAPPUS.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1966.

AMERIKA

Amerika, Du Land der Freien,
Du bestes auf dem Erdenrund!
Dir will ich meine Kräfte weihen,
Bis zu der letzten Lebensstund'!

Du hast den höchsten Traum erfüllet
Von Gleichheit und Gerechtigkeit,
Und hast den Bruderhass gestillet,
Befreit uns von dem Klassenstreit.

Auch nahmst hinweg die Seelenbürde
Der eitlen Überheblichkeit.
Du gabst uns wieder Menschenwürde
Und schufst so eine neue Zeit.

Ob Juden, Christ', ob Slav', Germanen,
Ob weiss, ob schwarz, ob arm, ob reich,
Wer immer waren unsere Ahnen,
Hier sind wir all einander gleich.

So wurdst Du Zuflucht für Millionen,
Die einst bedrückt in ihrem Land,
Hier nun in Ruh' und Frieden wohnen,
Sodass ein neu Geschlecht erstand.

Drum lasst uns dem Allmächtgen danken,
Dass Bürger wir von diesem Land,
Und lasst uns weichen nich noch wanken,
Bis alle Welt dies Glück erkannt!

OTTO H. KAPPUS.

13. September 1966.—Dem Bürgerverein gewidmet, am 30, September 1966.

NIXON'S FAILURE TO TRUST PEOPLE BRINGS MISTRUST OF GOVERNMENT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, President George Meany recently addressed the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization Convention with his usual candor on the present administration's stewardship of the National Government. I am inserting excerpts of his remarks in the RECORD for the review of our colleagues:

NIXON'S FAILURE TO TRUST PEOPLE BRINGS MISTRUST OF GOVERNMENT

The past two years have been years of grave problems for America. The labor movement, obviously, has not escaped the problems that affect all Americans in their daily lives. Neither will we escape the problems that are certain to come in the future.

Overriding all others is the crisis of public confidence in the institutions of government. Certainly Watergate has played a role in eroding public trust in government. But the erosion began when the people perceived that the government did not trust them enough to tell them the whole truth.

The Administration did not tell them the whole truth about its economic policies and their terrible consequences for working people.

The Administration did not level with the American people about the Russian grain deal.

The Administration has not let the people

in on what is really going on in our international relations.

And surely the Administration cannot expect the full trust and confidence of the American people when it pursues tax policies that penalize them for not being rich, while rewarding corporate wealth and special interests.

In a democracy, government rests on the informed consent of the governed, and the informed consent of the people can only be won by a government of candor.

Watergate would not have brought on the constitutional confrontation that faces this country today if the truth had been told on June 18, 1972. The economy would not be on the brink of a recession if the President had lived up to his promise of February 19, 1969, that inflation would be curbed without increasing unemployment.

The free trade union movement in America grew out of the soil of democracy. It was nurtured by the rights and liberties which are enjoyed by free citizens. Whenever those rights are threatened, whenever people are subordinated to money, then the free trade union movement is threatened.

Every American is affected every day by this Administration's mismanagement of the economy. Economic controls, as practiced by this Administration, are a sham and a shame.

The economic picture is deteriorating. Swollen corporate profits and exorbitant interest rates are feeding inflation but the Administration refuses to restrain the worst inflationary factors in the economy.

Housing construction is at a virtual standstill and threatens to trigger widespread unemployment. Worker buying power is declining, yet the Administration continues inequitable wage controls and vetoes a minimum wage bill that would bring some small measure of economic relief to low-income workers.

In fact, economic conditions today closely resemble those that led to the recession of 1969–70 and threaten again to cause recession this year.

Contrary to the opinion of some commentators and editorialists, the trade union movement in America is alive and well.

Affiliated unions have reported some collective bargaining gains, despite employer eagerness to serve as enforcers of the President's wage controls. There continues to be a steady, appreciable gain in membership, led by organization of government employes. In addition, several unions have reported new interest on the part of white collar workers in joining the labor movement.

Particularly heartening is the increase in union membership among members of minority groups in all industries and trades. This development brings new strength and talent to the labor movement and at the same time represents another signpost of progress in the continuing struggle for civil rights. For the surest way for minorities to be able to enjoy their civil rights is through the economic security and human dignity for which the labor movement has always stood.

Today, the labor movement is stronger politically than it has ever been in history. Many unions that had no political action programs before have good programs now.

The 1974 election becomes more and more important with every veto. The President is determined to falsely tag Congress with a "do-nothing" label, as a means of countering Watergate and of diverting attention from his own legislative failures.

In reality, the President is not seeking speedier congressional action, nor is he attempting to work with Congress as a co-equal branch of government. The President is using the veto, threats of the veto, and the impoundment of funds to blackmail Congress into accepting his own narrow programs.

President Nixon labels every program that benefits people as "inflationary," and every program that benefits the wealthy and the corporations as "in the national interest."

We reject that philosophy. We say that America cannot afford to junk decades of social progress for the many in the interest of further enrichment of the privileged and the powerful.

MEDIA VIOLENCE AND ITS EFFECT ON CHILDREN

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to preview a report soon to be published in the American Psychological Association's journal Development Psychology, studying the effects of media violence on children's behavior. Violence has become an increasingly accepted part of our lives, due in part, to the increasing amount of violence we allow to penetrate our home entertainment. Many of us have been concerned that the American people can, and have been anesthetized to violence at home and abroad through increasingly violent programs on television. The APA study lends great support to this fear.

The study showed that children who saw an aggressive film and then were made responsible for monitoring the behavior of younger children were much less likely to seek appropriate adult help when the younger children misbehaved than children who had not seen the film. The children appeared to have learned to tolerate real life aggression by being exposed to media violence. This suggests the frightening possibility that while some children are incorporating media-initiated violent responses into their everyday behavior, even more may be learning to tolerate them. Viewing violence under the guise of "entertainment" may increase tolerance to aggression occurring in the real world, and thus make a person less willing to assist when he witnesses such behavior in his own life.

I commend this study to the attention of my colleagues:

DOES MEDIA VIOLENCE INCREASE CHILDREN'S TOLERATION OF REAL LIFE AGGRESSION? [1]

(By Ronald S. Drabman [2] and Margaret Hanratty Thomas)

ABSTRACT

Twenty-two male and 22 female third and fourth graders were randomly divided into groups for a 2 (sex) by 2 (film, no film) factorial design. Children in the aggressive film group saw a cowboy film which depicted many violent events. All children were led to believe that they were responsible for watching the behavior of two younger children whom they could see on a video (TV) monitor. The younger children at first played quietly, then progressively became destructive. Their altercation culminated in a physical fight ending with the apparent destruction of the TV camera. The dependent measures were (1) the time it took a subject to seek adult help after the younger children began to be disruptive, and (2) whether or not the subject waited until the younger children had begun to abuse one another physically before seeking adult help. Results indicate that children who saw an aggressive film took longer to seek adult help than children who did not see the film. More importantly, children in the film group were much more likely to tolerate all but violent physical aggression and destruction before seeking help.

The widespread portrayal of violence in television and movies has come under strong attack during recent years due to increasing evidence that observation of such displays may foster similar behavior on the part of viewers. It is well documented that exposure to filmed violence may increase the likelihood that young children will exhibit aggressive behaviors toward both inanimate and live victims (e.g., Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961, 1963; Hanratty, *et al.*, 1969; Hanratty, O'Neal, & Sulzer, 1972; Liebert & Baron, 1972). These authors have consistently demonstrated that the presentation of media violence can provide opportunity for acquisition of novel aggressive skills and can encourage performance of similar behaviors through modeling and disinhibitory influences.

In addition to these effects, however, it appears reasonable to speculate that observation of filmed aggression may affect viewers in other undesirable ways. There is some evidence to suggest that children's conceptions of reality may be influenced by media dramatizations. In a study by Siegel (1958), seven-year-old children who heard radio serials about taxi drivers were asked to predict the ending of a newspaper story that was focused on a local cab driver. Those children who had listened to a dramatization in which taxi drivers were portrayed as being unusually aggressive attributed much more violence to the driver in the newspaper story than did children who had heard a radio serial in which taxi drivers behaved in a nonviolent manner. The conclusion that children's attitudes about the real world may be affected by fictional presentations is strengthened by the fact that only children who understood that newspapers report real events were retained in the final analysis.

Also, some writers have suggested that repeated observation of violence can result in emotional habituation (e.g., Goranson, 1970). Indeed, Berger (1962) demonstrated that adult subjects' emotional arousal progressively declined while watching a victim receive a large number of painful electric shocks. Similar findings have been reported by Lazarus and his associates (Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Alfert, 1964; Speisman, Lazarus, Mordkoff, & Davidson, 1964).

If observation of violence serves to shape viewers' expectancies about real life and behavior and/or reduce emotional responsivity to witnessed violence, it seems likely that reactions to aggression encountered in everyday life may be affected significantly by exposure to media violence. Specifically, it is proposed that viewing violence under the guise of "entertainment" may increase one's tolerance of aggression which occurs in the real world and thus make one less willing to aid when he witnesses such behavior in his own life. The present study was designed to assess the effects of viewing filmed violence and children's subsequent readiness to report to an authority figure an argument and fight between two younger children.

---

[1] The assistance of Gregory J. Jarvie who served as the experimenter is gratefully acknowledged. Thanks for providing subjects are due Sister Ann Olivia, principal of St. James School. This research was supported, in part, by National Institute of Mental Health Grants 1–RO3–MH24502–01 and 1–RO3–MH22189–01A1 to the first and second authors, respectively.

[2] Requests for reprints should be sent to Ronald S. Drabman, Department of Psychology, Florida Technological University, Box 5000, Orlando, Florida 32816.

METHOD

Participants and design

The subjects were 22 boys and 22 girls from the third and fourth grades of a parochial elementary school which serves a predominantly middle class area of a southern city. The study was carried out near the end of the school year. The same 21-year-old adult white male acted as the experimenter for all subjects. The experimental design was a 2×2 factorial with the variables of treatment condition (aggressive film versus no film) and sex of subject.

Procedure

The experimenter met each subject individually at the classroom and explained that he wanted the subject to "play some games." He then remarked that he was ahead of schedule and suggested that before beginning he show the subject his "new trailer." Upon arrival at the trailer, which was located in the school yard, the experimenter explained that the trailer was being used sometimes by a friend to work with kindergarten children from another school. The large room inside the trailer contained a variety of toys suitable for young children (i.e., a large number of blocks, picture books, crayons, and toy milk bottles). At the far end of the room, a large camera was mounted on a tripod. The experimenter pointed to the camera and said: "We have a a T.V. camera here. It takes pictures of everything going on in this room. In fact, it's taking pictures of us right new!" The experimenter then escorted the subject to a room in the school building where they were to "play games." Subjects in the *aggressive film group* were then shown an 8-minute western featuring Hopalong Cassidy. The film depicted several gunbattles, shootings, and fistfights. Immediately thereafter, the experimenter glanced at his watch and explained that he needed to make an important phone call. He then continued:

"I have somewhat of a problem. You see, I promised my friends who will be working with younger children in the trailer today that I would watch the children for him while he's gone. See, I can turn on this T.V. set and watch what's happening in the trailer. [The experimenter then turned on the monitor which showed the still vacant trailer.] Oh good! They haven't gotten there yet. There's no one there now. Well, I might get back before they arrive, but if I don't, could you watch the children for me? Thanks a lot. Just watch the T.V. and if the children get there before I come back, then you keep an eye on them. I imagine they'll be O.K. but sometimes little kids can get into trouble, and that's why an older person should be watching them. If anything *does* happen, come get me. I'll be in the principal's office."

Subjects in the *no film group* were given the same instructions immediately after their arrival at the room in the school building.

Each child then witnessed the same videotaped sequence. The purpose of the visit to the trailer was to insure that the subject would believe that the events he saw on the monitor were live.

After two minutes of tape which showed the unoccupied trailer, an adult male and two young children (a 4-year-old girl and a 5-year-old boy of approximately equal size) entered the trailer. The adult told the children that he had to leave, but that they could play while he was gone. After the adult left the children played quietly with crayons and paper for approximately one minute. They then each built two structures with the blocks. The girl criticized the boy's building, stating that hers was much nicer. After an interchange of derogatory comments, the boy maliciously knocked over one of the girl's buildings. The children continued arguing and destroyed each other's remaining buildings. They then began to push and threaten one another. The girl began chasing the boy, crying, while he taunted her with repeated shouts of "You can't catch me!" She hit him several times and, as they struggled near the camera, it appeared as though it was knocked over and had fallen to the floor. At this point, the video portion went dead, and the radio briefly continued while the children yelled accusations of blame at each other. Finally, the boy shouted "Watch out!", and a loud crash was heard. No more sounds were audible afterward.

The experimenter remained in the hallway outside the room and recorded the time which had elapsed from the beginning of the tape and the moment at which the subject left the room to notify him. If the subject did not respond within 70 seconds after the audio portion ended, the experimenter reentered the room and inquired if anything happened.

Debriefing

The experimenter immediately assured the subject that everything was being taken care of. He told the subject that his friend was now at the trailer and that no real harm had been done. No child appeared to have been upset by the experience. Finally, the experimenter asked the subject to solve five mazes and praised his performance warmly. Each child was thanked for his participation and given a candy bar.

RESULTS

Latency scores were computed by subtracting the amount of time which had elapsed before the first blocks were knocked down from the total time recorded by the experimenter. This number provided an accurate measure of the length of time during which the subject viewed the altercation before notifying the experimenter. Since these data were neither normally distributed nor showed homogeneity of error variance, nonparametric analyses were used. Table 1 presents the median latency scores for subjects in each of the four experimental groups. Comparisons by Mann-Whitney *U* tests revealed that, as anticipated, children who had seen the aggressive film responded more slowly than children who had not seen the film ($z=1.82$; $p=.034$) while sex of subject was not related to speed of responding ($z=0.27$, $p=0.39$).

TABLE 1.—MEDIAN LATENCY SCORES (IN SECONDS) FOR SUBJECTS IN THE 4 GROUPS

	Males	Females
Film	Md=104 range=13 to 196	Md=119. range=59 to 196.
No film	Md=63 range=13 to 196	Md=75. range=21 to 139.

Furthermore, since the primary interest was to determine the effect of viewing aggression and children's subsequent toleration of such behavior, subjects who notified the experimenter were classified on the basis of whether they responded to the children's arguing and destruction of each other's property or whether they responded only after more extreme forms of aggressive behavior were witnessed (i.e., hitting each other or breaking the camera). An analysis of these data (presented in Table 1) revealed a highly significant effect for treatment condition ($x^2=6.69$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). Whereas 58% of those subjects in the no film condition who notified the experimenter did so *before* the children began to fight physically, only 17% of the subjects in the film group responded to this type of aggression. Nonresponders were excluded from this analysis. There were 4 nonresponders in the film group and 3 in the no film condition. An analysis with these subjects included yielded similar results

($x^2=6.70$, $df=1$, $p<.01$).

Analysis of the relationship between sex and number of responders before and after the critical event yielded no differences.

($x^2=1.93$, $df=1$, $p>.17$).

TABLE 2.—SUBJECTS SEEKING HELP BEFORE OR AFTER PHYSICAL VIOLENCE

	Number of subjects responding before	Number of subjects responding after
Film	3	15
No film	11	8

Note: Nonresponders were excluded from this analysis.

Similarly, nonresponders were excluded from this analysis. There were 5 boys and 2 girls who failed to respond. An analysis with these subjects included also failed to reach significance ($x^2=0.42$, $df=1$, $p>.50$).

DISCUSSION

These results provide support for the notion that children's responsivity to real life aggression may be affected by previous observation of fictional violence. Latency scores were related to exposure to the aggressive film, and the basis on which the subject's decision to summon adult help was made also is clearly influenced by this variable. Several possible explanations of this effect are tenable. First of all, if media presentations furnish children with a concept of "what the world is really like" (National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, 1969; Siegel, 1958), then witnessing aggressive behavior on television and in movies may serve to make the viewer more likely to consider conflict and fighting as normative behaviors. Thus, when real life aggression is witnessed, it is not considered to be surprising or unusual and therefore does not seem to warrant action on the part of the observer. A similar interpretation is focused on contrast effects. Since it is quite unlikely that one might see aggression in his own life which is as extreme as that usually presented in the media, real life aggression might often seem to be trivial in comparison. Also, exposure to violence may reduce emotional responsivity to subsequent scenes of violence (Goranson, 1970) thereby making it less likely that individuals will react quickly. Because the subjects in the control group did not see a film, differential arousal might be offered as an alternative explanation for these findings. However, since all subjects were told explicity what they should do, it would seem that if subjects who had seen the aggressive film were more aroused than subjects in the no film group, then increased arousal should result in quicker responding by subjects in the film group (e.g., Spence, 1956; Zajonc, 1965). Further research is necessary to explore these alternative interpretations.

Many questions remain unanswered, and research is currently underway to investigate the impact of such variables as the degree and type of violence exhibited in the aggressive film, the age of the subjects, and characteristics of the participants in the real life aggression. However, the results of this study, taken together with others in which the modeling and disinhibitory effects of media violence have been demonstrated (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961, 1963; Hanratty *et al.*, 1969; Hanratty, O'Neil, & Sulzar, 1972; Lie-

bert & Baron, 1972), suggest the frightening possibility that while some children are incorporating such violent responses into their everyday behavior, even more may be learning to tolerate them.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1961, *63*, 575–582.

Bandura, A., Ross, D. & Ross, S. A. Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1963, *66*, 3–11.

Berger, S. Conditioning through vicarious instigation. *Psychological Review*, 1962, *69*, 405–456.

Goranson, R. E. Media violence and aggressive behavior: A review of experimental research. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 5, New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Hanratty, M. A., Liebert, R. M., Morris, L. W., & Fernandez, L. E. Imitation of film mediated aggression against live and inanimate victims. *Proceedings of the American Psychological Association*, 1969, *77*, 457–458.

Hanratty, M. A., O'Neal, E., & Sulzer, J. L. The effect of frustration upon imitation of aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1972, *21*, 30–34.

Lazarus, R., *Psychological stress and the copying process*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Lazarus, R., & Alfert, E. The short-circuiting of threat. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 1964, *69*, 195–205.

Liebert, R. M., & Baron, R. A. Some immediate effects of televised violence on children's behavior. *Developmental Psychology*, 1972, *6*, 469–475.

National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, *To establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Siegel, A. The influence of violence in the mass media upon children's role expectations. *Child Development*, 1958, *29*, 35–36.

Spence, K. G. *Behavior theory and conditioning*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956.

Spiesman, J., Lazarus, R., Mordkoff, A., & Davidson, L. Experimental reduction of stress based on ego-defense theory. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1964, *68*, 367–380.

Zajonc, R. B. Social facilitation. *Science*, 1965, *149*, 269–274.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT STUDY SUPPORTS THE VANIK-MOSS APPROACH TO CONSERVE GASOLINE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the recent cutoff of petroleum supplies by the Arab States to the United States underlines the importance we must now attach to immediate efforts to cut down our wasteful consumption of irreplaceable petroleum. The gas-gulping American automobile presents us with an ideal starting point.

Despite the fact that as a nation we account for only 5.7 percent of the world's population, we own 46.1 percent of the world's automobiles. There are 97.65 million cars circulating around our country, consuming 73.5 million gallons of gasoline each year—that is 14.3 percent of the total energy this Nation consumes.

In recent years the efficiency of the American automobile has seriously declined. Contrary to popular attitudes, this decline is attributable not so much to emission control as to increased vehicle weight and more optional equipment. This trend can and must be reversed. I have introduced with Senator FRANK MOSS legislation to encourage the production of more efficient automobiles through the imposition of a graduated excise tax (H.R. 9859).

The administration has been taking quiet steps in this direction. Under Secretary of the Interior John C. Whitaker recently announced that the Interior Department is actively contemplating the taxation of inefficient automobiles.

In addition, the Treasury Department has done some excellent work in evaluating the strength of the tax approach. Using a tax schedule similar to the one I have proposed in H.R. 9859, Treasury estimates that 1 million barrels of gasoline a day could be saved by 1980—that is the equivalent of over 2 million barrels of crude oil.

For the interest of my colleagues I am submitting this Treasury study to the RECORD:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT STUDY

SUMMARY

This study recommends a fuel economy tax to be levied on automobiles beginning in 1975.

The tax is based upon miles per gallon ratings developed by a uniform testing procedure to be conducted by automobile manufacturers under EPA guidance.

Basically the tax would establish a national automobile standard of 20 miles per gallon. Cars getting that mileage or better would pay no excise tax. Less efficient cars would pay a tax proportional to their fuel consumption. This tax was developed in lieu of a horsepower tax or a weight tax which are shown to be less effective.

The purpose of the tax is to save gasoline through encouraging the industry to design and produce more efficient vehicles. The basis for setting the tax rates are studies which assert that the industry can produce large cars which yield close to 20 miles per gallon using existing technology without sacrificing comfort, styling, or exhaust emission standards.

The tax should have the following effects.

1. Through inducing manufacturers to produce more efficient cars and reducing automobile purchases of large cars, it would save increasing amounts of gasoline. By 1980, the saving should reach 1 million barrels a day of gasoline.

2. The revenue from the tax would peak at $2.78 billion by 1976. Thereafter, it would rapidly decline as cars became more efficient and motorists increase their purchases of smaller cars. By 1980, the tax would draw about $600 million per year.

The tax is similar to bills already introduced this year in the Senate and the House designed to accomplish the same purpose.

The draft of the paper has been reviewed by staff in EPA, the Department of Transportation, and in Treasury tax analysis.

Introduction

One recurring energy conservation suggestion has been the thought that we could save considerable amounts of gasoline if we were to shift to more efficient automobiles. This has been constantly in the news columns of late, for example, in the *New York Times Magazine* on June 10, 1973, entitled "Auto-Suggestion." This memorandum is an exploration of the concept of a tax designed to encourage vehicle economy.

The trend in vehicle economy

Miles per gallon in passenger vehicles has been coming down significantly since 1050.

Automobiles in 1950 were averaging 14.95 miles per gallon. By 1972, this has dropped to 13.57. Why has automobile efficiency fallen so much? There seem to be several reasons.

a. Heavier cars

A study by the Environmental Protection Agency dated November 1972, entitled "Fuel Economy and Emission Control" indicates that vehicle weight is the most significant determinant of miles per gallon. Cars have been getting significantly heavier during the last 20 years. Each year the same model automobile is heavier than the year before. In 1955, for instance, the largest Ford V–8 weighed 3,236 lbs. By 1965, this weight grew to 3,422 lbs. and today a similar car weighs 4,292 lbs. The Cadillac Series 75 grew during the same period from 5,015 lbs. to 5,783 lbs. Even the Pinto grew from 1972 to 1973 from 2,094 lbs. to 2,216 lbs. In the absence of any economic incentives to reduce weight, therefore, cars are growing heavier, and hence greater users of fuel. On the other hand, much of the added weight has gone into safety or convenience features such as stronger frames, automatic transmissions, heavier but better tires, etc.

b. Increased accessories in automobiles

Factory installed power-using equipment has grown significantly in the last 10 years. Automatic transmissions have grown from 71 percent in 1960 to 93 percent in 1972. Power steering from 39 percent in 1960 to 86 percent in 1972. Factory air conditioning, the most costly of all, in terms of fuel use, has grown from 6.9 percent in 1960 to 70 percent in 1972. These added features require the use of addtiional gasoline.

c. Antipolution features

Pollution controls added since 1970 also take their toll in gasoline mileage. The EPA study shows that they have reduced engine efficiency by about 7 percent over comparable models without the pollution controls.

d. Urbanization of our population

We are becoming increasingly urbanized. Each year more of our population lives in urban areas and less in rural areas. In fact, 1960 to 1970, for instance, urban populations gained by 19.2 percent, whereas rural populations declined by 0.3 percent. This has a definite effect on mpg. City driving involves more stop and go, more idling, more fuel wastage than open country driving. This trend will probably continue.

The shift to smaller cars

Despite the long-term downward trend in fuel economy, the previous graph shows that in 1971 and 1972 the rate of decline in fuel economy has been less than it was in previous years. Why should this be so?

One important reason is that the public is shifting to the purchase of smaller cars. The following chart gives an indication of the change in the new car registrations during the last six years.

REGISTRATION OF NEW CARS BY GENERAL MARKET CLASS

Market class	1967–73 calendar years, percentage of total registrations							
	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1973 sales[1] (thousands)
High price class (Cadillac, Lincoln, etc.)	2.9	2.6	2.9	2.3	2.7	2.7	2.4	238
Medium price class (Pontiac, Olds, Buick, etc.)	17.8	17.0	16.8	13.7	15.1	14.5	12.7	1,257
Regular size (Ford, Chevrolet, Plymouth, etc.)	28.6	27.0	25.7	22.5	20.9	19.3	16.3	1,614
Special sports type (Chevrolet Monte Carlo, Ford Mustang, Chevrolet Camero, etc.)	12.8	11.7	11.1	10.3	8.6	8.2	9.9	980
Intermediate size (Ford Torino, Chevrolet, Olds Cutlass, etc.)	21.8	24.0	22.2	21.0	18.1	19.2	18.8	1,861
Compact size (Chevrolet Nova, Ford Maverick, Dodge Dart, Plymouth Valiant, etc.)	6.7	7.1	9.8	13.8	12.1	12.9	14.4	1,425
Subcompact size (Vega, Pinto, Gremlin)				1.6	7.4	8.2	9.6	950
Foreign cars	9.3	10.5	11.2	14.7	15.1	14.5	15.9	1,574
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	9,900

[1] Projected based on current trends and R. L. Polk data.

Source: Ward's Automobile Yearbook based on R. L. Polk data.

A more practical way of looking at the same figures is to see the change in the percent of large cars (medium, regular size, intermediate size, and special sports type) versus small cars (compact, sub-compact) and foreign cars since 1967. High price cars are excluded. They remain at the same level regardless of time and price and continue to be about 2.6 percent of the market. This could indicate that these vehicles occupy a special place in the market due to prestige or other reasons, and are highly price-inelastic.

The percentage of large cars has fallen from 81 percent in 1967 to 57.7 percent in 1973, while the percentage of compacts, sub-compacts and foreign cars has risen from 16.0 percent in 1968 to 39.9 percent in 1973. What this indicates is that the public is shifting its buying habits and buying smaller cars. Why should this be so?

Reasons for the shift

The reasons for shift to smaller cars appear to be many. One important reason may be that a higher percentage of the public are buying second and third cars now which tend to be smaller than the basic family car. The percentage of households which own two or more cars increased from 19.0 percent in 1961 to 29.8 percent in 1971, a 50 percent increase.

A second reason is a general change in the public taste in transportation. Foreign cars, for instance, have become popular, although their percentage of total U.S. sales have grown from 9.3 percent to 15.9 percent since 1967, a gain of 6.6 percent, while those of American make sub-compacts have grown from 0 to 9.6 percent in only three years.

It is unlikely that the increasing prices of new cars has been a major factor in encouraging car buyers to shift to less expensive models. New car prices have risen more slowly than those of the cost of living.

CAR PRICE INCREASES COMPARED WITH COST OF LIVING INCREASES

	Percent change from previous year	
	All items[1]	Cars[2]
1967	3.0	2.2
1968	4.7	3.63
1969	6.1	1.83
1970	5.5	3.51
1971	3.4	5.90
1972	3.4	2.62

[1] Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, reported in the Economic Report of the President, 1973, p. 252.
[2] Automotive News Almanac, Apr. 30, 1973, p. 78.

In fact, in real terms, the percentage of the family income spent on automobile purchases is declining. In 1950 a new car represented 62 percent of the average family income. By 1970, this figure had declined to 35%.*

AFL–CIO URGES NIXON RESIGNATION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 22, 1973, the AFL–CIO, the Nation's most powerful labor organization, called for President Nixon's resignation, or if the President refuses to resign, impeachment:

We believe that the American people have had enough. More than enough.

We therefore call upon Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to resign.

We ask him to resign in the interest of preserving our democratic system of government, which requires a relationship of trust and candor between the people and their political leaders.

We ask him to resign in the interest of restoring a fully functioning government, which his Administration is too deeply in disarray to provide.

We ask him to resign in the interest of national security.

If Mr. Nixon does not resign, we call upon the House of Representatives forthwith to initiate impeachment proceedings against him.

They also asked that Congress hold up the consideration of Representative GERALD FORD for Vice President:

Clearly, a President who has placed himself on the brink of impeachment should not be allowed to name his successor until the charges against him have been disposed of satisfactorily.

I insert the full text of the AFL–CIO statement for the benefit of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON PRESIDENT NIXON TO THE 10TH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., OCOBER 22, 1973

The Constitutional crisis that began with what the White House once described as a "third-rate burglary" has now been brought to a head by the absolutely unprecedented and shocking actions of President Nixon within the last 48 hours.

In rapid succession, these events have taken place:

The President demanded that Attorney General Elliot Richardson fire special Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox. Richardson refused and resigned. The President demanded that Deputy Attorney General William D. Ruckelshaus fire Cox. Ruckelshaus refused and was fired. The President ordered his Solicitor General, Robert H. Bork, to fire Cox, and Bork, now Acting Attorney General, complied. The President ordered the FBI to seal off the offices of the special prosecutor, the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General—thereby, in effect, taking possession of the Watergate evidence.

These incredible actions have revealed the extent to which Mr. Nixon is prepared to go to prevent the full disclosure of evidence relating to the Watergate cover-up and other charges of criminal conduct by high government officials. He had already refused the orders of two courts to turn nine of his tapes bearing on the Watergate matters over to Judge John Sirica.

The President seems determined not to discharge the chief obligation of his office. Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution states that, "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." But Mr. Nixon seems utterly determined to frustrate the full and impartial administration of the law.

When the Senate Judiciary Committee confirmed the appointment of Cox, it acted with the understanding, spelled out in the guidelines drawn up by the Attorney General, on May 19, that he would have:

"full authority with respect to . . . determining whether or not to contest the assertion of 'executive privilege' or any other testimonial privilege. . . . The attorney general will not countermand or interfere with the special prosecutor's decisions or actions . . . The special prosecutor will not be removed from his duties except for extraordinary improprieties on his part."

The special prosecutor's decision to press forward on the legal front to obtain the President's tapes hardly constitutes an "extraordinary impropriety." On the contrary, it constitutes the fulfillment of his mandate to "review all documentary evidence available from any source, as to which he shall have full access."

Similarly, the refusal of Attorney General Richardson to fire Cox was in accordance with the understanding between him and the special prosecutor, which understanding was also at the basis of the Senate's confirmation of Mr. Richardson as Attorney General.

Mr. Nixon's determination to prevent judicial examination of his tapes, no matter what the cost to our constitutional system, can only further erode public confidence in him. When the President appears fearful of facing a Supreme Court composed in large

* Source: 1972 Automobile Facts and Figures, page 41.

measure of his own appointees, the public can scarcely resist the darkest speculations.

We believe that the American people have had enough. More than enough.

We therefore call upon Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to resign.

We ask him to resign in the interest of preserving our democratic system of government, which requires a relationship of trust and candor between the people and their political leaders.

We ask him to resign in the interest of restoring a fully functioning government, which his Administration is too deeply in disarray to provide.

We ask him to resign in the interest of national security.

If Mr. Nixon does not resign, we call upon the House of Representatives forthwith to initiate impeachment proceedings against him.

We also call upon the Congress to hold up further consideration of the President's Vice President-designate, Mr. Ford. Clearly, a President who has placed himself on the brink of impeachment should not be allowed to name his successor until the charges against him have been disposed of satisfactorily.

We concur completely with Archibald Cox, who said at the time of his dismissal: "Whether we shall continue to be a government of laws and not of men is now for Congress and ultimately the American people to decide."

Impeachment is not a prospect we contemplate with pleasure. No decent American can derive any partisan satisfaction whatever from the misfortune of his nation. And surely the American labor movement is not interested in aiding any reckless attacks on the Presidency. We are especially concerned about the office of the Presidency in these times of grave danger on the international front.

But the cause of peace and freedom in the world cannot be served by a discredited Presidency at home. Our allies' best hope—mankind's best hope—lies in the strength of our democratic institutions.

Justice must be done, the risks of not doing it being more than a democracy can safely bear.

LABOR DELEGATES ARE NOT SATISFIED—CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS CALLED UNRESOLVED BY NIXON MOVE

(By Philip Shabecoff)

BAL HARBOUR, FLA., Oct. 23.—Delegates to the A.F.L.-C.I.O. convention here, who voted yesterday to ask President Nixon to resign, were startled but not satisfied today when they learned that the President had decided to surrender the Watergate tape recordings to a Federal judge.

The news broke just after the convention adjourned, and George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, said he would have no comment for the time being.

But other delegates said that they felt the President's reversal had not resolved the constitutional crisis and raised still more questions about the President's stability. Jerry Wurf, President of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employes, called the President's action one more illustration of the frightening irresponsibility of this man."

Mr. Wurf said that he took some comfort from the fact that the President had obviously seen that the American people "would not sit still for the kind of games he was playing." But the union leader added that the President must resign or be impeached.

ADDRESS BY HUMPHREY

Earlier, in an address to the convention, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey accused President Nixon of being a "man obsessed with power" and warned that "our existence as a democracy and our constitutional tradition of balanced and limited power are in mortal danger as of this hour."

Former Vice President Humphrey, after reviewing the recent actions of the President, asserted that "this pattern of behavior of exercising unrestrained power is dangerous; it is dictatorial; it is unacceptable for a free people."

The Minnesota Democrat who ran against Mr. Nixon in 1968, called on Congress and the judiciary to "act responsibly" to resolve the crisis of the Presidency.

He said that a new special prosecutor should be appointed either by Federal Judge John J. Sirica or by a special act of Congress and that the prosecutor should be given full access to evidence and all independent powers to carry forth the Watergate case.

"It is essential that this new inquiry be beyond the political reach of the President," Mr. Humphrey said.

He also urged "appropriate committees" of Congress to hold hearings quickly on impeachment motions filed by members of the House of Representatives. However, Senator Humphrey did not urge impeachment himself, explaining that as a Senator he would have to sit as judge or jury, if the House voted impeachment and that he did not want to "prejudge this case."

UNION ISSUES FADE

This tenth biennial convention of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. was dominated by the Presidential crisis to the extent that trade union issues faded almost into the background, at least on the floor of the meeting itself.

The only other major issue on the floor during this final day of the convention was the Middle East. It was not a controversial issue.

The convention voted unanimously for a resolution condemning what it said was Arab aggression against Israel, praising Israel's free democratic society and called on the United States Government to carry out a "massive airlift" of all equipment and supplies needed by Israel to replace her losses.

The convention also passed a resolution condemning the "violence" and "suppression" of the military junta in Chile and asked the United States Government to take diplomatic measures to speed the re-establishment of civilian rule and full political and trade union rights in that South American country.

DISTINGUISHED NEWSPAPERMAN WILLIAM B. STREET PASSES

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad task at this time to announce to my colleagues, and particularly to those from the Mid-South area, that we have lost a friend and a distinguished newspaperman. I have just been informed of the death, this morning, of William B. Street, the political editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

Those of us in public life who knew Bill Street can testify that honesty and fair play in journalism has lost one of its most devoted advocates. I think it fitting, and the way he would have wanted it, that he died at his typewriter in the Commercial Appeal newsroom, of a heart attack.

I will ask for a special order in the House next Tuesday, and invite those Members who knew him to join me in a tribute to a friend and outstanding journalist.

WHO IS AT FAULT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to blame all problems, real and imaginary, on others. We in public service recognize that while we deserve criticism for many of the problems that government has failed to solve, we are often criticized for events over which we have little or any control.

Harry "Scoop" Sklenar is a veteran journalist and editor of the Des Plaines Valley News, serving a number of constituents in my congressional district. His column of Thursday, October 18, is a truly penetrating, philosophical commentary which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD:

WHO IS AT FAULT

(By Harry Sklenar)

It was said that Diogenes spent a lifetime with a lantern seeking an honest man and failed. And a great Teacher told a crowd, "Whom among you without sin shall cast the first stone?" and none complied.

Perhaps Diogenes looked only in the high elective offices of the land, judging from recent disclosures of a top judge being termed guilty of accepting racing stock at below cost for allegedly securing favorable racing dates, reading that a U.S. Vice President pleaded no contest to charges of income tax evasion, and those Chicago policemen and their superior who were found guilty of gathering regular pay-offs from tavern owners.

Note, it takes two persons to complete a dishonest deal; one, the person making the offer, and another, the person accepting. Why is it so seldom that the person making the offer is given some form of punishment?

Perhaps we are all at fault for maintaining a society in which such acts are tolerated, becoming more acceptable rather than the exception to the point of having a relative add a device to a model car a youngster had allegedly constructed to assure victory.

Thus rather than cast a cynical eye on those holding political office and stating the system is rotten, remember it was you and I who make it so. We nominate the office holders, then endeavor to blemish their characters with wild accusations unrelated to their ability, then discover that few persons of high moral character and caliber care to even make a campaign try.

Currently, the Illinois state legislature is to consider a stronger ethics bill, yet the Governor, while backing the bill, is refusing to disclose the names of his own campaign contributors.

During the last decade, our character and moral principles dropped considerably. Today, we have states adding revenue from running lotteries with a portion of such revenue going to schools, then holding that gambling is wrong. Besides the gambling issue, we have the U.S. Supreme Court ruling on obscenity issues.

How many blemishes do you have on your character? Why not just take a casual observation on how many times you wished to hand a policeman some money for not writing that arrest ticket, or buying a magazine or book purely because it exhibits nude photos, or by attending films of that nature? To what extent have you added to the sales

volume of cigarettes when printed warnings advise you desist? Cigarette sales have been on the increase despite those warnings of being detrimental to your health.

While seeking to curtail the selling and smoking of cigarettes on one hand, we attempt to legalize the smoking of marijuana on the other. We jail persons for race horse betting outside of the track and hold it is perfectly legal for betting inside.

We learn that TV exhibitors hold that portrayals of violence and criminal methods have no effect on children, yet use this same media to aid children to learn to read and use television in schools to aid in the child's learning process.

It is strange that mankind has survived this long without introducing sex lessons at the grade school level, or taking surveys on bedtime practices.

If we take to blaming politicians for the state of evil, society or the system, remember it is just the mass of individuals such as you and I which make up society and formulate that system.

This means that each of us is responsible to stop these evil practices simply because "everyone else is doing it." Look at your own conscience and let that be your guide.

PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL RAMSEY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to share with the Members of this body an impressive monograph on Provost Marshal General Ramsey, which appeared recently in the Government Executive.

Gen. Lloyd B. Ramsey is originally from my congressional district and I am proud to say has had an outstanding and distinguished career as a true leader.

The article follows:

PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL RAMSEY

Ernie Pyle, the late famed war correspondent, once had this to say about the caliber of troops in the U.S. Army's Military Police Corps during World War II:

"The Military Police haven't the taint to them that they did in the last war. This time, they're a specially picked, highly trained permanent organization.

"From the MPs I saw, judging by their demeanor and their conduct, I believe that, next to Rangers and Paratroopers, they really are the pick of the Army."

While many veterans of World War II and subsequent wars can attest to the effectiveness of the Military Police Corps in maintaining troop discipline and promoting law and order within the Army, few ex-soldiers are likely to recall that their infrequent dealings with MPs were noticeably friendly.

But then breaking up saloon brawls involving drunken GIs, bawling out military drivers who are causing traffic jams, collaring troops who are absent without leave, and thwarting supply thieves (with which any army abounds) hardly are activities designed to enhance the MPs' popularity.

The role of MPs vis-a-vis the rest of the Army, however, has been changing in recent years, according to Maj. Gen. Lloyd B. Ramsey, whose command includes the Military Police Corps.

"We've increasingly emphasized the training of the MP to be a friend of the soldier," Ramsey said, "and standards for becoming an MP are much higher than those of the average soldier."

Today's MP, he said, spends as much or more time trying to keep soldiers out of trouble as he does dealing after the fact with flagrant lawbreakers or troublemakers. The emphasis is on choosing MP recruits who are sensitive to soldiers' problems.

Both in military police school, which is not under Ramsey's command, and throughout the Corps worldwide, heavy emphasis is placed upon human relations training and the application of psychological principles rather than force where possible in achieving Corps goals.

Ramsey said that in his three years as Provost Marshal General he has "tried to get out in the field as much as possible because that's where you find out what the problems are."

VISITS WITH A PURPOSE

He said, "These aren't inspection trips. They are trips I take to find out how we at the headquarters level can assist our people in the field to do a better job.

"We found, for example, that the vehicles the MPs were using were in terrible shape.

"Now we have what we call a law enforcement sedan going out to field installations. It has a bigger motor to support power demands of more sophisticated communications equipment, the siren, lights and so on. It has heavier upholstery because MPs continually have to get in and out of a vehicle and this is hard on the upholstery. And there are other features that will give MPs more maneuverability."

Among other activities or proposed changes prompted by the field visits:

"A study is now under way of our entire communications system—what types of radios should be installed in which of our cars, for example?"

The MPs uniform is being studied with an eye to making it more functional—"the dress uniform now is simply too restricting considering the vigorous activities MPs sometimes have to engage in. Also I think we're going to go to a badge instead of the traditional arm brassard."

The Corps, which is responsible for investigating misdemeanors but not felony crimes, has established a job slot for a "military police investigator" (MPI).

"Their big job is crime prevention." Ramsey said, "and they've done a tremendous job. We put them in civilian clothes or uniforms of some other branch if necessary. The MPIs broke up a mugging operation near one post theater. Another time, they shut down a house of prostitution being run by a service club."

The Military Police Corps is considering replacing its combat .45-caliber pistol with the .38 used by most civilian police which is less lethal in crowd situations and easier to handle.

Ramsey noted that military crime rates often rise and fall in patterns similar to those of the civilian population. During the past fiscal year, he said, Army crime rates have been on a downward trend, except for marijuana use offenses which have increased.

The office of Provost Marshal General also has responsibility for correction, custody, and rehabilitation of military prisoners, physical security of installations, traffic control involving military operations, handling of prisoners of war and civilian internees during wartime, apprehension of absentees and civil disturbance and disaster control.

Some 1100 longterm military prisoners are held in the Army's disciplinary barracks at Ft. Leavenworth, Kan. About 1000 prisoners given sentences of six months or less are now with the Army's Retraining Brigade at Ft. Riley, Kan., where, hopefully, they will be rehabilitated and later returned to duty.

"The latest psychological, sociological, educational and vocational ideas are applied in our rehabilitation program," Ramsey said. "They get humane motivational training and are kept up to date in basic combat techniques. If they don't make progress we discharge them after their sentence is up. But we have had a high degree of success with this effort."

Before the job was turned over to the Defense Supply Agency in July, Ramsey's office provided physical security advice to vital defense industries, and such surveys, he said, "kept me on the road a lot."

Maintaining security of arms rooms and other Army supply facilities remains a difficult problem. Ramsey said. He added, "We are always studying the newest types of locking and intrusion detection devices.

Army deserters have a tougher time staying out of Ft. Leavenworth these days. A data file on deserters and absentees is maintained at Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Ind., and linked to the FBI's National Crime Information Center. "A man now can be picked up for a traffic violation somewhere and turn up as a deserter when they run it through the NCIC." Ramsey said.

Ramsey, 55, saw extensive combat during World War II, received multiple wounds, was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and many other citations and decorations, and rose to infantry regiment and division staff posts. During 1969, he commanded the 23rd Infantry Division in Vietnam.

The word "leadership" crops up frequently when Ramsey is talking. He considers vigor and the ability to communicate two of the more important attributes of a good leader. A former athlete, he himself remains vigorous by working out in the gym regularly and playing badminton and golf. And his visits to the field help keep communications lines open.

"If a young man gets good leadership," Ramsey said, "he is going to be a good soldier. It is as simple as that."

ROBISON CALLS FOR INDEPENDENT "SPECIAL PROSECUTOR"

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, upon hearing that President Nixon agreed, this afternoon, to turn the White House tapes over to Judge Sirica in compliance with the court of appeals affirmative decision, one of my House colleagues said, "Whew, what a helluva high-wire act."

My own reaction is somewhat comparable for, though I have been cautioning both my constituents and myself to cool it insofar as early tendencies to conclude that the President, by his actions last weekend, had "put himself above the law" and was moving—in the words of the Waldie impeachment resolution as introduced in the House today—"knowingly and wilfully to obstruct justice" were concerned, it was obvious all along that the President had precipitated one of the most serious constitutional crises ever to plague and divide this Nation.

It will be difficult, now, to put back the pieces. Not all of them probably can be put back. Two of the brighter stars in the Nixon administration—Elliot Richardson and William Ruckelshaus—have left their posts and, at the moment

at least, we are without a special prosecutor to carry on the Watergate investigation with some assurance that, in the end, the full truth about Watergate would come out.

As to the latter problem, Congress should probably move now to do what it might better have done in the beginning—that is, to establish, through legislation, an independent special prosecutor for the purpose of completing the Watergate investigation who would not, then, be answerable, as was Archibald Cox, to the executive branch. It is largely hindsight, but it has seemed to me to have been an anomalous situation in which we placed Mr. Cox—that is, to charge him, as an employee of the executive branch—and, clearly, subject to removal from office by the President—to investigate that same executive branch all the way up to its top. From the beginning, this put the President and Mr. Cox in an awkward situation—an adversary situation—in which a confrontation like that which has now occurred was probably inevitable.

I have no way of knowing if Mr. Cox would resume his investigatory work into Watergate should Congress now so reestablish the special prosecutor post but that is at least a possibility. The chances of bringing either Mr. Richardson or Mr. Ruckelshaus back into Federal service are probably more remote, but they will be missed.

Looking back, I believe a number of things need to be said in behalf of the President. There are those, of course, who will give Mr. Nixon no quarter. To them—and this includes a number of my constituents who have contacted me over the weekend—the only reason the President did not earlier release the disputed tapes was because they must have been dangerously self-incriminating. As to that, we shall soon now see. But my earlier response was, if the tapes would have so incriminated the President why, then, did he agree to let Senator STENNIS hear them in their entirety? In point of fact, I now repeat what I also said, earlier in the weekend, to the effect that I felt the so-called Stennis compromise was not all that bad if what we really wanted to know from the tapes was the depth, if any, of Presidential involvement in either organizing Watergate or directing its subsequent attempted coverup. If the major question was over whether Judge Sirica or Senator STENNIS should hear the tapes, it was not on that ground, alone, that the President could be found to have moved "to obstruct justice."

Of more serious import, here, is the question—still unresolved—of the President's meaning in, at the same time, denying Mr. Cox access to other White House documents and material that might be pertinent to the Watergate inquiry. Perhaps Mr. Nixon will also backtrack now on this issue, as I think he should, though another way around that impasse — if it persists — would be through passage of the kind of law Prof. Alexander Bickel, of Yale, has suggested giving the Federal courts jurisdiction to enforce congressional subpenas. If we go that route, along with legislation recreating the independent special prosecutor post, it is clear that the President has not—as some have charged—put the executive branch above the other two branches of our Federal Government, nor could he do so if we are serious about pressing these matters.

Further, in the President's behalf, it needs to be suggested, at least, that he felt his proposed compromise was within the spirit, if not the letter, of the original Sirica decision as somewhat modified by the court of appeals. In my own judgment, this would have been obvious to all if, at the time of advancing that compromise, Mr. Nixon had also filed a timely appeal to the Supreme Court from the court of appeals decision. I cannot imagine that he did not get such advice for it would not only have been a necessary and proper legal move, but would also have avoided giving the appearance—with his compromise being considered as the judicial process moved on—of having put himself, on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, "above the law." Though this is water-over-the-dam, if such a course had been followed, I doubt that Mr. Cox would have felt is necessary to balk as he did, with his resulting dismissal followed by the Richardson resignation and the Ruckelshaus dismissal.

What all this points up once again, I feel, is that, despite the personnel changes that have been made in upper White House staff echelons, the President still remains too isolated both from public opinion and from those who, at least on occasion, could give him wise political advice.

In summary, the President sought to do what he thought was right but, in the manner chosen, botched the doing of it. With gratification and relief, I welcome the corrections in position be made today.

One final word about that question of impeachment: With alarm, did I note how readily that word sprang to so many lips—with scarcely a thought to the actual consequences, or to what such a traumatic experience, long-drawn out as it would be, would also be for a Nation already beset by so many serious problems and challenges both at home and abroad. I do not question the motives of those of my colleagues who have led today's impeachment drive, but it should be clear to all objective observers that, with the Vice Presidency now vacant, something like a political coup d'etat was being initiated and organized in an effort to overturn the mandate given by the electorate last fall which, if not given Mr. Nixon personally, was given in support of the political philosophy he was thought to generally espouse.

The President is not out of the Watergate woods yet—perhaps he never will be. But, if consideration must again be given to his impeachment on whatever grounds, let it be done only after the most mature and deliberative of thought on all our parts including that of the news media, large portions of which—over these past few days—came close to succumbing to that kind of advocacy journalism against which one of its own most distinguished spokesmen, Walter Cronkite, warned here in Washington only last week.

MENACE OF MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing concern over what effect the growth of American multinational corporations have on the American worker and the economy of the United States. Presently, there are hearings being conducted in the U.S. Senate on this very question.

I deem it appropriate, therefore, to insert into the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues a resolution adopted by the 38th UE International Convention. The resolution appeared in the October 8 issue of the UE News.

The resolution follows:

MENACE OF MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

A resolution on "The Menace of the Multinational Corporations" adopted by the 38th UE International Convention pointed out that these corporations now hold nearly $300 billion in cash reserves, more than twice as much as held by all central banks and monetary institutions.

This huge financial power is used to dictate policy to governments, menace workers and even the independence of nations.

One million American jobs were lost within five years as these corporations moved operations to cheap wage areas outside the U.S. The electronics industry was one specifically mentioned by the U.S. Tariff Commission as the center of such expansion away from the United States.

The convention resolution emphasizes that the interests of working people in foreign countries and those in the United States "can only be advanced by organizing and standing up to these Multi national corporations together." Such solidarity would help stop the attempts of the corporations to pit workers of one country against those of another "hammering down their standards of living and conditions of work."

The resolution calls for the UE to establish contact with foreign unions "in line with its policy of no discrimination as to ideology, in order to determine what cooperative steps must be taken to curb the power of the multi national corporations. . . .

That UE together with foreign unions encourage and assist the organization of unions where employees of such corporations are presently organized.

That UE fight the propaganda of those corporations which try to represent themselves as benevolent promoters of world peace and prosperity.

That the UE support legislation designed to curb the power of the multi-national corporations, such as the following provisions of the Burke-Hartke bill:

"(a) Compelling U.S. companies to pay U.S. income taxes on foreign profits whether or not the profits are returned to the U.S.

"(b) Repealing the U.S. tax credit allowed companies on foreign taxes.

"(c) Preventing the use of accelerated depreciation for overseas equipment.

"(d) Taxing the transfer of patents to overseas plants.

"(e) Empowering the President to ban the transfer overseas of capital and technology.

"(f) Repealing the sections of the tariff code that provide an incentive for U.S. manufacturers to ship components across the border to low wage nations for assembling and other production.

"(g) Compelling officials of U.S. international corporations employed abroad to pay U.S. income taxes on their earnings abroad.

"(h) Repealing the overseas Private Investment Corporation which insures multinationals against the loss of the foreign investments."

Finally, the resolution states: "At all times, the UE should take the position that international organization of the workers themselves, not legislation, is the only effective way to deal with the multi-national corporations."

NO MORE HONORARY OR COURTESY APPOINTMENTS TO ADVISORY COMMITTEES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, a letter in the October 19 issue of Science notes that Frank Sinatra accepted appointment to the National Advisory Heart and Lung Council to fill a 1-year unexpired term, then did not attend council meetings or contribute to the council's work between meetings.

The letter-writer, Julius H. Comroe, Jr., of the Cardiovascular Research Institute, School of Medicine, University of California at San Francisco, explains that he is bringing the matter to public attention, now that Mr. Sinatra's term has expired, for this reason:

Simply in the hope that the public may ask the secretary of H.E.W. that there be no more honorary or courtesy appointments to working councils whose responsibilities require the dedicated efforts of all its members.

I think that his point is a good one, and I ask that his letter be printed in full.

The letter follows:

CARDIOVASCULAR RESEARCH INSTITUTE, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif.

APPOINTMENTS TO WORKING GOVERNMENT COUNCILS

In December 1972, Frank Sinatra was appointed a member of the National Advisory Heart and Lung Council, to fill a 1-year unexpired term. This council, by law, consists of 5 ex officio members and 18 members appointed by the secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). The National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act of 1972 states that 5 of the 18 "shall be selected from members of the general public who are leaders in the fields of fundamental or medical sciences or in public affairs." Neither I nor any other council member questions the principle of appointing nonscientists to the council, or the wisdom shown by the secretary of HEW in the appointment of any individual. However, the scientists on the council do have a right to expect full participation of all members in the heavy work load of the council, and to expect that the nonscientists will bring new concepts and fresh points of view to the council's discussions—and express these effectively. The council must meet from four to six times a year, and members must spend much time between meetings on the council's business.

Mr. Sinatra accepted appointment to the council but did not attend even part of the four council meetings held since then (15 to 17 March, 29 and 30 March, 13 to 15 June, and 17 and 18 September), nor did he contribute to the council's work between meetings. Since his term has now expired, why bring the matter to public attention? Simply in the hope that the public may ask the secretary of HEW that there be no more honorary or courtesy appointments to working councils whose responsibilities require the dedicated efforts of all its members. Surely the government can find ways to honor those whose special talents or contributions deserve recognition without lessening the effectiveness and prestige of its working councils.

JULIUS H. COMROE, JR.

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL LEGAL COUNSEL NEEDED TO CHALLENGE ILLEGAL EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years we have witnessed an escalating succession of illegal actions on the part of the executive branch—actions flaunting the laws of the United States, the will of the Congress, and most importantly the trust of the American people.

The President's firing of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox, in violation of a solemn agreement between the Attorney General and the Senate, is merely the most recent of these arbitrary and illegal acts. Mr. Nixon's seizing of evidence, material to the investigation of the Federal grand jury, his violation of the first and fourth amendment rights of U.S. citizens by sanctioning an elaborate series of wiretaps, burglaries, and espionage, his interference with the judicial branch during the Ellsberg-Russo trial, his illegal use of campaign funds to insure his reelection, his impounding of more than $40 billion in funds for domestic programs, and his authorization of secret bombing in Cambodia represent some of the President's illegal actions during the past year.

Today I have introduced legislation that would enable Members of both Houses of Congress as elective officials to challenge illegal executive actions in the courts through the mechanism of Congressional Legal Counsel. This bill, establishing an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel, is similar to legislation introduced by Mr. MONDALE in the other body.

The head of the Office of Congressional Legal Counsel would be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, from among names submitted by the majority and minority leaders of the House and Senate. Duties of the Counsel would include a variety of informational and representational activities.

First, he—or she—would be required, upon request of either House of Congress, a joint committee, a committee, at least 3 Senators or 12 Representatives, to render a legal opinion on questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States. These questions would include whether:

A request for information or inspection of records under the Freedom of Information Act was properly denied by an agency of the U.S. Government;

A nomination, or an agreement with a foreign country or regional or international organization, should have been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent;

An activity has been undertaken or continued, or not undertaken or continued, by the executive branch of the U.S. Government in violation of the law or the Constitution or without any required authorization of law; and

Funds appropriated by Congress have been impounded in accordance with law.

Second, he would be required, upon requests from any of the same types of parties above, to advise and cooperate with other private parties bringing civil actions against officers and employees of the executive branch, or any agency or department thereof, regarding their execution of the laws and Constitution.

Third, he would be required, upon a similar request, to intervene or appear as amicus curiae in pending actions in Federal or State courts in which the issue is the constitutionality or interpretation of a law of the United States, or the validity of any official proceeding of or official action taken by either House of Congress, joint committees, committees or members, or any officer or employee of the Congress.

Fourth, upon request, he would be required to represent either House, a joint committee, committee, Member or employee of Congress in any legal action pending to which such House, committee, or employee is a party, and in which there is placed in issue the validity of any official proceeding of, or official action taken by, such House, committee, member, or employee.

Fifth, and most importantly, if the Congressional Legal Counsel has rendered a legal opinion, and if requested by either House, a joint committee, a committee, at least 6 Senators or at least 24 Representatives, he would be required "to bring a civil action, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, in a court of the United States to require an officer or employee of the executive branch of the U.S. Government, or any agency or department thereof, to act in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States as interpreted in such opinion."

The Congressional Legal Counsel, therefore, would be empowered to undertake a wide variety of activity, including representing the Congress and individual Members both as plaintiffs and defendants.

Most importantly, the bill would provide the Congress with an effective legal voice in combating illegal executive branch actions such as impoundment, overly broad claims of Executive privlege, failure to submit nominations to the

Senate for confirmation, and other similar abuses.

The statute would confer broad standing on the Office of Congressional Counsel in its representational activity, so as to afford the Congress with wide-ranging authority in challenging executive branch action in the courts.

Just as the Office of Legislative Counsel has, over the years, aided Members of the House and Senate in developing important legislation, so should an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel aid us in reasserting the power which we need to insure that this legislative function is carried out by an often balky executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the bill I have introduced at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill establishing an Office of Congressional Legal Counsel

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of this Act—

(1) "Member of Congress" means a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

(2) "Member of the House of Representatives" includes a Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

(3) "State" includes any territory or possession of the United States; and

(4) "impounding of budget authority" includes—

(A) withholding, delaying, deferring, freezing, or otherwise refusing to expend any part of budget authority made available (whether by establishing reserves or otherwise) and the termination or cancellation of authorized projects or activities to the extent that budget authority has been made available;

(B) withholding, delaying, deferring, freezing, or otherwise refusing to make any allocation of any part of budget authority (where such allocation is required in order to permit the budget authority to be expended or obligated);

(C) withholding, delaying, deferring, freezing, or otherwise refusing to permit a grantee to obligate any part of budget authority (whether by establishing contract controls, reserves, or otherwise); and

(D) any type of Executive action or inaction which effectively precludes or delays the obligation or expenditure of any part of authorized budget authority.

SEC. 2. (a) There is established within the Congress the Office of Congressional Legal Counsel, which shall be under the direction and control of the Congressional Legal Counsel. The Congressional Legal Counsel shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate from among recommendations submitted by the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Such appointment shall be made without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office. The Congressional Legal Counsel shall receive basic pay at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The Congressional Legal Counsel may appoint and fix the compensation of such Assistant Legal Counsels and other personnel as may be necessary to carry on the work of his office. All such appointments shall be made without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their office.

(c) The Congressional Legal Counsel shall promulgate for his office such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the duties imposed upon him by this Act. He may delegate authority for the performance of any such duty to any officer or employee of the Office of the Congressional Legal Counsel. No person serving as an officer or employee of such office may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while so serving.

(d) The Congressional Legal Counsel shall cause a seal of office to be made for his office, of such design as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Congressional Legal Counsel—

(1) to render, upon request of either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, at least three Senators, or twelve Members of the House of Representatives, legal opinions upon questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States, including but not limited to, whether—

(A) a request for information or inspection of a record or other matter under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, was properly denied by an agency of the United States Government;

(B) a nomination, or an agreement with a foreign country or regional or international organization, should have been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent;

(C) an activity has been undertaken or continued, or not undertaken or continued, by the executive branch of the United States Government in violation of the law or the Constitution or without any required authorization of law;

(D) a budget authority has been impounded in accordance with law;

(2) upon the request of either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, at least three Senators, or at least twelve Members of the House of Representatives—

(A) to advise and to consult and cooperate with parties bringing civil actions against officers and employees of the executive branch of the United States Government or any agency or department thereof, with respect to their execution of the laws, and the Constitution of the United States; and

(B) to intervene or appear as amicus curiae on behalf of persons making such request in any action pending in any court of the United States or of a State or political subdivision thereof, in which there is placed in issue the constitutionality or interpretation of any law of the United States, or the validity of any law of the United States, or the validity of any official proceeding of, or official action taken by, either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, or a Member of Congress, or any officer, employee, office, or agency of the Congress;

(3) to represent, upon request, either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, a Member of Congress, or any officer, employee, office, or agency of the Congress in any legal action pending in any court of the United States or of a State or political subdivision thereof to which such House, joint committee, committee member, officer, employee, office, or agency is a party and in which there is placed in issue the validity of any official proceeding of, or official action taken by, such House, joint committee, committee member, officer, employee, office, or agency; and

(4) if an opinion has been rendered in accordance with subparagraph (1) of this section, and upon request of either House of Congress, a joint committee of Congress, any committee of either House of Congress, at least six Senators, or at least twenty-four Members of the House of Representatives, to bring civil actions, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, in a court of the United States to require an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States Government, or any agency or department thereof, to act in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States as interpreted in such opinion.

(b) Upon receipt of written notice from the Congressional Legal Counsel to the effect that he has undertaken, pursuant to subsection (a)(3) of this section, to perform any such specified representational service with respect to any designated action or proceeding pending or to be instituted, the Attorney General shall be relieved of responsibility and shall have no authority to perform such service in such action or proceeding except at the request or with the approval of the Congressional Legal Counsel.

SEC. 4. (a) Permission to intervene or to file a brief amicus curiae under section 3(a)(2)(B) of this Act shall be of right, and may be denied by a court only upon an express finding that such intervention or filing is untimely and would significantly delay the pending action.

(b) Where an actual case or controversy exists, persons making requests under section 3(a)(4) of this Act shall have the right to obtain judicial review of the conduct in question without regard to the requirements for standing as set forth in any statutes, rules, or other requirement of standing.

(c) For the purpose of all proceedings incident to the trial and review of any action described by subsection (a)(3) of section 3 with respect to which the Congressional Legal Counsel has undertaken to provide representational service, and has so notified the Attorney General, the Congressional Legal Counsel shall have all powers conferred by law upon the Attorney General, any subordinate of the Attorney General, or any United States attorney.

(d) The Congressional Legal Counsel, or any attorney of his office designated by him for that purpose, shall be entitled for the purpose of performing duties imposed upon him pursuant to this Act to enter an appearance in any such proceeding before any court of the United States without compliance with any requirement for admission to practice before such court, except that the authorization conferred by this subsection shall not apply with respect to the admission of any person to practice before the United States Supreme Court.

SEC. 5. All legal opinions rendered by the Congressional Legal Counsel under section 3(a)(1) of this Act shall be published and made available for public inspection under such rules and regulations as the Congressional Legal Counsel shall promulgate.

SEC. 6. (a) Section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after "respective terms of office" the following: "the Congressional Legal Counsel,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before "or Legislative Counsel" the following: "Congressional Legal Counsel,"

(b) Section 3216(a) of such title is amended by inserting immediately before "and Legislative Counsel" the following: "Congressional Legal Counsel,".

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Congressional Legal Counsel such sums as may be necessary for the performance of the duties of the Congressional Legal Counsel under this Act. Amounts so appropriated shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Congressional Legal Counsel.

DOUBLES IRON CONTENT OF WHITE BREAD

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration has taken action which could endanger the health of all Americans.

After 3 years of controversy and in the face of dire warnings from competent hematologists, the FDA has ordered the Nation's bakeries to double the iron content of white bread.

One California hematologist has pointed out, obviously to no avail, that excess iron in the body can produce cirrhosis of the liver and pancreas, heart failure, diabetes, and impotence in males. Another physician who has treated iron-related disorders predicted that many Americans would have an iron overload in 10 years.

The FDA Commissioner admits that there is legitimate concern about our getting too much iron in our diets, but he still favors the regulation, because his research shows that Americans are not getting enough iron in their diets.

The Commissioner's concern about deficiencies in the diets of Americans is admirable, but his dictatorial act to make them consume more iron at a risk to life and health is unthinkable.

It may be all right with the American Bakers Association if we start getting medication at the grocery store instead of the local pharmacy, but I believe that most Americans would be more interested in the approval of hematologists, the real specialists in this area.

"No official comments were received from national or international hematologial societies," wrote the FDA in its regulation. That is hardly reason to assume the silent approval of responsible spokesmen in this field of medicine.

The order also sets higher iron levels for enriched bread and rolls and for enriched dough. It reads:

The Commissioner, on his own initiative, proposed that the standard for enriched bread, rolls, or buns also be amended by inserting the statement that iron and calcium may be added only in forms which are harmless and assimilable.

Unfortunately, what is harmless and assimilable is obviously open to debate. The FDA proposal has considerable support among the medical profession. But, there is also significant opposition from others in that same medical profession. The potential harm in adding to the iron content of bread is simply too important to be ignored.

It should not be the right of any Federal bureaucracy or any one bureaucrat to use the American public as human guinea pigs in a dietary supplement experiment.

I urge my colleagues to read the following United Press International account of the FDA action as it appeared in the October 13 edition of the Tyler, Tex., Morning Telegraph, one of the outstanding newspapers in my district.

DOUBLE RATION OF IRON DUE IN CONTENT OF WHITE BREAD

WASHINGTON.—In an order criticized by some doctors as a dangerous human experiment, the government Friday ordered the nation's bakeries to double the iron content of white bread.

The Food and Drug Administration said it was issuing the order, after three years of study and controversy, because research indicated Americans are not getting enough iron in their diet—partly because of the declining use of iron cookware. It will go into effect in six months.

Dr. William H. Crosby, chief of hematology at the Scripps Clinic in La Jolla, Calif., said there has been "absolutely no work done" to demonstrate that more iron in bread would be safe or effective.

"The manufacturers would not and could not provide such evidence," he said. "The fact that it may not be safe is really unconscionable."

Crosby said excessive iron can cause cirrhosis of the liver and pancreas, diabetes, heart failure and impotence in males.

Dr. Margaret Ann Krikker of Albany, N.Y., a general practitioner who has treated iron-related disorders and who helped circulate a petition against the proposal signed by more than 100 doctors, told UPI:

"This is an experiment, in my view an irresponsible experiment, unprecedented in the history of mankind . . . I predict a very significant portion of the population will have an iron overload in 10 years."

Dr. Alexander Schmidt, FDA commissioner, told UPI he realized there was "legitimate concern" from physicians who have said the move might result in too much iron in the diet—a potentially dangerous situation since the body can store and use iron but not eliminate it.

But he added: "As people's eating habits change, a significant number of people in the United States are getting less and less iron and becoming anemic. Some very good surveys have shown that as many as a quarter of young women in some areas have iron deficiency anemia . . ."

A spokesman for the American Bakers Association, which asked the FDA to order the change, said, "There are many children and women who are in menstruating years who have diagnosable anemia. This isn't going to cure that overnight, but it will make a very substantial contribution toward that."

The order sets higher iron levels for enriched bread and rolls and for enriched flour dough.

The new level of iron for enriched flour will be 40 milligrams per pound, compared to a present range of 13 to 16.5 mgs; for enriched bread it will be 25 mgs., compared to 8–12.5 presently.

RAW JUDICIAL POWER

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 I introduced House Joint Resolution 717 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of unborn children and other persons irrespective of their ages, health, functions or conditions of dependency. Such an amendment is made necessary by the Supreme Court's incredible decision last January prohibiting States from enacting laws prohibiting or regulating abortions. Associate Justice White in a dissenting opinion, said:

I find nothing in the language or history of the Constitution to support the Court's judgment. The Court simply fashions and announces a new constitutional right for pregnant mothers and with scarcely any reason or authority for its action, invests that right with sufficient substance to override most existing state abortion statutes.

Mr. Justice White later refers to the Court's decision as "an exercise of raw judicial power" and a more apt description of this decision cannot be made. Because the Supreme Court has abdicated its constitutional duty to interpret law and has elected to enact law, it becomes incumbent upon Congress and the people of these United States to restore the Constitution to its proper place as the basis and foundation of the American system. This can first be accomplished by dispelling the myth that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is. It is Abraham Lincoln who said in his first inaugural address:

If the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.

The Constitution is most emphatically not what the Supreme Court says it is; the Supreme Court is what the Constitution says the Supreme Court is. Since the Constitution places judicial power and not legislative power in the Supreme Court, one can only conclude that the Supreme Court itself has overstepped the bounds of the Constitution, and that its decision in Roe against Wade is unconstitutional. Those sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States are obliged by their oaths to perform precisely that action, and are not obliged to uphold a decision of the Supreme Court. Such an oath binds them to the Constitution as they have been given by God to understand the Constitution. Conversely, such an oath binds them to oppose the Supreme Court when the Court has acted unconstitutionally. It is for this reason that I have introduced the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment. As a Representative it is the very least I could do to fulfill the oath I have taken to uphold the Constitution.

B'NAI B'RITH STATEMENT ON MIDEAST CONFLICT

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I speak to you now, I am heartened by

news of a U.N.-sponsored cease-fire in the Middle East.

I fervently hope this will mean an end to the bloodshed and suffering in that beleaguered part of the world.

Along with other concerned colleagues, I introduced several resolutions in recent days to assist in Israel's defense against overwhelming odds. These measures called for first, an acceleration of the flow of economic and military aid to Israel; second, the initiation of diplomatic action to confine the war to its original combatants and third, an American commitment to bring about a negotiated settlement to the war.

At this time I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following sensitive appraisal of the conflict by the B'nai B'rith Council of Greater Boston:

STATEMENT OF THE B'NAI B'RITH COUNCIL OF GREATER BOSTON

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONFLICT

Egypt and Syria have once again chosen to violate a cease fire. Their armed forces crossed the cease fire lines initiating another major war. The battle is still fluid; the outcome uncertain. But surely one must ask why have the Arabs started a war that they are likely to lose?

THE ARAB PLAN

A. Even a small territorial gain would be a victory—if it could be solidified by a U.N. intervention for the establishment of a new cease fire. If the Egyptians, for example, can retain a bridgehead on the East Bank of the Canal, the two armies will no longer be separated by water, and the pressure for an imposed settlement will have been enhanced. The Arabs negotiating stance (if they choose to negotiate) would be stronger. Given the well-known UN pro-Arab bias and the "clout" afforded by Arab oil, a cease fire could be called as soon as the Egyptians consolidated any battle gains. They started this war in order to change the meaning and intent of UN Resolution 242. They seek to impose complete withdrawal of Israeli forces without linking it to a freely negotiated settlement and the establishment of secure boundaries. In this way they hope to set the stage for another round of war.

However, if the Israelis successfully counter-attack into Egyptian and Syrian territory, the Arabs count on the UN to bail them out. No cease fire will be passed by the UN Security Council, unless and until the Egyptians approve it—no matter what they say in public.

B. The Arab aim is to put an end to the State of Israel. As Nasser freely admitted, even the ostensibly limited objectives of today are stepping stones to a definitive solution tomorrow—the destruction of the State of Israel. At the same time, they are secure in the knowledge that no Israeli victory, however swift and large, can threaten the continued existence of any Arab states. The Arabs, therefore, feel, that given the disposition of international power they have everything to gain by attacking Israel. They place little value on human life and can gamble with impunity since the international community is not disposed to restrain them.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The attack by Egypt and Syria is only the most recent in a long and unremitting series of Arab aggressions against Israel going back to the formation of the State.

1. In November 1947 the United Nations voted to partition Palestine. The Arabs refused to accept the decision and immediately began country-wide assaults on the Jewish community in an attempt to "drive the Jews into the sea." In May of 1948, when the UN recognized the State of Israel, the full brunt of Syrian, Egyptian, Jordanian and Iraqui army units was concentrated on Israel in a concerted attack. The result, contrary to general expectation, was an Arab defeat.

2. In the years that followed, the Arab states refused to recognize the existence of Israel and their responsibilities under the UN Charter. After years of terrorist raids from Egyptian territory and Arab refusal to allow Israel its rightful maritime passage through the Suez Canal and also into the Red Sea via the Straits of Tiran the Israeli forces finally reacted and drove to the Suez Canal in 1956. Israel withdrew her forces, only on the basis of UN and other specific international assurances on the use of the Suez Canal and the Red Sea, and the establishment of a UN presence in the Sinai and Sharm-el Sheik. Nevertheless, immediately upon the Israeli withdrawal, the Egyptians closed the canal to Israeli shipping. The Arabs continued to deny the right of Israel to exist. Terrorists soon resumed incursions along other frontiers. Moreover, the Arabs chose to maintain a "state of belligerency"—which meant that they claim the right to undertake any and all warlike acts. On the other hand the Arabs argued that Israel must be held to their cease fire obligations and had no right to respond.

3. In 1967, President Nasser of Egypt decided the time was ripe to reverse the verdict of 1956. He unilaterally expelled the UN peacekeeping forces from the Sinai; he closed the Straits of Tiran—thus cutting off Israel's lifeline from Eilat to Africa and the Far East, constituting, under international law, an act of war—and poured enormous quantities of armor and infantry into the Sinai right up to Israel's vulnerable front lines.

In Cairo and the other Arab capitals, as American television viewers will recall, officially-inspired mobs paraded carrying banners with the skull and cross bones, and called for "Death to the Jews", while government radio stations interspersed martial airs with a call to "drive the Jews into the sea" and similar blood slogans. On June 5, Israel finally replied, destroying Egyptian and Syrian air power, and after Jordan bombarded Jerusalem, Israel responded to that attack.

In 1967, when Israel did not have defensible borders, she lost more men, proportionately, in 6 days of war than the U.S. lost in 10 years in Indo-China.

Israel and the world, hoped and believed, that this victory, so costly to both sides, would finally bring the Arabs to the negotiating table. But backed by the Russians and their allies in the United Nations, the Arabs attempted instead to rewrite history. They tried to convince the world that they were the victims instead of the criminal aggressors. They tried to regain their lost territory by diplomatic pressure, citing Israel's gains after such Arab attack and subsequent defeat, as evidence of Israel's "expansionist" tendencies—like the boy who killed his parents and asked the court for mercy as an orphan.

4. The Egyptians, who in 1967 were saved by the UN cease fire, broke a cease fire again by initating massive artillery strikes against Irsaeli forces in what Nasser called "The War of Attrition". The Egyptians felt that they would wear the Israelis down by trading deaths. When the Israelis refused to acquiesce in their assigned role, and, by air strikes, caused great losses to Egyptian forces, Egypt accepted a cease fire—this time arranged by the U.S. It was not even a few hours old before the Egyptians boldly used it as a cover for advancing Russian missile launches closer to the Canal in violation of the agreement it had made a few hours before.

5. Now, in October 1973, when they found it politically convenient, they have once again violated the cease fire and initiated hostilities.

CONSEQUENCES

What are the consequences of this Arab aggression likely to be if the Arabs are permitted once more, to escape the responsibilities of their actions?

1. It will make peace harder to achieve. Israel and thoughtful people throughout the world cannot be expected to soon forget this infamous Arab attempt at a Pearl Harbor, which occurred on Yom Kippur, the holiest religious holiday in Judaism.

2. It will confirm Israel's conviction that Arab promises and agreements are not to be relied on; that cease fires are merely tactical conveniences to be shed when no longer wanted; and that the only assurance of safety and survival remains—defensible borders.

The Israelis are the survivors and heirs of the pogroms and concentration camps of Europe, and refugees and heirs of refugees from Arab lands. They have suffered and died enough and will not stand by and allow themselves to be decimated once again. They want and need peace more than the Arabs because they can afford war less and are a peaceful people; but the first step for peace must come from the Arabs.

RESOLVED

A true and lasting peace is now, as it has been in the past, the only sensible goal for U.S. policy in the Middle East.

Because we, as Americans and as Jews, are committed to real peace; because we see clearly the dangers, futility and immorality of continued appeasement of the Arabs, because we are tired of violence and bloodshed, and because, as has been seen over the past 25 years; a truce is meaningless, an armistice is meaningless, a cease fire is meaningless, we declare our firm and unyielding solidarity with the people of Israel in their insistence upon secure, recognized and defensibe borders, to be achieved in a settlement of Middle East problems through free and untrammelled negotiations between the parties directly concerned in the conflict.

Therefore, we call upon:

1. All thoughtful people to condemn and oppose the brutal Egyptian/Syrian aggression.

2. The U.S. to accelerate the flow of arms and economic aid to Israel and, in particular, to replace immediately the equipment lost in the current fighting.

3. The President to maintain his long-range policy of the last 3 years, the essence of which is "no imposed solution" to the Middle East conflict.

4. All thoughtful people to recognize that the United Nations has prevented rather than aided the search for peace in the Middle East for 25 years. It has been morally bankrupt in its one-sided pro-Arab resolutions. In its present disposition it has no useful role to play in the resolution of this conflict. We, therefore, urge the U.S. to work for the restoration of the integrity of the UN by acting in accordance with the high ideals on which it was founded—even if we must stand alone.