

The following named Air Force officers for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Oliver, Hugh R., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be lieutenant colonel

Elkin, Clarence S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Thompson, Fred E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be major

Bule, Alton C., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be captain

Walton, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx

Howlett, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following officers for promotion in the Air Force Reserve, under the provisions of Section 8376, title 10, United States Code and Public Law 92-129.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Major to lieutenant colonel

Adcox, Alfred W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Agnor, Albert S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx

Barnes, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Bruce, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx

Brunton, Jack D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Butcher, Donald S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Butler, Henry M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx

Cochran, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx

Condon, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx

Corrada, Candido J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Colglazier, Benton W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Craig, Bobby L., xxx-xx-xxxx

Fehrenkamp, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Hallesy, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx

Hague, Wayne A., xxx-xx-xxxx

Hayden, Kent D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Jackson, William L. H., xxx-xx-xxxx

Jefferson, Grover D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Jenkins, Donnell B., xxx-xx-xxxx

Kemmerling, Paul T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

Miller, Charles H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx

Pastrana, Joaquin R., xxx-xx-xxxx

Ramsey, Frank S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Shows, Jesse L., xxx-xx-xxxx

Stankelis, Anthony A., xxx-xx-xxxx

NURSE CORPS

Hilbert, Arlene M., xxx-xx-xxxx

Kelly, Gerald W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Sartorius, Edith G., xxx-xx-xxxx

Willis, Elvira G., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Coyne, Edna R., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following persons for appointment as Reserves of the Air Force (Medical Corps),

in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 593, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation as medical officers under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Strate, Gerald H., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be lieutenant colonel

Jackson, Arnold J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Markham, Sanford M., xxx-xx-xxxx

Williams, Robert X., xxx-xx-xxxx

Wunder, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following person for appointment as a temporary officer in the United States Air Force (Medical Corps), in the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8444 and 8447, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation as a medical officer under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Griswold, Neil L., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following person for appointment as a Reserve of the Air Force in the grade of Lieutenant Colonel, Line of the Air Force, under the provisions of Section 593, Title 10, United States Code.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

Burdett, Wilson A., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force (Line of the Air Force) in the grade of Colonel, under the provisions of Sections 593 and 8351, Title 10, United States Code.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Colonel

Nelson, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following persons for appointment as Reserves of the Air Force, in the grade indicated (Line of the Air Force), under the provisions of Sections 593 and 1211, Title 10, United States Code.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Herrold, Ralph H., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be lieutenant colonel

Walker, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force (ANGUS), in the grade of Colonel (Line of the Air Force)

under the provisions of Sections 593, 8351, and 8392, Title 10, United States Code.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Funston, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx

Col. John P. Wittry, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, for appointment as permanent professor, U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333B, title 10, United States Code.

The following officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be first lieutenant (medical)

Chasen, Marvin M., xxx-xx-xxxx

Cogburn, Bobby E., xxx-xx-xxxx

England, Douglas M., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be captain (dental)

Schrader, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be first lieutenant (dental)

Hand, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, October 26, 1973:

ACTION AGENCY

Harry J. Hogan, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Director of the ACTION Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Charles R. Work, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator for Administration of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Thomas Army Rhoden, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Mississippi for a term of 4 years.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

J. Raymond Bell, of New York, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term of 3 years from October 22, 1971.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, during the year I have taken the occasion at frequent intervals to address myself to some of the important issues and problems of the day. I take this occasion to submit for the RECORD a number of these newsletters which are, in effect, position statements:

FEDERAL CUTBACK

(Feb. 22, 1973)

A process which began 40 years ago, back in the days of the New Deal—the uncontrolled growth of the federal government—is coming to an end. If President Nixon is to succeed in his avowed purpose to funnel

much of the power out of Washington and back to local government, he will need not only my help, but yours.

A \$256-million proposed budget for this fiscal year, \$31-billion above the present budget, would hardly appear to be a cutback of federal power. But the screams of log-rolling, pork barrel bureaucrats can be heard from the banks of the Potomac to Hawaii's tourist-filled shores. What's even worse, the President is talking about cutbacks in federal jobs, including a cut of 46,000 over the next year in the Executive Department. Those who have been schooled in the philosophy of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the Great Society, etc. know that it's a law of nature that federal spending always goes up and that federal payrolls grow.

Quite naturally, each of us will complain about cuts made in our favorite programs while applauding other slashes being attempted by the President. I am determined, for example, to continue my efforts to have the President free the \$6-billion in funds which he has impounded in the field of

pollution controls. This is not a wasteful program and should have top priority. This money, approved last year, would be of inestimable aid to Suffolk's Southwest Sewer District, and similar projects.

If he didn't see it clearly before, Mr. Nixon discovered during his first four years that the federal bureaucracy is like an octopus which, when you cut off one arm, grows two more in some other place. But he has not given up the fight and I think this could be his most important contribution to our welfare. If, as he says, he intends to get the government off our backs and its hand out of our pockets, he will have earned our gratitude. And he will most certainly have my help.

CRIMINAL CODE REFORM

(Apr. 5, 1973)

One of the most massive efforts in Congressional history—the attempt to rewrite and recodify the federal criminal code—is now underway. Upon its success rests, to a great extent, our hopes for the maintenance of an orderly society.

The bill in question, numbering 538 pages, is the longest measure ever to come before Congress. It will be subject to a two-year scrutiny and will, undoubtedly, draw considerable fire from the more permissive precincts of Congress. The general tenor of the bill can be determined from what was said at its introduction by its chief sponsor, Sen. John McClellan. "Our criminal law and procedure today tip the scale too far away from the best interests and full protection of society." Amen!

Under consideration in this umbrella legislation would be restoration of the death penalty for those convicted of murder or treason, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's rejection of such punishment, and an approach toward controlling pornography, which is virtually impossible under present law and court rulings.

If we are to have equitable law enforcement across this nation, this updating of the federal criminal code is a must. Public hearings will be held on this legislation and each individual section over the next year and I am sure that adjustments will be made according to input from the administration and the Department of Justice, as well as from individual Congressmen and their constituents.

Surely, our founding fathers never intended for criminals to move with impunity, as they have over the past decade or so, with the courts operating to shield the lawless rather than the victims of crime. If you agree, please stay alert for this important Congressional action and give me the benefit of your views in the form of a letter. Public opinion can be an important weapon in our efforts to put some fear of the law into the criminal element in this nation.

SENIOR CITIZENS

(May 3, 1973)

President Nixon has declared May as Senior Citizen Month, a time to recognize the achievements of older Americans and to insure that they maintain an active role in our society. I suppose that every group in our society welcomes recognition and our older folks are no exception. But they welcome action more and I sincerely believe that, for the first time in more than a decade, our elderly are seeing honest achievement in Washington to improve their lot.

We have instituted revenue sharing as a means of helping local governments to keep the lid on property taxes. It is rising property taxes, possibly more than any other factor, which have forced many of our older couples on Long Island to abandon the homes which have served them for a lifetime.

During the past four years, federal spending to help the poor and the elderly to meet their medical costs has increased by 67 per cent. Federal spending to provide assistance for older Americans has increased 71 per cent. All this comes at a time when President Nixon is fighting an uphill battle to reduce federal spending and to control inflation—an inflation due to the Great Society's uncontrolled spending and to Vietnam War outlays. And we all recognize that inflation is the cruellest tax of all, inflicting a particularly heavy levy on older citizens on fixed incomes.

This is a protest-prone world in which we live. Shoppers, anti-war groups, conservationists—almost anyone with a cause—feels free to take to the streets. Although our older citizens, who helped to build this nation, have more cause than most for protest, they have remained quiet, letting others plead their cause. They have channeled their energies into such service programs as the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, with 15,000 enrolled. Foster Grandparents, 10,000, and the Service Corps of Retired Executives 4,000.

We owe our older citizens recognition

during this month and concern for their interests during the entire year.

CONGRESSIONAL POWERS

(May 10, 1973)

One of the basic issues which has been disturbing many Congressmen over the past few years is the supposed usurpation by the President of powers supposedly belonging to Congress. An overbearing Executive Branch, they claim, is virtually ignoring the will of the Legislative Branch and is running the country all by itself. Congress, they say, is being reduced to the status of a debating society and Congress had better cut the President down to size before he forgets our address and stops sending us Presidential messages.

As in most capitol debates, there is a grain—a small grain—of truth here. Congress has not been exercising its power as it might, but this is the fault of Congress rather than of the President. The seniority system has often put men past their prime in positions of great responsibility. Demagoguery has all too often replaced statesmanship in recent years, so that Congress has continued to talk well past the time when it should have acted. Too much important legislation has been held in committee when it should have gone to the floor of both houses for discussion under the bright light of public scrutiny.

A conceivably dangerous step in the effort to curb the President is being considered by Congress in legislation entitled the War Powers Act. Of course, Congress wants to be consulted. Only the Congress can declare war, and we want no more VietNams. But in an age when the President has instant access to our nation's awesome nuclear deterrent and when minutes or seconds are the tolerance for decision, it may seem a step backwards to hamstringing our response potential in the hands of the President.

Congress can retain any power which it has lost for itself, not only to the Executive Branch but, in instances, to the federal courts, through the exercise of its legislative and appropriations functions. We appropriate the money which runs the government and it is a formidable power indeed. If the President is running roughshod over the separation doctrine—and I do not necessarily agree with that premise—the power of the purse can control him. Where the courts have arrogated our legislative powers, we can retain them by new legislation.

At present, Congressional Committees are busy on two fronts. One is the reform of our own cumbersome procedures, the other the updating of our needed responsiveness to the nation's budgetary and fiscal problems. Both will make for a more responsible, effective and independent Congress.

ENERGY CRISIS

(May 24, 1973)

Our energy-rich nation has always been able to have its cake and eat it too. We have been able to devour huge masses of fuel and have only recently become aware of the air pollution penalty which we are paying because of our millions of smokestacks and the automobile and truck fumes which engulf our cities.

There is another awareness which will come but has not yet penetrated the public consciousness. Most of the mail which I get concerns only one aspect of the energy situation, that dealing with pollution. There has been little communication from the public to my office yet on the possibilities of blackouts and brownouts, the reality that we might not be able to continue our air conditioned environment during the summer, the growing possibility of fuel rationing.

And yet the evidence is all around us that we are entering years of fuel crisis. So long as we lag in perfection of and production of

nuclear power for our generating plants, so long as use of the sun's energy for heating and generating is many years away, we will continue to be a civilization heavily dependent on fossil fuels. And with about half of our petroleum supply imported, we may well be at the mercy of mid-East nations who are increasingly hostile because of our support for Israel.

Congress is deeply concerned over our future energy needs and its inadequate supply and is now hard at work in search of solutions. We have, in fact, designated a Republican Congressional Task Force to concentrate in this field. As a member of this research group, I think it is indeed important for us to locate new sources of energy and new resources, but it is equally important that we do not, in the rush to keep our technological society rolling, give up the environmental gains of the past few years. For example, there is a vast oil depository waiting to be extracted from the Atlantic seabed off Long Island. But until absolute failsafe technology is developed, it would be a disastrous error to pump this oil at the risk of ruining our beaches and our offshore waters.

It will take great discipline in the coming years not to abandon our hard-won environmental gains in the face of a fuel squeeze which will most likely grow worse before it grows better.

TAX REFORM

(May 31, 1973)

For some years, tax reform has been a prime topic of parlor conversation in Washington. It matched the weather in terms of something which was discussed, with nothing much being done about it.

This, however, may well be the year for action. Tax reform is a misnomer because what we have had in the past has been a rehash of existing laws and theories. What we should have this year is a comprehensive look at tax resources and governmental services, taking into account the requirements and tax levies of government at all levels. To reform just the federal income tax without reference to and consideration of the other tax systems would be patchwork.

With regard to the federal income tax, Congress is zeroing in on the relatively few taxpayers—or, rather, non-taxpayers—with huge incomes, who are using loopholes in the law to pay nothing or very little. A proposed minimum tax aimed at those in the \$50,000-and-above bracket could be most effective in insuring that legal evasion by the well-to-do does not make a mockery of the income tax laws.

The administration has placed some other rather interesting proposals before Congress but it is up to Congress to act on tax reform. The reform package includes proposals for property tax relief for the elderly, similar to provisions of the New York State tax law, credits for those overburdened parents whose children attend parochial or private schools, and some tax-relief for those who rent, to match the benefits now enjoyed by property owners who are paying interest on their mortgages.

Perhaps the greatest blessing for the most people would be the proposed simplification of the basic Form 1040. If that can be put into English which the average taxpayer can comprehend, we'd have struck a major blow for tax reform.

PORNOGRAPHY

(July 19, 1973)

The United States Supreme Court, which has in recent years been castigated for its arrogation of legislative powers to reshape, not interpret, the Constitution and has been challenged for its predisposition to the rights of the lawless—rather than the victims of crime, deserves a great deal of credit for its

decision last month in cracking down on pornography.

In a split decision, with Nixon appointees leading the majority, the court ruled that states and localities may set their own standards on what is sheer obscenity and what is art. This will give local prosecutors the right to set clear standards on what is acceptable in a given community and what will bring instant legal action.

There will be many who deplore the court's decision as a form of censorship. But all commerce and conduct in an advanced civilization must be based on the give and take of reasonable controls, a balance of privilege and responsibility, benefit and burden. Every traffic light which we obey is a control on our freedom of movement. Various public agencies set standards for the quality of our food and drinking water and that, too, is an infringement to some extent on the freedoms of both the suppliers and consumers. But we recognize that such an infringement is necessary for our health. And so too have many people felt that movies like "Deep Throat" and the hundreds of pornographic books and magazines which have flooded certain porno shops are a danger to the moral and mental health of many communities.

This Supreme Court ruling does not ban smut nor does it define pornography in detail. Rather, the key to the ruling is that local community standards are to be defined and enforced. It may well be that New York City might decide that it is perfectly happy with the gutter vulgarity which is being distributed and screened in Fun City and would not in any way interfere with this commerce. At the same time Suffolk and Nassau might take action to put legal pressure on pornographers. If so, and I hope they do, I think Long Island would be the better for such a decision.

THE PEACE-HAWKS, A QUESTION OF MORALITY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we have recently seen a great shifting of attitudes of many Americans as a result of renewed hostilities in the Middle East. Many of the once cooing doves, who opposed U.S. involvement in Vietnam because it was "an immoral war," have suddenly sprouted a completely new set of feathers and now bear a striking resemblance to hawks. If the new "peace-hawks" find this a "moral war," I question their logic.

Our State Department's "commitment to foreign policy," by supplying planes, tanks, and other weapons to Israel, has so alienated many of our NATO and European allies that they have refused to allow the U.S. bases in their countries to be used as staging grounds for U.S. involvement in the Middle East. Apparently, our allies have more foresight into the dangers of choosing up sides in the conflict than our own foreign policy makers.

The President may feel that his "commitments" to Israel exceed his oath of office to uphold the Constitution and to conduct a foreign policy in the best interest of our country. Our national policy should not be one of pro-Israel, or pro-Arab for that matter. It should simply be pro-American.

CXIX—2217—Part 27

We should have learned our lesson from our involvement in Vietnam and Korea. Do we have any more "vital national interests" in supporting Israel than we had in supporting South Vietnam? I opposed our entrance into those wars, and I find no compelling reasons to change this position. Unless our country is attacked or we are in eminent danger of invasion, I do not believe that the majority of the people in my district want me to cast their vote to send one American boy overseas.

The mere presence of 3,500 U.S. marines, as well as numerous U.S. naval vessels and jet planes in that vicinity of the Mediterranean could provide the spark needed to ignite a direct U.S. involvement in the fighting. A single misdirected rocket or bomb hitting a U.S. ship could be the incident needed to plunge this country into yet another Vietnam or Korea.

The President is pursuing a potentially disastrous course of action. American presence in the Middle East has baited the war trap. The question remaining is: Will the American people allow this trap to be sprung?

JUSTICE, JUSTICE, WHERE IS JUSTICE?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the sentence imposed on former Vice President Spiro T. Agnew in Baltimore is but one more sign of the dual standard of justice that makes a mockery of the law in our country.

Although his family was not hungry, Agnew abused the high offices to which he was elected and stole from the U.S. Treasury through tax fraud.

Although his family did not lack decent housing, he took hundreds of thousands of dollars in "gifts" and bribes. The fine imposed on him was only a small fraction of his ill-gotten gains.

The Agnew children did not have to stay from school because there was no money for shoes for winter clothing. The Agnew children did not suffer the retarding effects of malnutrition and disease. Their father earned a high enough salary to support them well.

Was Agnew a drug addict who stole to maintain a heroin habit picked up when he was an unemployed teenager with no prospect of a job? Or was his addiction only to wealth and power, to country clubs with golf courses, to homes costing nearly \$200,000, to cocktail parties where he could be revered by the mightiest of journalists, industrialists and patriots?

Who, then, people our jails, if not Spiro Agnew and those like him who do violence to an entire Nation?

Pete Hamill, the New York Post columnist, made this analysis on October 12:

Go down to the Tombs and start ripping out the bars. Go over to Atlantic Avenue and

punch out the glass bricks of the Brooklyn jail. Set the bulldozers loose on Attica, crushing the walls, demolishing the guard towers, reducing all of it to twisted steel and powdered brick. Melt down all the machine guns on the walls. Burn all the uniforms of the guards. Let all the prisoners loose. There can be no prisons while Spiro Agnew is free.

How can society send a kid from Fox St. to the joint while Agnew is walking the streets? What judge can sleep at night, knowing that he is sending young men away to years of steel and bars, while Agnew sleeps in silk sheets?

The big Washington commentators are all talking about the "Agnew tragedy." What about the Attica tragedy? What about the tragedy that occurs every day in the criminal courts of this town? What about the tragedy of America? Waste no pity on Agnew. He revealed himself in court. By copping a plea on income tax evasion charges, he in effect admitted that he took criminal money and didn't pay taxes on it. Just like Al Capone.

And yet Elliot Richardson is talking about Agnew as if he were a respectable citizen who made a little mistake. He thinks that Agnew's resignation, along with the three-year probation and the \$10,000 fine, are sufficient disgrace. He sees no need for Agnew's "confinement in a penal institution," which is the way those people talk about going to the slam.

But this is an outrage. Agnew has, in effect, admitted that he is a criminal bum. He was the Vice President of the U.S., a guy who marched up and down this land shouting about "law and order." And every month or so, the guys with the envelopes would come to his office with cash. He was on the take, knowing exactly what he was doing. He was committing felony after felony and they've let him walk.

Until he walked into court the other day and copped his plea, it was possible to root for Agnew to fight it out, to not let himself be used by Richard Nixon as a diversion from Nixon's own disgusting stewardship. But once he entered that nolo contendere plea, in effect admitting what he had done, Agnew should have faced the full majesty of justice. "If you can't do the time, don't do the crime."

And for the crimes Agnew was involved in, he should have died in prison. He should have had to suffer everything that prisoners suffer in America, perhaps more. Agnew, after all, did not have racism, dope addiction, or despair to excuse his rotten acts. He filthied an entire country. He helped mortally wound the fabric of America. He helped ruin basic democratic institutions, which depend for their very existence on an act of faith between the people and the leaders they have chosen.

For these crimes, Agnew should have lain rotting in a place like the Tombs, while his wife and kids waited with the others, outside in the rain. He should have been called by a number, or had the screws give his cell a midnight toss. He should have heard the junkies screaming through the night. He should have spent the years wondering where the people he loved had gone, and what it was like to walk down a city street, or run in the surf on a beach. He should have done time like other felons.

But no: Agnew will play golf. He will keep the house he furnished with criminal money. He will write his memoirs. He will make speeches about the conspiracy against him. He will protest his innocence, and describe his common act of plea bargaining as some ultimate act of patriotism.

And Nixon himself will remain free. Nixon organized a private police force. He waged a secret war in Cambodia in defiance of the Congress. He is hiding tape recordings which are evidence in a criminal proceeding. He had burglars, extortionists, potential kid-

napers on his payroll. Under his leadership, the White House sank into the deepest cesspool of corruption in this nation's history. And now he will pick a successor to Agnew.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals recently reported on the need for a major overhaul of our judicial and correctional systems. Among its recommendations was one that many criminals should not be incarcerated, because the existing system of retribution and punishment does not deter crime. Instead, the Commission called for a sharp limit on sentences over 5 years, increased use of parole, probation, half-way houses, fines and work release programs rather than prison, and a change to the "least drastic" method of dealing with crime consistent with protection of the public.

Is the former Vice President one of the first beneficiaries of this type of progressive reform? Or were the fact as of his previous high post, his politically powerful friends and his white skin really what determined his lenient treatment?

Attorney General Richardson indicated that Agnew may not even be disbarred despite his felony conviction. As an ex-offender in New York and many other States, though, Agnew would be unable to be licensed as a barber or real estate salesman.

Can we now look forward to Spiro Agnew's becoming a legal aid lawyer, helping those he used to spit upon survive the judicial system which was so merciful to him? Can we count on Ted Agnew's forthright advocacy of reenfranchisement for ex-offenders? Will he travel from State legislature to State legislature to testify on the critical need to end economic and legal discrimination against former felons who have finished their sentences and simply want to return to their communities as useful citizens?

Although Ted Agnew avoided even a minute of incarceration in the Tombs, the District of Columbia jail or in any penal institution, can we depend on him to fight for drastic changes in our correctional system?

Or will the former Vice President just lounge around his country estate, dwelling in memories of past glories and forgetting the shame to which he subjected this Nation?

Now that he is just another convicted felon, maybe the Fortune Society or the American Civil Liberties Union will be able to solicit his support in their courageous battle to guarantee the civil and political rights of ex-offenders. Then he could begin to repay the country which tragically misplaced its trust in him. Then he could help instill some meaning into the concept of equal justice under law.

ON THE DEATH OF PAU CARLOS
SALVADOR DEFILLO DE CASALS

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the death of Pablo Casals at the age of 96

must be noted with deep regret. His was a full, rich life which has spanned most of modern history. While his passing was not out of season, yet we should all feel a sense of regret that time and history did not afford him the chance to return to his beloved homeland.

Of Casals, Thomas Mann said:

He is one of those artists who come to the rescue of humanity's honor.

Indeed, we would be hard pressed to name a single man of this century who so well understood the potential of art to confront tyranny. In modern times, Pablo Casals and his music have stood largely mute, in eloquent testimony to the silence imposed on Spain.

Today we mourn the death of Spain's greatest artist yet celebrate the life of her greatest patriot. The people of Spain will be permitted to do neither and yet, in blocking the public outpouring, General Franco only postpones the great wave that may yet wash him and his kind away and loses the claim he would still make on history.

As is true whenever art confronts tyranny, art must finally win and the ultimate proof is that Casals lives with us still in a way that the general will not—cannot—for even an hour beyond his death. Even now, the silence Spain's dictator imposes is simply the continuation of the silence Pablo Casals has observed for a generation.

And that silence is deafening.

The extent of Casals' dedication to his homeland is well known. The performances in Spanish hospitals; concerts overseas to raise money for the Loyalist cause back home; are all ample proof of that dedication. But in the tradition of expatriates in ages past, Casals left Barcelona when the Republican forces entered, crossed the Pyrenees and vowed never to recross the frontier while Franco ruled.

Yet, soon, Franco must follow Casals to the end which awaits all men and the use and meaning of power will acquire clearer definition. For Franco's power is in guns and, as such, passes as quickly and meaninglessly as metal rusts. But Casals' power is in art and, as such, is as strong as the mind of man and as enduring as his soul.

Last summer at New York City, Senor Casals spoke at a concert and, perhaps, wrote his own epitaph:

What can I say to you? 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 you to be, young, young all your life, and to say things to the world that are true.

DESALTING THE COLORADO
RIVER

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in the October 21 issue of the Milwaukee Journal appeared an article about the need for congressional funding to desalt the Colo-

rado River where it begins its flow into Mexico. The article was written by Russell G. Lynch, award-winning natural resources writer for the Journal and a leading conservationist in the State. He served as the first chairman of the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board. I ask that the article be reprinted here because of its importance and the wide interest it should have for Members.

The article follows:

NIXON'S PLAN TO DESALT THE COLORADO
AIDS MEXICO BUT NOT ROOT PROBLEM

(By R. G. Lynch)

Congress is about to be asked by President Nixon to provide \$115 million to reduce salinity in Colorado river water flowing into Mexico. Undoubtedly it will be granted to settle, with fairness, a 12-year-old controversy with our neighbor.

As federal spending goes, \$115 million is not much; but the Mexican problem is only the tip of an iceberg which promises to cost federal taxpayers billions—a frozen mass of interstate agreements, archaic state water laws, private "ownership" of available water, and massive saline pollution that is approaching a crisis level for users in the lower Colorado basin within the United States.

Underlying these problems is the basic one of insufficient water to meet expected population growth in the basin states.

Only national pressure could bring about vitally needed action by both Congress and the states. Contributing to public awakening on the issue, the National Water Commission's final report (issued in June), contains strong recommendations pertinent to the Colorado basin problems. It gives timely supporting material for taxpayers of other regions who want to urge their congressmen to do more about the Colorado than merely endorse a \$115 million check.

HOW CONTROVERSY BEGAN

The Mexican controversy was created by a single irrigation farming area near Yuma, Ariz. In announcing on Aug. 30 a settlement with Mexico, Herbert Brownell, head of a task force assigned to the problem, made it quite clear that most of the \$115 million would go to build the world's largest desalination plant and canals to process drainage from this one area, the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District.

The Wellton-Mohawk area's story illustrates how "economic development" of water uses can proceed with a total disregard of the consequences to others. Settlers began to farm the salty soil there around the turn of the century, irrigating with water from the Gila river, a tributary of the Colorado, and from wells. Eventually the Gila's flow was cut off by a dam upstream, making it a dry channel, and farmers sank more wells to get irrigation water. All this time, no drainage was provided, and the water applied to cropland sank into the ground.

The wells tapped underground water in an aquifer 50 miles long—a natural underground reservoir of porous rock or sand. Without drainage, irrigation water not evaporated or transpired by crops seeped back into the aquifer, dissolving and leaching salt from the soil on the way. The groundwater became saltier year by year and eventually got up into the root zone, forcing much of the land out of production.

The Bureau of Reclamation (BuRec) came to the rescue in the late 1950's, organizing the Wellton-Mohawk district and providing a canal to carry fresher water down from above Imperial dam on the Colorado.

If good root zone drainage had been provided by means of buried drain tiles, a method widely used elsewhere, all salt would have been washed from the farmed soil within a few years and thereafter the only increase of salinity in drainage returned to the Colorado river would have been by

concentration due to evaporation and transpiration. And there would have been no problem with Mexico.

But irrigation farming was not enough. The landowners and BuRec decided to renovate the salty groundwater aquifer for eventual use to irrigate more land. So some 70 wells were sunk 100 feet to the bottom of the aquifer to pump out the salt water; and irrigation drainage continued to seep back down to the aquifer, washing salt from many feet of saline soil.

Some of the wells pumped water with 17,000 parts per million (ppm) of salt, half as salty as the ocean; the average was about 4,000 ppm, five times as salty as the Colorado river water. It went down the dry Gila bed a few miles into the Colorado, above Yuma. Shortly, to prevent seepage, a concrete canal was provided. Soon Yuma had to stop taking its city water from the river; lawns and flowers were dying; metal in contact with the water was corroding. Yuma had to pay to have water brought down an irrigation supply canal from above Imperial dam.

This saline flood continued down to Morelos dam, just below the Mexican border, where a reservoir supplied Mexican irrigators. In 1961, Mexico began screaming, "Stop!" After negotiations, BuRec extended the concrete canal down to Morelos dam so, at times of greatest salinity, the drainage could be run into the river below the dam; at other times, into the reservoir. Also, some 50-foot wells were sunk in Wellton-Mohawk to pump less saline water at times; and water was run down to Morelos dam from Imperial dam to dilute the salinity.

Mexican protests resumed as farmers had more and more trouble with the salty water. Finally, last year, President Echeverria of Mexico stood before our Congress and demanded that the salinity problem be eliminated. So President Nixon set up the task force which brought about the settlement now needing only Congressional approval.

Wellton-Mohawk must be one of the world's most expensive irrigation projects, and it was subsidized by the same taxpayers who now must pay to stop the damage it causes. If BuRec, the developer, could be induced to reveal the total spent, it would be most interesting to compare the value of crops produced with their real cost.

This is not an isolated case of flagrant saline pollution by irrigators. Several areas in the upper Colorado basin discharge, among them, more than a quarter billion tons of salt a year into the river. Nor is Wellton-Mohawk an isolated case of irrigation that might be challenged on economic grounds.

RESEARCHERS' QUESTIONS

In recent months, questions about the desirability of more irrigation in general and of arid lands in particular, along with strong opposition to any more subsidized irrigation, have come from researchers at four universities (Wisconsin, Johns Hopkins, Iowa State and Arizona) and from Resources for the Future, Inc., as consultant to the National Water Commission.

The commission's June report called for an end to subsidized irrigation. It also called for creation of an independent Board of Review to evaluate water management proposals by such agencies as BuRec, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service, "because the appearance of impartiality is lacking, whatever the fact may be."

These two recommendations bear directly on the Colorado basin, for BuRec in a 1972 report listed a dozen projects to irrigate some 350,000 acres.

That report also outlined a 10-year salinity control program calling for more desalting plants upstream, with canals and evaporation basins, to control natural salt sources (springs, geysers, river flow over salt beds). Also, weather modification to give the basin 2,000,000 acre feet of added precipitation. The cost is estimated at \$500 million; if it over-

runs, like so many federal project estimates, it could approach a billion.

And beyond the 10-year program is contemplated a massive diversion of water to the Colorado from the Columbia basin.

Current low levels in Columbia reservoirs, threatening hydroelectric power shortages in the Pacific Northwest, are sure to cause vigorous opposition to such diversion. And cloud seeding to increase precipitation for the Colorado basin is likely to be opposed in Great Plains areas to the east, for fear that they will get less rain or snow.

As part of the salinity control program, BuRec undertook to convince upper basin irrigators that they should use more efficient methods, to save water and reduce salinity draining into the river. Even with proposed federal cost sharing, strong resistance is to be expected because a farmer who uses less water will lose his right to the amount saved; and sale of such water rights for transfer to another user is difficult, if not impossible, under western prior appropriation water laws (first come, first served).

In Colorado, a rapidly developing state, this problem is most serious. The director of the state Water Conservation Board recently stated that virtually all water available was essentially in private ownership and, if the state was to support projected population growth, transfer of water rights from agriculture to municipal and industrial users must be facilitated. "Without destroying agriculture," he said, "but by developing efficient irrigation practices."

The National Water Commission also examined this problem and recommended an overhaul of laws to simplify transfer of water rights.

This water crisis demands farsighted federal action. Changes can be brought about by re-evaluation of irrigation projects, by restrictions on salinity increases by irrigation districts; by making federal spending to control salinity and provide additional water contingent on state action to bring about sound water management.

OCTOBER IS PORK MONTH

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, Iowa is a leading producer of many important agricultural products. For example, Iowa farmers produce over \$5.5 billion worth of crops and livestock annually. About 25 percent of the Nation's pork supply and 15 percent of the grain-fed cattle are marketed from Iowa farms. Furthermore, 8 out of 10 Iowa workers depend, directly or indirectly, upon agriculture for their jobs.

With more attention being focused on the need for increased farm production to meet growing needs in the United States and the world, the efficiency of Iowa agriculture is important to the entire Nation. I am confident that Iowa farmers will continue to meet this challenge.

Mr. Speaker, October is Pork Month. I insert in the RECORD a recent editorial by Radio KOEL in Oelwein, Iowa, which concisely summarizes the significance of the swine industry in Iowa, and the important contribution Iowa farmers are making to the growing demand for pork and pork products throughout the world: EDITORIAL OF RADIO KOEL, OCTOBER 23, 1973

October "Pork Month" has special significance to Northeast Iowa. Not only did the

special event originate here 11 years ago, but this corner of the state is one of the world's leading hog producing areas. In fact, Delaware County is ranked as the top hog producing county in the whole country. The state accounts for one fourth of the nation's hog population . . . hogs account for 27% of the total Iowa cash receipts from farm marketing, and some 76,000 jobs in Iowa are related to the state's hog production. Despite these and other accomplishments, it's our viewpoint that this is not the time for our hog farmers to rest on their laurels. Economists tell us that with the current population trends, Americans in 1980 will need a 10% increase in ham, bacon, pork chops and other pork cuts.

Other reasons for new demands on the industry are the recent improvements of the quality of the product through research. The Northeast Iowa hog testing station at New Hampton is one of the places that's made an important contribution, by producing lean pork rather than lard. Weight conscious Americans no longer need refrain from eating the pork cuts, and more and more they are depending on pork for the basic meat diets. With our major technology in animal husbandry plus the ability to market an animal within 5 months, we think the future of the hog raiser has never looked brighter. We anticipate hog prices remaining good and thereby opening the way for some of our smaller farmers to get into the swine business. The swine industry is big business in Iowa.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT STUDY SUPPORTS THE VANIK-MOSS APPROACH TO CONSERVE GASOLINE—II

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Middle East crude oil embargo is already having an impact in this country. The Ashland Oil Co. recently announced that the shut-off of Arab oil has forced the company to place its gasoline and distillate customers on a 70-percent proration. It is clear that we can no longer afford to waste massive quantities of gasoline on overequipped, overpowered automobiles.

A recent staff study from the Treasury Department illustrates clearly the potential savings that are available through an excise tax on new automobiles. This tax would be assessed on the basis of the fuel economy of the vehicle. Senator Moss and I have been joined by 39 of my colleagues in introducing legislation designed to save our Nation 2 million barrels of crude oil a year by 1980 through the imposition of such a tax. I invite my colleagues to read this valuable report:

ARE LIGHTER CARS MORE EFFICIENT?

The EPA study indicates clearly that lighter cars do make significant savings in gasoline as shown by the following graph (not reproduced) relating automobile weight to gasoline mileage.

This test was made of six-hundred thirty 1973 vehicles. It shows that the mileage of the heaviest vehicle (5,500 lbs.) averaged 8.8 miles per gallon while that of the smallest vehicles (2,000 lbs.) averaged 25.5 miles per gallon. The between weight and fuel economy. So the public is consciously or unconsciously saving fuel by their purchase of smaller automobiles. American made automobiles, however, including the smaller cars

are still the highest fuel consumers (on the average) of any automobiles in the world. Could a Federal fuel economy tax, combined with this clear expression of trend in public preference in the direction of smaller cars result in a significant reduction in gasoline consumption? It is the hypothesis of this study that a Federal tax could do just that.

WHAT TYPE OF FUEL ECONOMY TAXES ARE AVAILABLE?

There are, undoubtedly, a great many possible taxes. The ones most commonly discussed are a gasoline tax, a horsepower tax, a weight tax and a miles-per-gallon tax.

The gasoline tax has been discussed in another memorandum dated June 4, 1973. This indicates that significant direct savings of fuel could be obtained from a 9 cent tax on each gallon of gasoline. It also suggests that a long-term effect of the rise in prices of gasoline would be an acceleration of the shift towards smaller cars. A gasoline tax would have the advantage that it would affect all cars, and not just new cars.

A horsepower tax has been suggested by several writers based on the concept that large horsepower is inefficient in fuel economy. A preliminary EPA study¹ indicates that this may not be necessarily true. There seems to be some correlation between horsepower and fuel economy. But the correlation is much less than that between weight and fuel economy.² Furthermore, a tax on horsepower alone could lead to the public purchasing large under-powered vehicles.

Since weight appears to be the most important factor in fuel economy, many have suggested that a weight tax would be best. It has the advantage that it is easy to measure, and easy for the public to understand. The principal disadvantage, however, is that it is close to, but not aimed directly at the purpose of the tax. The tax is designed to encourage fuel economy. Weight has a very high correlation with fuel economy. But since there is a direct way to measure fuel economy (miles per gallon) it appears better to levy the tax directly on this factor.

In addition, a weight tax offers no incentive to build more efficient vehicles but merely lighter ones. A rotary engine, for example, is much lighter than a conventional engine but a rotary engine, as presently designed, tends to be a heavy fuel consumer. EPA tests show that 1973 rotary engine vehicles show a 25 percent loss in fuel economy when compared to the average for the same weight vehicle equipped with conventional engines.

DEVELOPMENT OF FUEL STANDARDS

The Environmental Protection Agency is charged under the law with the responsibility for measuring and regulating the emissions of motor vehicles. As a by-product of this, the EPA has also determined the fuel economy of all vehicles tested in its emission testing program. In the fall of 1972, they published test results of 2,087 1952-1973 vehicles under urban and suburban driving conditions, with the results cited earlier in the paper. Results in detail for 1973 cars are shown below.

MILEAGE TESTS OF 1973 MODEL VEHICLES

| Inertia weight, model year 1973 | Average miles per gallon | Range | Number of data points |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 2,000..... | 25.5 | 23.7-28.5 | 6 |
| 2,250..... | 20.7 | 18.9-21.9 | 8 |
| 2,500..... | 19.9 | 13.3-23.7 | 74 |
| 2,750..... | 17.9 | 11.9-23.7 | 62 |
| 3,000..... | 16.2 | 13.6-19.7 | 37 |
| 3,500..... | 14.0 | 9.8-17.8 | 64 |
| 4,000..... | 11.2 | 7.7-14.6 | 69 |
| 4,500..... | 10.1 | 7.4-13.6 | 157 |
| 5,000..... | 9.4 | 7.6-11.8 | 96 |
| 5,500..... | 8.8 | 7.1-10.0 | 57 |

Source: EPA Fuel Economy and Emission Control, November 1972.

Footnotes at end of article.

In addition to this work, the EPA is also working towards the development of a fuel economy testing procedure which is universal (in that it includes both rural and freeway driving as well as urban and suburban) and can be conducted independently by automobile manufacturers themselves subject to EPA monitoring. EPA is presently working with a task force of the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) designed to develop and promulgate recommended practices for such tests. EPA indicated that an EPA developed procedure or an SAE recommended practice then be possible by the 1975 model year for each manufacturer to list the tested fuel economy of its vehicle at the time it is put on sale. It would be possible to develop a tax based on these ratings. How would such a tax work?

A FUEL ECONOMY TAX

The basic concept of the tax would be to determine a national fuel economy standard (e.g., 20 miles per gallon.)³ Vehicles getting this mileage or better would pay no tax at all. Vehicles which deliver less than 20 miles per gallon would pay an excise tax proportionate to the extra fuel which they consume.

For convenience purposes, fuel economy would be defined as gallons per 100 miles (GPCM). A vehicle which gets 20 miles per gallon would thus have a GPCM rating of 5.0 i.e., five gallons per 100 miles. The tax would be levied on all excess gallons (EG) in excess of 5.0 (e.g., \$.00 for each GPCM consumed in excess of the national standard of 5.0).

COMPUTATION OF EXCESS GALLONS (EG) FOR EACH MARKET CLASS OF CAR BASED ON 1973 MODELS

| Market class | Inertia weight ¹ | Miles per gallon ² | GPCM ³ | Excess gallons ⁴ |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| High..... | 5,373 | 8.95 | 11.17 | 6.17 |
| Medium..... | 4,797 | 9.68 | 10.33 | 5.33 |
| Regular..... | 4,734 | 9.77 | 10.24 | 5.24 |
| Sports..... | 4,230 | 10.69 | 9.35 | 4.35 |
| Intermediate..... | 4,142 | 10.89 | 9.18 | 4.18 |
| Compact..... | 3,323 | 14.78 | 6.77 | 1.77 |
| Subcompact..... | 2,648 | 18.72 | 5.34 | .34 |
| Foreign..... | 2,371 | 20.31 | 4.92 | -(.9) |
| Average..... | | 13.29 | 7.52 | 2.52 |

¹ These are weighted averages of 1973 model cars weight, using 1972 registration data. Inertia weight equals curb weight plus 300 lbs. Source: Automatic News Alumnac Issue, April 1973.

² Miles per gallon computed from EPA data for 1973 cars using inertia weight to nearest pound. Source: "Fuel Economy and Emission Controls." Average 13.29 compares with U.S. average for all cars of 13.57.

³ 100/mpg.
⁴ GPCM minus 5. (5=20 mpg).

⁵ Most foreign cars would pay no tax. There would, of course, be some tax on the Rolls Royce, Volvo, etc.

PRINCIPAL EFFECTS OF THE TAX

There are several effects of the tax which should be considered. These include encouragement to the industry to redesign automobiles to promote fuel efficiency; a change in consumer purchases due to elasticity of demand; a possible increase in foreign car purchases with corresponding effects on the balance of payments; increased revenue to the Treasury. Each of these will be treated separately.

1. *A redesign of the automobile.* Despite the fact that the United States is the leading producer of automobiles in the world and has more accumulated automobile manufacturing experience than any other country, American automobiles are less efficient at using fuel, generally speaking, than those produced by any other country. This has many causes. Fuel has always been cheap in the United States, while it is extremely expensive in most other parts of the world. Fuel taxes here are low. Americans are comparatively affluent and have been used to large vehicles, good roads, and traveling great distances. In short, there have been few

economic incentives that would influence automobile manufacturers to design fuel-efficient cars. Throughout Europe and Japan and most of the rest of the world, however, shortages and high prices of fuel, low income, and high taxes have placed a premium on efficient fuel use. As a result, no American manufactured car, including the Pinto and the Vega—our smallest sub-compacts—are as efficient at fuel use as the average foreign import.

The fuel economy tax would provide one of the first economic incentives for Detroit to design more efficient automobiles. It is expected that this economic incentive will be the most important single result of the tax. What kinds of changes can be introduced? There are many immediately available solutions which could greatly increase automobile efficiency. For example:

a. *Use of low friction tires.* A summary technical report entitled "Research and Development Opportunities for Improved Transportation Energy Usage, July 1972" indicates that steel belted radial ply tires as standard equipment on automobiles at a cost of about \$50 more per car can improve miles per gallon by 10 percent.

b. *Body shell design.* The same report estimates that the aero-dynamic drag of many cars can be reduced enough to give a potential fuel saving of 5 percent. Estimates of cost of redesign are unknown, let us assume \$50 per car.

c. *Redesign of power train.* A fuel savings of 10 to 15 percent at a consumer cost of \$100 to \$200 per car could result if the power train were redesigned to provide a better match of vehicle load to the engine.

d. *Use of smaller engines.* The report estimates that for an incremental cost of less than \$100 per car, automobiles could be powered by small engines plus a super-charger or turbo-charger to yield performance similar to that obtained with larger engines but with much less waste in routine operation.

e. *Provision of overdrive as standard equipment.* Over drives are useful only for sustained high-speed driving. They cost about \$150 to add to the standard transmission. The fuel saving in high speed driving, however, is about 20 percent.

f. *Alternate engine types.* EPA tests show diesel powered vehicles get about 70 percent more miles per gallon than do gasoline powered vehicles, while providing the same or better drivability features. The only diesel powered vehicles do cost much more—at least 200 more than a gasoline engine.⁴ Stratified charge vehicles also offer the possibility of some saving although the present indications are that the fuel saving is minimal.⁵ There are, therefore, possible savings in changing to newer engine types.

g. *Reduction of weight.* American cars weigh, on the average, twice as much as imported cars. Even our smallest cars weigh more than the average import. Weight reduction has the highest correlation with fuel economy of any other factor. It is likely that given sufficient incentives, Detroit could and would produce lighter weight automobiles even consistent with the growing safety features which nominally require more weight. Weight reduction can occur through use of lighter metals, plastics, redesign of engine block, frame, etc. These changes would be expensive and could add \$150 to the price of the car to effect a weight reduction of 500 lbs. This reduction, however, would be sufficient to change mpg from a 4,000 lb inertia weight from 11.2 to 14.0, and increase of mpg of 25 percent.

In short, there are a large number of options available to American industry which would permit them to produce more efficient cars and, therefore, to reduce the impact of the fuel economy tax. If the tax is set high enough and if Detroit has sufficient advance lead time to complete and design a car and

get it into production (about three years), the combination of tax and industrial redesign should yield significant national energy conservation benefits.

Adoption of the off-the-shelf technology listed would yield the following possible savings.

| | Percent miles per gallon improvement | Cost per car |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| (a) Low-friction tires..... | 10 | \$50 |
| (b) Body shell..... | 5 | 50 |
| (c) Power train..... | 10-15 | 100-200 |
| (d) Supercharger..... | 10 | 100 |
| (e) Overdrive..... | 5-15 | 150 |
| (f) Engine change..... | 70 | 200 |
| (g) Weight reduction..... | 25 | 150 |
| Total proposed saving..... | 135-150 | |
| Assumed accumulated saving..... | 75 | 800-900 |

¹ Estimated.

This means that the average American large car that now gets 11.8 miles per gallon (such as a Chevrolet Impala) could be redesigned to yield 20.65 mpg, but the changes would add as much as \$850 to the cost of the car.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Unpublished data furnished by Barry McNutt, EAP—(462-2514)

² The correlation is approximately 1-3 extra mpg for every 100 Hp. Thus, the average 4,000 lb. (inertia wt.) vehicle powered at 137 Hp. gets about 11.2 mpg. The same vehicle with a 230 Hp engine would get about 9.2 mpg. Adding 1,000 lbs. at 137 Hp would drop it to 9.4 mpg. i.e., a 73 percent increase in Hp yields a mpg loss of 18 percent; whereas the same mpg loss is caused by only a 25 percent increase in weight. Weight can thus be shown to be at least three times more important in fuel economy than horsepower.

³ The development of such a standard is essentially a political decision, i.e., how much fuel economy do we want our vehicles to have, and what is practical to demand? 1973 vehicles tested varied from 28.5 to 7.1 miles per gallon. What is a reasonable national goal?

The determination should be made taking into account:

- a. national fuel economy needs
- b. consumer vehicle performances
- c. practical design considerations

Setting the standard at 20 mpg appears to provide a compromise which is probably acceptable and understandable to the public. Any other could, of course, be used.

⁴ Exhaust emissions from three Diesel Powered Passenger Cars, EPA, March 1973.

⁵ An evaluation of three Honda Compound Vortex Controlled Combustion powered vehicles, EPA, December 1972.

LEONARD WOODCOCK CALLS FOR IMPEACHMENT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the Nation cried out against President Nixon's attempt at one-man rule. Many statements were made concerning Mr. Nixon's order to fire special Prosecutor Archibald Cox. The statement delivered by United Auto Workers President Leonard Woodcock is particularly interesting in its relevant and concise description of America's currently troubled ship-of-state.

I commend this thoughtful statement to my colleagues.

WOODCOCK CALLS FOR IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT

UAW President Leonard Woodcock issued the following statement:

"It is with deep regret that I urge the U.S. House of Representatives to impeach Richard Nixon, unless the President should save the nation that agony by his resignation.

"The shocking events of the past week-

end mandate such action. Mr. Nixon has broken faith with the constitution, the Congress and the people.

"He has assaulted the Federal judiciary by putting himself above the law and flouting the independence and authority of the courts. By his self-serving opportunistic and arrogant discharge of the special Watergate prosecutor and his effective dismissal of the attorney general and his deputy, Mr. Nixon once again shows his utter contempt for the Congress and the people.

"This latest ploy, if it succeeds, would insulate Mr. Nixon and his associates from prosecution and eliminate the possibility of a full and fair investigation of Watergate. All of this comes at a time when new clouds of suspicion have begun to gather around Mr. Nixon.

"Even before this latest outrage, there were ample grounds to begin hearings on impeachment. Mr. Nixon's closest hand-picked associates appear to have been involved in felonies. He has subverted the constitution by usurping Congress' power to make war and to pass appropriations. He has lied to the American people and shifted ground to suit his own momentary purposes.

"In calling upon the Congress to act, I am fully cognizant of the gravity of impeachment. I know, too, that the explosive and sensitive situation in the Middle East and its dangerous secondary effects threaten the whole world. There are equally serious threats to the common good on the domestic scene. We need unity and leadership, but we can afford neither unity won through cowardice and immorality, nor leadership stained by perfidy and tyranny. Those prices are too high. It is Mr. Nixon himself who has brought us to this tragic crisis. We must face up to it. If we fail to act, we risk the loss of national self-respect and the erosion of our political freedom. If we do not demand responsibility, we can never achieve real unity and unselfish dedicated leadership.

"We cannot ask the political questions now. It is too late. The matters are too serious. It is time to ask the hard legal and moral questions. It is time to put these matters to trial before Congress and the American people."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 29, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Lead me in Thy truth and teach me; for Thou art the God of my salvation; On Thee do I wait all the day.—Psalms 25: 5.

Eternal God and Father of us all, disturbed by the demanding duties of this disruptive day we pause at the altar of prayer to realize anew that Thou art God, that this is Thy world, and to remind ourselves that though the wrong seems oft so strong, Thou art the Ruler yet. In Thy strength we would be made strong, with Thy wisdom we would become wise, and by Thy grace we would face the tasks before us with faith and hope and love.

We pray for our country, our President, our Speaker, Members of Congress, and all who labor with them. Do Thou so dwell in their hearts and so direct their endeavors that justice, peace, and good will may everywhere prevail to the glory of Thy holy name and the good of our human family.

Again upon our spirits has come the sadness of farewell as we think of JOHN

P. SAYLOR who walks with us no more. We mourn the passing of him who devoted his life to his country, his State, and his district. May the comfort of Thy presence abide in the hearts of his family, his friends, and his colleagues.

In the spirit of Him who is the resurrection and the life 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. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 301. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document "A History and Accomplishments of

the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, without creating a precedent I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in that portion of the RECORD known as the Extensions of Remarks today and to include such extraneous material as they may deem relevant.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MANAGERS 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 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on S. 1081, granting rights-of-way across Federal lands.