

vide increases in supplemental security income benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 11334. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American Folk Life Center in the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 11335. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to restrict persons who are not citizens of the United States from acquiring more than 35 percentum of the nonvoting securities or more than 5 percentum of the voting securities of any issuer whose securities are registered under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11336. A bill to prohibit without congressional approval expenditures of appropriated funds with respect to private property used as residences by individuals whom the Secret Service is authorized to protect; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PREYER (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KYRROS, Mr. MCCRACKEN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. ROY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 11337. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain civil actions brought by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SLACK, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 11338. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to strengthen the regula-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tion of futures trading, to require public disclosure of certain information relating to sales of commodities, to bring all agricultural and other commodities traded on exchanges under regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 11339. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that patients may not be treated with investigational new drugs without their consent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FREY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LENT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina):

H.J. Res. 813. Joint resolution to express the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on the Handicapped be called by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself, Mr. WHITE, Mr. STEELE, and Mr. HANNA):

H.J. Res. 814. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.J. Res. 815. Joint resolution 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 the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a limit, established in relation to national income, on Federal revenue and expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 817. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a Special Prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. REES, Mr. FRASER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H. Con. Res. 376. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Richard M. Nixon should resign from the Office of President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRON:

H. Res. 689. Resolution to seek peace in the Middle East and to continue to support Israeli's deterrent strength through transfer of Phantom aircraft and other military supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 11340. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maritza Busch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 11341. A bill for the relief of James R. Oom, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 11342. A bill for the relief of Benjamin R. Lucardie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

350. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Yisrael Yeshayah, Speaker of the Knesset, Tel Aviv, Israel, relative to treatment of prisoners of war by Egypt and Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

351. Also, petition of James L. Dillard, St. Albans, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORTS ON BLIND VENDORS ON FEDERAL PROPERTY—RICHARD STARNE'S ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS ISSUES

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, October 30, the Washington Star-News published an article by Richard Starnes, of the Scripps-Howard News Service, entitled "GAO: Blind Get No Breaks." The article briefly reviews the recent report prepared by the Comptroller General of the United States on sources and uses of vending machine income on Federal property, which was authorized by the Subcommittee on the Handicapped.

Mr. Starnes' article also mentions S. 2581, the Randolph-Sheppard Act Amendments of 1973, which I introduced on October 13, and which thus far enjoys the cosponsorship of 28 Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

GAO: BLIND GET NO BREAKS
(By Richard Starnes)

A sharply worded report by the General Accounting Office accuses the Defense Department and the U.S. Postal Service of depriving blind concession stand operators of hundreds of jobs and possibly millions of dollars in income.

The GAO investigation was ordered by Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., coauthor of a 37-year-old law intended to give sightless persons preference in operating concession stands in government buildings.

In spite of the law, Randolph said, "blind vendors have met with obstacles every tortuous step of the way." He estimated that the 3,500 licensed blind vendors now operating stands could be doubled in five years "if the onerous restraints of undue competition are lifted."

"They (blind operators) find competition from federal employee welfare and recreation associations which operate their own vending machines. They find military post commanders who are unwilling to consider blind vendor sites at their installations. They even

find . . . that an employee association at a major federal space installation demanded that blind vendors give 10 percent of their profits to the employee association."

The GAO report made it clear that the principal abuses in the blind vendor program took place in Postal Service and Defense Department installations.

From responses to questionnaires sent to 291 postal installations, GAO found there were 68 vending stands operated by the blind, and one vending stand and 2,873 vending machines controlled by employee associations.

"Employee associations had gross receipts of \$2.8 million . . . and a net income of \$1.6 million," GAO reported.

"About \$86,800 of the net income was assigned to blind vendors under income-sharing arrangements; the remainder went for employee benefits such as recreation programs, scholarships, and gifts."

Six of 10 blind Postal Service vendors questioned at random by GAO reported net income of under \$3,000, the report said.

GAO noted that a Postal Service audit had found abuses in the handling of income from vending operations and that there had been insufficient supervision "to insure compliance with federal policies and regulations."

Expanding the blind vendor program in postal installations, the report added, "will depend on postal officials' attitudes" and

upon more vigorous action by state welfare agencies "in dealing with Postal Service officials on these matters."

In Defense Department installations, GAO charged, regulations "support and encourage" vending operations that benefit recreation and welfare associations of employees, but give "little consideration to the blind."

Military officials "have not been receptive" to efforts to establish additional blind concession stands, GAO investigators found. At six military installations in the Washington area, including the Pentagon, GAO investigators found 56 vending stands, only four of which were operated by the blind. Blind operators had gross receipts of \$230,600 and total net income of \$38,000 last year, the report said, while 6,000 vending machines and other vendors had gross sales of \$12.6 million and net income of \$2.5 million.

"Vending machine operations at military installations are, for the most part . . . activities which contribute to welfare and morale programs," the report said. "Military officials said blind vendors could reduce money available for these programs. It was difficult to determine how (military) installations used net vending income."

Blind vendors now operating stands in federal buildings earned an average of \$6,996 last year, GAO reported, on gross sales of \$109.8 million.

Sen. Randolph, who has introduced legislation to strengthen the blind vendor program, noted a Vocational Rehabilitation Administration estimate that there were at least 40,000 blind persons who could be trained to operate vending stands. There are, he said, "some 6,000 young blind people in high schools who will be graduating in the next three years," plus "at least 500 Vietnam veterans who were blinded during their service in the armed forces."

Hearings on the proposed amendments to the blind vendor law will be held in mid-November by the subcommittee on the handicapped of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SUPPORT FOR FOOD SUPPLEMENT BILL

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with more than 140 of my colleagues in the 93d Congress in sponsoring the food supplement bill, guaranteeing the right of Americans to supplement their diets with noninjurious vitamin and mineral supplements. Last week the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and the Environment opened hearings on this legislation, and I was pleased to be able to submit testimony supporting it.

The January 1, 1974, deadline for implementation of the FDA regulations limiting the sale of vitamin and mineral supplements is fast approaching. I urge those of my colleagues who are not aware of the substantial opposition to those regulations and support for the food supplement bill to investigate this situation because the need for House action

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

is now imperative. I include testimony on the bill at this point:

TESTIMONY BY HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG, OF FLORIDA, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1295, FOOD SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. Chairman, please allow me first to express my pleasure that the Subcommittee is holding hearings on this vital Food Supplement legislation. As the January 1, 1974 deadline for implementation of the Food and Drug Administration regulations on dietary supplements is fast approaching, it is incumbent upon the Congress to act quickly to protect the right of Americans to choose their own diets.

I have been concerned over the arbitrary actions of the FDA with regard to food supplements ever since my election to Congress. On January 22, 1971, I introduced H.R. 1201, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements and to prevent the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from limiting the sale of such supplements unless they were intrinsically injurious to health in the recommended dosage. On January 3, 1973 I reintroduced this legislation, also known as the "Hosmer Bill," in the 93rd Congress as H.R. 1295.

Let me say first of all, Mr. Chairman, that I support requirements for the labelling of vitamins and food supplements so as to accurately reflect the contents of such products. The legislation before you today would not affect those requirements, but it would prohibit the FDA from their continued attempts to ban sales of truthfully labeled vitamin and mineral food supplements for reasons other than safety and fraud.

The role of vitamins and nutrients in human health has long been the subject of controversy and differing opinions by leading medical specialists. Only in a very few sharply defined instances have experts been able to identify toxic effects from large doses of vitamins, and I support the FDA efforts to limit the sales of these products. The FDA currently has this authority under its Act, and my bill would not restrict this authority to prohibit sales of potentially dangerous products in any way.

However, the FDA has chosen to expand upon this authority in a way that might affect the health and well-being of millions of Americans by proceeding to define its own limits for "safe dosages" of important vitamins and minerals. While medical and nutrition experts do not agree as to safe dosage levels for these food supplements, there is considerable agreement that a majority of Americans do not obtain the necessary nutritional components from their everyday diets. Thus, millions of Americans rely upon vitamin and mineral supplements in dosages of their own choosing to make up dietary deficiencies.

If the FDA regulations are allowed to take effect, any amount over the FDA-recommended limits will require a doctor's prescription—and thereby impose a substantial additional financial burden upon precisely those Americans who can least afford it, most especially our less well-off senior citizens. There is no logical reason for requiring a person to have a doctor's prescription for an item which is not proven to be injurious to health and which an individual may deem necessary for his nutritional balance and personal health needs.

Mr. Chairman, the FDA has been trying to implement similar regulations for the past decade. In 1964, a U.S. District Court judge ruled against the FDA seizure of a sugar containing minerals and B vitamins, and at that time Judge Emmett C. Choate stated:

November 7, 1973

"The provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act did not vest in the Food and Drug Administration or any other Federal agency power to determine what foods should be included in the American diet. This is the function of the marketplace. . . . Plainly, only Congress can or should regulate the use of vitamins, and then only to prevent public injury."

My constituents agree strongly with Judge Choate—I have received hundreds of letters in support of the Food Supplement legislation. The FDA, on the other hand, has received more than 55,000 letters in opposition to their vitamin regulations. The Food Supplement Bill does not damage in any way the FDA responsibility to protect the American public against misleading labeling or injurious products. But it does guarantee the American people the right to supplement their diets according to their own nutritional beliefs and at a reasonable cost.

I urge the Subcommittee to act expeditiously on this legislation so that it can be considered by the House in the near future. If the Congress is not to accede to the FDA's arrogant power grab in this area, we must go on record immediately.

ATLANTA'S McDONALD AND LITTLE ADVERTISING AGENCY

HON. SAM NUNN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I am pleased to draw the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article which appeared in the fall issue of Dixie Business magazine recognizing the outstanding growth record of Atlanta's McDonald & Little Advertising Agency.

The success of Mike McDonald and Tom Little is well known in advertising circles throughout the South. Their phenomenal record of achievement is particularly noteworthy when one considers the fact that they built their thriving agency from a back-porch operation to the third largest Atlanta-owned agency in a little over 6 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article on the success of McDonald & Little be printed in the RECORD.

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

FROM A ZERO START TO \$6.5 MILLION IN 4 YEARS IS THE STORY OF ATLANTA'S McDONALD & LITTLE

(By Jack Majors)

Take two men who don't know each other, and put them together as partners in an ad agency. Add to the mixture that neither has an account in his back pocket, and stir in the fact that for economy reasons the first office is the screened porch of one of the partners.

Blend in as their first client a politico

whose only previous effort had been a try for the state legislature, and had lost every precinct. Give this candidate a speech defect, as a result of cerebral palsy, and aim him for a seat on the Atlanta Board of Education.

Not a promising recipe for success, but it's the beginning of McDonald & Little Advertising now completing its fourth year in business with over \$6,500,000 in billings. Housed in the Life of Georgia building in Atlanta the agency has 45 employees, and is said to be the third largest Atlanta-owned agency operating without branches.

The principals... Mike McDonald and Tom Little... met through Garland Porter, editor emeritus of Southern Advertising/Markets. At the time McDonald was director of the Atlanta office of the Marschalk Corporation and a senior vp of the firm. Little had been creative director of Burton-Campbell, Atlanta. Mike McDonald wanted to get into his own agency operation for the simple reason he wanted to stay in Atlanta. Tom Little just wanted to see his name on a door.

Each confided his ambition to Garland, who decided the two would make a good combination and invited them to have lunch together. They reacted well to each other and the ultimate result was a partnership agreement.

Their political candidate was a result of a recommendation by Charles Weltner, a former Atlanta Congressman who gave up his seat in 1966 rather than run on the same slate with Lester Maddox.

Both Little and McDonald were impressed with the candidate's courage and determination not to let a physical disability thwart his ambitions. The result was a slogan, "Now put a guy with guts on the school board." This struck a responsive chord with the voters, and the result was a victory for Howard Klein.

The campaign stamped the agency as a winner and soon the account list began fleshing out. And, one of the first actions taken was to bring in Tim Tully, a vp at Marschalk where he was responsible for Allied Brands, Coca-Cola, USA, media planning.

This move was representative of the basic philosophy of the two, expressed by Little as "all the damn business is in people." Since then, McDonald reports they have kept moving vans busy. The two feel it is necessary to keep making investments in bringing new talent into the agency, and into the market.

McDonald seconds Little's "people business."

One of the most talked about campaigns in recent Atlanta advertising, was the one put together for Peachtree Federal Savings & Loan. The firm started as number 13 among the S&L's in the metro area, and was operating from a single office in the Buckhead section... completely surrounded by branches of the major banks and other S&L's.

The campaign featured a radio spot series. Featured was a non-announcer type voice discussing the difference between the interest paid by Peachtree Federal and the banks. The non-announcer also wrote the spots... it was Tom Little. The spots finished with: "If you're losing interest in banks," an invitation to visit Peachtree Federal.

The campaign aroused immediate attention and comment... both good and bad... but most important it resulted in a surge of growth by the account that jumped in the standings from 13th to either 5th or 6th among the Atlanta S&L's. Today the association has three offices, a fact handled by making the announcer seem puzzled as to how he would tag his announcements in the future.

The agency also has done special work for Coca-Cola, USA. One assignment being a 4th of July national cold drink promotion, "Go

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

4th with Coke." McDonald & Little also created the theme of the recent national Coca-Cola memorabilia promotion, "We've brought back the good old trays." A later assignment was the creation of a video cassette production to be used in a training program for new employees.

The agency developed the videotape tracing the history and growth of the company and centered it around a theme of "A decent thing honestly made" a line penned by William A. White in a paean to Coca-Cola.

The completed product was made a part of a "can't fail" training program.

Another success chalked up by McDonald & Little is with Ellman's of Atlanta, a catalog showroom operation. The client, Bob Weinstein, in discussing his company's growth from \$11 to \$16 million in volume says, "I credit the advertising and marketing approach as being a major factor in our growth."

Among more recent accounts is the Six Flags Over Georgia, the giant amusement center outside Atlanta. For Six Flags the agency developed a "sneak-a-peak" promotion in conjunction with the McDonald's Systems of Atlanta (also a McDonald & Little account) that resulted in over 60,000 people visiting Six Flags before its official opening. The promotion started as a one-weekend shot, but crowd reaction was such that it spread over to the following weekend.

McDonald's wanted to expand their breakfast business with Egg McMuffin in the Atlanta area. The agency recognized that to achieve growth of the product that the Atlanta consumers would have to be persuaded to try and continue to purchase a "hard" muffin rather than the "soft" biscuits they were used to... English muffins being somewhat foreign.

Lately one of the biggest additions to the Atlanta scene has been the building of a new Atlanta coliseum by the group who owned the Atlanta Hawks basketball team, and the awarding of an ice hockey franchise to the National Hockey League to the group.

McDonald & Little was picked as the advertising agency.

One of the first items to be handled was the name of the new facility. The agency recommended the name "The Omni", and the owners went along... however the city officials balked, and opted instead for Atlanta/Fulton County Coliseum. Reaction of the public was such that the board later met and approved "The Omni". This gave the building a character and distinctiveness.

Today, The Omni is one of the hottest coliseums in the country. In its first year, over 2,000,000 people attended attractions there and new attendance records were set by Ringling Brothers circus and the Icecapades as well. Top attractions like Elvis Presley and Sonny & Cher also gave performances at The Omni.

The Omni campaigns were instrumental in the Omni Group winning recognition as "marketing group of the year for Atlanta" by the Atlanta chapter of the American Marketing Association, and a similar award, "the marketing communication program of the year" from the Marketing Communications Executives International, Atlanta chapter.

In 1972 the agency once again found itself involved in a political campaign. This time it was a relatively unknown state legislator seeking the U.S. Senate seat held by Dave Gambrell. When the campaign was completed, Sam Nunn had unseated Gambrell in the Democratic primary, as well as defeating 11 other aspirants for the nomination. Nunn then went on to win the senate seat against a well financed Republican.

The agency also has a real estate client...

Security Management, developers of projects including a condominium near Atlanta at Vinings. The client had originally decided to name the project Glen Oaks. The agency suggested Vinings Ferry... thus positioning the project promotionally with the geographical location... and the client went along. The advertising broke with headlines such as "things haven't moved so fast in Vinings since the brakes failed on a truckload of antiques".

McDonald & Little is a member of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, having applied for membership as soon as is allowed by the 4A's, and was accepted in the minimum time. Both McDonald and Little feel this has been money well spent.

Recent expansion at the agency has involved setting up its own public relations division under the leadership of Ted Simmons. Simmons is a veteran p.r. professional who had been with Ball/Cohn & Weyman before moving to McDonald & Little. Operative since May, the p.r. division has already picked up accounts like Cohn Communities, Electromagnetic Sciences, Shaw Industries (Dalton), Muscular Dystrophy Assn. of America (Atlanta chapter), and the Hilton Head Co. (Hilton Head, SC).

Heavily research oriented, McDonald & Little has announced an agreement has been signed with Kenneth Hollander & Associates to serve as agency research consultant. Hollander with a national reputation gained from work for Procter & Gamble, Hallmark Cards, Young & Rubicam in Chicago, and for the Interpublic Group (for Coca-Cola), has now established an office in Atlanta's Colony Square.

Marketing director is Tom Allison who came from Coca-Cola USA. Among recent accomplishments has been the design of a computerized system for Six-Flags that in a matter of hours from the time admission tickets are sold provides information about who the customers are and where they are from. This gives an almost instant view of what is happening, where the business is coming from; and provides a method of determining projections and share of market to be used in preparation of marketing plans.

Mike McDonald in summing up the year since the agency was formed in 1969 said he has "probably learned more about marketing and advertising in the past 3 1/2 years than in all my previous experience". Tom Little added "I've never had as much information as we get here."

A NEW APPROACH

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Dade County Public Safety Department, which serves the Greater Miami Metropolitan Area, has an innovative inservice training program which employs the use of professional quality video tape instructions made at the department. The program is a reflection of the department's philosophy that training must continue throughout a police officer's career if law enforcement agencies are to effectively utilize new technology and maintain the highest possible level of professionalism.

The November issue of the FBI Law

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Enforcement Bulletin features an article on this excellent program entitled "A New Approach to Inservice Training," which follows:

A NEW APPROACH TO INSERVICE TRAINING
(By Ms. Joyce M. Siemon and Maj. Charles C. Black)

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC
SAFETY DEPARTMENT,
Miami, Fla.

At the Dade County Public Safety Department, Miami, Fla., inservice training means more than just a periodic review of the recruit curriculum. It provides inservice training as a preliminary step in many assignment changes. It is Director E. Wilson Purdy's philosophy that training should be a layered program, going from the general to the specific and lasting throughout the officer's career. "The various functions performed by law enforcers require specialized instruction," states Director Purdy. "The training academy prepares the officer for generalized patrol duty. Those officers who are transferred to general investigation require additional training in the techniques and laws which apply to investigations. And, with each successive specific investigative assignment, such as homicide or robbery, another training overlay is needed." This philosophy extends to all specialized law enforcement functions from the organized crime bureau to the community service section.

The administration of the inservice training program requires the cooperation of the entire public safety department, but is initiated by the division most directly involved. The investigative training school, which is the first of its kind in the southeastern part of the United States, was planned and conceptualized by the chief of the police division, Walter J. Lougheed. Some special considerations influenced the development of the school. For one thing, there were only two precedents from which to draw guidelines. Maj. Charles C. Black, then chief of the detectives bureau, traveled to both the city of Los Angeles Police Department and the London Metropolitan Police Department to study their curricula. His research helped in determining what should be taught, but the problems of how, to whom, where, when, and funding had to be solved without the benefit of models.

Since assignments are not always made in convenient blocks, the investigative training school had to be designed for the single student as well as for the class. Another consideration was the Dade County Public Safety Department's commitment to regional training. Many smaller departments in Dade County, and the neighboring Palm Beach, Broward, and Monroe Counties, did not have the facilities or the funds for extensive training. It was, therefore, incumbent upon the public safety department to plan a school which would serve the entire region with indepth training on a decentralized basis.

TRAINING METHOD

Three training alternatives were considered. The first was traditional, expensive, and limited in scope. It involved bringing the students to the training facilities for lectures and classes where scheduling and time would present a problem; and both teachers and students would be handicapped. The second training alternative was to make use of technology and bring the training to the students. It was Chief Lougheed's idea to make use of video-tape equipment and a closed-circuit television system for this purpose. The third alternative was to combine the classroom approach with the technological methods.

Consequently, a curriculum was devised

which included video-tape presentations, discussion groups, and behavioral science techniques. The course's content was of such depth and quality that the over 200 officers who completed it received five college credits. A series of five 2-week courses was scheduled by the department's training bureau at a local college. All present Dade County Public Safety Department investigators participated in the program, which was coordinated by an investigator with more than 15 years of police experience. The library of video tapes, as well as the facilities of the television laboratory, are shared with the other four counties in the region for their inservice training. Subsequent to the five sessions involving public safety department personnel, the same formal 2-week course was offered to appropriate police personnel from the more than 25 municipal police agencies in Dade County.

The syllabus for the investigative training school (which will be repeated at appropriate intervals) includes specific investigative techniques, general human behavior characteristics, and information retrieval processes (both interrogatory and resource techniques).

The first hour of training, which included opening remarks by various staff members of the public safety department, gives an overview of the detective bureau organization and states the goals of the course. The other units of training are scheduled in a flexible pattern (possible through the use of video-tape equipment) according to the availability of instructors and the needs of the particular class. As new members join the investigative units, they, too, will be provided with training via private showings of the instructional tapes until a class can be filled for the entire curriculum to be presented. Regularly scheduled refresher courses are planned to update and expand upon the investigative training school. Pertinent portions of these presentations will also be recorded on video tape. (For a synopsis of the curriculum taught during the 2 weeks, see inservice curriculum.)

VIDEO TAPE

Using video-tape equipment to record lessons and dramatize techniques allows for program flexibility. Scheduling does not have to be dependent on instructor availability; more time can be devoted to the preparation of the presentation and to lesson-planning; and departments can train individuals or small classes on a continuing basis, or at their own locations.

The video-tape training project was funded by a regional grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). The video-tape equipment, personnel, and studio are housed by the Dade County Public Safety Department and are available to each of the other sheriffs in the regions either for the purpose of making training films or for showing them.

Utilization of video tapes for police training must be considered a new and fresh approach to the overall effort to improve police services. In order to be successful, however, the tapes must measure up to professional standards.

Television and movies have produced a sophisticated audience which would soon lose interest in a flickering, passive presentation. The regional video project director has defined the basic technical controls and facilities necessary to produce quality results.

A minimum of two cameras is necessary. The cameras must be integrally connected for synchronized switching. Many secondary benefits occur when using a multicamera system. All necessary video and a.c. power is carried through one multiconductor cable, thus, eliminating the need for several sepa-

November 7, 1973

rate cables from each camera to the control panel. Also, incorporated in the cable is wiring for intercom facilities for communications between camera operators and the production director. Tally lights which indicate presentations are also a feature of multi-camera operation. Separate remote camera controls located at the recorder positions insure proper levels for equal picture quality between camera changes.

It is also necessary to have a system so that various bits of information can be combined for distribution to various agencies for playback. Since the inception of electronic editing, it is no longer necessary to record a complete presentation from the beginning to the end all in one session without stopping. Selected segments or scenes can be assembled into one complete recording. If mistakes are made or certain changes required, they can be done without rerecording the entire tape.

Any presentation viewed by means of a screen is subconsciously compared to what has been seen in theaters and on commercial television. This is not to say that, to convey a training message via video tape, elaborate studios and engineers must be used; however, the production must be handled in such a way as to hold the attention of the viewers.

For example, the presentation of a person standing in front of one camera talking for 10 minutes without changing positions or angles to emphasize points would soon become a bore. Obviously, such a lesson could just as well be presented by voice or a written handout.

Video-tape equipment offers the opportunity to use imagination and drama in police training. Educators have long maintained that the lecture is the most ineffective teaching method. For too long, the law enforcement profession has had to rely on lectures though, because instructors have had neither the time, training, nor facilities to prepare diverse lessons.

The investigative training school, which used video tapes, took advantage of the medium's wide possibilities. Mock homicide scenes were taped, for example, which dramatized the techniques of scene preservation and investigation. Such scenes are interrupted by class discussions in which the students are asked to identify possible evidence or suggest procedures. The tape is then resumed showing the ideal approaches. At the end of the tape, the class can argue for or against the tape's presentation with a qualified instructor. In addition to the mock scenes, video tapes of factual reenactments are shown to the classes. In the tapes, actual subjects reenact the crimes they have confessed to committing, offering the students insight into the psychology of motivation and modus operandi. The detectives accompanying the subject emphasize the interrogatory techniques used in obtaining confessions and, also, demonstrate the practical applications of the *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), and related decisions. Two benefits result from this kind of lesson. The first is that students understand and remember the instructions better than if they had been just passive recipients of information. The second benefit is that the students, who have been trained and experienced as law enforcers, can improve the procedure with their original suggestions.

Another way in which the video tapes are used in the investigative training school is to ease the tensions which could result between news media, investigators, and the community when a major crime has occurred. Tapes of discussions between journalists are shown and commented upon

by the class. Often the remarks of the journalists will trigger the investigators into discussing their feelings about the news media. The tape and the class discussion contribute to an understanding of the news problems and suggest means of solving, or avoiding, them.

OTHER TEACHING TECHNIQUES

Not all of the lessons in the investigative training school depend on video-tape presentations. It would be a mistake to use technical aids to the exclusion of all other methods, however valuable they are. In the classes dealing with psychology, for example, behavioral science techniques are used. The students are involved in structured discussions aimed at revealing the workings of their own personalities. The self-understanding resulting from these discussions is transferred to understanding the general emotional factors of motivation. Investigators must be aware of human behavior patterns if they are to be successful in obtaining the help of witnesses or interrogating subjects.

Specific kinds of investigations such as frauds, sex offenses, or forgeries are taught by experienced members of the appropriate units. The lessons are planned to present variations and techniques used by perpetrators and means of apprehension. The instructors use written handouts, reference readings, lectures, and discussions to cover these subjects.

Other classes in the school depend on representatives from agencies such as the State attorney's office and the youth services division for instruction. Whenever possible the teaching staff is drawn from direct, authoritative sources.

CONCLUSION

We feel that the investigative training school is a vital and innovative step in the direction of professionalization. Too often it is expected that the good patrol officer will automatically be good in all police functions. Although we agree that investigators should first be successful officers, we disagree that the transition can be accomplished without added training. To accomplish our goals of complete service to the community of Dade County, the public safety department has emphasized effective training at all levels. The investigative training school is representative of our philosophy that training must combine the most advanced teaching methods with the most advanced personnel in a pragmatic approach toward excellence.

INSERVICE CURRICULUM

Course, Duration, and Topic Development

Sources of information—3 hours—Indepth discussion which illustrates sources of information for detectives; where information is located and how it can be retrieved; formal and informal methods for retrieval of information; records keeping public agencies, local, State, and Federal; and private agencies, as sources of information.

Computer systems—1 hour—Available message systems, local, State, and national; Dade County, Fla., Crime Information Center, National Crime Information Center.

Data processing—1 hour—Utilization of current data processing techniques.

Record bureau—2 hours—Discussion of what information is available from records bureau and how to obtain it.

Special equipment—4 hours—Review of all available special equipment for use by detectives; discussion of its purpose; practical demonstration and familiarization.

Other agencies—2 hours—Detectives' association with other enforcement agencies, (Federal Bureau of Investigation, Strike Force, Secret Service, Post Office, Internal Review, Drug Enforcement Administration.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Uniform crime reports—2 hours—Basic requirement of uniform crime reports.

Communication (messages and be on the lookout notices)—1 hour—Issuing broadcasts, form, context, and cancellation.

Detective sections—2 hours—30-minute discussion by detective sections outlining their functions. (Homicide, robbery, auto theft, general investigative unit.)

Case assignments—1 hour—Discussion regarding the assignment of cases to individual detectives; establishing by detectives of work priorities; recognizing workable cases.

Juvenile—2 hours—Responsibilities under Florida State statutes—juvenile court, youth hall, etc.

Narcotics—3 hours—Description of narcotics traffic in Dade County and familiarization with common items with which investigators will come in contact.

Arson—1 hour—Investigation of arson and the utilization of arson in relationship to other crimes.

Sex offenses—1 hour—Investigation and identification of sex offenders.

Airport and seaport activities—2 hours—Discussion of specific problems of the airport and seaport and how they relate to the investigators.

Frauds—2 hours—Individual and commercial frauds.

Burglary—4 hours—Residential, apartment, motel-hotel, industrial (safe).

Forgery—1 hour—Questioned documents and investigative techniques.

Interrogatories—2 hours—Interrogation of suspects; interviews.

Stakeouts and surveillances—2 hours—Techniques and methodology for conducting stakeouts and surveillances; fixed and moving surveillance; foot, automotive, and aerial methods.

Search warrants—2 hours—Recognizing the need for search warrants; obtaining search warrants.

Informants—2 hours—Development and use; protecting the informant.

Lineup and mug shots—2 hours—Value; use of mug shots to identify suspects; techniques of display, mock lineup.

Stolen property—2 hours—Pawn shops and fences.

Evidence and property—2 hours—Handling, identification, and control of evidence and property; receipts and records; chain of evidence; disposal.

Crime scene—8 hours—General rules for preserving crime scene; conducting investigation of scenes; note taking; evidence. (Mock homicide scene, mock robbery scene, and mock breaking and entering.)

Search and seizure—2 hours—Legal aspects of search and seizure without a warrant.

Physical evidence—2 hours—Recognition and security of potential physical evidence.

Polygraph—1 hour—Explanation of the operation and use of the polygraph.

Identikit and composite drawing—1 hour—Review of the purpose, procedure, and value of these identification procedures.

Psychology of personality—3 hours—Basic concepts of personality.

Ethnic groups—2 hours—Composition of ethnic groups and individual characteristics.

Organized crime bureau—1 hour—An overview of the organized crime bureau and its relationship with the investigator.

Air and water operations—1 hour—Utilization by the investigator of helicopter, fixed wing aircraft, and marine patrol.

Criminal law—2 hours—Review of recent decisions affecting law enforcement and their relationship to detective functions.

Case preparation—2 hours—Organization of cases, preparation of evidence, and review of witnesses' participation; making the case ready for presentation to the State attorney.

State attorney—1 hour—Functions of the State attorney's office; complaint filing procedure; improving State attorney/detective relationship.

Preliminaries and trials—2 hours—Purpose and procedures of the preliminary hearings; bond hearings, motions, et cetera. Participation of the detective in preliminary hearings and the trial; assisting the State attorney and courtroom demeanor.

Judicial view—1 hour—Judge's view of the detectives' participation in courtroom activity.

Community relations—½ hour—Review of departmental policy regarding community relations; discussion of current programs.

Press relations—½ hour—Review of departmental policy regarding press relations; detectives' role.

JOBS, TRAINING, AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR VETERANS

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, today, almost 1 year after the United States withdrew its forces from Vietnam, over 275,000 Vietnam era veterans remain jobless. Many of these men and women are unemployed as a result of hard luck and a lack of opportunities. Many are unfamiliar with the agencies and programs that can offer them occupational and educational assistance.

Jobs for Veterans, a national organization dedicated to linking veterans with a vast selection of occupational and educational opportunities, has published "A Digest of Veteran-Related Programs for Jobs, Training, and Education." This digest catalogs the responsibilities, services, and addresses of the many agencies and programs set up to aid veterans, including financial assistance plans.

Jobs for Veterans should be recommended for its efforts in compiling the educational and occupational information contained in the digest.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from "A Digest of Veteran-Related Programs for Jobs, Training, and Education" be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAJOR JOB-RELATED PROGRAMS

AFL-CIO VETERANS' ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Administered by: AFL-CIO Human Resources Development Institute (HRDI).

Purpose: To help veterans find jobs or training opportunities in their home towns through union channels. Servicemen being processed for discharged at several West Coast separation centers are briefed by HRDI staff, at the center, on the national job situation. This is followed by individual

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

interviews with those veterans who request it. Information on their job skills and preferences or training needs is forwarded to the HRDI (or AFL-CIO central labor council) office in their home towns. HRDI staff and the AFL-CIO central labor council are prepared to use their knowledge of the local job market and their union contacts to place veterans in jobs or training.

Source of more information: Veterans are urged to contact the AFL-CIO central labor council in their community as soon as possible after being separated or Veterans' Assistance Program, AFL-CIO Human Resources Development Institute, 815 16th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20006.

APPRENTICESHIP OUTREACH PROGRAM

Administered by: Department of Labor. Purpose: To conduct pre-apprenticeship training through contracts with industry, labor and other organizations. The program helps young men pass the examinations for entrance into apprenticeships.

Source of more information: Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C. 20210, or Regional Offices of Manpower Administration.

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Administered by: Department of Labor, in cooperation with industry and labor.

Purpose: To enable a trainee to work as a full-time employee, receiving apprenticeship training as he earns a salary. Apprenticeships can be arranged in a wide range of occupations.

Source of more information: Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C. 20210.

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM—COP

Administered by: U. S. Office of Education.

Source of more information: Your state education agency (for a list of COP), or Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202.

FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE PREFERENCE

Administered by: U. S. Civil Service Commission.

Purpose: To give preference in federal employment throughout the country to qualifying veterans in areas such as the following:

1. Competitive Civil Service Commission exams (10 point preference to veterans with a service connected disability, 5 point preference to other veterans).

2. Waiver of age, height, and weight requirements in most instances.

3. Restriction of examination for jobs as guard, elevator operator, messenger, and custodian to veterans as long as veteran applicants are available.

4. Re-employment rights and crediting of time spent in active military service toward experience required for eligibility in position of kind held before service (or on the basis of actual experience gained in the Armed Forces).

5. Precedence on Civil Service registers (list of eligible applicants).

6. Review by Civil Service Commission of agency's reason for passing over veterans and selecting nonveteran.

Source of more information: Most large post offices, Federal Job Information Centers, Regional Offices of the CSC, United States Veterans Assistance Centers, or United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C. 20415.

JOB PLACEMENT SERVICES—STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Administered by: State Employment Service in cooperation with U.S. Department of Labor.

Purpose: To provide job referral and counseling services, with priority given to veterans and preferential treatment to disabled veterans.

Source of more information: Your local State Employment Service Office.

VETERANS PROGRAM (OMBE)

Administered by: Office of Minority Business Enterprise.

Purpose: The OMBE mission is to provide centralized leadership for a national program to enhance minority ownership of business. It coordinates existing federal, state, local and private sector programs and resources. It develops new business opportunities, new initiatives in existing programs, and new institutions when necessary. OMBE identifies sources of capital, expertise and information, and makes them available to minority businessmen. And it acts as the repository and disseminator of all information useful in stimulating minority business development.

Source of more information: Director, Office of Minority Business Enterprise, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT—MDTA

Administered by: U. S. Department of Labor and U.S. Office of Education.

Purpose: This program provides training for unemployed or underemployed persons who cannot reasonably obtain full-time employment without training. Training includes, but is not limited to, basic education, communication skills, employability skills and occupational training, including on-the-job training. Eligible veterans are granted priority in selection.

Workers given priority for training include: (1) veterans; (2) the unemployed; (3) persons working below their skill capacity or substantially less than full time.

Source of more information: Schools and other non-public agencies interested in institutional training should contact either their state education agency or the U.S. Office of Education (Division of Manpower Development and Training), Washington, D.C. 20202. All others should contact either their local or state employment service office, or the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Wahsington, D.C. 20210.

MEDIHC—MILITARY EXPERIENCE DIRECTED INTO HEALTH CAREERS—PROGRAM

Administered by: Department of Defense and Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Purpose: To assist servicemen and women, including those trained in medical skills while in the service, in finding a career in the health field upon return to civilian life. The serviceman is contacted 3-6 months prior to separation through Department of Defense's Transition Program, and efforts are made to counsel and place him in an appropriate health career, by referring him to a state MEDIHC agency for follow-up counseling.

Source of more information: Director, Training Program, ATTN: DOD MEDIHC Coordinator, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (M&RA) Room 2C252, Washington, D.C. 20301.

NEW CAREERS

Administered by: Department of Labor.

Source of more information: Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. 20210, or Regional Offices of the Manpower Administration.

November 7, 1973

ON-THE-JOB AND APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING ASSISTANCE—GI BILL

Administered by: Veterans Administration.

Purpose: To provide veterans enrolled in approved programs of on-the-job or apprenticeship training with a monthly allowance to supplement their starting wages. The allowance is paid directly to the veteran and can continue as long as two years for approved on-the-job training, and longer for apprenticeship training.

Source of more information: Your local VA office or Veterans Administration, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20420.

POLICE MANPOWER

Administered by: International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Department of Defense (through Transition Program). Funds are provided by the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Purpose: To assist state and local law enforcement agencies in meeting critical personnel shortages throughout the U.S. The program operates on the premise that the returning servicemen with his relative maturity and disciplined background offers a prime manpower source for the law enforcement profession.

Source of more information: Director, Training Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (M&RA), The Pentagon Room 2C252, Washington, D.C. 20301.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR VETERANS

Administered by: Department of Labor (or U.S. Civil Service Commission, for Federal employment)

Purpose: To enable an honorably discharged veteran to return to the position he would have attained (or another position of comparable seniority, status and pay) had he not served on military duty. His entitlement includes all benefits he would have received had he not been absent, such as pay increases. He must be qualified to do the job to which he returns; if disabled in service, the veteran is entitled to another job of comparable seniority, status and pay. The job the veteran left must have been non-temporary, and he may not have served more than 5 years (all service over 4 years at the request of the Government). He generally must apply to his employer within 90 days after separation from active duty or release from hospitalization. Reservists and National Guardsmen returning from initial active duty for training of 3 or more months have 31 days in which to apply; otherwise they must report back for the next regularly scheduled work period after their return home. Veterans returning from active duty have protection against discharge without cause for one year.

Source of more information: Veterans Reemployment Rights representative at your Department of Labor Regional Office or office of Veterans Reemployment Rights, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. 20210.

SMALL BUSINESS LOANS AND ASSISTANCE

Purpose: Several programs are available to provide loans, loan guarantees, lease guarantees, and management and technical assistance to persons needing this assistance for the purchase, construction, expansion operation, etc., of small business. Disadvantaged (include Vietnam Era veterans), and minority applicants are given special consideration under certain programs.

Source of more information: Small Business Administration, 1441 L Street, Northwest, Washington 20416.

TRANSITION PROGRAM

Administered by: Department of Defense.

Purpose: To provide maximum in-service training or educational opportunities to servicemen during their last 6 months of

duty in order to prepare them for re-entry into a productive civilian life. Emphasis is placed on four basic items: counseling, skill training, education and placement.

Source of more information: Your nearest military installation or Director, Training Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (M&R), The Pentagon Room 2C252, Washington, D.C. 20301.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR EX-SERVICE MEN—UCX

Administered by: Department of Labor in cooperation with the State Unemployment Insurance (UI) service.

Source of more information: Local State Employment Service or Bureau of Unemployment Insurance, Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. 20210.

VETERANS JOBS—JOB OPPORTUNITIES IN BUSINESS SECTOR—PROGRAM

Administered by: National Alliance of Businessmen (N.A.B.) in cooperation with the Department of Labor.

Purpose: To find employment in the private sector for Vietnam era veterans through the well-known JOBS program. In the Veterans JOBS/program, businessmen are asked to set aside "For Veterans Only" a share of the positions an employer would normally fill during a year. Special increased emphasis will be given to hiring handicapped veterans, disadvantaged veterans and those who are members of minority groups or under 25 years of age. Pledges for jobs are generally referred to the State Employment Service, which locates veterans to fill the jobs.

Sources of more information: The N.A.B. Metro Chairman in your city or Vice President, Veterans Affairs Office, National Alliance of Businessmen, 1730 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT APPOINTMENTS

Administered by: U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Purpose: To provide special federal civilian jobs to returning veterans with no more than 2 years of education beyond high school who agree to participate in a training or educational program. These positions are at grades GS-1 to 5, or the equivalent; eligibility extends for one year after separation for honorably discharged veterans with at least 180 days of active duty, or less if there is a service-connected disability.

Source of more information: Area or regional Civil Service Commission Offices, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C. 20415.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

Administered by: U.S. Office of Education (Department of Health, Education and Welfare).

Purpose: To furnish federal funds to subsidize work programs providing jobs for needy undergraduate and graduate students. Federal funds amount to 80%; the remaining 20% is provided by the participating college or business. Students work an average of up to 15 hours a week while attending classes full-time and up to 40 hours a week during summer or other vacations. Jobs may be on or off-campus with a public or other non-profit agency. Veterans may draw VA education benefits while participating in the program, but participation of any individual is based upon need as determined by the college financial assistance officer.

Source of more information: Financial aid officer at the appropriate college or Division of Student Assistance, Bureau of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Higher Education, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

"GI BILL" EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

Administered by: Veterans Administration.

Purpose: To provide a substantial allowance for veterans enrolled in an approved course of education or training, usually for a period of up to 36 months. Payments are made directly to the veteran to help offset the costs of tuition and other expenses, according to the number of his dependents and the type of training, which can include the following:

1. Institutional (full or part-time); pre-high school, high school, trade school, college or university.
2. On-the-job or apprenticeship training.
3. Farm cooperative training.
4. Correspondence courses.
5. Flight school.
6. Remedial or tutorial services.
7. Predischarge education program leading to high school diploma (PREP).
8. Other institutional programs for active duty servicemen.

Source of more information: Local VA Office or Veterans Administration, 810 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20420.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Administered by: U.S. Office of Education (Department of Health, Education and Welfare) through grants to state school systems.

Purpose: To provide comprehensive occupational training, primarily in a classroom setting (full or part-time), for youths or adults. Training can be conducted in or out of regular public schools; new emphasis has been placed on the poor and disadvantaged. Generally, one dollar of Federal Funds is provided for every dollar of state funds.

Source of more information: Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

LOANS, SCHOLARSHIPS AND OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A number of loans, grants, fellowships, and scholarships are available to students in any field of study through the U.S. Office of Education. Two of these are listed below.

NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOANS

Administered by: U.S. Office of Education (Department of Health, Education and Welfare).

Purpose: To establish loan funds at accredited higher education institutions to permit needy undergraduate and graduate students who are enrolled at least halftime to complete their education. A student may borrow up to \$10,000 at the graduate or professional level; for students who have successfully completed two years of a program leading to a bachelor's degree, up to \$5,000; and for other students, up to \$2,500. No interest will be paid until payment of the loan begins, and the rate is only 3%. Partial or total loan cancellation is provided for students who enter certain fields of teaching or specified military duty after receipt of the loan.

Source of more information: Financial aid officer at the appropriate school or Division of Student Assistance, Bureau of Higher Education, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT INSURED LOANS—GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Administered by: U.S. Office of Education (Department of Health, Education and Welfare).

Purpose: To authorize loans from private lenders to be federally guaranteed and insured for undergraduate and graduate students at accredited institutions (including vocational and technical). Payment of the loan may be deferred during years while the student is attending school and during this

period interest charges up to 7% will be paid by the Federal Government.

Source of more information: A local private lender or Division of Insured Loans, Bureau of Higher Education, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

GEORGE WOODARD'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO BAY AREA INDIANS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1973, the Heritage Section of the Citizen's Advisory Committee for the City of Santa Clara will honor Mr. George Woodard, president of the American Indian Council of Santa Clara County. I would like to take this opportunity to cite Mr. Woodard's many contributions to the community which have led to this honor.

Born on the Crow Creek Reservation near Fort Thompson, S. Dak., George rose from rather humble beginnings. Denied the educational opportunities most of us enjoy, he received only a minimum of formal education in Government and public schools. However, through a series of special courses, he has made himself a well-educated man.

George's early life was spent as a cowboy, rodeo performer, logger, surveyor, trader, artist, government employee, deputy sheriff, foreman and executive superintendent. With this variety of experience and his self-taught education, he went on to become a successful businessman, owning three businesses in California and Arizona. Having proved that he could do well at anything he tried, he sold his businesses and began to devote himself, on a full time basis, to working for and with people. Knowing firsthand the needs and handicaps of the Indian community, George began to improve the quality of opportunity for Indian people and, in turn, for those of every race and ethnic background.

To this end, he helped organize the American Indian Council of Santa Clara Valley. He was elected president in 1962 and has remained in that office. He also helped organize the Sioux Club, a social and language organization; the American Indian Foundation, which he serves as treasurer; and the Urban Indian Health Council, of which he is a board member. He was appointed to the American Indian Education Council by the State superintendent of education and has encouraged Indian educators to rewrite Indian history to give teachers more realistic reference to Indian culture and tradition. In addition, he served as a member of the two-man negotiating team between the Indian group occupy-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing Alcatraz Island and the Federal Government. In fact, these are but a few of the many Indian and community organizations and associations that have received the benefits of his time, energy and efforts.

For the future, George continues to look toward broadening and improving services and programs for Indians. He is presently working on projects such as a free Indian medical/dental clinic in Santa Clara Valley, the establishment of an Indian village, the creation of an intake and referral system to update and upgrade services for the needy of Santa Clara County, the organization of an Indian cultural facility, and the feasibility of an all-Indian college.

In sum, George Woodard has contributed to the community not only his vast resources of energy and creativity, but also his perception and understanding of problems. His personal warmth, basic decency and firm commitment to change have touched and improved the lives of many citizens of the Santa Clara Valley. His life and work are an inspiration to us all, showing how the efforts of one exceptional individual can enable many people to fulfill their potential and become valuable contributors themselves to our diverse society.

AMERICAN VIEWPOINT WITH 50 YEARS OF SERVICE AS AN ESTABLISHED AMERICAN INSTITUTION, TO BEGIN NEW PROGRAM STRESSING HIGHER ETHICAL STANDARDS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, since 1922, we have had in this country a purposeful and useful organization, American Viewpoint, Inc., which is nonprofit, nonpolitical, nonpartisan, and nonsectarian.

The forerunner of the incorporated group was the American Viewpoint Society, organized by a group of prominent people in American education concerned with the problem of maintaining the American ideals and principles in citizenship which were basic to the founding and growth of the United States.

At the beginning of its existence it undertook two major tasks—both important to education. The first was the publication of the American Viewpoint series of textbooks for junior high schools, then a new unit in the school system. The second task set—and accomplished—was the publication of health and safety education books. Parallel with these two initial publishing ventures, the activities included pioneer efforts in developing naturalization courses for prospective citizens under private auspices and later in the public schools. During World War II, American Viewpoint produced a series of morale booklets. For the next

two-dozen years, beginning in 1949, American Viewpoint had as its president and leader, Dr. Herbert C. Mayer, an educator with broad experiences.

Dr. Mayer's tenure was marked by the publication of books on the "American Idea," and magazine articles on American Viewpoint's work and program, which, by 1950, included a cooperative effort with the Association of American Colleges. This was followed in 1953 by a study of the means of prevention of juvenile delinquency in the United States. Then American Viewpoint established a program to teach ethical and moral values in the elementary schools.

With the recent election of a new president, Ivan B. Hill of Chapel Hill, N.C., and with the retirement of Dr. Mayer, a new program stressing honesty, integrity, and responsibility had been outlined and will be organized and implemented. Mr. Hill comes out of retirement to lead American Viewpoint. He has been one of the organization's directors for a number of years. Himself a former management consultant and advertising executive, Mr. Hill, has announced that, although retiring as an officer, Dr. Mayer, 80, will serve as a consultant to the officers of American Viewpoint.

Mr. President, I received a November 5, 1973 letter from Mr. Hill recapping American Viewpoint's plans for extending economic and political freedom in America by promoting higher ethical standards. I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of his communication on behalf of American Viewpoint, Inc.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered printed as follows:

AMERICAN VIEWPOINT INC.,
New York, N.Y., November 5, 1973.
SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: In our recent discussions on the need for extending economic and political freedom in America by promoting better ethics, I mentioned to you the new program of American Viewpoint, Inc., one of America's oldest non-partisan, non-sectarian, non-profit educational organizations, which has been designed to achieve this goal.

For the past 50 years, American Viewpoint has been concerned with the problem of maintaining American ideals and principles in citizenship which were basic to the founding and growth of the nation.

Over the years, this educational organization pioneered in publishing a series of textbooks for junior high schools (then a new unit in the school system), health and safety education books and an adult education series. Prominent Americans such as Albert Bushell Hart, professor of American history at Harvard University; Angelo Patri, the beloved School Master of New York; General Douglas MacArthur; Walter Lippman and many others were contributing authors.

American Viewpoint also was an early participant in the development of naturalization courses for prospective citizens, instituted a successful college lecture series and engaged in research and writing in the field of prevention of juvenile delinquency. The latter led to the development of helpful materials for teaching moral and ethical values in elementary schools.

Now this organization, that so long ago committed itself to education for good citizenship, has been aroused to tackle that job

November 7, 1973

with increased vigor and with three significant new approaches.

The singular and specific first task for American Viewpoint is to promulgate the need for honesty and individual responsibility in our American society in order to maintain our economic and political freedom. Through expanded use of the mass communications media and the updating and broader dissemination of American Viewpoint education materials we wish to stimulate a move to re-stigmatize dishonesty in American culture. We wish to make it socially and economically "all right" and "smart" for the individual to work and be honest rather than "goof off" and lie or steal. Further, we believe that it is absolutely necessary that as citizens we must increase our faith in one another if we expect to justifiably increase faith in our local, state and national government. It has been well stated that honesty is a basic working social principle—not just a moral guideline.

Second, we shall promulgate the need to avoid conflicts of interest wherever one holds a public job and spends taxpayer's money or a corporate job and spends shareholder's money. To increase an individual's responsibility to be honest in a bureaucracy, to relate such responsibility to his own welfare and that of his family and friends, would have a major impact on all bureaucracies whether government or corporate, in labor or educational institutions. We must all realize that however much we sometimes carelessly condemn bureaucrats, no complex, interdependent industrial society can function without the great foundation structures of bureaucracies, corporate and government, so our task is to change the duress of "team play" for personal gains to cooperation for total corporate and social goals.

Our third approach is to continue American Viewpoint's original commitment to promulgate the teaching of ethics in the elementary schools and encourage the establishment of ethics seminars, using case study methods, in secondary, college and graduate schools. To effectively carry out this program, we should encourage textbook publishers and school program suppliers to prepare ethical teaching materials. We must stimulate our educators to recognize that in America, whether one looks through the liberal or through the conservative glass, one sees that freedom is based on individual discipline, individual responsibility and a shared concern for the rights of others.

Three new divisions have been established to implement the expanded program:

Government and corporate: To collect, analyze and publicize all local, state and federal statutes and regulations relating to conflicts of interest and recommend new statutes.

Professional and trade associations: To collect, analyze and publicize codes of ethics from groups such as the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, National Real Estate Boards, labor unions, etc. Develop and recommend means for each group to implement its own code.

Educational: To collect, analyze and publicize what schools are doing in ethical education. Develop and encourage publishers preparation of teaching materials. Bring together a comprehensive central Ethical Library for widespread teaching source use. Initiate and sponsor specific, but limited, research programs relating to materials and methods of teaching ethics, particularly in elementary schools.

American Viewpoint's ethical approach is based on the cooperation and sharing concept inherent in the Golden Rule, a principle common to all major religions. Most people agree on most things that are right or wrong, otherwise we would have no order. But the specific ethical definition that is most applicable is one given by Dr. Albert Schweitzer: "In a general sense," Dr. Schweitzer said,

"ethics is the name we give to our concern for good behavior. We feel an obligation to consider not only our own personal well-being, but also that of others and of human society as a whole."

American Viewpoint does not believe that it would be productive to get into the maelstrom of philosophical, linguistic or situational ethics. It does not intend to set up a system, "scientific" or otherwise, to validate any moral codes.

In all its 50 years of existence, American Viewpoint has never attempted to be a mouthpiece for any one collection of views as to arbitrary standards of morality. The thrust of its program is to challenge young and old, rich and poor, average and elite to understand that the common denominator that makes a free society possible is man's faith in his fellow man and cooperation in the efforts to survive. It believes that if America is to remain free, we must greatly and immediately improve our honesty and our ethics, that it's the selfish thing for each American to do—to be honest.

The new American Viewpoint program has been discussed in depth with many educators, lawyers, politicians, business leaders and others. All have agreed on the high de-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sirability of the goals. One noted that the political and economic benefits that would accrue to America from a 20% to 30% increase in integrity aren't as important (desirable as this would be) as what might happen to our economic and political freedoms—given the current level of so little faith in business and government—if our national integrity should decline even further.

It has appeared most urgent that someone, some organization, in America should undertake a program such as I have outlined here. The directors of American Viewpoint, Inc., an organization with a 50-year heritage in good citizenship education, have accepted the challenge.

They have approved this new program in its entirety and elected me the new president. Dr. Herbert Mayer, American Viewpoint president since 1949, celebrates his 80th year by continuing as a director and consultant. The American Viewpoint office has been moved from New York City to University Square, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, an area of great universities including the University of North Carolina, North Carolina State University and Duke University.

Here, from this dynamic environment, we hope to contribute significantly toward ex-

tending economic and political freedom throughout America.

Sincerely,

IVAN B. HILL.

VOTING RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN JOEL PRITCHARD, 93D CONGRESS, ROLLCALLS 1 THROUGH 520

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a number of constituents who have asked for copies of my voting record, that record for the 93d Congress through October 12, 1973, is included here.

My voting record shows that there has been a total of 520 rollcalls and quorum votes and that I have an attendance figure of 94 percent. The voting record is as follows:

Rollcall	Date	Description	Member's response	Rollcall	Date	Description	Member's response
1	Jan. 3, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	71	Apr. 4, 1973	H. Res. 337 (on passage).	Nay.
2	do	Election of the Speaker.	Ford.	72	do	Call of the House.	Present.
3	do	H. Res. 6 (on passage).	Nay.	73	do	do	Do.
4	Jan. 15, 1973	Call of the House.	Absent.	74	do	H. R. 5683 (on amendment to).	Yea.
5	Jan. 25, 1973	do	Do.	75	do	H. R. 5683 (on passage).	Nay.
6	Jan. 29, 1973	do	Present.	76	Apr. 5, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
7	Jan. 31, 1973	do	Do.	77	do	H. Res. 340 (on agreement to).	Yea.
8	do	H. Res. 172 (on agreement to).	Nay.	78	Apr. 9, 1973	Call of the House.	Absent.
9	do	H. Res. 176 (on agreement to).	Yea.	79	do	H. R. 4586 (on passage).	Not voting.
10	do	H. Res. 132 (on agreement to).	Yea.	80	do	H. R. 342 (on passage).	Do.
11	Feb. 5, 1973	H. Res. 123 (on agreement to).	Yea.	81	Apr. 10, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
12	Feb. 6, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	82	do	H. R. 3298 (veto override).	Yay.
13	Feb. 7, 1973	do	Do.	83	do	H. Res. 348 (on agreement to).	Nay.
14	do	H. Res. 188 (on agreement to).	Nay.	84	Apr. 11, 1973	H. Res. 349 (on agreement to).	Yea.
15	do	H. R. 2107 (on amendment to).	Yea.	85	do	H. R. 3180 (on passage).	Nay.
16	do	do	Yea.	86	Apr. 12, 1973	H. J. Res. 496 (on passage).	Yea.
17	do	H. R. 2107 (on passage).	Nay.	87	Apr. 16, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
18	Feb. 20, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	88	do	H. Res. 357 (on agreement to).	Yay.
19	do	H. R. 3694 (on passage).	Nay.	89	do	Call of the House.	Present.
20	Feb. 21, 1973	H. J. Res. 345 (on passage).	Yea.	90	do	H. R. 6168 (on amendment to).	Aye.
21	Feb. 22, 1973	H. R. 1975 (on amendment to).	Not voting.	91	do	do	Yea.
22	Feb. 23, 1973	H. R. 1975 (on passage).	Nay.	92	do	do	Yay.
23	Feb. 27, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	93	do	do	Yea.
24	do	H. R. 3577 (on passage).	Yea.	94	do	do	Yay.
25	Feb. 28, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	95	do	do	Nay.
26	do	H. Res. 256 (on agreement to).	Yea.	96	do	H. R. 6168 (motion to recommit).	Aye.
27	do	H. Res. 18 (on agreement to).	Nay.	97	do	H. R. 6168 (on passage).	Yea.
28	do	H. Res. 257 (on agreement to).	Nay.	98	Apr. 17, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
29	Mar. 1, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	99	do	do	Do.
30	do	H. R. 3298 (on passage).	Yea.	100	do	H. R. 6691 (on amendment to).	Aye.
31	Mar. 5, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	101	Apr. 18, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
32	do	H. J. Res. 345 (on amendment to).	Yea.	102	do	H. R. 6169 (motion to recommit).	Yea.
33	do	H. Res. 393 (on agreement to).	Present.	103	do	Call of the House.	Present.
34	Mar. 6, 1973	Call of the House.	Do.	104	do	Procedural Motions.	Yea.
35	Mar. 7, 1973	do	Do.	105	do	do	Nay.
36	do	H. Res. 272 (on amendment to).	Nay.	106	do	Call of the House.	Present.
37	do	H. Res. 259 (on amendment to).	No.	107	do	H. Res. 360 (on agreement to).	Present.
38	do	H. Res. 259 (on passage).	Yea.	108	do	S. 50 (on amendment to).	Yay.
39	Mar. 8, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	109	Apr. 19, 1973	do	Present.
40	do	do	Do.	110	do	S. 502 (on amendment to).	Yea.
41	do	H. R. 17 (on amendment to).	Nay.	111	do	do	No.
42	do	H. R. 17 (on passage).	Yea.	112	Apr. 30, 1973	Call of the House.	Absent.
43	Mar. 13, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	113	do	do	Do.
44	do	H. R. 4318 (on amendment to).	Nay.	114	do	S. 398 (agree to conference report).	Not voting.
45	do	H. R. 71 (on passage).	Yea.	115	May 1, 1973	H. Res. 351 (on agreement to).	Yea.
46	Mar. 14, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	116	do	H. R. 3932 (on amendment to).	Yea.
47	do	do	Do.	117	do	H. R. 3932 (on passage).	Yay.
48	do	S. 583 (on passage).	Yea.	118	May 2, 1973	H. Res. 370 (on agreement to).	Yay.
49	Mar. 15, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	119	do	H. R. 6388 (on passage).	Yea.
50	do	H. R. 2246 (on passage).	Yea.	120	May 3, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
51	Mar. 20, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	121	do	H. R. 392 (on amendment).	Yay.
52	Mar. 20, 1973	H. Res. 285 (on passage).	Yea.	122	do	H. R. 392 (on passage).	Yay.
53	Mar. 21, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	123	May 7, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
54	do	H. R. 5446 (on passage).	Yea.	124	do	H. R. 4967 (on passage).	Yea.
55	Mar. 22, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	125	do	H. R. 6574 (on passage).	Yea.
56	do	H. Res. 308 (on passage).	Nay.	126	do	H. R. 2828 (on passage).	Yea.
57	do	H. R. 5445 (on passage).	Yea.	127	do	H. R. 29 (on amendment).	Yea.
58	Mar. 27, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	128	May 8, 1973	H. R. 5452 (on passage).	Yea.
59	Mar. 28, 1973	do	Do.	129	do	H. R. 5451 (on passage).	Yea.
60	Mar. 29, 1973	do	Do.	130	May 9, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
61	do	H. R. 5293 (motion to recommit).	Nay.	131	do	H. R. 7445 (on passage).	Yea.
62	do	H. R. 5293 (on passage).	Yea.	132	do	H. R. 6370 (on amendment).	No.
63	Apr. 2, 1973	H. R. 3153 (on amendment to).	Yea.	133	do	H. R. 6370 (on passage).	Yea.
64	do	H. Res. 330 (on passage).	Yea.	134	May 10, 1973	S. 394 (agree to conference report).	Yea.
65	Apr. 3, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	135	do	H. Res. 389 (on agreement to).	Yea.
66	do	do	Do.	136	do	H. R. 7447 (on amendment to).	Yea.
67	do	do	Do.	137	do	H. R. 7447 (on amendment to).	Nay.
68	do	do	Do.	138	do	do	Yea.
69	Apr. 4, 1973	do	Do.	139	do	do	Yea.
70	do	H. R. 3577 (agree to conf. rpt.).	Not voting.	140	do	do	Yea.

Rollcall	Date	Description	Member's response	Rollcall	Date	Description	Member's response
141	May 10, 1973	H.R. 7447 (on passage).	Yea.	250	do	H.R. 8760 (on passage).	Yea.
142	May 15, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	251	do	H. Res. 435 (on agreement to).	Yea.
143	do	H.R. 6768 (on amendment to).	Nay.	252	June 21, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
144	do	do	Nay.	253	do	do	Do.
145	do	H.R. 6878 (motion to recommit).	Nay.	254	do	H.R. 7824 (motion to recommit).	Nay.
146	do	H.R. 6768 (on passage).	Yea.	255	do	H.R. 7824 (on amendment to).	Nay.
147	May 16, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	256	do	do	Nay.
148	do	H.R. 5777 (on passage).	Yea.	257	do	do	Nay.
149	May 21, 1973	H.J. Res. 512 (on passage).	Not voting.	258	do	do	Nay.
150	do	H.R. 6330 (on passage).	Yea.	259	do	do	Aye.
151	May 22, 1973	Call of the House.	Absent.	260	do	H.R. 7824 (procedural motion).	Nay.
152	do	H.R. 6717 (on passage).	Yea.	261	do	H.R. 7824 (on amendment to).	No.
153	do	H.R. 7200 (motion to recommit).	Nay.	262	do	do	Aye.
154	do	H.R. 7200 (on passage).	Yea.	263	do	H.R. 7824 (on passage).	Yea.
155	May 23, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	264	June 22, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
156	do	S. 516 (veto override).	Nay.	265	do	H.R. 8510 (on amendment to).	No.
157	do	Call of the House.	Present.	266	do	do	Aye.
158	do	H.R. 7528 (on amendment to).	No.	267	do	Call of the House.	Present.
159	do	H.R. 7528 (on passage).	Yea.	268	do	H.R. 8825 (on amendment to).	Aye.
160	May 29, 1973	H. Res. 408 (on agreement to).	Yea.	269	do	H.R. 8825 (on passage).	No.
161	do	H.R. 6912 (on amendment to).	Aye.	270	do	H.R. 8825 (on procedural motion).	Aye.
162	do	do	Nay.	271	do	Call of the House.	Yea.
163	do	H.R. 6912 (on passage).	Yea.	272	June 25, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
164	May 30, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	273	do	H.R. 7447 (procedural motion).	Yea.
165	do	do	Present.	274	do	do	Present.
166	do	H.R. 5857 (on passage).	Yea.	275	do	H. Res. 454 (on agreement to).	Nay.
167	do	H.R. 5858 (on passage).	Yea.	276	do	Call of the House.	Yea.
168	May 31, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	277	do	H.R. 8652 (on amendment to).	Present.
169	do	H.R. 7806 (on passage).	Yea.	278	do	H.R. 8652 (on passage).	No.
170	do	H.R. 7724 (on amendment to).	Yea.	279	do	Call of the House.	Present.
171	do	H.R. 7724 (on passage).	Yea.	280	do	do	Do.
172	do	H.R. 6458 (on passage).	Absent.	281	June 26, 1973	do	Aye.
173	June 4, 1973	Call of the House.	Not voting.	282	do	H.J. Res. 636 (limit debate).	Yea.
174	do	H. Res. 398 (on agreement to).	Present.	283	do	H.J. Res. 636 (to amend).	Yea.
175	June 5, 1973	Call of the House.	do	284	do	do	Yea.
176	do	H.R. 8070 (on passage).	Yea.	285	do	do	Present.
177	do	Call of the House.	Present.	286	do	H.J. Res. 636 (on passage).	No.
178	June 6, 1973	do	Present.	287	do	H. Res. 455 (on agreement to).	Yea.
179	do	H.R. 7935 (on amendment to).	No.	288	do	Call of the House.	Present.
180	do	do	No.	289	do	H.R. 8877 (on amendment to).	Do.
181	do	do	Aye.	290	do	do	Nay.
182	do	do	Aye.	291	do	do	Yea.
183	do	do	Nay.	292	do	do	Nay.
184	do	do	Yea.	293	do	do	Yea.
185	do	do	No.	294	do	H.R. 8877 (motion to recommit).	Yea.
186	do	do	No.	295	do	H.R. 8877 (on passage).	Yea.
187	do	do	Yea.	296	June 27, 1973	Call of the House.	Absent.
188	do	do	Yea.	297	do	H.R. 8215 (on passage).	Yea.
189	do	do	Yea.	298	do	H.R. 4200 (on passage).	Present.
190	do	H.R. 7935 (on passage).	Yea.	299	do	H. Res. 470 (on agreement to).	Yea.
191	do	Call of the House.	Present.	300	do	H.R. 7447 (override veto).	Yea.
192	do	Motion to adjourn.	Nay.	301	do	Call of the House.	Present.
193	June 7, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	302	do	do	Do.
194	do	H. Res. 382 (on agreement to).	Nay.	303	do	do	Yea.
195	do	H. Res. 7645 (on passage).	Nay.	304	do	H.R. 8917 (on passage).	Present.
196	do	H.R. 6760 (on passage).	Yea.	305	June 28, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
197	June 8, 1973	H.R. 2246 (agree to conference report).	Yea.	306	do	H.R. 8537 (on amendment to).	Present.
198	do	H. Res. 426 (on agreement to).	Yea.	307	do	Call of the House.	No.
199	do	H.R. 7670 (on passage).	Yea.	308	do	H.R. 8947 (on amendment to).	No.
200	June 11, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	309	do	do	Yea.
201	do	do	Do.	310	do	do	Yea.
202	do	Procedural motion.	Yea.	311	do	H.R. 8947 (on passage).	Yea.
203	do	H.R. 4083 (on passage).	Yea.	312	June 29, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
204	do	H.R. 6713 (on passage).	Yea.	313	do	H.R. 9055 (on amendment to).	Nay.
205	do	H.R. 8250 (on passage).	Yea.	314	do	do	Aye.
206	do	H.R. 4771 (on passage).	Yea.	315	do	H.R. 9055 (on passage).	Nay.
207	June 12, 1973	H.R. 5293 (agree to conference report).	Yea.	316	do	Call of the House.	Present.
208	do	H. Res. 423 (on agreement to).	Yea.	317	do	H.R. 8916 (on amendment to).	Yea.
209	do	H.R. 77 (on amendment to).	Yea.	318	do	H.R. 8316 (on passage).	Yea.
210	do	do	No.	319	do	H.R. 8410 (procedural motion).	Yea.
211	do	do	Yea.	320	June 30, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
212	do	H.R. 77 (on passage).	Yea.	321	do	H.R. 8850 (motion to concur).	Yea.
213	June 13, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	322	do	H.J. Res. 636 (agree to conference report).	Yea.
214	do	H. Res. 392 (on agreement to).	Nay.	323	do	H.R. 7445 (motion to concur).	Present.
215	do	H.R. 8410 (on amendment to).	Yea.	324	July 10, 1973	Call of the House.	Aye.
216	do	do	Yea.	325	do	H.R. 8860 (on amendment to).	No.
217	do	H. Res. 437 (on agreement to).	Yea.	326	do	do	Present.
218	do	Call of the House.	Present.	327	do	do	Aye.
219	do	H.R. 8410 (on passage).	Yea.	328	July 11, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
220	June 14, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	329	do	H.R. 8860 (amendment to).	Aye.
221	do	do	Do.	330	do	do	Yea.
222	do	H.R. 3926 (on amendment).	Nay.	331	do	do	Aye.
223	do	do	Nay.	332	do	do	Yea.
224	do	H.R. 3926 (on passage).	Yea.	333	do	Call of the House.	Present.
225	do	Call of the House.	Absent.	334	do	H.R. 8860 (procedural motion).	Yea.
226	June 16, 1973	do	Do.	335	do	H.R. 8506 (on amendment to).	Yea.
227	do	do	Do.	336	do	do	Yea.
228	do	H.R. 8619 (on amendment to).	Not voting.	337	July 16, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
229	do	do	Do.	338	do	H.R. 8860 (on amendment to).	Nay.
230	do	H.R. 8619 (on passage).	Do.	339	do	Call of the House.	Present.
231	June 18, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.	340	do	H.R. 8860 (on amendment to).	Yea.
232	do	do	Do.	341	July 17, 1973	Call of the House.	Present.
233	do	H.R. 8658 (on passage).	Yea.	342	do	S. 504 (agree to conference report).	Yea.
234	do	Call of the House.	Present.	343	do	H.R. 6078 (on passage).	Yea.
235	do	H.R. 8152 (on amendment to).	Yea.	344	do	H.R. 8949 (on passage).	Yea.
236	do	do	Nay.	345	do	H.R. 9048 (on passage).	Yea.
237	do	H.R. 8152 (on passage).	Yea.	346	do	S. 2120 (on passage).	Yea.
238	June 19, 1973	H.R. 689 (on passage).	Yea.	347	do	S. 1752 (on passage).	Nay.
239	do	H.R. 6129 (on passage).	Yea.	348	July 18, 1973	Call of the House.	Absent.
240	do	H.R. 7127 (on passage).	Yea.	349	do	H.J. Res. 542 (on amendment to).	Absent.
241	do	H. Res. 434 (on agreement to).	Yea.	350	do	do	Absent.
242	do	H.R. 5464 (on amendment to).	Yea.	351	do	do	Absent.
243	do	H.R. 5464 (on passage).	Yea.	352	do	H.J. Res. 542 (on passage).	Present.
244	do	H.R. 5094 (on passage).	Nay.	353	July 19, 1973	Call of the House.	Yea.
245	June 20, 1973	Call of the House.	Absent.	354	do	H.R. 8860 (on amendment to).	Yea.
246	do	H.R. 8760 (on amendment to).	Nay.	355	do	do	Yea.
247	do	do	Aye.	356	do	do	Yea.
248	do	do	Yea.	357	do	do	Yea.
249	do	H. Res. 448 (on agreement to).	Nay.	358	do	do	Yea.

Rollcall	Date	Description	Member's response	Rollcall	Date	Description	Member's response
360	July 19, 1973	H.R. 8860 (procedural motion)	Nay.	440	do	H.R. 8547 (on amendment to)	Nay.
361	do	H.R. 8860 (motion to recommit)	No.	441	do	H.R. 8547 (on passage)	Yea.
362	do	H.R. 8860 (procedural motion)	Yea.	442	Sept. 10, 1973	H.R. Res. 536 (on agreement to)	Yea.
363	do	H.R. 8860 (on passage)	No.	443	do	H.R. 7482 (on passage)	Yea.
364	July 20, 1973	Call of the House	Present.	444	Sept. 11, 1973	Call of the House	Present.
365	do	H.R. 8538 (on amendment to)	Yea.	445	do	H.R. 7645 (agree to conference report)	Yea.
366	do	H.R. 8538 (on passage)	Yea.	446	do	H.R. 2096 (on passage)	Nay.
367	July 23, 1973	H.R. Res. 493 (on agreement to)	Yea.	447	do	H.R. Res. 511 (on agreement to)	Nay.
368	do	H.R. 5356 (on amendment to)	Yea.	448	Sept. 12, 1973	Call of the House	Present.
369	do	do	No.	449	do	S. 504 (veto override)	Yea.
370	do	do	Yea.	450	do	H.R. 7879 (on passage)	Yea.
371	do	H.R. 5356 (on passage)	Present.	451	do	H.R. 7974 (on passage)	Yea.
372	do	Call of the House	Nay.	452	Sept. 13, 1973	H.R. 8619 (motion to instruct conferees)	Yea.
373	do	Procedural motion	Yea.	453	do	H.R. 6575 (on passage)	Nay.
374	July 24, 1973	S. 1888 (motion to recommit)	Yea.	454	do	Call of the House	Present.
375	do	S. 1888 (procedural motion)	Present.	455	do	H.R. 9639 (on amendment to)	Yea.
376	do	Call of the House	Yea.	456	do	H.R. 9639 (on passage)	Yea.
377	do	H.R. 8480 (on amendment to)	Yea.	457	do	H.R. 9553 (on passage)	May.
378	do	do	Present.	458	Sept. 17, 1973	H.R. 7265 (on passage)	Yea.
379	July 25, 1973	Call of the House	Yea.	459	Sept. 18, 1973	H.R. 8070 (agree to conference report)	Yea.
380	do	S. 1423 (agree to conference report)	Present.	460	do	H.R. 7730 (on passage)	Nay.
381	do	Call in committee	No.	461	do	H.R. 37 (on passage)	Yea.
382	do	H.R. 8480 (on amendment to)	No.	462	do	Call of the House	Present.
383	do	do	No.	463	do	H.R. 420 (on agreement to)	Yea.
384	do	do	Aye.	464	Sept. 19, 1973	Call of the House	Present.
385	do	H.R. 8480 (motion to recommit)	Aye.	465	do	H.R. 7935 (veto override)	Yea.
386	do	H.R. 8480 (on passage)	Yea.	466	do	H.R. 9715 (on amendment to)	Nay.
387	July 26, 1973	Call of the House	Present.	467	do	H.R. 9715 (on passage)	Yea.
388	do	do	Do.	468	do	H.R. 9256 (on passage)	Not voting.
389	do	do	Do.	469	Sept. 20, 1973	Call of the House	Present.
390	do	do	Do.	470	do	H.R. 8917 (agree to conference report)	Yea.
391	do	H.R. 9360 (on amendment to)	Nay.	471	do	H.R. 8917 (procedural motion)	Yea.
392	do	do	No.	472	do	H.R. 9281 (motion to recommit)	Nay.
393	do	do	No.	473	do	H.R. 9281 (on passage)	Yea.
394	do	Call of the House	Present.	474	do	H.R. 9256 (on passage)	Yea.
395	do	H.R. 9360 (on amendment to)	No.	475	Sept. 25, 1973	H.R. 8619 (agreed to conference report)	Yea.
396	do	do	Nay.	476	do	H.J. Res. 727 (on amendment to)	Nay.
397	do	H.R. 9360 (motion to recommit)	No.	477	do	do	Yea.
398	do	H.R. 9360 (on passage)	Yea.	478	do	do	Yea.
399	do	H.R. 8947 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	479	do	H.J. Res. 727 (on passage)	Yea.
400	do	H. Res. 512 (on agreement to)	Nay.	480	Sept. 26, 1973	Call of the House	Present.
401	do	S. Con. Res. 42 (on agreement)	Yea.	481	do	H.R. 981 (on amendment to)	Aye.
402	do	H.R. 9474 (on passage)	Yea.	482	do	do	No.
403	do	Call of the House	Present.	483	do	H.R. 981 (passage)	Yea.
404	July 31, 1973	do	Do.	484	Oct. 1, 1973	Call of the House	Present.
405	do	H.R. 9286 (on amendment to)	No.	485	do	H.R. 8029 (on passage)	Yea.
406	do	do	Yea.	486	do	S. 2419 (on passage)	Nay.
407	do	do	Nay.	487	do	H.R. 10397 (on passage)	Yea.
408	do	do	Nay.	488	Oct. 2, 1973	S. 795 (agree to conference report)	Yea.
409	do	do	Nay.	489	do	S. 1914 (on passage)	Yea.
410	do	do	Yea.	490	Oct. 3, 1973	Call of the House	Present.
411	do	H.R. 9286 (on passage)	Yea.	491	do	H. Res. 372 (on agreement)	Aye.
412	Aug. 1, 1973	H.R. 8825 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	492	do	Call of the House	Present.
413	do	H.R. 8825 (procedural motion)	Nay.	493	do	H.R. 6452 (on amendment to)	No.
414	do	Call of the House	Present.	494	do	do	No.
415	do	H.R. 8825 (on amendment to)	Nay.	495	do	do	Nay.
416	do	do	Present.	496	do	H.R. 6452 (on passage)	Yea.
417	Aug. 2, 1973	Call of the House	Yea.	497	do	H.R. 10088 (on passage)	Absent.
418	do	H. Res. 515 (on agreement to)	Yea.	498	Oct. 4, 1973	Call of the House	No.
419	do	H.R. 9130 (on amendment to)	Yea.	499	do	H.J. Res. 748 (on amendment to)	Aye.
420	do	do	Yea.	500	do	H.J. Res. 748 (on passage)	Present.
421	do	do	No.	501	Oct. 9, 1973	Call of the House	Yea.
422	do	do	Aye.	502	do	H. Res. 581 (on agreement to)	Present.
423	do	do	Not voting.	503	do	Call in Committee	Do.
424	do	H.R. 9130 (on passage)	Yea.	504	Oct. 10, 1973	Call of the House	Aye.
425	Aug. 3, 1973	S. 1636 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	505	do	H.R. 9682 (on amendment to)	No.
426	do	H. Res. 518 (on agreement to)	Yea.	506	do	do	No.
427	do	S. 502 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	507	do	do	No.
428	do	H.R. 7935 (on amendment to)	Yea.	508	do	do	No.
429	do	S. 1888 (motion to concur)	Yea.	509	do	Call in Committee	Present.
430	do	S. 1888 (procedural motion)	Nay.	510	do	H.R. 9682 (on amendment to)	Not voting.
431	do	H.R. 8658 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	511	do	do	No.
432	do	H.R. 8760 (agree to conference report)	Yea.	512	do	H.R. 9582 (on passage)	Yea.
433	Sept. 5, 1973	Call of the House	Present.	513	Oct. 11, 1973	Call of the House	Present.
434	do	H. Res. 512 (on agreement)	Yea.	514	do	H.J. Res. 727 (on motion)	Do.
435	do	H. Res. 504 (on agreement)	Yea.	515	do	H.J. Res. 727 (agree to conference report)	Aye.
436	do	H.R. 8920 (on passage)	Yea.	516	do	Call of the House	Present.
437	Sept. 6, 1973	H.R. 6912 (agree on conference report)	Yea.	517	do	H.R. 10614 (on passage)	Yea.
438	do	H.R. 8351 (on passage)	Yea.	518	do	H.R. 10614 (on passage)	Present.
439	do	H. Res. 484 (on agreement to)	Yea.	519	Oct. 12, 1973	Call of the House	Yea.
				520	do	H.J. Res. 542 (agree to conference report)	Present.

human terms. In a letter from the Prince Georges County executive in Maryland to District Court Judge Frank A. Kaufman, the tragedy of forced busing is made starkly clear. This letter recites facts, not theories, from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues:

OCTOBER 8, 1973.

HON. FRANK A. KAUFMAN,
U.S. District Court,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR JUDGE KAUFMAN: I feel compelled as the chief elected officer of Prince Georges County to call to your attention the damage being done by your decision to require

massive busing of our school children for the purposes of achieving a uniform racial quota for each school in our system. I firmly support the concept of an open society where everyone is given an equal educational opportunity regardless of their race, creed or national origin. But being opposed to a legally segregated school system does not mean one has to favor the establishment of an arbitrary racial quota for each school in order to guarantee everyone the benefits of a quality education. I urge you to give careful consideration to the adverse effects already apparent from the previous decision before issuing any new rulings following your review of our latest pupil statistics this December. Any further large scale pupil reas-

THE COST OF BUSING

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the massive accumulation of evidence to the contrary, the few remaining proponents of forced busing still try to maintain that the costs of forced busing are not significant either in material or

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 7, 1973

signments would only worsen tensions and cost the citizens and their children needless anguish and scarce tax dollars.

As a result of the implementation of the court ordered plan on January 29, 1973 there has been a decisive increase in disciplinary problems in the schools, and an additional expense to the taxpayers of \$1.2 million in this year's budget for additional buses and drivers, plus \$114,000 to create 13 more positions to augment the security staff of our school board. But most distressing of all has been the emotional torment suffered by so many of our children and their parents as the kids were uprooted from their neighborhoods and family friends in order to be transported miles away to another school that needed a few more children of their particular race in order to achieve an idealized standard. This concern has become even more heightened following several tragic traffic accidents involving children who never would have been there to be injured or killed if they had not been transferred by the court ordered plan.

The money, the emotional energy, and the time invested could all achieve much more if they were focused on the main ingredients necessary to provide an excellent education; such as, lower pupil-teacher ratios, enriched

curriculum and better equipped facilities. Even with vigorous enforcement of open housing ordinances racial percentages will naturally change from time to time in various neighborhoods. I hope as these changes occur in the future we will not be compelled to continuously restructure our school attendance boundaries accordingly. The cost is too great and the results indicate that the children who are supposed to benefit the most often suffer the greatest.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM W. GULLETT.

**COUNTRY NEEDS RAILROAD
SYSTEM**

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Members of the House will take H.R. 9142, the Northeast Rail Transportation Act, under consideration. The purpose

of this bill is to restructure the six bankrupt railroads in the Northeast into a viable and economically sound railroad system. I believe that H.R. 9142 addresses itself to solving the problems of our Northeast rail transport system in an acceptable manner. I support the concept of a for-profit railroad system—a system whose continuation is of dire importance to the continued operation of many of our country's industries. As a case in point, I am submitting to the record statistics which underline the dependency of the General Motors Corp. on the Northeast railroads. As one can see by glancing over these figures, any disruption of this rail service has an adverse impact on the entire corporation—an impact which directly affects the numerous workers, managers, stockholders, and customers of General Motors. It is my hope that these figures will serve as a means of aiding my colleagues in determining the effects of the discontinuation of these services on the industries of our country.

The statistics follow:

GM FACILITIES SERVED EXCLUSIVELY BY PENN CENTRAL¹

GM FACILITIES SERVED EXCLUSIVELY BY ERIE LACKAWANNA RAILROAD

State and division	Plant city	Number of carloads per week			Average number of employees	State and division	Plant city	Number of carloads per week			Average number of employees	
		In	Out	Total				In	Out	Total		
Connecticut: New Departure-Hyatt.	Bristol	3	4	7	3,013	New Jersey: GM parts	Bloomfield	40	0	40	134	
Illinois: Central foundry	Danville	238	66	304	2,382	Do	Englewood	25	0	25	598	
Indiana:						New York:	Chevrolet	25	70	95	3,242	
Chevrolet	Muncie	39	41	80	2,234	Harrison radiator	do	1	75	76	893	
Delco electronics	Kokomo	2	17	19	11,067	Ohio:	Fisher body	Mansfield	140	330	470	2,979
Delco Remy	Anderson	35	58	93	15,991	Do	Packard electric	Warren	16	40	56	13,322
Do	Muncie	30	6	36	1,244	Total: 6 plants			247	515	762	21,168
Detroit Diesel-Allison	Indianapolis	1	4	5	11,550							
Fisher body	Marion	121	541	662	3,581							
GM parts	Indianapolis	5	0	5	52							
Guide Lamp	Anderson	18	91	109	5,262							
Massachusetts:												
GM assembly	Framingham	363	26	389	3,835							
GM parts	Boston	17	0	17	278							
Michigan:												
Cadillac	Detroit	164	118	282	10,726							
Chevrolet	Warren	84	166	250	3,506							
Fisher body	Grand Rapids No. 1	96	444	540	2,737							
Do	Grand Rapids No. 2	15	62	77	2,248							
GM assembly	Lansing	336	0	336	4,881							
GMC truck warehouse	Willow Run	313	219	532	4,967							
Hydra-Matic	do	1	0	1	644							
Oldsmobile	Ypsilanti	78	85	163	6,628							
New Jersey:	Lansing ²	214	322	536	17,075							
Delco Remy	New Brunswick	10	6	16	673							
GM assembly	Linden	402	91	493	4,548							
United Delco	New Brunswick	0	0	0	111							
New York:												
Chevrolet	Massena	42	31	73	976							
Do	Tonawanda	453	232	685	10,092							
Fisher body	Syracuse	7	176	183	1,511							
GM assembly	Tarrytown	396	0	396	3,917							
GM parts	Buffalo	6	0	6	68							
Harrison Radiator	Lockport	3	327	330	8,323							
Ohio:												
Delco Moraine	Dayton	14	11	25	5,499							
Delco Products	do	5	39	44	5,726							
Fisher body	Cleveland	11	161	172	2,931							
Do	Columbus	1	51	52	3,744							
Do	Elyria	21	192	213	2,562							
Frigidaire	Lordstown	8	64	72	2,768							
GM assembly	Moraine	28	319	347	15,781							
Do	Lordstown	184	242	426	8,203							
GM parts	Norwood ³	0	200	200	4,459							
Do	Cincinnati	13	0	13	267							
Terex	Toledo	20	41	61	12							
	Hudson	0	6	6	3,112							
Total: 42 plants		3,797	4,459	8,256	199,184							

¹ Rail service totally by Penn Central.

² Rail service in and out by Penn Central, also in and out by Grand Trunk Western. Vehicles out totally by Grand Trunk Western.

³ Rail service totally by Baltimore & Ohio, except outbound vehicles totally.

¹ Plant served by Canton RR, switch line to Baltimore & Ohio and Penn Central.

² Plant served jointly by both Chesapeake & Ohio and Penn Central.

³ Gear and axle and forge.

⁴ Plant served jointly by both Grand Trunk Western and Penn Central.

⁵ Plant served by Rochester Subway RR, switchline to Baltimore & Ohio and Penn Central.

⁶ Plant served jointly by both Baltimore & Ohio and Penn Central.

November 7, 1973

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

36285

GM FACILITIES SERVED EXCLUSIVELY BY LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD

State and division	Plant city	Number of carloads per week			Average number of employees
		In	Out	Total	
New Jersey: New Departure- Hyatt.	Clark	0	19	19	2,653

GM FACILITIES SERVED EXCLUSIVELY BY PENN CENTRAL AFFILIATED RAILROADS

State and division	Plant city	Number of carloads per week			Average number of employees
		In	Out	Total	
Indiana Chevrolet	Indianapolis ¹	93	537	630	5,146
Michigan: Fisher Fleetwood	Detroit ²	93	0	91	5,006

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LEONARD CARMICHAEL BY S. DILLON RIPLEY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, the tribute paid by Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, to the late Dr. Leonard Carmichael, who served for 11 years as Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and during which period he made extraordinary contributions to the Capital City and to our country.

The text of Dr. Ripley's remarks, contained in his monthly column, "The View From the Castle," published in the Smithsonian on November 1973, follows:

SECRETARY RIPLEY'S COMMENTS: THE VIEW FROM THE CASTLE—THE DEATH OF THE SEVENTH SECRETARY COMES AS A PERSONAL AS WELL AS A PROFESSIONAL LOSS FOR THE SMITHSONIAN

Few people could rival the wit or charm of Leonard Carmichael. When his eyes twinkled and his eyelids fluttered and his mouth pursed, you knew that he was about to utter something loud, positive and usually anecdotal and entertaining. I always found him endlessly cheery, keenly interested and willing to listen, a good teacher without being repetitive. He was a man of dry wit, always ready with a hearty laugh.

Everyone seemed to love him during his long career as teacher and administrator at four universities—Princeton, Brown, Rochester, and Tufts. Here, where he served as sec-

retary from 1953 to 1964, it would be hard to overestimate the sense of personal as well as professional loss that the entire Smithsonian family felt on his death September 16.

Dr. Carmichael brought impressive credentials as well as personal charm to the Castle. He was renowned in his field of psychology, particularly for his work on the relation between the sense organs and behavior. He and a colleague demonstrated that the brain emits faint electrical impulses which can be recorded and analyzed; they published what is believed to be the first paper on the use on humans of the electroencephalograph. During World War II he directed the mobilization of scientists and engineers for such projects as radar and atomic energy.

Latterly I had known him as a predecessor at the Smithsonian, one of my "team down at the store" (SMITHSONIAN, July 1973). It seemed inconceivable to me that anything could happen to my predecessors, so secure did they make me feel in following old and honorable traditions of the Institution and so helpful were they in thinking of new ways to look at old things. I was prepared to go on this way forever. Perhaps it was selfish. I had no inkling that Dr. Carmichael's life and continuing career with our friends at the National Geographic Society and the American Philosophical Society would be cut short by the onset of cancer, or that the chain would thus be broken.

His career at the Smithsonian was made notable by three events. During his 11 years as secretary, he pushed forward and succeeded in realizing the concept of a great new institution, the National Museum of History and Technology, now the most frequently visited museum in the world.

In the 1950s he approached Harvard University and together with President Nathan Pusey helped create a pioneer consortium in Cambridge between Harvard College Observ-

atory and the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory—one of the finest centers of its kind.

During that same decade he joined with the Commission of Fine Arts to save one of Washington's largest, finest and most historic buildings, the U.S. Patent Office, from the wrecker and the sordid asphalt, beloved of the parking lot millionaires. The epitome of American 19th-century aspirations, a makeshift hospital during the Civil War, this building has become a haven of beauty and inspiration for downtown commercial Washington, a promise and a centerpiece for the future of urban renovation, the home of the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts.

Truly, Leonard Carmichael created splendid works and left his mark on Washington.

A LOOK AT ENLISTMENTS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, over 389,000 young men and women enlisted in the military services in fiscal year 1973. The best quarter for enlistment, of course, was the first, which follows graduation from high school. Fully 140,000 enlisted in the July-September period. The enlistment figures, both overall and by State, are interesting and useful to all of us, I believe. I therefore commend them to your attention:

CHARGEABLE ENLISTMENTS BY QUARTER, SERVICE, AND STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1973

	Army					Navy					Marine Corps				
	1st	2d	3d	4th	Total	1st	2d	3d	4th	Total	1st	2d	3d	4th	Total
Alabama	1,444	1,200	941	777	4,362	485	222	162	288	1,157	154	110	92	113	469
Arizona	540	445	305	312	1,602	459	232	165	240	1,096	204	135	130	155	624
Arkansas	653	535	527	342	2,057	584	284	200	259	1,327	263	189	177	169	798
California	5,373	4,371	3,674	2,248	15,666	4,291	2,267	1,491	1,596	9,605	1,430	1,087	1,215	1,101	4,833
Colorado	677	544	387	280	1,888	656	380	263	340	1,639	176	128	143	146	593
Connecticut	448	318	198	104	1,063	360	204	141	123	828	196	97	94	83	470
Delaware	44	8	40	26	118	63	32	14	4	113	47	31	26	27	131
Florida	2,344	1,880	1,520	1,122	6,866	1,173	574	415	537	2,699	389	237	245	244	1,115
Georgia	1,744	1,499	1,225	924	5,392	832	382	249	324	1,787	350	227	211	227	1,015
Idaho	203	235	160	146	745	245	132	75	98	550	72	54	65	63	254
Illinois	2,550	1,970	1,290	831	6,641	1,570	917	622	635	3,744	870	528	612	623	2,533
Indiana	1,535	1,076	692	603	3,906	1,166	603	447	559	2,775	378	256	368	379	1,381
Iowa	921	648	500	449	2,518	679	353	269	264	1,565	249	202	179	213	843
Kansas	623	470	333	280	1,706	536	226	158	159	1,079	199	116	137	159	611
Kentucky	1,386	1,010	832	486	3,714	633	313	224	295	1,465	269	172	157	188	785
Louisiana	1,134	929	714	535	3,312	550	250	193	194	1,187	166	200	209	205	780

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 7, 1973

CHARGEABLE ENLISTMENTS BY QUARTER, SERVICE, AND STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1973—Continued

	Army					Navy					Marine Corps				
	1st	2d	3d	4th	Total	1st	2d	3d	4th	Total	1st	2d	3d	4th	Total
Maine	332	224	143	138	837	283	188	120	111	702	97	62	60	67	286
Maryland	1,004	828	469	312	2,613	792	415	297	251	1,755	447	296	253	227	1,223
Massachusetts	1,136	840	554	335	2,865	849	491	327	350	2,017	310	173	192	246	921
Michigan	2,126	1,585	1,195	712	5,618	1,700	982	672	790	4,144	951	569	535	455	2,510
Minnesota	1,131	970	454	3,266	864	507	283	281	1,935	390	233	234	251	1,108	
Mississippi	737	637	543	467	2,384	336	150	104	179	769	196	107	91	103	497
Missouri	1,537	1,129	756	502	3,924	1,087	517	327	356	2,287	494	319	327	351	1,491
Montana	210	210	169	115	704	216	128	91	63	498	52	33	35	43	163
Nebraska	392	327	254	189	1,162	379	175	147	140	841	128	84	115	97	424
Nevada	133	109	86	67	395	105	43	25	40	213	34	35	32	19	120
New Hampshire	163	129	81	73	446	155	66	53	45	319	60	19	31	27	137
New Jersey	1,393	1,080	807	382	3,662	1,055	564	373	480	2,472	388	275	276	346	1,285
New Mexico	351	290	212	236	1,089	384	162	90	130	766	101	78	81	89	349
New York	3,432	2,579	1,911	1,024	8,946	2,502	1,386	987	1,020	5,895	989	718	765	664	3,136
North Carolina	1,867	1,712	1,607	1,495	6,681	657	339	245	316	1,557	397	277	335	356	1,365
North Dakota	258	215	133	138	744	137	120	91	88	436	82	50	55	36	223
Ohio	2,985	2,250	1,295	934	7,464	2,372	1,131	856	860	5,219	1,010	730	790	712	3,242
Oklahoma	919	640	459	355	2,373	630	289	217	281	1,417	221	108	147	185	661
Oregon	756	646	518	376	2,296	679	320	245	254	1,498	151	129	126	117	523
Pennsylvania	2,683	1,946	1,230	848	6,707	2,100	1,088	741	735	4,664	1,098	678	588	590	2,954
Rhode Island	227	160	96	54	537	208	119	83	82	492	48	38	54	52	192
South Carolina	1,027	756	697	658	3,138	525	242	174	224	1,165	158	112	115	95	480
South Dakota	213	135	109	107	564	79	59	36	30	204	19	19	19	6	63
Tennessee	1,370	1,112	764	537	3,783	831	385	262	389	1,867	324	219	227	240	1,010
Texas	3,727	2,981	2,210	1,816	10,734	2,394	1,319	817	1,175	5,705	1,083	677	725	752	3,237
Utah	305	260	214	157	936	188	119	88	82	477	85	57	58	34	234
Vermont	113	85	67	49	314	65	39	35	48	187	40	21	31	26	118
Virginia	1,564	1,366	993	682	4,605	598	317	224	256	1,395	301	202	215	206	924
Washington	1,344	1,114	778	524	3,760	936	487	345	346	2,114	236	165	165	177	743
West Virginia	697	551	408	316	1,972	386	166	112	132	796	192	117	95	144	548
Wisconsin	1,312	1,016	620	457	3,405	958	486	300	480	2,224	415	251	273	289	1,228
Wyoming	81	76	61	34	252	98	64	34	61	257	18	20	12	16	66
District of Columbia	175	143	94	49	461	65	36	26	19	146	73	53	44	23	193
Alaska	91	76	58	35	260	41	28	29	32	130	9	8	14	9	39
Hawaii	178	187	190	186	741	84	74	51	105	314	20	12	15	17	64
Puerto Rico	795	668	557	462	2,483	27	27	9	19	82	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	22	26	19	17	84	3	2	2	0	7	9	1	2	4	16
Virgin Islands	18	18	8	14	58	1	3	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0
Worldwide	58,424	46,215	34,414	24,771	163,824	39,011	20,404	14,006	16,166	89,587	16,037	10,714	11,192	11,166	49,101
	Air Force					All services total									
	1st	2d	3d	4th	Total	1st	2d	3d	4th	Total	1st	2d	3d	4th	Total
Alabama	312	230	223	257	1,022	2,395	1,762	1,418	1,435	7,010					
Arizona	249	224	198	207	878	1,452	1,036	798	914	4,200					
Arkansas	368	319	268	224	1,179	1,868	1,327	1,172	994	5,361					
California	2,413	2,017	2,102	2,077	8,609	13,467	9,742	8,482	7,022	38,713					
Colorado	316	255	259	266	1,096	1,825	1,307	1,052	1,032	5,216					
Connecticut	338	279	266	233	1,116	1,342	898	699	543	3,482					
Delaware	39	35	40	38	152	193	106	120	95	514					
Florida	1,087	927	806	783	3,603	4,993	3,618	2,986	2,686	14,283					
Georgia	701	582	546	505	2,335	3,621	2,690	2,231	1,981	10,529					
Idaho	121	121	126	130	498	641	543	426	437	2,047					
Illinois	742	689	573	538	2,542	5,732	4,104	3,097	2,627	15,560					
Indiana	772	565	553	504	2,394	3,851	2,500	2,060	2,045	10,456					
Iowa	439	327	318	284	1,368	2,288	1,530	1,266	1,210	6,294					
Kansas	295	257	213	212	977	1,653	1,069	841	810	4,373					
Kentucky	507	388	411	366	1,672	2,795	1,883	1,624	1,335	7,637					
Louisiana	794	564	538	504	2,400	2,644	1,943	1,654	1,438	7,679					
Maine	196	178	166	209	749	908	652	489	525	2,574					
Maryland	465	419	394	316	1,594	2,708	1,958	1,413	1,106	7,185					
Massachusetts	561	502	408	419	1,890	2,856	2,006	1,481	1,350	7,693					
Michigan	889	674	701	634	2,898	5,666	3,810	3,103	2,591	15,170					
Minnesota	502	414	359	389	1,664	2,887	2,124	1,587	1,375	7,973					
Mississippi	340	271	265	307	1,183	1,609	1,165	1,003	1,056	4,833					
Missouri	770	669	577	597	2,613	3,888	2,634	1,987	1,806	10,315					
Montana	117	89	99	74	379	595	460	394	325	2,047					
Nebraska	215	131	140	137	623	1,114	717	656	563	3,050					
Nevada	52	48	50	40	190	324	235	193	166	918					
New Hampshire	112	73	80	61	326	490	287	245	206	1,228					
New Jersey	572	425	394	382	1,773	3,408	2,344	1,850	1,590	9,192					
New Mexico	204	123	133	126	586	1,040	653	516	581	2,790					
New York	1,795	1,413	1,376	1,074	5,658	8,718	6,096	5,039	3,782	23,635					
North Carolina	55	38	44	38	175	532	423	323	300	1,578					
North Dakota	1,444	1,107	1,170	1,039	4,760	7,811	5,218	4,111	3,545	20,685					
Ohio	406	305	302	291	1,304	2,176	1,342	1,125	1,112	5,755					
Oklahoma	320	242	298	285	1,145	1,906	1,337	1,187	1,032	5,462					
Oregon	1,515	1,175	902	907	4,499	7,396	4,887	3,461	3,080	18,824					
Pennsylvania	347	261	249	270	1,127	2,057	1,371	1,235	1,247	5,910					
Rhode Island	96	99	79	86	360	407	312	243	229	1,191					
South Carolina	653	453	493	476	2,075	3,178	2,169	1,746	1,642	8,735					
South Dakota	154	101	124	96	475	732	537	484	369	2,122					
Tennessee	37	33	25	28	123	234	294	194	181	853					
Texas	576	386	326	341	1,629	3,261	2,139	1,519	1,567	26,726					
Utah	76	49	48	61	234	294	194	181	184	853					
Vermont	475	352	321	365	1,513	2,938	2,237	1,753	1,509	8,437					
Virginia	463	442	405	381	1,691	2,979	2,208	1,693	1,428	8,303					
Washington	266	199	151	204	820	1,541	1,033								

November 7, 1973

36287

A BAD WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am most dismayed that neither House of Congress saw fit to sustain the President's veto of House Joint Resolution 542, the war powers resolution. I am dismayed, not because we are not in need of good war powers legislation, but because this law does more harm than good. It is ambiguous and could be interpreted as giving a President more power than he currently has. It also permits Congress, by its own inaction, to vitally affect U.S. foreign policy.

The Senate bill, as originally passed by that body was far superior to the conference report which has now been enacted into law. The other body very wisely forbade all use of U.S. troops in combat except under three specific circumstances: To repel or forestall an armed attack upon this country, its territories or possessions; to repel or forestall an armed attack upon our armed forces overseas; and to protect, subject to specific guidelines, U.S. citizens and nationals abroad during their evacuation.

The conference report contained a similar provision, although it did not allow for protection during an evacuation. The problem is that in the law, as enacted, makes this merely the sense of Congress. It has no force of law. The explanatory statement of the conferees clearly states that—

Subsequent sections of the joint resolution are not dependent upon the language of this subsection, as was the case with the Senate bill (section 3).

And what are these "subsequent sections"? They are procedures to be implemented when U.S. troops are introduced into combat in the absence of prior congressional authorization! There are no restrictions, just Presidential reports to Congress. The only real restrictions in this very ambiguous law, if I can make an attempt at divining its meaning, come into play after a 60-day period, unless Congress insists on earlier termination of hostilities by concurrent resolution. The way I see it, the President could ignore the "sense of Congress" and do what he pleases as long as he files a report.

Although the conference report does provide for expeditious handling of a resolution to authorize continued U.S. involvement in hostilities in excess of the 60-day period, I believe that an adroit parliamentary expert could find a way to prevent definitive action by the Congress. Every Congressman should have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and be counted on an issue as important as the commitment in combat of our boys in uniform. This law does not even require that Congress be called back into session if hostilities are started during an adjournment. A better approach in a war powers resolution would have been to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

require reconvening of Congress and to require the automatic introduction and floor consideration of an appropriate resolution to either continue or end the use of U.S. troops, if no such resolution has been acted upon within 15 days of the end of the permitted period of hostilities. To allow Congress, by its inaction, to change the course of our Nation's history, is to abdicate our sworn duties under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the time never comes when over two-thirds of my colleagues will have cause to regret the action they have taken today. With a little luck and a lot of understanding, perhaps mankind will turn away from the use of force as a means to resolve international differences. If not, this law might tragically come back to haunt us and our Nation, as did the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I pray for peace.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is facing crises through Watergate, ITT, and related matters, it must also be a time of thoughtful consideration for our citizens. We must insist that the facts and truth be known, but we also must be careful that we are not emotionally swept away by feelings of frustration or superjudgment.

My long-time friend, The Rev. Charles A. Sumners recently delivered a sermon in the historic St. David's Episcopal Church of Austin. It is one of the oldest churches in Texas and occupies an imposing height in the very heart of our city. For over a 100 years, it has been a vital and moving force for all Austin citizens, and it is led today by my personal friend Charles Sumners who has distinguished himself as a leading minister and is today the dean of ministers in our State.

While we are judging and casting stones, let us remember that we, too, have to be judged. Reverend Sumners' remarks are timely and poignant. I insert his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF REV. CHARLES A. SUMNERS

Our nation has experienced the trauma that comes when a strong leader has been shown to have feet of clay. The resignation of Spiro Agnew was a shock of major proportions to all of us.

Our lament recalls the words recorded in II Samuel when David was told of the death of the great Saul and his son, Jonathan: The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places

How are the mighty fallen.

Much more pertinent are the words put upon the lips of Cardinal Woolsey in Shakespeare's King Henry VIII, in Act III, Scene 2. The Cardinal has been discovered in his nefarious scheming. His death was eminent. He says to Cromwell:

"Farewell!, a long farewell to any my greatness."

The tragedy of this event is seen first in the life of Mr. Agnew himself. When he was first

chosen as Mr. Nixon's running mate, he observed that the name Agnew was not exactly a household word. The observation was correct. This changed radically, and not alone because of the office he held. He himself came forth as a strong, eloquent, articulate spokesman for ideas that needed expression. He seemed almost youthful in his vitality and maturity. He captured the imagination of a nation. A fresh new leader had appeared. He seemed to have the basic integrity that all of us want in those men who hold high office. Apparently our hopes have been shown to be without foundation. We cry inwardly for him and for his family. Cardinal Woolsey spoke for him:

"Farewell, a long farewell to all my greatness."

The tragedy we face is not Mr. Agnew's alone. Our nation's position in the world is marked by a dark spot. I have been, am now, proud of being an American. I must confess my pride has received a grievous found, and, somehow I stand a little less tall.

Part of the tragedy is that the events in the life of this prominent politician inevitably reflect upon all men in public life. This is unfair, but a truth. Many men and women in public office have withstood the pressures put upon them before and after election. One in particular comes to mind—Dewitt Greer, Chairman of the Texas Highway Commission. Dewitt Greer served as State Highway Engineer before he became Chairman of the Commission, and at no time has there ever been any indication of any sort of graft or taking of bribes. A man of honor and ability, Dewitt Greer is a distinguished public servant. There are others, in Texas and elsewhere but the fact remains that Mr. Agnew's fall becomes a burden upon every man and woman who serves in public office. This is, indeed, tragic in a democracy.

Doubtless there is some good that may come from this tragedy.

We do learn from tragedies—costly lessons, indeed. We know now that serious thought must be given to the designing of a system that will make it unnecessary for a man to be dependent upon gifts from the wealthy or from corporations. Such a system is not easy to define, for any man with a faulty character will find a way to defeat the system. We must find a system that will be more costly to defeat than it will be to abide by.

A vital lesson to be learned is to look more carefully, to scrutinize more closely, the men who are chosen as candidates. The present system of selecting a Vice President seems most inadequate. Seven or eight times in the history of our nation, the Vice President of the death of the President, has become the Chief Executive of this land. Fortunately or these United States, elements of greatness have been revealed in some of these men; but recent events strongly suggest that more attention be paid to the selection of a running mate for the President than is now evident.

One more observation should be expressed. What has happened in the nation reminds us that we must be greatly concerned about the candidates we support in state and city elections. Our great State of Texas has also been rocked by the failures of some of our leaders. We must be far more concerned in local elections, where the opportunity for personal involvement is far more possible.

The words "personal involvement" go to the heart of what I feel is most important to be said. Somehow Mr. Agnew's frailty stabs my heart with the recognition of my own responsibilities and my weaknesses. I must believe that there is no more reason for integrity on the part of the Vice-President of the United States than there is for integrity on the part of the Rector of Saint David's Church, Austin, Texas, or the husband of my wife or the father of my sons. Furthermore, my own integrity is no more

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

important than is the integrity of every man and woman in this congregation.

Let me ask: Are you, each and every one of you, are you not deeply grateful that your life, the thoughts of your heart, your thoughtlessness, your selfishness, your subtle scheming in achieving objectives—are you not grateful that all of this cannot be made visible and audible in this very hour? The great cry in this day: Tell it like it is—God forbid! I have no right to judge another, but as for me, I want no man to hear or see the inside of me . . . What of you?

My plea to God is not for justice. That I do not want. Far from it. What I need is mercy, the gracious mercy of an all-loving, Redeeming God, the mercy God revealed in Jesus Christ.

As I serve myself, I recall other words of Cardinal Woolsey. I am not sure of his exact words as I quote from memory, but the heart of his lament is in my heart:

O Cromwell, Cromwell! Had I but served my God with half the zeal
I served my king, he would not in mine age
Have left me naked to my enemies.

There may be some question about the great Cardinal's theology, but I know what he means. If I had served my God as I have served myself, certainly I would be a stronger man.

There are some words I would like to say to Mr. Agnew, and to each of you, for in them I find great solace. And not only solace. Indeed, I find the power to lift up my head and walk again as a man.

The words are: Thanks be to God for His redeeming, strengthening grace in Jesus Christ our Lord. God forgives—as Christ forgave.

We have spoken of tragedy. Perhaps the greatest tragedy in our own lives is that we do not receive what God has visibly offered in Jesus Christ. One of the primary reasons for attending worship in a Church is to hear again and again: God forgives!! Admittedly if I expect mercy and forgiveness from God, I am therefore compelled to offer mercy and forgiveness to my fellow man. I cannot merely see in Mr. Agnew a man who at one time failed to do what he should have done. I must see him as a man God loves enough to die on the cross for him. I dare not proudly assert that all politicians lack integrity, for I, too, am a politician in a very real sense in all my earthly relationships. If I have any integrity whatever, I must see myself as one who walks with Mr. Agnew, a sinner walking the pathways of life with another sinner. I look to God for His redeeming, strengthening grace. My pride gives way to an humble and contrite heart.

Kipling voices the rightful prayer:

The tumult and the shouting dies;
The Captains and the Kings depart;
Still stands thine ancient sacrifice
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

BOY SCOUT LEADER RETIRES

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 1973, an outstanding American, Mr. Hratch Charles "Rex" Mugar, retired from his 43-year career of service with the Boy Scouts of America.

Through all these years, he has guided

thousands of boys and men in the attributes of duty to God, love of country, and good citizenship.

He has, through dynamic leadership and personal example, guided the development of boys in the principles of the Scout oath and law in Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

It is with great pride and pleasure that I commend Rex to you and our colleagues, for his singular contribution to the youth of our Nation.

THE GREAT PROTEIN ROBBERY:
NO. 12

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the depletion of the marine resources in the waters off the U.S. coast by foreign fishing fleets continues day after day. The massive foreign fishing effort is devastating the fish stocks and threatens to destroy for all time the potentially renewable fish resources that are so important to all mankind as an invaluable source of protein. We must assert U.S. jurisdiction over our coastal and anadromous fish species and regulate the fishing effort on those species so that they will be able to regenerate to previous levels, thus assuring a continued supply of protein.

The Studds-Magnuson bill, H.R. 8665, will allow us to assert the necessary jurisdiction and control over these marine resources, and stop the "Great Protein Robbery" occurring right now off our shores. A number of groups and organizations across the country have endorsed and expressed support for our bill, which would extend U.S. fisheries jurisdiction over anadromous species and over coastal species out to 200 miles pending a resolution of this matter at the Law of the Sea Conference. One of the most eloquent statements of endorsement appeared in the September-October 1973 edition of the *Marine Angler*, the publication of the International Game Fish Association, based in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. The article follows:

IGFA SUPPORTS EXTENSION OF U.S. COASTAL MARINE FISHERIES JURISDICTION

For the past decade IGFA has received a constant series of reports from throughout the world concerning the depletion of game fish and commercial species due to exploitation of local fisheries stock by foreign fishing fleets. These reports are consistently increasing as the problem continues to grow to alarming proportions.

Very few countries or states that depend on fishing for their livelihood are free from this problem, but probably nowhere in the world is there a better example of the situation that exists than off the eastern coast—particularly the northeastern coast—of the United States.

Since the mid sixties there has been a rapid escalation of fishery efforts being exerted on U.S. Atlantic coast marine fisheries by foreign commercial fleets. Statistics produced by the U.S. Senate show that in 1972, as many as 776 foreign fishing trawlers, seiners, and long liners per month plied the

November 7, 1973

waters of the continental shelf adjacent to the eastern coast of the U.S.

Commercial species such as flounder, perch and herring have been dangerously depleted, while haddock, the lifeblood of Boston, Massachusetts fishermen, have been all but wiped out by foreign fleets. Game fish species such as shark and mackerel are also being ravaged: in 1971, foreign ships took 99.3 percent of the total mackerel catch from U.S. Atlantic waters as well as 99.1 percent of the sharks.

Long-existing multi-national machinery, designed to provide for rational international management of the fisheries has proven itself incapable of dealing with the mounting problems through effective regulatory action. Though the number of foreign vessels fishing off U.S. coastal waters is stabilizing, the ships themselves are becoming larger and more sophisticated, resulting in a higher degree of efficiency in their catch. Also, areas of operation are continuously expanding due to increasing demands in the world need for protein, so that the ocean is literally being vacuumed clean of species in certain areas.

The need for international agreements in regulating fisheries in the ocean waters has increased sharply over the past two years. Species such as tuna that migrate over great distances can only be preserved through joint action by the international community.

The United Nations has initiated machinery to deal with the law of the sea problems. A conference is scheduled to be held in Santiago, Chile in 1974, which will deal with all of the problems relating to the oceans of the world and their contents, including rights to the ocean floor. This Law of the Sea Conference should be a vital tool for the establishment of international fishery regulations. However, a few people expect dramatic results in solving the offshore fishery dilemma in the immediate future. There are some who feel that it will take many years to arrive at an acceptable solution.

In the meantime, there is overwhelming evidence that present regulations by all governments, agencies and commissions are woefully inadequate and incapable for forestalling irreparable devastation of eastern U.S. coastal fisheries.

In light of the substantiated evidence available, IGFA supports the immediate extension of the U.S. coastal marine fisheries jurisdiction to the 200 mile limit, with such extension to remain in effect only until an international agreement can be reached through the LOS conferences.

Among the many bills now before the U.S. Congress which call for reforms in offshore fisheries jurisdiction, two come closest to meeting the required needs. One is Senate Bill 1988, which was introduced by Warren G. Magnuson (Washington). The other is an identical bill, number 9137, before the House of Representatives, which was introduced by Gerry E. Studds (Massachusetts). Both bills have received substantial support, but they need additional votes for passage.

Among the many important provisions included in these bills are: extended jurisdiction over anadromous fish (except to the extent that it infringes on the territorial waters or fishery zone of another country); controls over rational utilization and conservation of fishery resources (which includes seeking treaties with foreign countries which will make possible development of the maximum yields of coastal fish common both to U.S. jurisdictional waters and to waters over which such foreign countries have jurisdiction); the implementation of needed research through government programs and funding to private and public agencies and individuals; and most important—a proviso for the immediate termination of this legislation when the international Law of the Sea treaties regarding fisheries jurisdiction and conservation shall enter into force.

IGFA has no alternative but to urge the support of this legislation. It is the only stop-gap measure that will offer a reasonable degree of hope for the salvation and restoration of the offshore fisheries. It is the only immediately effective way to halt the rapid decline of species populations vital to the survival of other fish populations. And it is the only real hope not only for the future of sport fishing in U.S. coastal waters but for the domestic fishing fleet which must be expanded to meet the domestic needs.

Certain of the U.S. commercial interests that fish in distant waters can be expected to oppose these measures. However, we believe that the trend toward 200 mile limits has already been strongly established by other countries, and that the regulations may not complicate commercial fishing efforts to the degree that has been suggested by various groups. In any event, the combined domestic commercial and sport fisheries are more valuable collectively to the American economy, and this fact should be weighed carefully. Salt water game fishermen alone spend close to one and one-half billion dollars each year. These 10 million salt water anglers and their sport must be duly recognized.

IGFA is equally dedicated to representing pelagic game fishermen from all parts of the world in future LOS conferences in order that the sport fisherman is not the forgotten one when decisions are made affecting the game fish populations of the world.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION: A TIME FOR QUESTIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Post of yesterday columnist James Wechsler raised serious questions about the confirmation of GERALD FORD during this unprecedented period of doubt about the continuation of office of the President. Mr. Wechsler at the conclusion of his column states that the "healthiest" solution to the current problem would be the adoption of a bill calling for a new special election. I commend the whole column to the attention of my colleagues:

THE FORD CASE

(By James A. Wechsler)

Gerald Ford may be Richard Nixon's last secret weapon or his ultimate revenge against his disaffected countrymen.

For as the Senate Rules Committee completed the first—and possibly final—phase of its examination of Ford yesterday, large numbers of onlookers must have felt a new unease about the prospective substitution of Ford for Nixon in the highest office of an emotionally battered nation.

Yet there appeared little disposition among the Democratic Senate interrogators to offer any spirited challenge to Ford's credentials for the Vice Presidency. Even when potentially explosive questions were raised involving, for example, widely-published reports of Ford's early role in blocking a House investigation of Watergate, the questioners were almost apologetic in tone.

Perhaps the atmosphere will change if testimony to be taken in executive session confounds some of Ford's protestations of fiscal and general virtue. But for the moment both Democrats and progressive Republicans act like men entrapped.

Ford has been an amiable, rather well-rehearsed witness with no trace of arrogance. Indeed, there were intervals when his de-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

manor invited remembrance of Winston Churchill's celebrated remark about Clement Attlee—"a modest little man, plenty to be modest about." Ford's larger size is not to be confused with stature.

Such reflections could not have eluded Mr. Nixon when he tapped Ford for the Vice Presidency. Even as Ford tried with plaintive earnestness to describe his grasp of world affairs—some of his best friends, he indicated, are very important international personages—and his gifts for domestic leadership, his pedestrian if frequently unexceptionable responses seemed to enlarge Richard Nixon's dimensions.

The truth is that at no point during his 25 years of plodding, faithfully partisan service in the House had Ford been a serious contender for his party's Vice Presidential nomination. He was a congenial member of the Congressional club with a mighty consistent record of reactionary votes on home-front issues and unswerving allegiance to the Pentagon's wisdom in foreign affairs.

It may be said that in many respects his domestic positions were a carbon copy of Richard Nixon's, and that he dutifully followed Nixon when the latter reversed himself and began his Moscow-Peking initiatives. Defenders of the Ford appointment argue that Mr. Nixon was wholly justified in honoring so faithful a servant, and that critics of the Ford choice are really trying to upset the 1972 "mandate" by blocking the appointment, impeaching Mr. Nixon (or forcing his resignation) and thereby capturing the Presidency for Democratic Speaker Carl Albert.

A sensitivity to these charges no doubt explains why so many Congressional Democrats have been echoing Republican demands for swift confirmation of Ford. Many may be more heavily influenced by the belief that there is no chance of Mr. Nixon resigning until Ford is safely installed.

That may well be the case—at least pending new, shattering episodes such as the saga of the missing tapes.

Conceivably Ford's elevation will reveal hitherto hidden assets—of leadership—in the man. But the discernibly growing pressure among right-wing Republicans for Mr. Nixon's departure, presumably in the immediate aftermath of Ford's confirmation, raises a more ominous possibility.

It is that Ford is envisaged by the Republican Right as "our own man"—and one who will be an utterly pliant captive of the GOP's Goldwater-Buckley-Dominick faction.

Long before the disclosure of tainted concessions to special interests and other scandals that have brought Mr. Nixon to the edge of political ruin, he had become an ideologically suspicious character to many of his former companions. His Moscow-Peking journeys and his identification—short-lived—with the Moynihan Family Assistance Plan were heresies not easily forgiven by his old disciples.

It is not hard to imagine the GOP rightists projecting Ford as the manipulable man who will give them new dominance within the Administration and a firm base for operations in 1976. The coup would be bloodless.

That scenario should restrain thoughtless elation among those who believe (as I do) that Mr. Nixon faces ultimately irresistible pressure for resignation and are prepared (as I am not) to embrace Ford's confirmation to hasten that day.

The President's problems multiply hourly; there is no miracle formula for his survival on the horizon. But I am still convinced that the healthiest solution for the national crisis is to convince Mr. Nixon that his support for a statute mandating a new national election upon his resignation would offer him the most dramatic and honorable way out.

Perhaps too many "practical men" in both parties are reluctant to give the nation a chance to begin anew, under fresh com-

mand—whether Republican or Democratic. But the idea may gain new ground with the prospect of a Ford Presidency is contemplated long enough. It may even finally begin to acquire appeal in the increasingly stormy view from the White House and Key Biscayne.

In the same newspaper the day before yesterday, November 5, the New York Post ran an editorial that also raised the issue of Presidential succession that would be solved by the adoption of the special election formula. I also commend this to your attention:

FORD'S NOMINATION: A TIME FOR QUESTIONS

As defection spreads among many who were once his strongest supporters, the possibility that President Nixon may feel compelled to resign his office can no longer be dismissed as partisan fantasy.

Indeed events are moving so swiftly that the real question may be whether the United States must unquestioningly resign itself to the advent of Rep. Gerald Ford (R-Mich.) as his successor.

The issue deserves serious reflection by those who are convinced that Mr. Nixon must eventually step down.

We have said on a series of occasions—most recently after two of the most crucial tapes in the Watergate affair were pronounced "non-existent"—that the President's loss of credibility is so total that his capacity to govern has been fatally impaired.

That judgment is now being expressed by newspapers that warmly advocated his election a year ago. It is being echoed in discussions among many Republican political figures and Sen. Brooke (R-Mass.) advanced it on ABC's *Issues and Answers* yesterday.

Unfortunately, however, the growing pressure for Mr. Nixon's early abdication has been accompanied by suggestions in too many places that Congress confirm his designation of Congressman Ford without any real deliberation.

We believe it would be a serious misfortune if the country and the Congress were stampeded into mindless approval of the Ford designation in order to hasten Mr. Nixon's departure.

It is admittedly unlikely, barring some shattering new revelation containing the immediate threat of a successful impeachment move, that Mr. Nixon will resign during an interim when the Presidency would be inherited by Democratic House Speaker Carl Albert.

But surely the country will gain little—and may even suffer new turmoil—if Rep. Ford is in effect catapulted into the Vice Presidency without intense scrutiny merely because that seemed likely to speed Mr. Nixon's exit.

Plainly there are grave questions—beyond his ultra-conservative voting record—about Congressman Ford's qualifications for the Presidency, despite the personal popularity he enjoys among members of the Congressional club. The same must be said of Mr. Albert.

It must be noted in behalf of both men that they have indicated some humility about their limitations. "I really would not like to be President . . . I wasn't even expecting to be the Vice Presidential nominee," Ford said the other day. And Mr. Albert has said: "I want to stay on as Speaker. I've geared my whole life to the Speakership."

Perhaps such disclaimers were traditional political rhetoric. They may also involve a measure of realistic self-appraisal.

The immediate issue at hand is Ford's confirmation. Profound as Mr. Nixon's predicament has become, it is conceivable that other options will emerge if there is no rush to get Ford in as a lever for getting Nixon out.

If the inquiry into Ford creates deeper con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cern about his capabilities or renders him vulnerable on other grounds, Mr. Nixon could still turn to someone of larger stature as a replacement.

Or he could pledge to resign if the Congress adopted a statute calling for a new national election next year—a procedure that would answer the argument that the Democrats are seeking to "reverse" the 1972 result without a test of public sentiment.

Those dramatic alternatives may seem remote at this moment. But how many Americans imagined a year ago, after the overwhelming Nixon-Agnew election triumph, that Spiro Agnew would be in oblivion by now and that Mr. Nixon's resignation would be a subject of serious national speculation?

THE SMALL WORLD OF FOOD

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

MR. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting the third of four articles from the Minneapolis Tribune series on the world's food supply. This article focuses on the great need for increased supplies and productivity in less-developed nations, and the prospects of accomplishing this as seen by some of the world food experts, including people from the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Bank, and the agricultural research community.

The article follows:

THE SMALL WORLD OF FOOD: POSSIBLE SCARCITY OF FOOD HAUNTS POOR OF AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA

(NOTE.—Food shortages, surpluses, costs and boycotts are in the headlines nearly every day. To find out why food has become a major concern, Staff Correspondent Al McConaghay has investigated the relationships of food problems around the world. This is the third of four articles.)

(By Al McConaghay)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The crowded poor are never far from the shadow of hunger.

With recent harvest failures underscoring fears of fundamental deterioration in the world food supply, this shadow lengthens ominously over the destitute of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

To those for whom food is a daily struggle, the present anxiety over scarcity spawns a dread that transcends the annoyance of consumers in richer nations at the rising cost of brisket.

The future of these residents of the Third World haunts any discussion of global food supply. And even here it is apparent that all peoples, rich and poor, are affected by shortage.

The higher cost of eggs in Minneapolis' Great Northern Market, by the way of illustration, may directly reveal the nutritional prospect of a street urchin in Calcutta.

Egg prices reflect rising costs of soybean meal for chickens. This higher soybean price means that the fixed funds of international relief groups will buy less protein-rich edible soy oils for India.

"All of us in the world live out of the same food basket," declares Maurice J. Williams, acting head of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

He might have added that when the contents of that basket diminish, everyone is affected in times of scarcity and high prices and the poor are affected most of all.

The present concern over food supply follows a period of relative stability. During the 20 years prior to 1972, global food production

increased at a slightly higher rate than the population.

Nations with food deficits bought grain at reasonable and relatively constant prices from the exporting countries—mainly the United States, Canada, Australia and Argentina.

Hungry nations without ready money relied on concessional sales or grants from the United States, which was seeking to reduce the cost of storing surplus grain created by its price-support programs.

In general this system worked adequately. For the most part people ate marginally better than they ever had, and there were no major, unrelieved famines—perhaps the best such record in history.

This, nevertheless, was thin gruel for many. The extent of malnutrition is a matter of debate. But hundreds of millions of people received less than the recommended minimum of calories.

Alan Berg, World Bank deputy director for nutrition, estimates that some 75 million children born today in developing countries will die before their fifth birthday from malnutrition or related illness.

"There can be no serious doubt that there is a relationship between severe malnutrition in infancy and mental retardation," says Robert McNamara, World Bank president.

NEW SEEDS AID RICH MORE THAN POOR

With the advent of the "Green Revolution" in the late 1960s, there was considerable optimism that the new strains of wheat and rice were about to introduce an era of plenty.

There were, in fact, extraordinary advances in food production. But it now appears that the Green Revolution, in the analogy of one expert, skimmed the cream off the top of the technology.

The Green Revolution requires the capital-intensive skills of modern Western agriculture. And the techniques of fertilizer, irrigation and pesticides still require troublesome introduction.

Lester Brown of the Overseas Development Council also points out that where larger farmers have greater access to credit and advisory help, the new seeds aid the rich more than the poor.

Besides emphasizing the differences between rich and poor in some countries (experts argue that the equivalent of a U.S. extension service would help solve this) the new rice and wheat has a higher susceptibility to disease.

In any case Norman Borlaug, whose contribution to the Green Revolution was recognized with the 1970 Nobel Peace Prize, contends his work "only bought us some time"—perhaps 20 or 30 years.

At the moment science seems to have no immediate further breakthroughs in food production in sight although some developments appear promising for the middle distance.

Purdue University scientists recently announced they have developed a means of upgrading the protein content of sorghum, a principal crop in some arid African and Asian regions.

Although the new supersorghum seeds are not expected to be generally available for at least five years, they will help ease the supply-demand pressures of the 1980s.

A complicated process that produces something called single-cell protein from petroleum is now believed to be a commercially viable source of livestock feed in France.

Nevin Scrimshaw, professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, head of the United Nations protein advisory group, says it is "a potentially significant" addition to soy and fish meals.

Also highly regarded is the effort, now thought to be two or three years away, to make commercially available seeds of a corn variety (Opaque 2) with a greatly improved protein value.

A wheat-rye hybrid called Triticale is now

November 7, 1973

grown commercially in a small area and there are hopes that this nutritionally souped-up grain may eventually make a major contribution.

SOME POOR NATIONS NEGLECT AGRICULTURE

But it is the present that desperately concerns some nations. Rising prices and freight rates shot their food bills up 40 percent, a drain of cash reserves that could retard their economic growth.

Moreover, these nations quickly discovered also that U.S. laws discourage giving food away when it can be sold and that the U.S. government was determined to sell where it could.

Since last year the PL480 program of concessional food sales and grants to food-short nations was reduced by 40 to 50 percent in commodity volume, according to government sources.

In the key area of wheat, activity halved. This year 2 million tons were distributed. Last year 4 million tons were provided and 4.5 million tons were available in 1971.

Critics charge the administration with allowing its passion for budget reduction to blind it to the needs of the poorest nations, an assertion officials rigorously deny.

William Paddock, Washington consultant and author, argues, however, that traditional U.S. food handouts encouraged developing nations to neglect population control and agricultural development.

Certainly, some of these nations have shown a preference for armaments and national airlines and have deferred construction of such essential agricultural facilities as fertilizer plants.

U.S. HARVEST CLAIM IS IN DISPUTE

It can be said of U.S. policy that it kept most of its markets open, despite the increasing costs to American consumers, to respond to the four years of unprecedented demand by foreign buyers.

The International Wheat Council, a group made up of representatives of exporting governments, however estimates demand of importing nations will exceed export supplies by as much as 6 million tons in calendar 1973.

In August A. H. Boerma, director-general of the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), scheduled a meeting because he was "seriously alarmed" at "deteriorating" cereal supplies.

But the United States assured delegates at that session in September that while supplies were tight, there was no crisis and this year's harvest would be able to satisfy demand at prevailing prices.

That position is in dispute. Countries like Bangladesh and Pakistan unsuccessfully are seeking for U.S. aid. Private relief agency officials say food is needed in several areas.

But the administration claims that—except for some starvation among West African nomads that has since been largely alleviated—minimal global food requirements will be met this year.

North America, which has become the world's granary, is expected to have a record harvest this year and next year's fence-to-fence planting in the United States is likely to be even bigger.

The Agriculture Department predicts a record crop in the Soviet Union this year. India's fall harvest is expected to recover from last year's drought. A better wheat crop is seen in Australia.

Long-term official projections on global food supply are not very satisfying. The department estimates that supply will meet demand through 1980, but this reflects purchasing power—the ability to buy—and not need.

The FAO also has a forecast to 1980. Basically it says there will be an oversupply of cereals and insatiable demand for livestock products and feed grains.

This does not allay all fears. World grain reserves are at a 20-year low. The United States ends payments to keep land out of

production next year, removing another hedge against shortage.

DEVELOPING NATIONS DEPEND ON U.S. CROPS

"In the last few years we have not only consumed all the food produced in the world but eaten all the reserves," said Reid Bryson of the University of Wisconsin's Environmental Institute.

In the FAO's annual report, Boerma stated that "the world food situation in 1973 is more difficult than at any time since the years immediately following the devastation of the second world war."

Borlaug observed recently that it was a global food production drop of less than 4 percent, largely due to weather, that provoked the present sense of crisis and soaring food costs.

"This year the ice was so thin that only good monsoon rainfalls in India prevented a famine in which 40 to 50 million people would have perished," he said.

What if the United States' crop partially failed next year because of weather or scarcity of essential farm supplies such as fertilizer? he was asked.

"The developing nations would be ruined," he replied. "100 million people could die like this"—he snapped his fingers—"and we couldn't do anything about it.

"We are closer to one world than most people realize."

WHAT I CAN DO TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this week I was privileged to have in Washington three young ladies from my Fifth Congressional District of Indiana. They were the winners of a contest I sponsored urging students to write essays on how they could help to conserve energy.

Everyone must begin now to think seriously about the energy crisis and I can think of no better place to start than with our young people. We are facing a very serious crisis in this Nation and the three winning essays present some excellent ideas on how individuals can help to conserve our precious energy.

Over 70 young people in my district entered the contest and I would like at this point to share the three chosen by the judges to be most outstanding:

WHAT I CAN DO TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

(By Ruth Harris, Eastern High School, Greentown, Ind.)

Anybody actively concerned with the energy crisis should have collected a list of little energy-saving hints. In this essay, I will include those most easily done on the individual basis.

One of these hints is walking. Walking along with bike-riding, is probably one of the best fuel-saving devices around. It not only saves energy, but it saves money and conditions your body at the same time. To the Washington Redskins, walking and running are a definite part of their daily work-out, but to many it is a time to collect their thoughts, cool off after an argument, meditate, or to wake up in the morning air. Walking can be all this and still be a mode of transportation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Some other methods of preserving against excessive fuel consumption would concern automobiles. The reason I wish to stress energy preservation with automobiles is the fact they use a larger amount of fuel than industry does, even a larger amount than anything in the nation today.

There are several ways of conserving gasoline in the car. If one drives five to ten miles slower than the speed limit and eliminates jack rabbit starting, he will still be able to reach his final destination safer and with more gas in the tank.

Also, people should turn off their engines while waiting for trains or for pick-ups. They should keep all automotive vehicles in good running condition, too.

Even though automobiles are responsible for a very large portion of the energy shortage, they are not entirely to blame. Every day in our own homes, wastes are made of our precious energy supply. Each and every day or hour someone unintentionally leaves a stove on, uses an electric can opener when opening by hand would be just as convenient, or uses both garbage disposal and trash compacters.

Heating and cooling power can be conserved with easy tasks. In the summer months, pulled shades on windows facing the sun unburdens a portion of the heavy load on an air conditioner. Storm windows and insulation protect against the wasting of energy.

Other methods of cutting down on individual fuel consumption. Thermostats on furnaces should be turned down while asleep or while on a vacation or on a trip. Refrigerators and freezers can also be turned down during the owner's or owners' absence.

For safety and previous energy conservation, I would check all electric wires and fuel pipes in and around my home. Short circuits probably do not use that much extra money, but that is definitely no excuse for not repairing them.

Recycling old waste materials is now being steadily stressed as an energy consumption conservation practice along with being an ecological precaution. Recycling trash and garbage such as paper, glass, aluminum and scrap metal uses approximately one-fifth of the energy quota used originally in the manufacturing. Recycling proves that energy minded industrialists and nature minded ecologists can work together for all mankind in unison.

One other good thing about recycling waste materials is the individual basis on which it can be carried out. Saving empty jars, cans and newspapers can give a person a warm patriotic pride, as they help keep America beautiful as they keep it going.

Every single precaution helps stretch the nation's energy supply. Even if it saves only enough energy to last two minutes. If two hundred million people save two minutes each, in one day's time they would have saved over 6,666,666 hours, 277,777 days, or in other terms, 788 years. Those figures are for one day only!

The situation, however, would be quite difficult to achieve, because not everyone would help in the energy preservation. In fact, many people would unfortunately waste the nation's precious motion potion. The figures can go as drastically the extreme and as quickly in opposite direction. For every three thousand people who buy an extra luxury appliance and use it for only one hour, an entire year is wasted. Twenty thousand miles are wasted when only ten thousand people drive two extra, unnecessary miles.

Figures like these only require a pen and a little brain energy. This is the only form of energy that increases and develops with use. No matter how costly the other energies become, none, however, will be as priceless as the mind. For the mind is the first and final resort in solving our problems—including the energy crisis.

There are several outlets at which brain power can be put to use. Things like running an ad with energy-saving tips in the local daily or weekly newspapers; placing an original bumper sticker advocating energy conservation; and the good old stand-by, word of mouth. Small but constant to those I associate with daily style plant themselves in their subconsciences and wait a chance to appear again in the form of a slightly guilty sensation.

I could also put my questionable amount of intellect to use by keeping a ledger. When the electric and/or gas bill arrives I would enter it in the book. Gasoline money would also be accounted for in the ledger. The sum of these figures would represent the total I or my household spent on energy during that period. Before the next fuel bill would come due, rigid restrictions on squandering of energy would be applied. The next time the bills arrive the numbers will not hurt as much. Next I would compute my savings and communicate the results with others.

One other important tool I have forgotten is writing our Washington representatives. They are there to help us keep aware of all happenings in the Congress and to represent their area in those happenings.

A suggestion I might write to my congressman (if it hasn't already been suggested) would be to set aside an Energy Day. This day would be devoted to observation of energy preservation. If the figures I mentioned before are correct, the nation would benefit greatly from Earth Day. Perhaps I am carrying this to an extreme, but it is better to take it to an extreme now, before it becomes an unpleasant surprise, before suggested tips become mandatory, before it is beyond all hope, before it is too late.

WHAT I CAN DO TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

(By Desma Conrad, Anderson High School, Anderson, Ind.)

With the realization that any change involving the conservation of energy will be a gradual one, each individual can participate in the drive to lift the burden. The American standard of living is so high that luxuries of the past have become necessities today. Many sacrifices should be made in the home to decrease the amount of energy required every day.

As one person, I can be responsible for turning off sources of excess power. The current is frequently running through a light bulb when nobody occupies the room. The amount of electricity can be cut down on a multiple circuit if some light bulbs are unscrewed or if I use the daylight to my advantage. Other electrical appliances such as a radio, television, or phonograph should be switched off when not in use. My censored use of the television will lower the consumption of energy considerably over a duration of time. The "instant on" features of some televisions can be disconnected to stop the flow of electrical current.

Major appliances are in demand daily; it would be wise to operate them only every twenty-four hours. A dishwasher could be utilized more sparingly. In decent weather a clothesline can serve the purpose of a vent dryer. By minimizing the amount of hot water tapped, extra water doesn't have to be pumped and heated. A lowered temperature of the water heater may account for less fuel. Correcting leaky faucets can end the wasting of much water.

The pilot light of a gas stove requires half the total gas that a stove consumes. By extinguishing the pilot light of an appliance lying idle for a long duration of time, I could conserve energy.

The cleaning device of a self-cleaning oven is just added extravagance when the air conditioner is pulling on the source of electricity. I could avoid taxing extra energy by purchasing a standard model refrigerator

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rather than a frost-free model. Unnecessary or lengthy openings of the refrigerator door could be avoided. Allowing food to thaw thoroughly before cooking can save fuel in preparation of the meal to be set on the table.

There are several means by which the energy necessary to heat and cool a house can be reduced. The providing of adequate insulation and weather stripping, besides installing storm doors and windows and double-pane glass, can aid in the conservation of energy. In exceptionally large houses where certain rooms are not occupied, closed doors would block the necessary heat or cool air required to keep that room at a balanced temperature. Setting the thermostat a few degrees lower will drop the percentage of fuel consumption. The need for heat is not as great when moisture supplements the air through the means of a humidifier. Clean filters in a furnace and air conditioner are essential as there is less pull on the motor. I can close the fireplace damper in summer and protect the windows from direct sunlight. Windows can be exposed to take advantage of solar heat in winter. It is also beneficial to maintain proper attic ventilation. The air conditioner should not be abused; for example, if someone is on vacation or absent from the house for an intermediate length of time, it should not be kept running. Fans can be utilized in remote parts of the house in the cooling-off season.

The elimination of unnecessary driving and the formation of car pools can greatly affect the amount of gas saved weekly. If many errands are to be run, gas can be saved by myself or anyone who plans to do them without backtracking and perhaps makes a list before starting out on his errand. For short trips the possibilities of walking, boarding public transportation vehicles or riding bicycles are available.

The engine should be, by all means, shut off when the cars of a train appear endless. Being religious about frequent engine tune-ups, regularly checking proper inflation of tires, and warming the motor before driving will assure that no unnecessary amount of gas is consumed. Usage of a multi-grade motor oil could insure a smoother running system. Reduction of speed on highways saves gasoline. For instance, when the speed of a vehicle on an interstate is lowered from seventy miles per hour to fifty miles per hour, the amount of fuel reduction can add up to twenty-five percent. Driving at a consistent speed and refraining from excessive braking decreases the pull on the engine. Large car models are not maintained very economically in the event of an energy crisis. Even though heavy cars aid you to some extent while driving on ice in winter, the powerful engines, automatic transmission, and air conditioning require less fuel in lighter and smaller models. The drag on the engine when towing a trailer or camper is reduced if you slow down. Bottled gas lines should be checked for leaks. Since I am capable of driving, I am more aware of the significance of the aforementioned suggestions as an aid in conserving gasoline.

As a consumer I have the opportunity to purchase materials which may be recycled. Even though aluminum and plastic containers require more energy to produce than steel and glass containers, some energy may be saved in the long run because they can be more easily recycled.

Increasing my familiarity with the possibilities of conservation by compiling all the facts has brought to my realization the need for nationwide cooperation. As a citizen it is my duty to instill this awareness into my neighbors' thoughts. Those in my community may listen if they understand that I am a concerned citizen, but my major influence will lie with those upon whom I have already made an impression. Any conservation of energy is a start. Conducting drives to gather glass bottles, carefully planning errands, making use of daylight

time, and wisely selecting enjoyable television programs are small beginnings. Change must first be gradual; however, with everyone's contributing efforts, the results can be astounding.

WHAT I CAN DO TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

(By Deborah Lynne Thompson, Maconaquah High School, Bunker Hill, Ind.)

In recent months there has been increasingly more coverage of the energy crisis. The newspapers and magazines have at least one article in each publication about the crisis. Today more young people are concerned about their country and its welfare. It is very important to me that this problem be discussed and solved. In our world of quick changes, a solution must be found to the energy shortage.

While trying to give my personal views on how to solve this problem, I decided to discuss my hometown. I live in a small town named Bunker Hill. The population is approximately one thousand and fifty people. We are located in the center of a triangle formed by Kokomo, Grissom Air Force Base, and Peru. We have an excellent location situated close to U.S. 31, State Road 218, and a new system of school buildings from kindergarten on up. Since I live in this area, I felt it would be beneficial to discuss how to conserve energy in Bunker Hill. I have done research in three different areas and come up with some very interesting facts.

First, I looked at the housing in Bunker Hill. In all, there are roughly one hundred and twenty-five two-story houses. Most of these houses are at least seventy-five years old and well-insulated. The average amount of heat used in one month during bad weather costs thirty-five dollars. However, I found that the age of the occupants makes a big difference. Many of the people in these houses are elderly. These homes are kept much warmer than the homes of younger occupants. Also involved in the use of energy is the material used to build the house and how well it is insulated. From my point of view, everyone should be able to cut down on the amount of fuel used in heating the home. There are several ways this can be done. One is to do everything possible to cut down on drafts. It has been estimated that from fifteen to thirty percent of your heat is lost in this way.

Here are some of my suggestions: 1) caulk around windows and doors; 2) install storm windows or insulating glass; 3) set your thermostat around seventy during the day and five or ten degrees lower at night; 4) replace all dirty filters; 5) seal off attics and unused rooms; 6) close your fireplace damper; 7) don't block radiators or registers; 8) close the drapes at night to keep heat in and open them during the day, and 9) always close doors quickly when entering or leaving.

Another area of research was that of the school buses of Maconaquah School Corporation. There are thirty-one buses which transport students each day, three spare buses, and one minibus. Each of these buses carries approximately sixty-six students. However, some buses carry as many as three loads of students each morning and night. The sum accumulation of miles in one day is one thousand five hundred and fifty miles. The buses are high horsepower and get four or five miles per gallon. This would mean that each day the school buses use three hundred and ten gallons of gasoline. At the present time, the school has one ten-thousand gallon tank with separate keys for each bus. A computer keeps a record of the amount used by each bus and a record of the total amount used. Every two weeks a written statement is sent to the Administration Building. The School Board has looked into the future and seen the need for a storage area for gasoline. A recent vote passed the Board to buy another ten-thousand gallon tank to be

November 7, 1973

used for storage. In my mind, this shows concern and foresight on the part of my School Board and I am very pleased.

The last area which I researched was that of students driving cars to school. Three hundred and thirty cars are registered at the High School. Of these, some are repeats since some families have more than one car. No one has a definite idea of the number of occupants each of these cars have. It is estimated that nearly six hundred students use cars for transportation. Of these, only half need cars because of jobs during or right after school. This tells me several ways to conserve energy.

Some of these are: (1) those who do not have to drive to school should ride the bus; (2) those who live in the same area should form car pools, and (3) all the ones who do drive should learn some of the simple ways to get greater gas mileage. Some of these are: (1) don't stop or start quickly; (2) use the fuel that matches your car engine; (3) make sure the car is in good order; (4) inflate your tires correctly for the weight of the car; (5) obey the speed limit, and (6) drive using only needed extras, that is, turn off your air conditioner and roll down your windows.

Of course, these are only a few specific areas. There are many ways the townspeople of Bunker Hill could conserve energy. One very good way would be to walk to the grocery store, hardware store, Post Office, and other shops in town. It would conserve energy and also be good exercise if housewives would buy a two-wheel cart to carry their groceries and packages home in.

Another easy way to save gasoline primarily would be to use bicycles for short-distance travel. Just in this past year more bicycles were sold than in the previous three years together. This must show that some people are interested in cycling. To me it is a way to save gas and lose weight at the same time.

Even when you discuss the use of electricity, there are several ways to save it. Some of them are: (1) limit the time you watch your television set; (2) use your air conditioner only on the extremely hot days and not at all at night; (3) do not use a great many large appliances at the same time (such as television, stereo, air conditioner, and stove); (4) use only the lights that are needed; (5) unplug appliances when not in use, and (6) during the summer don't use lights until they are necessary.

All in all, these are my thoughts and ideas on how to help solve the energy crisis. As a concerned future leader, I want my world and the world of my children to be the best possible.

H.R. 9142—REGIONAL RAIL REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1973

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support H.R. 9142, but I do so with great reluctance and with the hope that certain necessary improvements will be made in the bill during its consideration. My reservations are predicated upon my belief that the cost of this legislation will far exceed what is presently authorized by the bill.

H.R. 9142 provides for approximately \$1.4 billion to be devoted to the reorganization of the railroads in the Northeast part of the country, with \$1 billion of the total being in the form of Government guaranteed loans and the remaining \$400 million coming from direct Federal expenditure. There are at least

three areas in the bill that have convinced me that \$1.4 billion will be nowhere near enough.

First, the manner in which the new corporation will acquire properties of the bankrupt estates is of such a nature that a higher price than the \$200 million currently contemplated will probably ultimately be needed. This is due to the fact that valuation takes place subsequent to conveyance and opens up opportunities for the large insurance companies, banks, and other elements of the Wall Street establishment that are the creditors of the bankrupt railroads to engage in extensive litigation to increase the price that will have to be paid for the properties. In committee we moved toward reaching a compromise whereby conveyance would be in the context of a section 77 bankruptcy proceeding. The intent of the compromise was to allow the court to make a determination as to the disposition of the bankruptcy proceeding before it, thereby limiting the claims that the creditors can make in subsequent legal proceedings. Our intent will not be realized, however, unless several further amendments to H.R. 9142 are successful, and I urge my colleagues' support of these amendments.

My second area of concern is the extensive benefits which are provided in the labor protection provisions. Virtually all members of the committee, myself included, agree that protecting the well-being of the workingman should be a social cost payable by the Federal Government rather than a burden on the new corporation. I am greatly concerned, however, that title VIII goes far beyond what is necessary to provide adequate labor protection.

The language that the full committee adopted was the product of a bargaining session involving representatives of labor and of some railroad management, neither of whom will have to bear the costs of the provisions that they agreed upon. The result of their agreement will be to place the railroad employee in a far better position than his colleagues in other industries. For example, an employee with more than 5 years' service can receive a monthly displacement allowance for the rest of his working life. Such displacement allowances are figured on a unique compensation formula which permits an employee to inflate the benefits to which he is eligible far beyond that to which he is realistically entitled. As a result of provisions such as these, the \$250 million presently authorized for labor protection by the bill will be inadequate to cover the costs that the Federal Government will incur. Again, several amendments will be offered to correct these shortcomings, and I urge my colleagues to support them.

Finally, the bill provides for extensive Federal subsidization for the purchase of non-profitable lines that should be abandoned pursuant to the system plan. Again, the \$50 million provided for these purposes is insufficient, and we can rest assured that unless these provisions are modified, we will be called on in the near future to provide much more money. While I recognize that localities, States, and interested private parties should have the right to some Federal assistance

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to continue to operate a branch line which they might consider essential even though it is a money loser, I do not think that the taxpayers as a whole should be called upon to subsidize purchases of such lines. Corrective amendments which would eliminate the mandatory application of Federal funds to the purchase of these branch lines will be offered, and I strongly urge their support.

H.R. 9142 is the result of extensive deliberations and compromise by both the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee. I realize the severity of the crisis with which this bill attempts to deal, and I am convinced that in many respects it is the best solution to the problems of the Northeast roads. I am equally convinced, however, that the changes I have mentioned must be made if a disastrous financial impact on the American taxpayer is to be avoided.

CERTIFICATION OF VICE-PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE GERALD R. FORD

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the RECORD a copy of the statement I made before the Senate Rules Committee supporting the confirmation of Vice-President-designate GERALD R. FORD. I am hopeful these observations may be of some help to colleagues:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., CONCERNING THE CONFIRMATION PROCEEDINGS OF VICE-PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE GERALD R. FORD

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, I asked to appear before your Committee only after long and careful thought. I have come in the hope that my observations may be of some help to you—and to the American people—in assessing the man, Gerald Ford.

I appear today as a Democrat Member of the Congress serving my fourth term in the House. In February of this year I formally changed my party affiliation from Republican to Democrat. I cite this background to indicate that I have been able to know and observe Jerry Ford from the perspective of a member who has been privileged to serve on both sides of the aisle.

I am here to declare my support for Mr. Ford's confirmation, and I do so with full knowledge that, if confirmed, he may well ascend to the Presidency within a short time.

In candor, he was not my first choice for this job. We have had many fundamental differences on key issues. Nevertheless, I believe he has the personal integrity and the basic competence to function effectively as President. And while the full investigative process must be properly completed, I feel it is essential that we bring his confirmation to a vote at the earliest moment.

While Jerry Ford is a friend, I do not appear here today as a matter of friendship; I come to add my own insight and personal judgment on a matter that is of critical importance to our country.

It seems to me that four key questions have arisen with respect to Gerald Ford's suitability to serve as President. They are

issues that might best be labeled, (1) integrity, (2) competence, (3) independence of mind, and (4) partisanship.

Let me begin by addressing the matter of integrity.

On the basis of a seven year working relationship as colleagues—and as friends—I have never had occasion to doubt the integrity of Jerry Ford. In all our dealings I have found him to be honorable, respectful of differences, and a man of his word. Despite frequent and sharp disagreements on issues, I have found him to be truthful, decent, and trustworthy.

While the public has heard many charges suggesting financial improprieties by Mr. Ford, I, personally, do not believe these charges.

On the matter of competence.

I have found Gerald Ford to be a thoughtful, rational, and able decision maker. From contact with him I believe he is keenly aware of the limitations any one person faces when required to assume the burdens of the Presidency. As President he would need—as every President does—a broad spectrum of skilled advisors to assist him. I am convinced he would assemble skilled specialists reflecting a diversity of viewpoints. I believe he would be open and fair in re-establishing a co-equal working relationship with the Congress.

By his actions and words he has demonstrated to me his awareness of the profound responsibilities and complexities of the office of the Presidency—I believe he would bring patient sustained effort and even-handed rationality to the decision making process. Most importantly, I believe he would do so in a spirit of mutual respect and good will. For these reasons I believe he has the capacity to be an able and effective President.

As to independence of mind.

Many people have written to me to express their concern that Jerry Ford may be a "Nixon rubber stamp"—or a "mindless yes-man". His partisan role as House minority leader has given many citizens this impression.

As President I believe Jerry Ford would be his own man, I believe he understands that the office of the Presidency belongs to the people of America, and not to any temporary incumbent President. I believe he feels that a President is a steward of a special—almost sacred—public trust, and that as President he must take inside himself the hopes and concerns of every citizen across our land. I believe he would see himself as an instrument for the public's work, knowing that only by being his own man, could he then fully and freely be the public's man, a President of the people.

I believe he has the inner strength and decency to serve us all equally.

Finally to partisanship.

Jerry Ford has often played the role of partisan battering ram—and many properly wonder if he can rise above narrow partisanship. I believe he can and will—but clearly it will require him to reverse personal behavior patterns long established. I think he realizes that the skilled discharge of the public's business is not, and should never be, a partisan matter. Perhaps the greatest test of his capacity to lead will be his ability to resist the partisan reflex.

Partisanship has a proper role, but it is a lesser one, and particularly so at a time when the entire fabric of the body politic so badly needs repair. I believe Mr. Ford would strive to establish more bi-partisanship in the formulation of our national policy—and certainly it is badly needed.

These then, gentlemen, are my perceptions and judgments. And my best hopes—along with yours—will go with Gerald Ford if he is confirmed. Our good faith and willingness to work with him are strengths he must deserve—and have—if he is to serve America well.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before your Committee.

REMARKS OF DEREK BOK, PRESIDENT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the remarks of the distinguished president of Harvard University, Derek Bok, at morning prayers in Appleton Chapel on October 29, 1973.

The remarks of President Bok on this occasion are, I think, of particular significance in view of the extraordinary events through which our country is now passing.

Mr. Bok's remarks follow:

PRESIDENT BOK DELIVERS MORNING PRAYERS
"Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil."

How clear this passage from Exodus remains. How incontestably correct its message. And how deceptively simple its challenge on first reading: When the occasion demands, can we summon the courage to stand alone and refuse to do what we know is wrong?

But life rarely allows the challenge to be put in such a simple form, and this is particularly true in public life.

What, after all, is wrong? Very seldom is a conscientious public servant asked to pursue a course of action that has no possible redeeming justification. In this practical age, where urgent crises are ever present in our domestic and international life, reasons of state can all too easily be advanced to excuse almost every questionable act, and few principles remain that have not become familiar subjects for pragmatic compromise.

In these tangled circumstances, can we safely trust our own judgment when others seem prepared to take the opposite course? Can we be sure that we are not excessively stubborn or, worse yet, the victim of some latent desire for martyred notoriety or some hidden animus toward the very officials whose policies we disapprove?

And is it really wise to resist even to the point of leaving one's post in protest? If we are genuinely concerned, is it not the better course to remain in office and continue to use our influence for the objectives we hold dear? Should we depart and risk replacement by weaker men less principled and determined than ourselves?

For those of us who merely observe the ebb and flow of public life, these issues may seem easily resolved. For those who actually bear responsibility for the consequences of their decisions, the burdens of choice can be very heavy.

Surely these burdens must have been great for our colleague, Archibald Cox, for I have never known a man who took his responsibilities more seriously or struggled harder to be true to his principles. In the end, he perceived a principle that could not be compromised even to placate the uncertain demands of international security and domestic harmony. It was a principle worth defending, even by refusing to obey a Presidential order, in order to press its importance vividly on the mind of the nation. As he put the issue at the very end of his term of office: "Whether ours shall continue to be a government of laws and not of men is now for Congress and ultimately the American people to decide."

His actions, like those of Mr. Richardson and Mr. Ruckelshaus, take on an added significance within the University community from whence he came, for the University must be sensitive to everything that bears

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

upon the moral education of its members. In part, this responsibility can be discharged within the classroom—and there is more to be accomplished here than we have achieved thus far. In part, the responsibility implies a willingness by the University itself to grapple seriously and openly with the moral questions that inhere in the institutional decisions that it makes.

It is ironic that in our conversation on the morning before he decided to accept his Washington post, one of Archie's chief concerns was whether his decision would set a bad example for his younger colleagues by suggesting that important government service was automatically to be preferred to the professor's chief responsibility as a teacher. In retrospect, it appears that he has taught us more in government service than he could have hoped to achieve in those Harvard classrooms where we welcome him back with admiration.

But beyond these efforts lies the truth embedded in Aristotle's *Ethics*: If you would understand virtue, observe the conduct of virtuous men.

Over the past twenty years, I have watched Archie Cox fulfill this role in many different circumstances.

When I was a law student, I saw him resign his government post when a political settlement by the President compromised the integrity of his office.

While I served as Dean, I watched him meet his obligations to his University through countless hours of grinding effort to keep civility and order on the campus.

Just after I left the Deanship, I saw him face an angry, jeering crowd in Sanders Theatre to plead for the free speech he considered so fundamental to the University's existence.

And now he has again stood firmly and wisely on principle under conditions of extraordinary stress.

Few of us will face similar challenges in such dramatic form. But all of us will surely encounter situations, however private and unheralded, that offer a similar moral challenge. By his example, he has encouraged us all to recognize these challenges more clearly and face them with greater strength.

CONSIDERATION OF A GOVERNMENT-PUBLIC OIL SHALE CORPORATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, for several years now, the Nation's attention has been drawn to the Alaskan North Slope oil discoveries and the Environmental Impact Statements which have been developed to justify the construction of the trans-Alaskan pipeline.

Unfortunately, there has been another Environmental Impact Statement and a pending oil decision which has received almost no attention—but which is probably much more significant for the long-range energy supply and environmental quality of the Nation. Released August 30, the Final EIS for the prototype Oil Shale Leasing program is now being reviewed for probable approval by Interior Secretary Rogers Morton. The consequences of an eventual commercial development of the Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado oil shales are staggering—both in a positive and a negative sense.

November 7, 1973

WHAT IS OIL SHALE?

Eight trillion barrels of oil lie locked in the rocks of the "Green River Formation" of the three corners area of Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado—enough to meet our Nation's needs for hundreds of years at today's consumption rates.

Formed by the same forces that made liquid oil millions of years ago, shale oil was laid down in rock strata in many parts of the world, including the U.S.S.R., Brazil, Manchuria, and Scotland. The oil is in a solid form called kerogen, and is rendered collectable only after more than 900 degrees of heat is applied in a process known as "retorting."

The kerogen bearing rock is first crushed to fist-sized pieces to speed heating, and then retorted to yield the relatively high-sulfur content oil. The resulting crude oil is treated with hydrogen to remove excess sulfur and is also treated to decrease its viscosity so it can be pumped easily through oil pipelines.

PUBLIC POLICY QUESTIONS IN OIL SHALE DEVELOPMENT

But along with the potential of at least a partial easing of our national energy crisis, oil shale development present us with huge problems in two main areas:

First, the relationship of private business with the public interest, and

Second, the environment.

Both stand to be raked over the coals in our frantic quest for more petroleum energy resources.

The entity that stands to gain the most in commercial development of shale oil is not the American public, but big oil—already the most sheltered business in—and out of—our country, and the closest thing to a Government sanctioned monopoly that we know. Because over 70 percent of the high-yield western slope oil shale lands are publicly owned, some looming questions confront us: since the oil and its associated minerals are a gift of nature and on public land, can we justify allowing a private monopolistic entity to profit by sales of the public's property? Is it fair for big oil to sell the public's property to the public?

Furthermore, is it fair for American taxpayers to subsidize Big Oil's shale oil development through the unique tax breaks that particular industry receives, when Big Oil will in turn sell the products of that subsidized development back to the public at what will undoubtedly be set, profitable prices? Can we be assured that retail petroleum prices are fair—genuinely a product of competitive free enterprise and not industry self-protection and collusion? Can we develop an oil shale industry that does not serve to reinforce the stranglehold of controlled supply that helps create the Big Oil monopoly?

Mr. Speaker, just as the Federal Government has initiated and directed broad scale efforts of social welfare, and in the same manner undertaken advocacy of military weapons systems in the pursuit of national security, the Federal Government must now take wholesale action in the crucial area of national energy resources. It must be more than just verbiage and press releases; it must yield solid action. The nature of the oil mo-

nopoly and the energy crisis demands a new course toward a solution of these problems.

THE NEED FOR A FEDERALLY SPONSORED PROGRAM OF COMMERCIAL SHALE OIL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Speaker, I believe the concept of a federally sponsored program of commercial shale oil development has much to offer. Probably most important in such a consideration is the competitive influence that a non-industry element could have on Big Oil. For perhaps the first time in history, Big Oil would be confronted with real competition—an entity created by the Congress to sell products which would bear some relationship to the costs of production.

PUBLIC CORPORATION WILL INSURE QUICK DEVELOPMENT

The Tennessee Valley Authority is an example of what such a nonindustry corporation might be like. "A corporation clothed with the power of government, but possessed with the flexibility and initiative of private enterprise," said Franklin D. Roosevelt.

TVA is an example of how new administrative concepts must be created for national resource development at a Federal level. In addition, it provided a "yardstick" of production costs and profit levels that the country could use to gauge other, similar, utilities.

Another important advantage to Government sponsored and supported oil shale development would be a guarantee to the American public that the oil shale reserves would be developed as soon as possible. All too often oil land leases have been given to oil companies—and then the oil companies move only as fast as they have to in order to maintain the current high price of oil.

The evidence available indicates that the industry has very definitely seen the potential of oil shale, but has deliberately limited their commercial involvement to ongoing studies and research that allows them to "keep track of the trends" in the industry while waiting for prices to reach the profit levels they want.

But the oil industry is talking out of both sides of its mouth: although on one hand claiming relative disinterest and economic infeasibility, the country's largest oil companies have been buying up every piece of oil shale land on private lands that they can get their hands on. As long ago as April of 1967, 13 companies, including the 7 largest, owned or held option to over 65 percent of our Nation's known private oil shale lands.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS

The other area of major controversy, Mr. Speaker, is the environmental consequence of commercial development of oil shale lands. The cheapest and most practical method of oil shale mining is "surface mining," a polite and innocuous term for strip mining. The western slope of the Rocky Mountains stands to suffer the same wrath from strip mining that the Appalachians have in the East. The same physical effects: permanent landscape scars, polluted rivers and streams, buried topsoils, and a desolation that most of us cannot even imagine. And this strip mining will have

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the same social effects: displaced families, confused migrations of people, sale and destruction of local cultures, and short term employment can all be bred of oil shale mining.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that eventually these beautiful oil shale lands must be developed. Our fanatical dependence on hydrocarbon energy seems to realize no bounds, and our efforts to conserve it are pitiful in the face of the demand.

So in any commercial oil shale venture, Mr. Speaker, we must work to guarantee an absolute dedication to a true restoration and rehabilitation of the lands whose bounty we reap. We must learn from the horror of coal stripping—and if error is made, we must make it in the favor of nature that yields its fruits to the people.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am working on legislation that I hope might help provide some answers and solutions to the economic, environmental, and public policy questions involved in oil shale development. Consideration of a public-Government oil shale corporation has revealed several points worth attention:

An initial Federal commitment must be made for the corporation to foster development of a truly competitive shale oil industry.

How much should such a venture be financed? Is the public stock sale scheme used by COMSAT feasible and applicable in this similar concept? Would public ownership serve as a means of lowering costs to the Government while also giving people a stake and an interest in the future of petroleum energy?

Provisions requiring shale oil crude product to be sold at the lowest possible rate consistent with a return of investment, with interest, and a reasonable rate of return to any stockholders.

A provision allowing only domestic sales of shale oil produced by the corporation to prevent the depletion of the petroleum resources we are attempting to conserve.

Provision for common carrier transport from the mining or retorting site of all crude oil or its byproducts.

Complete public access to the corporation's data and records, except for patents and inventions, which shall be sold at the profit of the corporation.

A provision urging development of processes whereby the associated minerals and ores are removed in a one-step, retort-harvest system. As of this date, each intermingled mineral contained in oil shale must be removed in its own exclusive process. If these operations could be combined into a single step along with the oil retorting, both operating costs and yields would probably benefit.

A provision prohibiting oil industry participation on the board of directors of the formed corporation, or as stockholders or financial participants.

Encouragement of a small business consortium approach to mining-crushing-retorting-transportation segments of a commercial shale oil industry. A commercial oil shale operation is a huge undertaking, until now conducted usually

by well financed companies only. But a group of smaller companies could coordinate their separate expertise to accomplish the same operations.

Should the corporation make use of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior—except parks, preserves, and so forth—or should the commercial facility be operated on leased private lands? If Federal lands are used, lease rates and royalties must be paid in the same manner as foreseen under the Interior's private commercial oil shale operation to insure a real equity in competition.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that our energy policy be more adequately directed in the national interest. Consideration of public development and management of our Nation's oil shale treasure could open up vast new possibilities in relatively low cost, energy reserves developed with a maximum consideration for the environment.

WORLD FOOD BANK—A SENATOR'S VISION 20 YEARS AGO

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

MR. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, last month a group of economists from North America, Europe, and Japan proposed creating an international food bank from which food could be withdrawn to meet serious shortages.

Participants in the conference which resulted in this proposal reported that the alternative is to do nothing and to accumulate agricultural problems even more dangerous than those experienced in the past 20 years.

It has occurred to us in North Carolina that this event offers an example of the vision of a man who served as commissioner of agriculture and then Governor of our State before coming to the U.S. Senate where he served from 1954 until his death in 1957. The man was Kerr Scott who almost 20 years ago made a similar proposal in legislation to establish a world food bank. Following is a speech which Senator Scott delivered in 1954 in support of such an idea:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 30, 1955]

SPEECH BY HON. W. KERR SCOTT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, AT SHELBY, N.C., TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1954.

Friends, history has a strange way of repeating itself.

Some 3,500 years ago, in far away Egypt, the government warehouses were bulging at the seams with corn and other supplies of surplus crops.

Seven years earlier Joseph had warned Pharaoh that a time of famine and scarcity was in the making, and urged him to buy up all surplus food crops against that emergency.

Pharaoh, the King of Egypt, heeded the advice of Joseph, and his government—for 7 years—bought up the annual 20 percent surplus production of the land.

That, my friends, is what the Bible tells us about the agricultural and economic problems of that ancient day and age.

Later events proved the wisdom of Joseph's

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

advice and the action taken by the government of Pharaoh.

Today, in America, our Government warehouses, like those of Egypt, in the days of long ago, are bulging with surplus stocks of agricultural products.

What we are going to do about those surpluses is one of the prime questions of the hour.

Let's go back to the Bible again, and find out what was done with the surpluses of 35 centuries ago.

The Bible tells us that these surplus food stocks were used to feed the people of Egypt, during the lean years that followed the gathering of the surplus, and that which was not required for Egypt, was divided up and sold to the peoples of foreign lands in their hour of scarcity and need.

That's the way they did things back in the days of long ago, when, according to the Bible, God was directing—through His prophets and servants—the hand and actions of men.

And, I am convinced that God still stands ready to direct the hand of man in solving the problems that face us today. All that we need to do is to get in tune, as a Nation, with His plans and purpose.

And, now let's do a bit of reviewing of more recent history—of that period following immediately after the Hoover depression—and stake out the reasons why we have surplus stocks of food in Government warehouses.

As a part of the overall plan to set the almost wrecked economy of America back on the track, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt initiated three major reforms or programs, all of which won immediate and almost universal approval.

First, there was the Bank Deposit Insurance Act that gave stability, to our financial institutions, which at that time were failing at a rate of about three banks a day.

Second, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was armed with billions of dollars to pump life into a staggering and near prostrate national industrial life.

Third, farm price support program was set in motion, and this program ended an era of widespread loss, under the hammer of the auctioneer, of farm homes and holdings, city and town homes, and small businesses.

It was just as effective in halting such losses as was the Bank Deposit Insurance Act in halting bank failures, and as was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in halting big business and industrial failures.

The word "bankruptcy" started slipping off the front pages of the newspapers, and crawling back between the covers of the dictionary.

Soon millions of unemployed men and women proudly had their names taken from welfare relief rolls as they were added, in increasing numbers, to revived and expanded industrial payrolls.

The first farm price support legislation was later declared unconstitutional, and a new beginning was made. The 90 percent parity program and act, with amendments, which finally emerged, was born of national economic necessity, and was nurtured by the hands of men with experience in the fields of agriculture, economics, and government.

Now, the term price-support program can mean any one of several things to the uninformed and newcomers to the idea, and it usually does, to their confusion. But, those of us who have been in the thick of the fight to establish and maintain a workable 90-percent parity-price support program over period of years, welcome all true converts to the cause. Their assistance and support, even if it comes late, is needed.

President Roosevelt did not pull the 90-percent parity-price support program out of thin air like a magician lifts a rabbit out of a hat. He built it carefully, in con-

sultation and cooperation with the 48-State Commissioners of Agriculture and other leaders, and, at that time, I was one of those commissioners.

This, however, was not the first time that I had the privilege of working with President Roosevelt. On Thanksgiving Day of 1932, after he was elected but prior to the time he took the oath of office as President, I, as master of the North Carolina State Grange, was one of a group of farm leaders from all over the United States who met with him at Warm Springs. The President-elect had called this conference for a discussion of the farm problem and to obtain suggestions as how best to solve it.

I recall as vividly as if it had happened yesterday, one of the things Mr. Roosevelt said that day. With no trace of a smile—things were too grim back in those days for much smiling—he told us, "I am going to have you farm folks locked up in a room and keep you there until you are able to come out with a program that will solve the farm problem and get the economy of this Nation back on its feet."

And, incidentally, I was the only southerner who was invited to attend that Warm Springs conference when President-elect Roosevelt started building the foundation of the Nation's farm program.

As an administrator of the Federal land bank, covering 11 Southern States, I saw, with my own eyes, the misery and heartbreak, that lay like a funeral pall over every farm community in the wake of the depression—misery and heartbreak we were able to alleviate, in thousands of cases, through Federal land bank loans.

Private bank loans for agriculture had completely broken down, as they had for almost everything else. Agriculture was sick, sick almost unto death, and as a result, industry's smokestacks stood stark and naked against the sky, and the wheels, shuttles, looms, saws, and joiners were silent.

In that day and hour it was engraved on my heart and brain that the economy of this Nation can be kept healthy and thriving, year in and year out, the wheels of industry kept turning, and employment at a high level, only if proper measures are maintained to assure the farmer-producer receiving his fair share of the national income—that is, a price level of at least 90 percent of parity.

The price-support program we fought for and set in motion through the 1936 amendments to the Agricultural Act, together with allied measures, was designed, and has operated successfully, as a means of stabilizing the overall economy of the Nation.

It is true, as has been charged by the self-styled economy bloc of Congress, that our farm program, in the absence of acreage limitations, has resulted in the accumulation of surpluses in certain commodities. But, let me point out in this connection, that farmers have always, when called upon to do so, voted upon themselves the necessary acreage limitations.

An outstanding example of this is found in the flue-cured tobacco program which has operated so successfully.

The important question of acreage limitations and the further accumulation of surplus stocks, are matters, however, that lie in the future, and are subject, until the law is changed, in a large measure to the whims and fancies of an unsympathetic Secretary of Agriculture.

Just as important, we are faced with the problem of Government warehouses already bulging with surplus food and other agricultural products. And, incidentally, had it not been for such surplus stocks on hand when World War II broke out, the United States and our allies would have been in a pretty bad fix.

In seeking the answer to the question of what should be done with these surpluses,

November 7, 1973

common sense dictates that we examine our relationships with the other nations of the world, particularly in respect to those nations we count as allies in the battle against communism.

As a Nation we have seen and recognized the benefits that flow, back and forth, from cooperative effort. We are a full-fledged partner, in fact, the largest single contributing partner, in NATO, and are pouring our resources of all kinds into the pooled effort to hold communism in check, and we must and shall continue to do so.

Many of our allies in this united determination to keep the flame of freedom and liberty burning are faced with serious food shortages on their home fronts. Even in Great Britain—the strongest of our allies—the rationing of some food items still goes on.

Why would it not be the part of common sense to make it possible for our allies to spend more of their money, at home, for military arms to implement NATO, and for us to make more of our NATO contribution in the form of our surplus food stocks, food that is needed by our allies?

Only American makers of the instruments of war—those who manufacture and sell guns and tanks, ammunition, and warplanes, and the like—could be expected to object, and I seriously doubt that they would.

Now the British are not the only ally we have that is faced with food shortage, and to whom we are furnishing a part of their requirements in munitions of war to present a strong front against the threats of communism. Some of our other allies are faced with even more acute shortages. In some instances almost faminelike conditions prevail.

Adoption of such a plan would bring about immediate reductions in our piled up surpluses of food stocks, and, at the same time, would relieve some of the financial burden the American taxpayer is having to carry.

This, however, would be only a partial solution to the bulging food warehouse problem, but successful experience in another field points the way toward total solution.

I am talking now about establishment of a World Food Bank, to be administered by the United Nations or by a special agency made up of the United States and our allies in the fight against communism.

For several years the United States has been a participating partner in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, a world bank organization to which we have pledged, in stock subscription, more than \$3 billion to help bolster the economy of financially weak nations.

Each member nation's contribution or subscription to the bank's capital stock or operating capital is based upon its estimated individual capacity to cooperate in assisting less fortunate nations in times of emergency and stress.

Altogether, 54 nations are stock subscribers to this International Bank, and a total of 78 separate loans, ranging in size from a few million to \$250 million, have been made in 29 member nations.

The World Bank, of which the United States is by far the largest single stockholder, came into existence on December 27, 1945, and as of June 30, 1953, its operation had resulted in a net profit in excess of \$76 million.

This International Bank operates just like any other bank. That is, it makes no contributions or grants, but rather lends its money, at interest, with eventual repayment required.

A World Food Bank might well be established along similar lines, with those member nations which draw upon its resource being required to repay their withdrawals, to the bank, either in kind, when they have good crop years, or in equivalent cash.

We—that is, the United States—would not be alone in contributing food stocks to such a World Food Bank, for there are other nations that also have surplus problems, involving various crops, from time to time, and each could contribute or pledge to the common pool of food stocks in accordance with its excess production in one or more crops.

Food-short member nations should be permitted to withdraw from the World Food Bank under a formula which gives weight to both reserve stocks on hand or in sight, and probable total world need in the immediate foreseeable future.

Here, in this land of plenty in which we live, it is hard to realize that approximately 1 billion people of the total world population of 2,400,000,000, go to bed every night with their hunger only partially satisfied.

Through operation of such a World Food Bank plan as I am suggesting, severe food scarcities in many, many instances would be largely eliminated, and the hunger stricken and threatened people of lukewarm, allied nations would be made stronger—both physically and in will—to defend themselves against communistic assaults and cold war threats.

Many of those nations that yearn for themselves the freedoms and blessings of a democratic way of life, need bread and butter just as sorely as they need guns and tanks to preserve their independence. Let's make it easy for them to buy our surplus bread and butter stocks so that they will be better able to make their own guns and tanks to preserve or win the freedom for which they yearn.

And, in this connection, it would be well to remember that a man can, and usually will, fight a lot better on a full stomach than on an empty one.

To our enemies, let's present armed might and resolute unity as a deterrent to war; to our friends and allies, in lands of food scarcity, let's present the ability to enjoy three square meals a day as proof that democracy does pay off, not only in freedom, but also in a better standard of living.

Communism breeds and thrives on hunger, and no greater contribution could be made to world peace and tranquility by us or any other nation, than the filling up of empty places in hungry human stomachs.

Just as actions speak louder than words, food sometimes speaks louder than guns.

Such a World Food Bank would serve a manifold purpose, including: First, the promotion of true friendship among untold millions of people the world over, second, progress on the highway leading toward peace among all nations; and third, the wiping out of piled up surpluses which are costing the American taxpayer more than half a million dollars a day in warehouse fees alone.

It is a goal worth striving for, and one toward which I pledge my efforts.

GROWING FEELING THAT AMERICAN EDUCATION IS NOT DOING ITS JOB

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week during "American Education Week," Chicago's WBBM Radio 78 broadcast an editorial on the subject of American education. This editorial concerns various reorganizational corrections in the educational system, including the advantage of the "voucher system" concept.

I believe it to be a very timely pene-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

trating commentary and I commend it to the attention of all Members:

A Good ALTERNATIVE

American education is going through a period of agonizing reappraisal. There is a growing feeling that somehow the schools—with their fancy equipment and scores of specialists—have failed to do the job. This week—parents, teachers and the state education office are discussing just how and what the schools are doing or not doing. In observance of American Education Week, these groups are leading discussions designed to take a look at fundamental education priorities, goals and concepts.

One concept they might consider during their meetings is the "Voucher System." As we've said before, there are various models of the plan but basically it works like this: parents pay their school taxes. Their local Board of Education in turn gives them a voucher. The parents then pick the school where they want their kids enrolled. That school may be public, private or parochial. The voucher pays for part or all of the tuition.

The advantages of this kind of a system over the present system are many. First of all, it gives parents a freedom of choice between schools. Second, it forces the schools to diversify and improve their programs in order to attract students.

Also—according to University of Chicago Professor Milton Friedman—"it permits gradual change. The existing schools would remain so long as they satisfied the demands of parents."

It is apparent, however, that parents are not satisfied. That's one reason they're "getting involved" in American Education Week. And that's one reason we urge them to think long and hard about the "Voucher System."

DICK LEWIS RECIPIENT OF THE NASSAU COUNTY PRESS ASSOCIATION'S GOOD NEIGHBOR AWARD

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 26 a dear friend and neighbor of mine, Mr. Dick Lewis, was awarded the Nassau County Press Association's Good Neighbor Award. As a salute and tribute to Dick, the following article from the Massapequa Observer is inserted in the RECORD.

DICK LEWIS NAMED FOR GOOD NEIGHBOR AWARD

There are in each community people who give unselfishly of their own time, energy and more often than not also money to serve their fellow men. They may be businessmen promoting their community, they may be members of service clubs, of civic organizations or governmental bodies such as school boards, they may be people involved in youth activities, they may be volunteers working for causes benefiting all of us.

Good neighbors are worthy of praise and recognition. And this is exactly what will happen on the evening of Friday, October 26, at the Lido Beach Golf Club, when the Nassau County Press Association, the organization of the county's weekly newspapers, presents its Good Neighbor Awards.

Each member newspaper selected one Good Neighbor from its community, who will be the newspaper's guest at this affair, which is also the Press Association's annual dinner-dance and installation of officers.

The Massapequa Observer's Good Neigh-

bor is Richard J. Lewis, the original Big Chief who more than any one individual helped to put the Massapequas on the map.

Born in Canarsie May 16, 1899, Land of the Great Canarsie Indian Tribe, the school of Richard James Lewis, Sr., came to an abrupt ending by a serious accident when he was 13. Constantly in pain, his only great hope was God. At 18 he gratefully accepted a watchman's job on 6 two family homes then under construction in City Line. With great patience and enthusiasm he finally sold the corner property and was paid a commission of 2½ per cent; \$750. He now launched into the real estate business in earnest when his father set up a small corner for him in his mother's front porch. At 22 he rented a 15x15 store at 9605 Glenwood Rd., Canarsie and with a rolltop desk, two chairs, a telephone and an old Standard car he was established as the youngest real estate broker in town. Many came to wish him success and to cheer on this crippled, stout hearted boy and thus he became called "Big Chief Lewis". He married at 26 on New Years Eve, had five children, is grandfather to 17 and is about to become a great grandfather. He worked long and hard and became well known as Big Chief Lewis throughout Brooklyn by his sincere, positive attitude. The war and depression almost ended a brilliant career but undaunted he kept his real estate office open and entered many other fields of endeavor. At one time he was president of eleven corporations. A flourishing coal and coke business was wiped out overnight by the oncoming unions, an automobile agency was a complete failure.

Flying became the rage of the nation and Dick began taking lessons at the old Curtis Field. After receiving a waiver from Washington because of his condition, he received his license, bought a plane and began to sell farms, top soil, sand and gravel through the country. Never idle, he assembled the parcel of land which was to become the Brooklyn Terminal Market and sold it to the City of New York.

For several years he had seven offices located in New York, Brooklyn and Long Island. Often a visitor to his Grandfather's farmhouse in Seaford, now the site of the 7th Pct. he decided to settle in Massapequa, the name and town fascinating him. He located at 2 Central Avenue and finally expanded to 4250 Sunrise Highway. Dick Lewis was the broker who advertised Massapequa as the Garden Spot of Long Island, the Miracle Mile of Long Island, and who had the nerve to set the price of \$1000. per foot for Sunrise Highway property. Everyone but Mr. Bill Martin of South Shore Fed. S & L thought he had taken leave of his senses. He spent much time, effort and money to put Massapequa in the spotlight of Long Island where it rightfully belongs. He became one of the most community-minded citizens and his donations to all good causes, charities and the needy are well known. As a handsome landmark for Massapequa, the 20 foot Indian Chief and 70 foot pole has become well known throughout the world as visitors from other lands come daily to photograph this unique grouping. Various schools bring youngsters by buses to view and admire this familiar scene. Massapequa has been very good to Dick Lewis but in return Dick Lewis has done his best to keep Massapequa in the forefront of Long Island and the world.

"PETE" WALKER—A MAN OF SPIRIT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, R. R. "Pete" Walker of Columbia, Ky., was a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

wonderful man of many talents. Although he and I were members of different political parties, we were personal friends; and our fathers before us were friends. He was an excellent newspaperman, and a most congenial soul. His son, John Walker, is an assistant in my congressional office. It is with sadness and a deep sense of loss that I include for the RECORD an account of his passing:

[From the Adair County (Ky.) News, Oct. 2, 1973]

A FRIEND HAS DIED: "PETE" WALKER WAS A MAN OF SPIRIT
(By Gordon Crump)

A friend has died. Pete Walker never aspired to be called anything more grand than Pete. He played down his own triumphs, and had no need of superficial fame or recognition.

For the better part of the past year we spent many hours a day together. Other Adair Countians may have known him longer, but the man I knew did not change from the first day we met, until we shared lunch two days before his death.

I marveled at this man's natural inclination to be jovial and kind, though he was intelligent enough and basically tough enough to deal with people in any way he wished to do. He chose kindness, and good humor.

He was a man of spirit and enormous energy. Many who knew him as a boy around his father's store at Gradyville saw him as a kind of all-American youth—fun-loving, sometimes a practical joker, but sure of himself and able to hold his own in any situation.

The man that grew from this boy was bright, studious, imaginative, practical, determined, self-sacrificing when the need arose, courteous, even-tempered, energetic, and afever, as well as a thinker.

The whole range of human events played against his consciousness. The foibles of man were not insulting to him, but rather humorous and deserving of the great understanding he was capable of displaying.

I admired his skill with words, and I think he saw some merit in my best work. Many times we collaborated on stories, he filling in the background while I did the more current points.

He knew instinctively the kinds of stories readers wanted. He had great insight into national and international politics because of his own political career, but he rarely wrote anything about these, preferring instead those folksy stories on someone who had done something superlative by growing the biggest pumpkin, or catching the largest fish. He believed the news of everyday people outweighed the sometimes-overestimated importance of "big news."

When a few months ago he began a regular program of exercise, he invited me to jog around the fairgrounds track with him. We talked politics, stopped to admire the giant oaks there and he told me stories of monumental horse races run on the track. I seldom noticed that we had jogged around the track three or four times, because I was in company of a man who enjoyed life—all of it from the folksy stories and events to the most complex theoretical discussions.

A few weeks ago we went to Gradyville and to the place where he was born. He knew all the stories—the old swinging bridge, the robbery of the bank next to his father's store—the building of the church and the way the road once ran. As we talked and looked, I thought I detected some sadness at his seeing these things again, and I wrote it off as the sadness which always comes upon one seeing changes in one's home community.

The absolute respect and admiration he

showed toward his partner, Ed Waggener, was returned in full measure because somewhere, perhaps long ago, the two men had become attuned to each other and the relationship grew into a silent agreement never to be petty or estranged in their relationship.

I admired his relationship with his family. Once when I stepped into his office to discuss some business matter, he was talking on the phone with someone, thoroughly enjoying every word and grinning that infectious grin. I realized he was talking with his wife, Edith, and that he was paying her high compliments on a dish she had made for his lunch.

Always in a hurry and trying to do many things at once, it was not uncommon for him to interrupt his work in mid-morning and with an expectant look on his face, pick up the phone and call one of his children. The conversations were good-natured, loving and respectful. He never failed to say something intended to cheer them or reassure them that he thought of them.

No one who saw them together could doubt his great love for his wife. He believed in the work she does, and gave her great credit for her role in the family. If she stopped by the office during the day, it was an event for him and the keen eyes danced and his face softened to a smile. This much we saw. He thoroughly admired his mother-in-law, Mrs. Horace Cundiff.

He was devoted to the newspaper business perhaps even more than to the chess-game of politics. He was good at what he did, and gave thousands of persons pleasure through the reading of what he wrote.

He was always accessible, to friend and stranger alike. The door to his office was rarely closed except upon the discussion of the most confidential aspects of the business.

He was comfortable with men, because he was sure of his own masculinity. He enjoyed arising early and was a member of the Early Coffee Club. Here, he engaged many local thinkers on a wide range of subjects, from the best way to cure cussaws to the lasting effects of Watergate. His opinions were always listened to and many times passed along to others.

And now he is gone.

One does not overnight replace a Pete Walker. He was an unique man, who charted his own path and played it by the most humane rules. He admired efficiency and brilliance, qualities he possessed to a high degree. He never sought recognition for the many things he did to help Adair Countians, from aiding a child to get into college to his major efforts, that never became public knowledge, in matters of roads, schools and health facilities.

He sought little for himself, but much for the Adair Countians he loved.

It will take a little more effort from the rest of us even to begin to fill the void left by his departure.

May God bless this fine human being.

WOLVES IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING, OR
KILLERS OF THE DREAM?

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, in the letter which follows a gentleman from El Paso, Tex., recapitulates in his local newspaper, the El Paso Herald, a dream which he had after watching the President's recent news conference. Mr. Stewart, the author of this letter, speculates

November 7, 1973

that the moose which was so viciously attacked by wolves in his dream may well be symbolic of events surrounding the President, that is the moose is the President of the United States and the wolves are symbols of the antagonism and viciousness of the news media. I wonder, though, whether this dream may just as well symbolically depict what is happening to our Republic as a consequence of ill-founded and irrational attacks.

The letter follows:

After the President's News Conference Friday Evening, I retired with mixed emotions, saddened by the events of recent months.

At 4 am Saturday morning I was awakened by a horrible dream. I found myself with a Canadian wild life conservation officer in the "Bush" of British Columbia. We were observing the fall migration of some of the birds of that area. He called my attention to a very large bull Moose that had been wounded by Trophy hunters—Timber Wolves had smelled the blood and were closing in. What followed was so very vivid and real that I awoke—my heart pounding with excitement—what happened seemed so very cruel—the wolves would dart in and out snapping and biting the wounded moose. My friend called my attention to the leader of the pack as he darted from behind, hamstrung, all the pack then moved in for the kill.

The dream was so very real that I decided to get up and write it down.

I can't say for sure that the Wounded Moose represents the President or the wolves represent the news media.

I don't put much stock in dreams and I don't dream very often but I just could not let this go untold.

R. JACK STEWART.

FOURTH ANNUAL GOOD SAMARITAN
AWARD AT ST. ROSE HOSPITAL

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 21, 1973, I had the pleasure of attending the fourth annual Good Samaritan Award presentation at St. Rose Hospital in Hayward, Calif. It was delightful to be present with the many people attending to honor all the nominees who had, by their concern for their fellow man, committed such unselfish and charitable acts.

The winner of this year's award is Mrs. Amparo Galindo, of Union City, who was nominated by Mr. Ben Torres, of the Tiburcio Vasquez Medical Clinic. Mrs. Galindo holds a full-time position as health counselor with the New Haven Headstart program. Yet she also assists many non-English-speaking people by translating for them at clinics and hospitals so they might receive proper medical attention. She has, on many occasions, used her own financial resources to purchase food and clothing for needy families in cases of emergency. She has also become familiar with the rules and regulations of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service in order to assist individuals in obtaining their U.S. citizenship. Mrs. Galindo is truly an example of the Good Samaritan.

Other nominees for this year's award were: Annie Fong, who serves as a tutor at El Rancho Verde School and is involved in activities supporting the Chinese-American Scholarship Fund; the Edwin Gowan family, who, together, have assisted families and individuals in times of bereavement or illness by cooking meals, babysitting, and generally easing the burdens of others; Charles R. "Dick" Sadler, who has given shelter to troubled boys and who has been instrumental in developing boys clubs in southern Alameda County; Pam Gerace and Carla Weaver, two young girls, whose swift action in assisting a heart attack victim to the hospital saved his life; Judge Thomas L. Foley, who has for years volunteered his time to many community projects, including the March of Dimes and the Hayward Boys Club; and Lorraine Souza, who has generously volunteered her time in a number of convalescent homes and has organized carolers to cheer hospital patients during the Christmas season.

It was particularly fitting that these people were honored at this time, and I hope their acts of charity will serve as a model for others who might feel that our world, faced with so many problems, cannot be changed by the act of just one individual. These individuals represent an inspiration and an example that we all should attempt to emulate.

"ST. ALBANS HOSPITAL SHOULD BE FOR HUMANS, NOT ANIMALS"
AN EDITORIAL BY WABC RADIO,
NEW YORK

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months Congressman JOSEPH ADDABBO and I have worked closely with Queens veterans groups to persuade the Defense Department not to simply shut down St. Albans Naval Hospital, but to convert it to a nursing care facility for veterans to fulfill the pressing needs faced by these worthy men and women.

We have encountered some foolish arguments about why Defense does not want to convert the hospital, and from time to time these bureaucratic bubble-heads come up with another hare-brained idea. Their latest proposal was to allow the Department of Agriculture use of the hospital for an animal quarantine center.

Defense has been confronted with stiff opposition to this idea, and WABC radio recently broadcast an editorial opposing this suggestion, and I insert their sound comments at this point in the RECORD: ST. ALBANS HOSPITAL SHOULD BE FOR HUMANS, NOT ANIMALS

When the closing of St. Albans Hospital was announced, everyone started talking about vets. But the word vets meant different things to different people. The Agriculture Department in Washington wants to turn the former naval hospital into an animal quarantine center and bring in veterinarians.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

But the people of St. Albans, Queens, along with the Mayor and the City planning Commission want a Veterans Hospital. Not enough has been done for the returning Vietnam Veterans in the New York metropolitan area. And one of the reasons very little has been done is that there hasn't been enough space. We hope the government sees the light and gives St. Albans, Queens, the much needed Veterans Hospital.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 42

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the person who recently said, "Outlawing handguns would make our job an awful lot easier," was not, as some people might think, a so-called "radical advocate" of gun control. His name is William Taylor, and he is the superintendent-in-chief of the Boston Police Department.

William Taylor's job is to find the killer after the murder has been committed. Members of Congress can make his job easier by passing strong gun control legislation. Every day we delay means the death of 12 more handgun victims.

Included below is a June 10 Boston Globe article by Nathan Cobb, quoting Chief Taylor, and the story of another murder from the October 28 New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 28, 1973]
GROCER KILLS A CUSTOMER IN AN ALTERCATION
OVER BILL

A 29-year-old Bronx grocer was arrested yesterday in the fatal shooting of a customer during an argument over a bill and in the unintentional wounding of a passenger in a bus passing by.

The police said the grocer, Elias Galarsa of 1465 Boston Road, became involved in an argument with Miguel Negron, 38, of 1010 East 178th Street, over a \$51 grocery bill. Mr. Negron reportedly struck Mr. Galarsa on the head with his fist, rupturing one of the grocer's ear drums.

Mr. Galarsa then allegedly drew a pistol and fired five shots, three of them striking Mr. Negron and two going wild, hitting a northbound No. 7 Transit Authority bus. One of the wild bullets passed through a bus window and through the hat of Thomas Montgomery, 30, of 2114 Belmont Avenue, cutting his scalp.

The grocer surrendered at the 48th Precinct station house and was charged with murder and illegal possession of a gun.

[From the Boston Globe, June 10, 1973]
HANDGUNS IN AMERICA—DESIGNED FOR DEATH

(By Nathan Cobb)

Every 13 seconds—about the time it takes to light a cigarette—someone in the United States buys a handgun.

And every 58 minutes, a handgun is used to kill a human being in this country.

Chances are very good that before you've finished reading this Sunday paper another man, woman or child will be dead or dying, shot by a handgun.

The Great American Handgun Boom, flourishing despite five-year-old Federal laws supposedly designed to curtail the nation's privately owned small arms arsenal, is being

matched by startling increases in handgun crime.

An in-depth *Globe* study, which revealed that 50 percent more handguns are being produced in the US since passage of the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act, has also discovered a corresponding leap in violent handgun use.

In comparing national violent crime statistics compiled three years before and three years after the passage of ostensibly stronger gun laws, these facts stand out:

Handgun murders jumped 87 percent between 1966 and 1971, while murders with other types of weapons rose at less than half that rate. In 1971, the last year for which the FBI makes such figures available, 8991 Americans were murdered with handguns—more than with all other types of weapons combined.

During the same period, 1966-1971, handgun murders of police officers more than doubled. In the decade from 1962 to 1971, records show, 530 of 722 murdered policemen—73 percent—were killed with handguns.

Aggravated assaults with firearms—of which the handgun is the most popular type—also doubled from 1966 to 1971. Meanwhile, aggravated assaults with all other types of weapons rose at less than half the gun rate.

Robberies by firearm nearly tripled between 1968 and 1971. The FBI estimates that roughly two out of three armed robberies are now committed with guns, and local law enforcement authorities confirm the handgun is the most popular robbery weapon.

The country's private cache of handguns stands at 30 to 40 million, with 2.5 million more being manufactured or imported this year alone. Four of 10 guns now being made in the US are handguns, and there is one handgun for every 1.5 American families.

In Boston, the capital of a state with one of the nation's strictest gun laws, 43 percent of the 377 murders committed since January 1970, have involved handguns. Last year, nine times as many people were murdered with handguns than with rifles and shotguns combined. Further, aggravated assault with a firearm in Boston has risen almost 50 percent since state laws regarding gun purchase were toughened in 1968, while armed robbery has more than tripled.

According to William J. Taylor, superintendent-in-chief of the Boston Police Dept., the handgun is far and away the most prevalent weapon used in all types of armed crime. "One of the major factors driving up the crime rate is the availability of handguns," Taylor said recently. "Outlawing handguns would make our job an awful lot easier."

That Boston's handgun murder rate is slightly lower than the national average may well be attributable to the fact that handguns are more difficult to acquire legally in Massachusetts than in most states. In any case, the FBI reports that there is a significant correlation between gun ownership and gun crime—the South, where gun ownership is highest, has the highest gun murder rate and the highest rate for aggravated assaults with firearms of any region in the country; the Northeast, with lowest gun ownership, has the lowest rates for such gun crimes.

Since 1967 at least three presidential crime commissions have linked violent crime to the stockpile of handguns in America, recommending solutions ranging from stiffer laws to an outright ban. The most famous the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, reported in 1969 that "Firearms, particularly handguns, facilitate the commission and increase the danger of most violent crimes—murder, robbery and assault.

"We believe," the commission, chaired by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, continued, "on the basis of all the evidence before us, that reduc-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing the availability of the handgun will reduce firearms violence."

Who kills with a handgun? According to Lt. Det. Jerome P. McCallum, acting head of the Homicide Bureau of the Boston Police Dept., the scenario for murder in the Hub goes like this: "Someone is drinking . . . there's an argument . . . a handgun is somewhere nearby . . . someone reaches for it . . . and a killing occurs."

Indeed, the FBI's 1971 Uniform Crime Report points out that "The significant fact emerges that most murders are committed by relatives of the victim or persons acquainted with the victim."

Adds McCallum a 15-year veteran of murder investigations "It's the availability of the blasted handgun, that's all."

At 1010 Commonwealth av., row upon row of handguns lines the walls behind the locked steel cage protecting the Firearms Identification Bureau of the Massachusetts Department of Public Safety. More are found inside several large metal drawers, and all have been involved in some type of firearms violation. Last year, the bureau investigated 708 cases, a 43 percent jump over two years ago. Ninety-four of the cases were fatal shootings.

Handgun murders in the United States

1966	4,805
1967	5,803
1968	6,825
1969	7,441
1970	8,221
1971	8,991

"I'd have to say that roughly three-quarters of the guns we see are handguns," Lt. Carl M. Majesky, head of the bureau, said last week. "We work on any crime involving firearms outside Boston, primarily identifying weapons, and we feel handguns are used so often in crime because they're concealable and convenient."

Across town, deep beneath the John F. Kennedy Federal Building, a similar scene is found in the storage room of the Boston district office of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Bureau (ATF) of the U.S. Treasury Dept. There, handguns by the dozens normally hang from the walls, most of them seized in undercover operations carried out against people selling guns illegally.

"The majority of guns we see and buy—in other words, most of the guns being dealt illegally—are handguns," admitted Arthur A. Montuori, special agent in charge. "But even though we make arrests, we don't get all the guns. They're still out there some place, on the illegal market." ATF, in fact, seized fewer than three weapons for every criminal case it initiated last year.

Some law enforcement officials claim that black market sales of handguns may equal legal transactions in number. In Boston, as in any American city, it is easy to get a gun if you want one: in bars, on the street, in well-known apartments.

But there is a striking fact about handguns used in crimes. While most are not owned legally, virtually all were at one time legal guns which were legitimately manufactured, probably in New England. Somewhere along the line, however, they were stolen from the manufacturer, the retailer or, most likely, in a housebreak. Many also came from neighboring states such as Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine, where laws regarding purchase are weak.

In Boston last year, only one of 43 handgun murders was alleged to have been committed by a legally registered owner.

"Guns used in crime almost always come through the black market," said McCallum, "and the black market originates in housebreaks and other types of robberies of legal

owners. So, in the end, the source for illegal guns is legal owners."

Despite the overwhelming statistics which link handgun ownership to violent crime, the handgun trade seldom meets trouble in the form of genuinely restrictive legislation. The business is locked firmly to the National Rifle Association (NRA), which claims 1 million devout members and warned in the February issue of "The American Rifleman," its monthly magazine, that "Communist leaders and their henchmen or unwitting tools continue to demand that U.S. citizens give up their guns . . ."

"Henchmen" and "tools" notwithstanding, the more than 60 bills that have been filed this year in both branches of Congress to amend the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act or add further restrictions to firearms pose little real threat to the handgun market.

Some are so innocuous they are backed by the gun lobby itself. Those with teeth are given little chance of passage.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy's Personal Safety Firearms Act of 1973, which would ban the domestic output of all hand-held firearms not designed for "sporting uses," is currently resting quietly in the Senate Judiciary Committee, where a similar bill died during the last Congress. There is little hope within the senator's office that it will be approved in its present form, and he is searching for a more popular bill with which to couple some of his currently proposed measures in amendment form.

An even stronger bill, filed by Sen. Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.) and proposing to ban all private ownership of handguns, is currently pending before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. But it is essentially a carbon copy of a measure defeated 87-7 last year on the Senate floor.

The closest shave the handgun business has had recently came in the form of a bill filed last year by Sen. Birch E. Bayh (D-Ind.) which proposed to ban the sale, importation and manufacture of certain small handguns. Aimed primarily at the new domestic manufacturers of so-called "Saturday Night Specials," those cheap handguns made with foreign parts, it passed the Senate by 68-25 on June 27, 1972, but died in the House without reaching a vote.

In Massachusetts, which passed the first gun control law in North America in 1962, attempts to toughen laws continue to go down to ignominious defeat. A 1973 bill prohibiting the sale and possession of handguns, except for or by members of the armed forces and law enforcement officials was reported unfavorably this year by a unanimous vote of the Joint Public Safety Committee.

This hardy perennial, sponsored by Sen. Jack H. Backman (D-Brookline) drew a vociferous and protesting group of 1000 gun owners to a public hearing Feb. 15. Another bill, sponsored by Rep. Peter F. Harrington (D-Newton), would have required the registration of handguns with a barrel length of less than six inches or an overall length of less than 18 inches. It was defeated in the House by a 151-70 margin.

What finally did pass were six bills, backed by gun owners, which increased penalties for violating various sections of the state's current gun laws.

"The opponents of strong gun laws are very well-organized," Sen. Backman explained recently. "But, the proponents who far outnumber the gun lobbyists, don't ban together. They just don't get excited."

National polls, in fact, have consistently shown the public solidly backs, stiffer gun laws. But the number of handguns—and the violent crimes in which they're used—continues to mount.

November 7, 1973

VICE-PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE FORD DISPLAYS FITNESS FOR LEADERSHIP

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the conduct of our colleague GERALD R. FORD during the Senate Committee hearings relating to his confirmation as Vice President of the United States—pursuant to the provisions of the 25th amendment to the U.S. Constitution—should bring pride to all of the Members of this House.

In addition, speaking in behalf of my Republican colleagues, I cannot help but observe that GERALD FORD provides the kind of fresh, open, and straight-forward impression which should and basically does characterize the public leaders elected from my party.

Washington Columnist David S. Broder has written a most complimentary article in behalf of GERALD FORD, which I call to the attention of my colleagues and particularly those from my side of the aisle.

Mr. Broder sets forth in eloquent literary style the outstanding attributes of GERALD FORD which qualify him for the future role of Vice President and for executive leadership of our Nation.

The article follows:

GERALD FORD: TRADITION AND CIVILITY

In this season of troubles in Washington, welcome reassurance is coming from the personality and performance of that comfortably familiar figure—Gerald R. Ford.

As the Vice President-designate and heir apparent to a severely beleaguered President, the gentleman from Grand Rapids is the man on the spot. He is the key figure in an unprecedented experiment, testing whether a government of divided partisanship can make an untried provision of the Constitution operate in a climate of pervasive public distrust.

His conscientious preparation, his evident cooperativeness and his candor are making his confirmation hearings an occasion in which the country can not only learn something of the character of its new Vice President but relearn the value of one of its oldest traditions—the tradition of civility.

Ford's second sentence to the Senate Rules Committee was: "I feel that I am among friends." That is a rather remarkable thing for the Republican leader of the House to say to a committee of the Democratic Congress, which is not only sitting in judgment on him but is taking preliminary steps to remove from office the Republican President who appointed him.

But it is a statement that springs naturally to Ford, who operates, under any circumstance, in a tradition of civility, of mutual accommodation, of respect for persons and institutions.

This unwritten tradition underlies the written Constitution, but it has been badly battered in these recent years, as one President lashed out at opponents of his war policies and his successor compiled an "enemies list."

Whatever his shortcomings, in intellect, oratory, or wit, Gerry Ford is one of the most decent human beings in Washington. He is not a hater, nor is he under a constant compulsion to prove his own worth by dominating and downgrading others.

The qualities he has displayed in his confirmation hearings—and in 25 years in Congress—may be just what the doctor ordered for this badly battered Republic. A congressman's wife who watched his testimony on television remarked that he reminded her of Eisenhower. He lacks the personality and the smile that made it so easy to "like Ike," but that flat Midwestern voice and that open face encourage trust.

When he says, as he did, that "my platform, gentlemen, is always to support truth and intelligent compromise," you know that is the authentic Ford credo—and not a line some public relations adviser furnished.

A House colleague, enlisting support for his confirmation among Democrats, says he has been surprised to learn how many members of the opposition "really do consider Gerry a personal friend." Such friendships are rare among congressmen of opposite parties, and particularly among those whose leadership roles require them to operate, as Ford has, in a highly partisan fashion.

But Ford does not let partisanship carry to the point of personal enmity. It is inconceivable that his office would compile an "enemies list." As remarked previously here, his style of leadership in the House has been genuinely open and consultative. As Vice President or President, he testified, he would continue to make himself accessible to members of Congress and the press.

Even in the stress of this current situation, he has deliberately reached outside his own circle for guidance. In advance of the hearings, he sought out a group of certified "eggheads" and told them he was concerned that his reputation as a non-intellectual not be taken by them as a sign that he was anti-intellectual. He seemed genuinely relieved at being told that the very fact that he had sought such a meeting went a long way toward establishing the point he wanted to make.

A colleague in the Republican leadership says, "We learned very quickly that Gerry does not like to make decisions alone." A Ford administration would be an exercise in collective leadership.

Those members of Congress who know him best are unanimous in their belief that should Ford become President, he would seek to continue the main lines of the Nixon foreign and domestic policy—détente abroad and decentralization at home.

He would try to keep Henry Kissinger and Melvin Laird as chief foreign and domestic policy lieutenants knowing full well that both men are more guileful and sophisticated than he is himself.

What Ford would bring to such a government is the simplicity and honesty and openness and benignity that have been missing so long from the White House.

As the awareness of those qualities in him has sunk in, the hunger for their restoration in national leadership has grown. "The sooner the better" doctrine now applies, not just to Ford's confirmation for the vice presidency, but to the step beyond.

LOUIS WARD STANGER: A RETIRED BAPTIST MINISTER

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a retired Baptist minister. In it he enclosed a poem, the content of which I think is noteworthy and poignant. Our country today needs

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

more dedicated ministers such as Louis Ward Stanger:

To Dr. TIM LEE CARTER: IN APPRECIATION
The letter you wrote and dated the third, Of July, I acknowledge, altho I am late; The time has flown by like a high, flying bird, And I am ashamed as I look at the date.

But, believe me, altho these words may belie My good intentions I hoping that you Will realize Mrs. Stanger and I In this very brief note are saying "thank you."

Sixty years! It's hard for us to believe it. But, believe it or not, each year we can trace; Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could retrieve it,

And live it again with much greater grace? That we know, of course, is impossible; still The thot, tho it's fanciful, wont go away; But this we can do, God helping us, fill With honor and dignity what's left today.

AN INDEPENDENT SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an article that appeared in this morning's New York Times. It is written by Raoul Berger, the eminent constitutional scholar at Harvard, and it succinctly rebuts doubts about the constitutionality of a court-appointed special prosecutor. Mr. Berger points out that the executive branch cannot be expected to investigate itself, and that court appointment is expressly provided for in article II, section 2 of the Constitution. He further points out that any other construction would produce an absurd vacuum, and reminds us that the Constitution should never be construed in that fashion.

At a time when the Judiciary Committee is giving careful consideration to the legislation that I and 113 cosponsors have introduced to authorize court appointment of a special prosecutor, I believe Mr. Berger's commonsense reasoning should commend itself to all of us in the Congress. I, therefore insert his article at this point in the RECORD:

THE PROSECUTOR

(By Raoul Berger)

CONCORD, MASS.—It is generally agreed that the appointment of a special prosecutor to carry on the task begun by Archibald Cox is indispensable to restoration of confidence in the administration of justice. The nation cannot tolerate the spectacle of a potential defendant in the Presidency dictating to a prosecutor how far investigation may go. Acting Attorney General Bork's protestation that he means to be utterly independent in pursuing the Watergate and related investigations furnishes even less security than was furnished by the express charter of independence given to Mr. Cox by Attorney General Richardson.

As the Supreme Court stated in *Humphrey's Executor v. United States*, "one who holds his office only during the pleasure of another, cannot be depended upon to maintain an attitude of independence against the latter's will."

With good reason, therefore, has public

sentiment crystallized in favor of a statute that would establish a special prosecutor as an agency completely independent of the President, to be appointed by a court. The power of Congress to establish independent agencies is indisputable; power to vest appointments in the courts is expressly conferred by Article II, Section 2(2) of the Constitution: "Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments."

Prof. Alexander Bickel argues that "the prosecutorial function belong[s] solely to the executive branch and 'judicial power is not compatible with the exercise of hiring, firing and, for all I know, of supervising of prosecutors.'" It is a mistake to regard the prosecutorial function as immovably embedded in the executive branch. In *Ex parte Seibold* (1879), the Supreme Court said that a marshal, for instance, an "executive officer" ordinarily appointed by the President, is yet "preeminently an officer of the courts," whose appointment could be vested in the courts. As a lawyer, a special prosecutor is no less an officer of the court, who closely shares in its administration of justice. It was objected in *Seibold* that "the Act of Congress imposes upon the Circuit Court duties not judicial, in requiring them to appoint supervisors of election, whose duties, it is alleged, are entirely executive in character."

Commenting on Article II, Section 2(2), the Court stated. "It is no doubt usual and proper to vest the appointment of inferior officers in that department of the government, executive or judicial, or in that particular executive department to which the duties of such officers appertain. But there is no absolute requirement to this effect in the Constitution. . . ."

Had the framers considered that appointments and functions fell into ironclad compartments, they would have lodged all "executive" appointments in the President. Instead they gave him quite limited powers of appointment and left the bulk of the appointment power in the discretion of the Congress. They left Congress free, in the present extraordinary circumstances, to place a prosecutorial function outside the executive department when quite plainly it could not be trusted to investigate and prosecute itself.

Those who have been ready enough to argue for an illimitable power of removal—a power nowhere mentioned in the Constitution, which was the subject of protracted controversy in the first Congress, and which argument is discredited by Madison's statement in that debate that the President would be impeachable "for the wanton removal of meritorious officers"—should not be too quick to place limits upon the express and unqualified Congressional power to vest appointments in the courts.

Particularly is this true when the result of an illiberal interpretation is to insulate the close aides of the President and the President himself—70 per cent of the American people believe that he was implicated in the Watergate cover-up conspiracy—from full and independent investigation. For centuries it has been a canon of interpretation that even express terms must give way when a given application produces absurd or unreasonable results. Implied powers stand no higher.

To insist that the President must investigate and prosecute himself, for that is what the argument for executive control of prosecution boils down to, is plainly unreasonable. The power of appointment and the separation of powers were not designed to obstruct justice.

Let our guide be the utterance of Congressman Bland in the first Congress. Faced

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EPA SPEAKER

with the fact that the Constitution made no provision for removal, he said, "it was essentially necessary that such a power should be lodged somewhere, or it would be impossible to carry the Government into execution."

Somewhere there must exist power to provide for an independent special prosecutor to carry forward an untrammeled investigation of White House participation in a criminal conspiracy. Without straining, it can be found in Article II, Section 2(2). It follows that a statute authorizing a court to appoint a special prosecutor would be constitutional.

NATIONAL RIVER ACADEMY APPOINTS 27 TO THIRD CLASS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the National River Academy is training the rivermen of America to man the inland waterways of the United States, and to move the commerce that is vital to the Nation.

On October 25, 1973, the New Orleans Times-Picayune reported the activities of the NRA. I commend the directors, officers, personnel, and supporters of the academy for an outstanding service that they perform for a great and dynamic Nation which depends on our rivers for transporting the needs of our people.

The article follows:

NATIONAL RIVER ACADEMY APPOINTS 27 TO THIRD CLASS—SEVEN NEW CADETS FROM LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI

(By Capt. Thon-as L. Lewis)

The National River Academy, Helena, Ark., has announced the appointment of 27 men to its third river cadet class, which will commence training on Oct. 28. This class makes a total of 51 participants in the cadet training program.

"Making up the largest class in the academy's history, the new cadets represent ten states bordering the inland river system, from Louisiana to New York. Almost half have previously worked as river deck hands, and more than one-third have completed some college work," it was stated.

BILOXI MEETING

The Rivers and Harbors Association of Mississippi says a record number of leaders from the state interested in water resources and in the development of waterways and conservation will attend the 16th annual meeting. The meeting is scheduled for Nov. 1-2 at the Sheraton Hotel in Biloxi.

President Thompson Pound said the program committee of the convention requests advance reservations be made directly with the Sheraton. Donald Colmer of Jackson, Miss., who is chairman of the board, is serving as the program chairman.

For their exceptional work during the 1973 flood the Corps of Engineers, along with the Mississippi River Commission, is being honored.

The featured speaker at the luncheon on Friday, Nov. 2, will be Maj. Gen. Charles Noble, president of the Mississippi River Commission.

To be honored at the luncheon also will be Gen. Carroll LeTellier, South Atlantic Division Engineer of the Corps in Atlanta, and Gen. Harry Griffith, Southwest Division Engineer of the Corps in Dallas, Tex.

November 7, 1973

opinion on this grave matter. Therefore, I would appreciate your responding to the question below. Your prompt reply is requested and you need not indicate your name and address if you prefer.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF.

DO YOU FAVOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES?

Yes, —; No, —; No opinion, —.

Name _____

Address _____

Thank you very much for taking the time to participate. I am grateful for having your opinion which I will transmit to the House Judiciary Committee.

CHANCELLOR DEAN E. McHENRY TO RETIRE AFTER NEARLY FOUR DECADES OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, California has long been recognized as a leader in the field of higher education—a reputation earned through the combined efforts of many individuals.

Foremost among those who have dedicated their lives to providing California students with a system of learning, second to none is a man who is about to retire after nearly four decades of service to Californians in the field of higher education—Dean McHenry, the chancellor of the University of California at Santa Cruz.

Dean E. McHenry has devoted his life to building the future of California by improving, refining, and strengthening the quality of higher education in California. For 37 years he has contributed his visions, hard work, and leadership to nearly all facets of education.

He first joined the University of California system as a faculty member at UCLA in 1939. Later he served as dean of social studies and chairman of the Political Science Department at that campus.

It is, however, in his role as the first and only chancellor at Santa Cruz that he will be most remembered. After serving a 3-year term as dean of academic planning for the UC system, he was appointed chancellor of UC Santa Cruz in 1961. As the president of the University of California system, Charles J. Hitch, recently stated,

It is hard for me to think of the Santa Cruz campus without Dean McHenry.

I would echo and amplify these words for the chancellor has been planning and organizing the campus from its very conception.

For those of you who have been there, I am sure that you will agree that this campus, which overlooks the Monterey Bay, is one of the most beautiful in our Nation. In addition to the esthetic beauty of this area, the university has earned a reputation for academic excellence. As one of the founders of the Adlai E. Stevenson College, I am proud of my per-

CONGRESSMAN WOLFF POLLS HIS CONSTITUENTS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert in the RECORD the text of a questionnaire I am sending to every resident of my congressional district asking their opinion on the current Judiciary Committee inquiry into the legal grounds for impeachment proceedings.

I believe it is extremely important that we be aware of how our constituents think about this most serious matter.

Dear Friend and Constituent,

The most pressing issue facing this nation today is the question whether or not the President should be impeached.

As a result of the rising tide of American public opinion and at the request of numerous members of the House of Representatives, the Judiciary Committee has begun an examination of the grounds for possible impeachment.

As your representative in Congress, I believe it is my responsibility to ascertain your

November 7, 1973

36303

sonal association with this campus and Chancellor McHenry.

I support the view of the chairman of the University of California Regents, Dean A. Watkins, that the university and the people of California owe Chancellor McHenry a tremendous debt. We are indeed grateful for his outstanding contribution, and are fortunate that a man of his caliber has dedicated his life for the benefit of his fellow citizens.

I am certain that his wife, Jane, who has worked along with him during these many years of public service and their four children, are looking forward to his well-deserved retirement at the end of this school year in order that he might spend more time with their six grandchildren.

Although we will all miss him at UC Santa Cruz, his mark impressed upon our education system will long be remembered.

OLD NORTH REFORMED CHURCH

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year, the Old North Reformed Church, in Dumont, N.J., is celebrating its 250th anniversary. This occasion, I believe, once again underscores the indomitable spirit that sustained our forbears during their darkest days in the new world. Today, Old North Reformed stands as a solemn tribute to our heritage of faith.

Located at the intersection of Madison and Washington Avenues, Old North Reformed is a familiar Bergen County landmark. Originally, the church was a small octagonal structure, located near its present site. Members of the first congregation were mostly Dutch farmers.

The present structure was built in 1801. The steeple and interior are considered to be outstanding examples of Dutch-Colonial architecture. In 1926, when the steeple was struck by lightning, the entire community turned out to help rebuild it.

The people of Dumont and the entire State are proud of Old North Reformed; the church is a tribute to the principles of perseverance and pride.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record excerpts from an article dealing with this historic church. The article, which appeared in the New York Times October 28, provides additional insight into the story of Old North Reformed. The excerpts follow:

Old North was founded in 1724, but it has already begun a year-long 250th birthday party.

The Dumont church, a county landmark at the intersection of Washington and Madison Avenues and the "mother" of Reformed churches in Westwood, Oradell, Cresskill and Bergenfield, began its life in a little octagonal sandstone edifice not far from its present location.

The Dutch settlers, practically all of them farmers, brought their own chairs. Their children and slaves occupied benches around four of the church's eight sides.

The present building was constructed in 1801 under the supervision of Peter Durie,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

for a time a resident of Teaneck. Its slender, graceful steeple and oak-beamed interior are said to represent the finest type of Dutch-Colonial architecture in America.

Worship was in Dutch, slaves were relegated to benches in the balcony and, because there was no heat, parishioners brought their own foot warmers. Not until 1836 were stoves installed in the four corners of the building.

The original pews and their knee-high doors, which helped keep out the cold, are still used. So are the slave benches.

Families bought the best pews—in the center of the sanctuary—at auction. Less desirable locations were rented.

In 1859, Old North was enlarged by extending its altar and choir loft into a cemetery in the rear of the church. The new choir stalls were built over the graves.

The chipped and broken gravestones in the little churchyard reflect the country's early Dutch influence, for there are names such as Blauvelt, Westervelt, Brinkerhoff, Van DeLinda and Demarest.

Col. Isaac Nicholl and Peter Lozier, revered as Revolutionary War heroes, are both buried in the back of the Dumont church.

When the church steeple was hit by lightning in 1926, the whole town, including Protestants, Roman Catholics and Jews, turned out to help rebuild it.

The Rev. Dr. Albert H. Van Dyke has served as pastor of Old North for the last 15 years.

OFFICE OF WATERGATE SPECIAL PROSECUTOR FORCE

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I would suppose that many of you have received communications regarding the appointment of Mr. Leon Jaworski as special prosecutor and, more specifically, the scope of his special functions, duties, and responsibilities, and how he may be removed from office.

The Executive order in this regard is printed in today's Federal Register, volume 838, No. 214. I insert herewith the Federal Register notification with respect to the establishment of the Office of Watergate Special Prosecution Force for the information of all concerned:

[Title 28—Judicial Administration, Chapter I—Department of Justice, Order 551-73; Part O—Organization of the Department of Justice]

Establishing the Office of Watergate Special Prosecution Force

By virtue of the authority vested in me by 28 U.S.C. 509, 510 and 5 U.S.C. 301, there is hereby established in the Department of Justice, the Office of Watergate Special Prosecution Force, to be headed by a Director. Accordingly, Part O of Chapter I of Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended as follows:

1. Section 0.1(a) which lists the organization units of the Department, is amended by adding "Office of Watergate Special Prosecution Force" immediately after "Office of Criminal Justice."

2. A new Subpart G-1 is added immediately after Subpart G, to read as follows:

SUBPART G-1—OFFICE OF WATERGATE SPECIAL PROSECUTION FORCE

Sec.

0.37 General functions

0.38 Special functions

Authority: 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, and 5 U.S.C. 301.

SUBPART G-1—OFFICE OF WATERGATE SPECIAL PROSECUTION FORCE

§ 0.37 General functions.

The Office of Watergate Special Prosecution Force shall be under the direction of a Director who shall be the Special Prosecutor appointed by the Attorney General. The duties and responsibilities of the Special Prosecutor are set forth in the attached appendix below which is incorporated and made a part hereof.

§ 0.38 Specific functions.

The Special Prosecutor is assigned and delegated the following specific functions with respect to matters specified in this subpart:

(a) Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 515(a), to conduct any kind of legal proceeding, civil or criminal, including grand jury proceedings, which United States attorneys are authorized by law to conduct, and to designate attorneys to conduct such legal proceedings.

(b) To approve or disapprove the production or disclosures of information or files relating to matters within his cognizance in response to a subpoena, order, or other demand of a court or other authority. (See Part 16(B) of this chapter.)

(c) To apply for and to exercise the authority vested in the Attorney General under 18 U.S.C. 6005 relating to immunity of witnesses in Congressional proceedings.

The listing of these specific functions is for the purpose of illustrating the authority entrusted to the Special Prosecutor and is not intended to limit in any manner his authority to carry out his functions and responsibilities.

Dated: November 2, 1973.

ROBERT H. BORK,
Acting Attorney General.

APPENDIX—DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

The Special Prosecutor. There is appointed by the Attorney General, within the Department of Justice, a Special Prosecutor to whom the Attorney General shall delegate the authorities and provide the staff and other resources described below.

The Special Prosecutor shall have full authority for investigating and prosecuting offenses against the United States arising out of the unauthorized entry into Democratic National Committee Headquarters at the Watergate, all offenses arising out of the 1972 Presidential Election for which the Special Prosecutor deems it necessary and appropriate to assume responsibility, allegations involving the President, members of the White House staff, or Presidential appointees, and any other matters which he consents to have assigned to him by the Attorney General.

In particular, the Special Prosecutor shall have full authority with respect to the above matters for:

Conducting proceedings before grand juries and any other investigations he deems necessary;

Reviewing all documentary evidence available from any source, as to which he shall have full access;

Determining whether or not to contest the assertion of "Executive Privilege" or any other testimonial privilege;

Determining whether or not application should be made to any Federal court for a grant of immunity to any witness, consistently with applicable statutory requirements, or for warrants, subpoenas, or other court orders;

Deciding whether or not to prosecute any individual, firm, corporation or group of individuals;

Initiating and conducting prosecutions, framing indictments, filing informations, and handling all aspects of any cases within his jurisdiction (whether initiated before or after his assumption of duties), including any appeals;

Coordinating and directing the activities

of all Department of Justice personnel, including United States Attorneys;

Dealing with and appearing before Congressional committees having jurisdiction over any aspect of the above matters and determining what documents, information, and assistance shall be provided to such committees.

In exercising this authority, the Special Prosecutor will have the greatest degree of independence that is consistent with the Attorney General's statutory accountability for all matters falling within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. The Attorney General will not command or interfere with the Special Prosecutor's decisions or actions. The Special Prosecutor will determine whether and to what extent he will inform or consult with the Attorney General about the conduct of his duties and responsibilities. In accordance with assurances given by the President to the Attorney General that the President will not exercise his Constitutional powers to effect the discharge of the Special Prosecutor or to limit the independence that he is hereby given, the Special Prosecutor will not be removed from his duties except for extraordinary improprieties on his part and without the President's first consulting the Majority and the Minority Leaders and Chairmen and ranking Minority Members of the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives and ascertaining that their consensus is in accord with his proposed action.

STAFF AND RESOURCE SUPPORT

1. *Selection of Staff.* The Special Prosecutor shall have full authority to organize, select, and hire his own staff of attorneys, investigators, and supporting personnel, on a full or part-time basis, in such numbers and with such qualifications as he may reasonably require. He may request the Assistant Attorneys General and other officers of the Department of Justice to assign such personnel and to provide such other assistance as he may reasonably require. All personnel in the Department of Justice, including United States Attorneys, shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the Special Prosecutor.

2. *Budget.* The Special Prosecutor will be provided with such funds and facilities to carry out his responsibilities as he may reasonably require. He shall have the right to submit budget requests for funds, positions, and other assistance, and such requests shall receive the highest priority.

3. *Designation and responsibility.* The personnel acting as the staff and assistants of the Special Prosecutor shall be known as the Watergate Special Prosecution Force and shall be responsible only to the Special Prosecutor.

Continued responsibilities of Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division. Except for the specific investigative and prosecutorial duties assigned to the Special Prosecutor, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division will continue to exercise all of the duties currently assigned to him.

Applicable departmental policies. Except as otherwise herein specified or as mutually agreed between the Special Prosecutor and the Attorney General, the Watergate Special Prosecution Force will be subject to the administrative regulations and policies of the Department of Justice.

Public reports. The Special Prosecutor may from time to time make public such statements or reports as he deems appropriate and shall upon completion of his assignment submit a final report to the appropriate persons or entities of the Congress.

Duration of assignment. The Special Prosecutor will carry out these responsibilities, with the full support of the Department of Justice, until such time as, in his judgment, he has completed them or until a date mutually agreed upon between the Attorney General and himself.

[FR Doc. 73-23693 Filed 11-6-73; 8:45 am]

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WE MUST HAVE AN INDEPENDENT SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee has completed its hearings on the bills to create a special statutory prosecutor to continue the work begun under Mr. Archibald Cox. If there is any one thing that is clear in the confusing situation we find ourselves in, it is that a truly independent prosecutor is absolutely essential if public confidence in our legislative system is to be restored.

The promises of the White House, to the effect that the new special prosecutor, Mr. Leon Jaworski, will not be dismissed without the approval of congressional leaders of both parties, mean little following the President's breach of similar promises regarding the independence of Special Prosecutor Cox. As the Akron Beacon Journal said in a recent editorial:

Too many people followed orders without question in the Nixon Administration.

Moreover, Mr. Nixon has announced that he in no way is yielding the legal right to dismiss any employee of the executive branch.

Recently, a member of my staff, Mrs. Melanie Fein, on her own initiative, located a statement by President Nixon himself in his famous "Checkers" speech of 1952, which makes a persuasive case that no Presidential appointee can be trusted to clean up the "mess" that Mr. Nixon's administration has made. Mrs. Fein included the statement in a letter to the editor which appeared in the Washington Post of November 6.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the Akron Beacon Journal editorial of October 30 and Mrs. Fein's letter to the Post for inclusion in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Oct. 30, 1973]

ONLY A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR WITH NO CHAINS WILL DO

If President Nixon didn't get the message from Cox, Richardson and Ruckelshaus, maybe acting Atty. Gen. Robert H. Bork can get through to him.

If not, Congress, bolstered by support from an angry American public, stands ready to deliver it loud and clear. The message: Nothing less than a truly independent special Watergate prosecutor will suffice.

Bork is making it known he has no intention of playing any part in a White House plan to name a new special prosecutor—wrapped in the same old chains which had bound Archibald Cox.

That seems precisely what President Nixon had in mind. Friday he said Bork would name a new prosecutor who would get "total cooperation" from the White House.

But it soon became clear that Nixon is ready to climb back into the trenches. "We will not provide presidential documents to a special prosecutor," he said.

We salute Bork for refusing to jettison his principles despite what must be enormous White House pressure. Clearly, a new face in the same old White House straitjacket can't be nearly good enough for the public

November 7, 1973

or Congress. People want the truth, not more cover-ups.

Alexander Haig, President Nixon's aide, defends the White House plan for a new prosecutor as fair. But we expect nothing else from a military man who got where he is by following orders.

Too many people followed orders without question in the Nixon administration. That's how Watergate was allowed to happen.

If the President is serious about demanding the power to control the Watergate investigation, the cease-fire he achieved by surrendering his controversial White House tapes will be short-lived.

It was because Cox did not have the independence he was promised that Nixon was faced with one of his gravest crises. Cox's firing by Nixon for balking at White House orders to rein in his investigation touched off America's first serious talk of impeachment in a century.

The Mideast crisis may have temporarily taken some public notice away from the issue, but the people are still angry about the Cox incident. A repeat could boil the controversy over.

Congress—and the public, we think—isn't about to buy the idea of another chained-up prosecutor, one the White House will "co-operate" with—and also command. Surely the President, a wise politician, must see that.

The last thing Richard Nixon needs is another slugfest with the courts or Congress, because the public is no longer in his corner on this issue. Nixon desperately needs to build confidence. He can't do it by stringing up another puppet prosecutor and dangling him in front of the American people, telling them he is "independent."

If the President is unwilling to follow the advice of Republican Congressional leaders and name an independent prosecutor, Congress or the courts will have to do it instead.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 6, 1973]

MR. NIXON'S ADVICE

The case for a special, independent prosecutor to investigate Watergate was persuasively stated by President Nixon himself in his famous "Checkers" speech in 1952. Contending that Presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson could not be trusted to clean up the corruption growing out of the Truman administration, the then Senator Nixon stated:

Take the problem of corruption. You have read about the mess in Washington. Mr. Stevenson can't clean it up because he was picked by the man, Truman, under whose administration the mess was made.

You wouldn't trust the man who made the mess to clean it up. That is Truman. And, by the same token you can't trust the man who was picked by the man who made the mess to clean it up, and that is Stevenson. And so I say, Eisenhower, who owes nothing to Truman, nothing to the big-city bosses—he is the man who can clean up the mess in Washington.

Likewise, neither President Nixon nor any presidential appointee can be trusted to clean up the Watergate "mess" that his own administration has made.

MELANIE FEIN.

Washington.

RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT ISRAEL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, during this most merciless war between the

Arab nations and Israel, the United States has readily provided Israel with the weapons she needs to defend herself.

Many of Philadelphia's private organizations and public figures alike have announced their support of Israel, and I am pleased to state that the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, Order Sons of Italy has unanimously adopted a resolution in support of the United States continuing policy of supplying the Israelis with assistance.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a copy of this resolution which was sent to the President:

ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA,
GRAND LODGE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., October 25, 1973.

HON. RICHARD NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, Order Sons of Italy in America, I am pleased to advise you that the Grand Council of the Grand Lodge unanimously adopted and promulgated the following Resolution on Friday, October 19th, 1973:

"Whereas, Egypt and Syria committed an unprovoked and premeditated attack against Israel on Yom Kippur, the most solemn and holy day of the Jewish year; and

"Whereas, this diabolical attack, aided and abetted by the U.S.S.R. violated not only international law but every common ethical standard of humanity; and

"Whereas, the State of Israel is a bastion of democracy and a beacon for oppressed peoples in the Middle East; and

"Whereas, it is in the interest of the United States of America to protect the integrity of Israel and to maintain Israel's deterrent strength by insuring the balance of power in the Middle East; and

"Whereas a true and lasting peace is now, as it has been in the past, the only sensible goal for United States policy in the Middle East;

"Therefore, be it resolved that the Grand Council of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, Order Sons of Italy in America, representing over 100,000 Americans of Italian descent, vigorously supports the present policy of the Government of the United States to provide Israel with whatever assistance is required to defend herself; and

"Resolved, further, that the aforesaid Grand Council urges the United States to continue its efforts to achieve a firm ceasefire and to seek immediate direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States which will hopefully lead to a just and durable peace and which will provide for Israel secure, recognized and defensible borders."

We sincerely trust and pray that the purposes and goals of this Resolution are given serious consideration by your Administration.

Respectfully submitted,
FRANK J. MONTEMURO, Jr.,
Grand Venerable.

TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation amending title II of the Social Security Act in-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

creasing to \$7,500 the amount of allowable outside earnings.

Under present law, a social security recipient's benefits are reduced if earnings exceed \$200 per month.

In these days of rapidly rising costs, we all recognize that social security income in and of itself is often inadequate to meet the basic necessities of our older citizens. Our social security laws are outmoded when they result in penalizing retirees after working so many long hard years and contributing so much to achieve social security status.

By imposing a low income ceiling, our older people are discouraged from seeking part-time employment enabling them to supplement their incomes in order to maintain a decent standard of living. Moreover, such archaic restrictions result in cutting off a vital labor force in our society. By forcing them out of the work force, our senior citizens are deprived of the opportunity of making further contributions to society.

Accordingly, I invite my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this measure to enable our older Americans, who have contributed so much to our Nation, to enjoy their retirement with dignity.

TRIBUTE TO SHERIFF JOHN HOYT AND DEPUTY RICHARD DAVIS

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on October 26, I was privileged to add my praises to those of the citizens of San Augustine County, Texas, at ceremonies held to honor Sheriff John Hoyt and Deputy Richard Davis. Those men each suffered loss of one eye during a shootout last July which left one woman dead and five persons wounded.

Although San Augustine is not a part of the Second Congressional District of Texas which I represent here in Congress, I served its citizens for 6 years in the Texas State Senate, and I know that the courage, dedication to duty, and personal sacrifice that so clearly mark Mr. Hoyt and Mr. Davis are not atypical of the character of the people of East Texas.

At this time, I would like to insert the text of my speech before the citizens of San Augustine as a way of introducing Sheriff Hoyt and Deputy Davis to my colleagues in the House, and also to remind us all that honesty, courage, and sacrifice are still very much a part of the American people.

SPEECH OF HON. CHARLES WILSON

You know, politicians in Washington always make a grand show of coming back to their districts to talk with their constituents, to listen to what they have to say. It's called "taking the pulse of the country," as if we were all Congressional surgeons or something who then could rush back to Washington and prescribe whatever miracle medicine the country needed.

This is all well and good, I guess, at least in theory. But in the past few weeks I suspect many of you have thought of going

to Washington to take our pulse up there before the condition gets much worse. Perhaps a tourniquet around the nation's capitol before the infection spreads or something.

That's why it's so wonderful to come back to San Augustine where you don't just feel the pulse of the country, but you can touch instead the very life's blood of democracy. Here in the gentle piney woods, in the cradle of Texas liberty and heritage, in the oldest town in Texas, you can learn that America's heart is still beating strong.

It was from here, from all these pleasant country towns around San Augustine, that Gen. Sam Houston's First Army of the Republic of Texas found the men who marched on San Jacinto. It was from here, with that proud victorious army, that a tradition, a legacy, of courage and sacrifice was first established.

We are here today to honor and give witness to the fact that that tradition still lives in the piney woods. Sheriff John Hoyt and Deputy Richard Davis, in the humble act of carrying out their public trust, have provided an example of bravery and sacrifice that would have made Sam Houston proud.

It was the kind of act, on their part, that restore the confidence of all of us in our forms of government. And I wish I could have carried with me all of my fellow Congressmen to meet with you, because their own faith needs strengthening.

A few years ago, the supreme law enforcement officer in the nation told the American public to "watch what we do, not what we say." In the years since—years that have seen many grand pronouncements on law and order—we have finally come to learn just what it was they were doing all that time. The very man who made that statement is now under indictment for what he was *doing* while he was *saying* he supported law and order.

In view of this background, it is heartening to return from Washington, where rhetoric often has the force of reality, to a place where there is no conflict between doing and saying, where one doesn't need to search beneath the rhetoric to find the substance, to a place where law enforcement is practiced instead of merely preached.

It takes no great courage to give a speech for law and order. You take no risks in doing so, and you can always count on loud applause. Likewise, there is no danger involved in passing harsh laws or in denouncing criminals. There is always another man, a braver man, who must enforce those laws and apprehend those criminals. It's easy to be a general in the war against crime: it's the men in the front lines, men like John Hoyt and Richard Davis and, yes, men like Sam Houston, who will always win our wars for us, who will always heed that call to duty.

As our country passes through one of its most trying times, one of its great crises, it is good that we can look out and still see men like this, men who hold a public trust to be greater than private gain. In Washington, a week ago today, an Attorney General of the United States, and his deputy, resigned their high offices rather than betray their public trust and break a solemn oath. Here, today, we honor a sheriff and his deputy who ran greater risks and paid equal prices in order to uphold their public trust.

It is here, in the beautiful piney forests of East Texas, where one can find true law enforcement. John Hoyt and Richard Davis do not hold press conferences or give speeches on national television. They do not say one thing while doing another, do not mislead the people who put them in office with a barrage of rhetoric. They simply and humbly do what you elected them to do: they enforce the law, even when they do so at great cost to themselves.

You should be proud of them, and proud of yourselves as well, because it is in places like this, and with men like this, that the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 7, 1973

Integrity of our country can survive. And it is, of course, that same honor and integrity that is the foundation of true law and order.

When I go back to Washington next week to do the job you elected me to do, I will have done a great deal more than just felt the pulse of my constituents. Because I have found that here, in the heart of America, we are strong and healthy, and we still respect our public trusts. That is a powerful medicine for the nation's ills, and that is what I take back to Washington.

TRUCK POLLUTION: AN OMISSION

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on October 25 of this year, I spoke about an article in the New York Times which alleged that the trucking industry had managed to avoid necessary stringent antipollution regulations by the Environmental Protection Agency. My remarks may be found on page 35027 of October 25, 1973, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article itself was supposed to have been in the Extensions of the RECORD but was inadvertently omitted. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 13, 1973]
TRUCKS ESCAPE STRINGENT POLLUTION CURBS

WASHINGTON, October 12—Many a pedestrian, engulfed in fumes, smoke and soot from a passing truck or bus, has wondered if anyone is trying to stop the noxious belching.

In fact, very little is being done. The nation's 23 million trucks, which are driven almost constantly, have escaped stringent antipollution regulation by the Government.

The trucking industry's success at avoiding tough regulation has been called the "most effective coup that industry has pulled off on the Environmental Protection Agency," according to a trucking representative quoted in a staff memorandum circulating through the agency.

The representative—an official of the Cummins Engine Company, Inc., one of the largest truck engine makers indicated, according to the memo, that the company was cutting back its efforts to curb pollution "due to speculation that E.P.A. had no intention of instituting" rigorous antipollution rules on trucks for several years.

Emission standards for trucks and buses have been set, but rules covering some pollutants are eight or nine times more stringent for cars than they are for heavy-duty trucks. The environmental agency has delayed issuing tougher regulations on heavy trucks until a "substantive" new test procedure can be developed.

According to the Cummins representative, as noted in the memo—the environmental agency is committed to a long project to find a new test procedure, which is bound to result in additional delays and could postpone instituting controls for heavy-duty engines for years.

Eric Stork, a deputy assistant administrator of the environmental agency, predicted that new regulations for trucks would be in effect by 1977 or 1978, but apparently the industry is counting on a later date. Some officials of the agency do not expect the new standards until 1979 or 1980.

Mr. Stork explained that it was much more complicated to set pollution standards for trucks than for automobiles. Cars have relatively standard equipment, he said, but there is an "incredible diversity with trucks."

Most trucks are tailor-made, he said. There are only about a half-dozen truck engine manufacturers, Mr. Stork said, but trucks have a wide variety of carburetors, transmissions, wheels, exhaust systems and other equipment.

Another factor is that the amount of weight a truck carries varies widely, he said.

NOT PRACTICAL

"We have to prove the emissions' effects on air quality" from all these different trucks, before new standards are set, Mr. Stork said. "We have an enormous amount of work to do to figure out how to control trucks," he maintained, because "it isn't practical to control emissions on trucks as we do with cars."

Heavy-duty trucks have been regulated by the environmental agency since 1970; light-duty trucks since 1968.

Light-duty trucks—campers, pickups, four-wheel drive vehicles or any trucks under 6,000 pounds—undergo the same tests as automobiles. The exhaust standards that light trucks will have to meet by 1975 are more lenient than standards for cars in 1975, even though many of these trucks have the same engines as passenger cars.

As a result, light-duty truck manufacturers will not have to install an expensive anti-pollution device called a catalytic converter, an item car manufacturers will be adopting.

The regulations that heavy-duty trucks will have to meet by 1974 developed from a test procedure devised by the trucking industry in California.

"The controls now are based on unsatisfactory testing," Mr. Stork acknowledged.

An example of the difference between the regulations for cars and trucks is the amount of carbon monoxide they are allowed to emit.

A heavy-duty truck with a gasoline engine meeting E.P.A. standards would be emitting about 130 grams per mile of carbon monoxide while an automobile would be limited to a maximum of 15 grams per mile, under the 1975 standards.

Diesel-powered trucks could emit about 34 grams per mile of nitrogen oxides, according to an estimate by the E.P.A., while cars could emit only 2 grams per mile.

Department of Transportation figures show there are 23 million trucks and 100 million cars on the road.

chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, our distinguished colleague, WILLIAM A. BARRETT, and I commend it to the attention of all of my colleagues at this time:

How CAN WE HOUSE OUR POOR?

For years, many Americans have pondered the question: "How can we House our Poor?" Since the late 1930's, however, we have, while we have pondered, also been doing something to house our Nation's disadvantaged. The Public Housing program is responsible for 1114 units of Public Housing in Portland, and the Federally subsidized 235 and 236 moderate income program is responsible for several hundred more units in Portland and vicinity. None of the programs which provided for this development were perfect, but all contributed in their way to alleviate the critical housing shortage for many families and senior citizens.

Since January of this year, however, the Federal Government has stopped all programs to provide housing for poor and moderate income Americans. In January, the President called for a moratorium on all subsidized housing programs terming them expensive, inefficient and unsuccessful. After 10 months of "study", he proposed that all three of these subsidized housing programs, i.e., public housing, the 235 purchase program which subsidized the mortgages of lower income families down to one per cent thus allowing them to purchase a home of their own, and the 236 program which subsidized developers' mortgages down to one per cent in exchange for a promise that their units rent for low rental amounts, be done away with.

As an alternative, the President proposed that he would at some time in the future send to Congress a Housing Allowance system under which cash would be given directly to low and moderate income families so that they could purchase their own housing on the private market. This legislation, would not, he said, be forthcoming until 1974 or 1975, and could not be enacted until 1976.

After enactment, the program would begin as an experiment in a few cities with a selected Senior Citizen target population, and if it worked, it would be expanded to include increasing numbers of people until all needy Americans were covered by the system. For those of us involved in housing the nation's poor, the President's announcement was received with skepticism and very mixed emotions. Let me elaborate.

First, there was no need for an 18 month moratorium. With minor modifications, and a tightening up on abuses in the programs in a few large cities, the existing programs could have been continued, until a new program had proven itself. Stopping the existing programs until a better system could be developed makes no more sense than not eating anything because steak is too expensive. In the latter case you would starve; in the former you live in a condemned house.

Even if there was no break in the continuity of our housing programs, the housing allowance is not the answer. Giving subsidies to low and moderate income families to allow them to purchase housing on the private market would work well if there was enough housing on the market to go around. Unfortunately there are not enough housing units. In Portland, the vacancy ratio is only four units out of every hundred. At least twice that many would be needed for even a moderately successful housing allowance program. And even with the higher vacancy ratio, families and senior citizens of limited means will suddenly be able to compete for more choice housing with those of higher incomes driving already expensive housing costs even higher.

Your housing costs and mine will go up, and the subsidy needed by low income families attempting to compete in the same market will of necessity have to increase. New housing constructed to meet the new

HOW CAN WE HOUSE OUR POOR?

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the executive director of the Portland, Maine, Housing Authority, John S. Dexter, Jr., addressed the members of the Portland Women's Rotary Club on the subject of the Federal Government's role in housing our Nation's low- and moderate-income citizens. In his thoughtful and cogent remarks, Mr. Dexter argues convincingly against the current administration's housing allowance system as a simple substitute for the sections 235 and 236 housing programs under the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Rather, he urges, in a carefully considered response to the question "How Can We House Our Poor?" that the 235 and 236 programs be retained, but in significantly modified forms. Mr. Dexter's suggestions are worthy of careful consideration. I have already sent a copy of his address to the

demand will be financed with mortgages in excess of 9% as is currently the case again driving the cost of housing even higher. And each year, in an inflationary economy, the size of the housing subsidy must grow placing a bigger and bigger burden on the Federal Government, and indirectly, the taxpayer.

In summary, then, the housing allowance program, proposed by the Administration, rather than alleviating the plight of the poor, will instead raise the price of all our housing while taking an ever increasing bite from our pocket books through ever increasing taxes.

Despite a price tag which I believe is unacceptable, the housing allowance does have strong advantages from a social point of view which I believe are essential for a successful housing program. By allowing low and moderate income families to live anywhere they can find suitable housing, it would, if used on a large scale, eliminate large concentrations of low income, often hard core families. Further, it would tend to mix socio-economic groups thus reducing tensions and social conflicts between income strata. The old nemesis of public and subsidized moderate income housing, the crowding of large low income families together into a small space so that their bad habits can re-enforce each other, would be eliminated.

Before I give you my personal answers to the question: "How can we House our Poor?", it is essential that I briefly answer the President's charges that Public Housing is wasteful and inefficient, and that it does not solve the problem. The current average per unit operating cost of a Portland Housing Authority Unit is \$62.00 per month.

Forty per cent of that cost is for utilities. I do not believe that that is a wasteful or inefficient expenditure. In addition to this figure, we must, with Federal Government help, retire the mortgages on our buildings. As of yesterday, the interest rate on these mortgages was under 5 1/2% due to their tax exempt status. This is 4% below the current market rate which a private developer would secure and thus our amortization costs are lower.

To make the picture look even rosier, our tenants pay us on the average \$51.00 per month in rent. Thus our net subsidy, exclusive of mortgage retirement, is only \$11.00 per unit each month. And, to counter the charge that public housing construction costs are exorbitant, I would point out that our last two projects cost us \$20,000 per unit and \$15,000 per unit respectively, including streets, sidewalks, sewers, and community building space.

Now, "How can we house our poor?" If you can accept my contention that the construction of public housing and moderate income 235 and 236 housing is cheaper in the long run than a housing allowance, and yet feel, as the Housing Authority and I do that large concentrations of low income families do a dis-service to the families and the Community, then I believe you will agree with my conclusions.

First, the Federal Government must continue to develop housing. This is the only way to expand our housing stock at reasonable cost.

Second, we must stop building large concentrations of low income housing, and start building single units or small clusters of 10 units or less, or, as a further alternative, we must mix income groups in all Federally assisted housing including FHA insured.

Third, when there is an expanding housing market with Government help to allow enough slack, we should add to our arsenal of weapons the housing allowance on a limited basis, it would be especially useful for families who are almost, but not quite able to afford private market housing on their own.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fourth, and most importantly, we must stop building housing as we have for the last 200 years. The only way to truly lower housing costs, is to lower the cost of the housing itself. To do this, we must develop a mass producable, factory manufactured dwelling unit constructed from the latest plastics, fiberglass, and metals. We must then adopt a nationwide building code which will make such a home acceptable to local code enforcement officials. I believe that a nation that can put a man on the moon and spend millions on an SST that never got beyond the mock up stage can use those same now vacant plants and skilled technicians to build the universal, reasonably priced housing unit.

That, I believe, is "How we can House our Poor."

ALASKA MARINE MAMMALS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 has occasioned a great deal of comment, some of it favorable, and some of it critical. During the August recess, I and several members of my subcommittee went into the field to look into the question.

One of the hearings that we held was in Anchorage, Alaska, and a principal issue of concern in the course of those hearings was the question of the proper control of native taking. It is clear that Alaskan Natives depend to a great extent upon the taking of marine mammals for subsistence. It was not the purpose of the act to inhibit this activity, but it was the purpose of the act to prevent wasteful and poor management practices.

The Department of the Interior has recently prepared a document highlighting the act as it applies to Alaska Natives, and answering several of the questions that have been raised. The summary is useful and the answers to the questions are helpful and imaginative responses in areas of ambiguity in the act. I commend the Department for its actions in this regard:

NATIVE EXEMPTION HIGHLIGHTS OF THE MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1972 AND REGULATIONS

Date of enactment: October 21, 1972.

Effective date: December 21, 1972 (on this date the moratorium takes effect).

Jurisdiction: Department of Interior: Walrus, sea otters, polar bear, and manatee.

Department of Commerce: Seals, whales, sea lions, and porpoises.

Moratorium: On December 21, 1972, except as otherwise specified, there will be an indefinite complete cessation of the taking of marine mammals and a complete ban on the importation into the United States of marine mammals and marine mammal products.

Native exemption to moratorium: The provisions of this Act shall not apply with respect to the taking of any marine mammal by any Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo who dwells on the coast of the North Pacific Ocean or the Arctic Ocean if such taking—

(1) is for subsistence purposes by Alaskan natives who reside in Alaska, or

(Subsistence means the use by Alaskan Native of marine mammals taken by Alaskan Natives for food, clothing, shelter, heating, transportation, and other uses necessary to maintain the life of the taker or for those

who depend upon the taker to provide them with such subsistence.)

(2) is done for purposes of creating and selling authentic native articles of handicrafts and clothing,

(Authentic native articles of handicrafts and clothing means items made by an Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo which (a) were commonly produced on or before December 21, 1972, and (b) are composed wholly or in some significant respect of natural materials, and (c) are significantly altered from their natural form and which are produced, decorated, or fashioned in the exercise of traditional native handicrafts without the use of pantographs, multiple carvers, or similar mass copying devices. Improved methods of production utilizing modern implements such as sewing machines or modern techniques at a tannery registered pursuant to 18.23(c) may be used so long as no large scale mass production industry results. Traditional native handicrafts include, but are not limited to, weaving, carving, stitching, sewing, lacing, beading, drawing, and painting. The formation of traditional native groups, such as cooperatives, is permitted so long as no large scale mass production results.)

(3) in each case, is not accomplished in a wasteful manner.

(Wasteful manner means any taking or method of taking which is likely to result in the killing or injuring of marine mammals beyond those needed for subsistence purposes or for the making of authentic native articles of handicrafts and clothing or which results in the waste of a substantial portion of the marine mammal and includes without limitation the employment of a method of taking which is not likely to assure the capture or killing of a marine mammal, or which is not immediately followed by a reasonable effort to retrieve the marine mammal.)

Definitions: 1. *Alaskan Native* means a person defined in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. Sec. 1603(b) (85 Stat. 588) as a citizen of the United States who is of one-fourth degree or more Alaska Indian (including Tsimshian Indians enrolled or not enrolled in the Metlakatla Indian Community), Eskimo, or Aleut blood, or combination thereof. The term includes any Native, as so defined, either or both of whose adoptive parents are not Natives. It also includes, in the absence of proof of a minimum blood quantum, any citizen of the United States who is regarded as an Alaska Native by the Native village or town of which he claims to be a member and whose father or mother is (or, if deceased, was) regarded as Native by any Native village or Native town. Any such citizen enrolled by the Secretary pursuant to Section 5 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act shall be conclusively presumed to be an Alaskan Native for purposes of this part.

2. *Native village or towns* means any tribe, band, clan, group, village, community.

3. *Take* means to harass, hunt, capture, collect, or kill, or attempt to harass, hunt, capture, collect, or kill any marine mammal, including, without limitation, any of the following: The collection of dead animals or parts thereof; the restraint or detention of a marine mammal, no matter how temporary; tagging a marine mammal; or the negligent or intentional operation of an aircraft or vessel, or the doing of any other negligent or intentional act which results in the disturbing or molesting of a marine mammal.

Restrictions: (1) No marine mammal taken for subsistence may be sold or otherwise transferred to any person other than an Alaskan Native or delivered, carried, transported, or shipped in interstate or foreign commerce, unless:

It is being sent by an Alaskan Native directly or through a registered agent or reg-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

istered tannery for the purpose of processing, and will be returned directly or through a registered agent to the Alaskan Native; or It is an edible portion and it is sold in a native village or town in Alaska.

No marine mammal taken for purposes of creating and selling authentic native articles of handicraft and clothing may be sold or otherwise transferred to any person other than an Indian, Aleut or Eskimo, or delivered, carried, transported or shipped in interstate or foreign commerce, unless:

It is being sent by an Indian, Aleut or Eskimo directly or through a registered agent to a registered tannery for the purpose of processing, and will be returned directly or through a registered agent to the Indian, Aleut or Eskimo; or

It has been first transformed into an authentic native article of handicraft or clothing; or

It is an edible portion and it is sold (A) in an Alaskan native village or town or (B) to an Alaskan Native for his consumption.

(2) No person shall use any aircraft to take any marine mammal in violation of 16 U.S.C. 742j-1, 85 Stat. 480, Pub. L. 92-159.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, whenever, under the Act, the Secretary determines any species or stock of marine mammals to be depleted, he may prescribe regulations pursuant to Section 103 of the Act upon the taking of such marine mammals by any Indian, Aleut or Eskimo and, during the existence of such regulations, all takings of such marine mammals by such persons shall conform to such regulations.

Summary: In brief this means Congress has made special provisions for Alaska Natives to continue taking marine mammals for their way of life; however, they require the people to use all of the animals they kill.

Every effort must be made to bring in the meat of all walrus taken and does not allow the killing of animals for just the tusks. It allows the sale or barter of ivory between Natives but does not provide for non-natives to buy, acquire, or possess ivory or any other parts of marine mammals until they have been transformed into authentic native articles of handicraft or clothing. This includes polar bear hides.

COMMON QUESTIONS

1. Can Natives now kill sea otter?

Sea otters have been protected since 1911 and were not commonly used for subsistence or articles of handicrafts or clothing on December 21, 1972. Apparently, Congress did not intend to allow the Natives to create any new industries, but rather to maintain a true subsistence type of life style, if they so chose. Therefore, the answer would have to be no.

2. Is it legal for a native to ship marine mammal skins for the purpose of tanning and then subsequently return the skins to Alaska for use in manufacturing traditional items?

Yes. Provided, if they are sent directly to a registered tannery or agent within the United States which may possess and process marine mammal products for Indians, Aleuts or Eskimos.

3. Is it legal for a native to give, barter, or sell raw ivory, or polar bear hides to a non-native?

No. In order to give, barter, or sell marine mammals to non-natives, the raw material must be changed into an authentic native article of arts or crafts. This applies only to animals taken after December 21, 1972.

4. Is it legal for a native to give, barter, or sell seal hides, ivory, or polar bear hides to another native?

Yes.

5. Is it legal to use aircraft to take and transport polar bear?

Aircraft cannot be used in the taking; however, they can be used for transportation.

6. Is it legal for a native living in the Interior to go to the coast, set up a tent and hunt?

Yes. This is legal. A tent or wherever he is staying is considered his dwelling place. The question arises because the Act states that only coastal dwelling Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts can take marine mammals.

7. Are State regulations requiring sealing of polar bear hides still in force?

Yes. The State will continue to seal polar bear hides as they have done in the past.

8. Do the regulations covering "take" apply to beach dead animals?

Only Natives can take beach dead animals. Walrus tusks, whale bones, etc., can only be sold after they have been turned into authentic native arts or crafts.

9. Can a non-Native who is married to a Native woman take marine mammals for subsistence for his family?

No. The Act is very specific on this issue and makes provisions for only Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos to take marine mammals.

10. Can Natives hunt walrus on or around Walrus Islands (Togiak Area)?

The State of Alaska has set aside the Walrus Islands and adjacent waters as a State Game Sanctuary and prohibits the killing of walrus there. The Marine Mammal Act does replace State Hunting Regulations and allows Natives to take marine mammals at any time for subsistence purposes. However, since the State owns the Islands and adjacent waters, it can prohibit trespassing and thus not allow anyone in that area.

11. Who enforces the Marine Mammal regulations?

Federal Agents of both National Marine Fisheries Service (Department of Commerce) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Department of Interior). In addition State Fish and Wildlife Protection officers have been deputized authorizing them to enforce the provisions of both Commerce and Interior regulations. Violations will be handled in Federal Courts.

TESTIMONY ON NOMINATION OF GERALD R. FORD

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege Monday to testify before the Senate Rules Committee with respect to our colleague and friend, GERALD R. FORD. I thought perhaps others may wish to enlarge or comment on that testimony which follows:

TESTIMONY ON NOMINATION OF GERALD R. FORD TO BE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I testify before you today from perhaps a different standpoint than the other friends and colleagues of Jerry Ford who have appeared before the Committee.

First, in the nearly six years I have been privileged to serve in the Congress, I have found myself quite often in disagreement with the positions and views Congressman Ford has expressed. This has been true particularly during the past three years, when Jerry, as Minority Leader, in view of his own concept of the responsibilities of a Minority Leader, has been required to advance the President's cause in a substantial number of cases where the check-and-balance respon-

November 7, 1973

sibilities of the Congress have been in direct conflict with White House positions.

We have had vigorous disagreement and debate on issues as fundamental as the Vietnam War, the ABM, the SST, and criteria for impeachment, both of Justice Douglas and the President, and of congressional responsibility to ascertain the truth from the executive branch.

It is precisely because of Jerry Ford's conduct in these disagreements, however, that I feel he is perhaps as qualified as any individual I know to be Vice President of the United States. Should fate or the constitutional process of impeachment so require, I believe Jerry Ford would be an able President of the United States, and perhaps the best kind of President we could have at this stage in our history.

In this connection, I would like to suggest that the key criteria of leadership essential to the nation today are integrity, calm judgment, humility and the ability to draw people together without rancor despite their differing views. This last quality is a unique aspect of Jerry Ford, one which I have never seen excelled by any of the able leaders I have observed, whether in business, in political life or in combat.

There is a basic trust which Jerry Ford inspires in those who work with him, a trust which is rare in an individual who is in constant confrontation with shifting political coalitions and with individuals of deeply-held views on serious issues.

I have puzzled over just exactly what it is in Congressman Ford which has occasioned my own faith and trust in his leadership. With some hesitancy, I would like to suggest the thought that it stems from an absolute and almost painful honesty on his part, an honesty which goes to the very best of our tradition and roots in the history of the American midwest.

You as Senators, and I as a Member of the House, are trained to be skeptical of the fluent phrase and the well-articulated argument. We know how easy it is to be less than precise—to seek to be politic and satisfy all viewpoints with a comment which displeases no one yet says nothing of substance. Time and again, in difficult floor debates, or in personal conversations with colleagues, I have seen Jerry resist the soothing, less-than-exact words which might have won the battle of the hour, but left resentment in retrospect on the part of those he has asked to follow his leadership.

An example of Jerry's service in this regard occurred in the historic House debate on June 29 of this year when the House voted to end the Vietnam War by a vote of 204 to 204.

In the debate on the floor, appears the following question and answer:

Mr. McCLOSKEY. "Mr. Chairman, do I understand correctly that under this bill which would authorize bombing to be continued up to August 15 the White House is committed when this bill is enacted and signed into law that all bombing would cease on August 15, that all military activity in and over Laos, Cambodia, and North and South Vietnam would cease unless the President came back to the Congress and asked for and obtained authority to commence military activity?"

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. "That is my understanding."

A lawyer will immediately perceive the lack of clarity or commitment in the phrase "That is my understanding."

Later in the debate, just prior to the vote, Jerry spoke again:

"Mr. Chairman, I just finished talking with the President himself for approximately 10 minutes, and he assured me personally that everything I said on the floor of the House is a commitment by him."

This precision of language and legislative history of course represents a major contri-

bution to the law of the land, since "an understanding" has been replaced by a clear and exact commitment, one of immense importance at this hour of uncertainty in Southeast Asia.

I have seen him fight hard fights, with the ultimate decision resting on a handful of votes of those of us who, in Jerry's mind, were standing in the way of a crucial victory on a major issue. Never once have I seen him threaten, offer promise of reward, or in any way act in less than the manner all of us would hope a great statesman would act in the best of our national traditions.

This is a real leadership in its own right, a leadership which could perhaps do more to restore the faith of our people in these difficult times than any brilliance, political skill or charisma which might be the attributes of other able leaders who might be nominated for the Office of Vice President.

A further quality I would like to mention is the inherent humility of Jerry Ford, his capacity to admit mistakes and to accept blame.

For too long, I think, have we sought to defy our national leaders. A President is a man, not a god. His task is to see that the laws are faithfully executed, not to rule as some sort of emperor with divine guidance. A little humility in the White House could be a refreshing thing.

I would like to comment on one other matter of which I have had personal experience, the comments of Robert Winter-Berger in his book, *The Washington Pay-off*.

In April, 1971, I came back from a trip to Vietnam and Laos, dedicated to challenging the Administration's Vietnam policy in the Republican primaries in the event no better qualified Republican came forward to do so. I felt strongly about our Vietnam policy and was likewise concerned by what seemed to me an increasing pattern of untruthfulness and corruption on the part of the Nixon Administration.

At the San Francisco Airport, I happened to buy one of the first copies of Mr. Winter-Berger's book detailing a series of experiences Mr. Winter-Berger had had while serving as a Washington lobbyist. I was particularly interested in the specific examples Mr. Winter-Berger described relating to Republican practices, practices in which Congressman Ford's office was prominently mentioned.

I called Mr. Winter-Berger and he met for more than an hour in my office in the Longworth Building. We went over, in some detail, his experiences with Jerry Ford, with my attention and questions seeking to probe for any conduct on Ford's part which would justify citation as examples of political corruption of the type I was claiming as typical of Richard Nixon's past political history, items such as the 1956 Hughes loan, the 1962 California gubernatorial campaign misrepresentation and the like.

At the conclusion of the interview, I had reached the opinion that even accepting the facts Mr. Winter-Berger related as being true, I could not conclude from those facts that there was a single instance of wrongdoing on Jerry Ford's part. I had no reason to disbelieve any of Mr. Winter-Berger's allegations and placed reliance on what he said; nevertheless, I did not feel his conclusions from those facts could be construed as supportive of any allegation of misconduct.

In conclusion, I have said before that I have puzzled sometimes over exactly what it is about Jerry Ford that causes me to like him so well and respect him so much. Whatever his qualities are, they have inspired my own complete trust, faith and respect.

I believe those qualities will possibly also go a long way in restoring the public's faith in our system of government, a faith which, in my judgment, is our most priceless asset as a nation. Thank you.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EPA AND THE ENERGY CRUNCH

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency recently conducted hearings involving two Indiana power companies, Public Service Indiana and Northern Indiana Public Service Co. On the day prior to the commencement of the hearings, October 17, 1973, the president of Public Service Indiana, Mr. Walter J. Matthews, released a statement, the text of which I wish to include in the RECORD. Since the citation of Public Service Indiana for violation of air pollution guidelines, Mr. Matthews has been under threat of imprisonment and heavy fines. Yet the demands made by the EPA are not possible to meet. As an example of the threat EPA poses to the well-being of the American people, I present Mr. Matthews' statement on clean air:

STATEMENT BY WALTER J. MATTHEWS, PRESIDENT, PUBLIC SERVICE INDIANA

Everybody's for clean air.

The electric utility industry included. Matter of fact, few industries have done more or invested more heavily in air quality improvement. We all want clean air but we in the energy business don't think regulatory tangle and strangle is the way to achieve it.

Here's the problem as it relates to two electric power plants in Indiana—plants that help provide energy to nearly 900,000 customers: Northern Indiana Public Service Company's Bailly Station near Chesterton . . . and Public Service Indiana's Wabash River Station north of Terre Haute.

The Environmental Protection Agency has cited both utilities for allegedly failing to comply with the 1970 Clean Air Act at these two plants. EPA says the plants are in violation of the state's Air Pollution Control Regulation 13 governing sulfur dioxide emissions. It threatens top officers with imprisonment and stiff fines. EPA claims neither utility has complied with the implementation plan of the Clean Air Act. APC 13 sets a January 1975 deadline for installation of effective sulfur dioxide removal equipment on all stationary sources.

We challenge this action by EPA on both a legal and common sense basis.

Public Service Indiana sought and has been granted a variance from sulfur dioxide regulations at its Wabash River Station by the Vigo County Air Pollution Control Board. This variance was approved by the State Air Pollution Control Board, which previously had granted similar variances at four other coal-fired plants of the company and at the coal-fired plants of Northern Indiana Public Service.

These variances recognized the fact that sulfur dioxide removal equipment is not commercially available and will not be available to meet the January 1, 1975, installation deadline.

At the time of the EPA citation, legal challenges of APC 13 and EPA's arbitrary approval of the state's implementation plan were pending in both federal and state courts. The EPA citation ignores these pending actions that question the very constitutionality of the regulations.

That's the legal basis for our position. Now let's turn to the common sense side of the issue.

First, it is essential to realize that there is no evidence that public health hazards are presented by the operation of these power

stations. Indeed, there is no indication that emissions from these plants violate applicable state regulations. Monitoring data provided by the Vigo County Health Department indicate that the quality of ambient air—that is, the air people breathe—in the Terre Haute region is well above acceptable standards.

Hear what Mark Sutton, director of the Vigo County Air Pollution Control Board, says in granting a variance for Wabash River Station: "A continuing factor in allowing this variance is that all ambient air sampling for sulfur dioxide which has been done in the past two years indicates that we are not exceeding the primary or secondary ambient air standards for sulfur dioxide."

Indeed the quality of air in Terre Haute today is dramatically better than it was only a few years ago when coal was the primary fuel heating homes and offices throughout the area.

The Clean Air Act sets nationwide emission standards and gives little recognition to wide variations in geography and economic development from area to area. What makes sense in New York City or Los Angeles doesn't automatically make sense in Terre Haute or in Michigan City.

EPA's inflexible approach to air quality standards imposes tremendous cost burdens on energy users without corresponding benefits. To require heavy investment to protect the corn fields of Vigo County to the same degree that you would protect the densely populated urban areas doesn't make much sense.

We simply cannot see or measure any adverse effect on vegetation or wildlife around any of our generating stations. Agricultural productivity in Vigo County has increased over the years, not declined.

One of Indiana's largest livestock operations is located some five miles from Public Service Indiana's largest generating station. There has been no observable impact on this operation from the nearby power plant.

EPA emission standards, in our opinion, were not set with any real scientific precision or based on defensible documentation. They are arbitrary and they virtually assure unnecessarily high corrective costs in relation to any benefits.

APC 13 requires that sulfur dioxide removal equipment be installed and in operation by January 1975. Let's assume for the moment that we were to charge full speed ahead toward this goal. And let's assume that commercially proven sulfur dioxide removal systems were available—systems that have demonstrated through extended full-service performance that they would do all they were designed to do. (While vendors claim such equipment is available today, we have found none who will guarantee their performance claims and back them up with meaningful warranties.) Let's assume, too, that such equipment were already ordered, designed, fabricated and delivered to Wabash River Station . . . at the site ready to be installed.

Even this would not permit us to meet the deadline.

Installation of such equipment would of necessity be scheduled unit by unit so that the station could continue to supply essential energy to meet customer power needs. Installation of sulfur dioxide removal systems on all six generating units at this plant would require an estimated 60 months to complete. Testing and final adjustment would further extend the timetable.

I would now like to touch upon the economic impact of this regulation. It is estimated that the cost of installing sulfur dioxide removal equipment at present state-of-the-art efficiencies would amount to some \$60 million at Wabash River Station alone. Extending similar equipment across the board to all Public Service Indiana plants would result in tremendous cost that would affect every customer we serve. Our customers'

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

electric bills would be increased by approximately 25%.

Now if this vast outlay of money would produce real and corresponding benefits to the public, utilities such as Public Service Indiana and NIPSCO would certainly move forward to get the job done. But we hate to see the forced installation of untried and unproven systems which, with further development, could be upgraded in efficiency and reduced in cost.

Capital costs stay imbedded for a long time. Customers will be helping us pay for this equipment long after more enlightened environmental approaches may say there's no need for it—or obsolescence forces its abandonment.

Now lest what I have said so far suggests that we are dragging our feet and only reluctantly working toward practical solutions to sulfur dioxide removal, may I offer a brief rundown of what we have been doing.

In June 1972 NIPSCO joined with EPA to build a \$10 million sulfur dioxide removal demonstration unit at its Mitchell Station in Gary. It also has been test-burning low sulfur Western coal.

Since 1966 Public Service Indiana has been participating in research in sulfur dioxide removal. Wheelabrator Corporation installed a demonstration system at one of our stations; worked for 2½ years before concluding that the process was not commercially adaptable.

Since 1969 our company has been a part of the Babcock & Wilcox/Esso effort to control sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions with a dry sorbent process.

Beginning in 1971 our company supported research by Combustion Engineering that led to installation of a demonstration unit at a plant of Louisville Gas & Electric. While this process looks very promising it remains in preliminary test stage and requires much more time and study to demonstrate its efficiency and reliability.

Two years ago Public Service Indiana with the support of NIPSCO and eleven other utilities became a partner with Westinghouse, AMAX Coal, Peabody Coal Company and the Bechtel Corporation in a coal gasification project aimed at finding a practical way to remove pollutants from coal through gasification prior to fueling electric generating units. We're optimistic about this process and expect it to lead to a full size demonstration unit being built at our station south of Terre Haute.

And finally, even with our serious reservations about the present state of the art of sulfur dioxide removal, we have made a commitment to install a scrubber module at our new Gibson Station slated for operation in 1975. To begin with, one-ninth of the total gas flow from this unit will be directed through the scrubber and if it performs satisfactorily the system might be extended to the entire plant.

Utilities aren't perfect. We don't know all the answers. But we have demonstrated a real desire to help do our full part in cleaning up the air and water around us. Our two companies alone have spent \$190 million on environmental quality and have budgeted even more in the years immediately ahead.

But utilities do have the responsibility to the public to provide dependable electric service at reasonable cost. We can't meet that obligation in the face of unreasonable pressures to spend awesome amounts for nonproductive programs with dubious benefits.

Where does this leave us and many other utilities: The choices are not pleasant. We can shut down stations and run into serious impairment of service—including the probability of widespread outages. We can ignore the EPA restrictions and subject our officers and companies to severe criminal action. Or we can work toward reason in regulation. We can try to convince members of Congress that the Clean Air Act poses grave energy and economic problems . . . and work

toward modifications that would *first* document the actual health hazards of sulfur dioxide and establish corresponding ambient air standards; *second*, recognize engineering realities and present state-of-the-art technology; *third*, provide for cost-benefit analysis; and *fourth*, set realistic timetables that permit programmed installation of equipment compatible with continued operation of power stations.

We think this will do much to assure the American people of what they really deserve: A sound and reasonable approach to environmental goals that leads to meaningful benefits at a price we can afford.

Yes, we want clean air and clean water. But let's put these high goals in proper perspective. The job calls for reason and logic, not blind zeal.

UNIVERSITY OF SANTA CLARA HONORS THREE WITH DEGREES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent event at the University of Santa Clara in my congressional district. Three individuals who have given their time, financial support and boundless energy to the cause of higher education, and specifically higher education at the University of Santa Clara, were honored with the conferral of honorary degrees.

Fr. Charles S. Casassa received an honorary doctorate of humane letters. Father Cassassa has long been recognized as an outstanding educational administrator and as a civic leader. He was president of Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles from 1949 to 1969 and was named chancellor of the university in 1969. He also serves on the board of trustees of Gonzaga University and the University of San Francisco. Indeed, this fine man has dedicated most of his life to service to his fellow man through education.

Thomas J. Bannan received an honorary doctorate of science. Named to the University of Santa Clara Board of Regents in 1970, he and his fine family have a history of generous support to the university. Indeed, on October 19 the university celebrated the dedication of Burchman A. Bannan Hall, named in memory of Thomas' late brother. This lovely building is only the latest of many generous contributions to the university from the Bannan family. It would be difficult for the University of Santa Clara to provide the quality education now being offered were it not for the concern and interest of the Bannan family.

I was especially pleased that my close personal friend, Albert J. Ruffo, was awarded an honorary doctorate of laws. A prominent San Jose attorney, Mr. Ruffo served for 8 years as a member of the board of trustees for the California State Colleges and is currently a member of the advisory board for San Jose State University. He also has served as a city councilman and mayor for the city of San Jose and has been a member of the board of governors for the State bar

November 7, 1973

of California. A senior partner for Ruffo, Ferrari, and McNeil, he nevertheless takes the time and energy from his already busy life to serve on the board of regents of the University of Santa Clara. He has performed a valuable service to the university in this capacity.

I am pleased that these three fine men have been honored by the University of Santa Clara, and I would like to add my own words of praise for their generous and productive efforts in behalf of the university. It is a fine institution which, because their dynamic interest, is assured of future growth and progress.

FLOOD PREVENTION DAMS DEDICATED IN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, recently I participated in a ceremony dedicating five flood prevention and sediment control dams in a watershed in my district. A number of governmental agencies have cooperated in this project along with the Boy Scouts of America.

Among the speakers at the dedication was State conservationist Jesse Hicks and I want to share with my colleagues the timely remarks which he made. The remarks follow:

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Forty years or more ago, farm youngsters often used to go swimming in creeks. If they could find a deep pool in the creek, where the swimming would be better or where they could jump off a bank while holding their nose, so much the better.

We think of the creeks back in those days as running clear and clean, with a minimum amount of pollution. A youngster could catch a crawfish, a tadpole, or perhaps bring home a nice string of fish after "wetting his line" for an afternoon.

It may be true that there was less chemical pollution in the streams in those days, but they were a long way from being pure. In fact: there was about three times as much mud or sediment coming off farmland in those "good old days" as there is now. Soil conservation has really paid off on farmland in North Carolina and across the Nation.

It was in those days, back in the 1930's, the conservation movement got started, with Hugh Hammond Bennett of North Carolina as the leader. He was concerned about soil erosion. He was grieved by the "dust bowl" conditions that devastated Oklahoma and other Great Plains States in the thirties.

And so it was right here in North Carolina, down in Anson County, that the Brown Creek Soil and Water Conservation District was organized as the first Soil and Water Conservation District in the Nation, and now there are over 3,000 such districts in every State across the country. Dr. Bennett, or Chief Bennett as many of us in the Soil Conservation Service know him, was the moving force behind this. He was a determined man.

He would go anywhere—from a small dirt farm to the halls of Congress—to talk about his dream of conservation. So concerned was he about erosion that the Soil Conservation Service was first called the Soil Erosion Service, and it was a very appropriate name. Chief Bennett fought erosion like Billy Sunday fought the devil, and used some of the same publicity devices as that famous Evangelist.

I believe both of them won partial victories—Billy Sunday never quite got rid of Satan and we've never quite brought erosion under complete control, but I think each one set the enemy back pretty well.

North Carolina can be very proud of Hugh Hammond Bennett. He was a great North Carolinian. Were he alive, he would be very proud of this project that is being dedicated here today. Because it is the young citizens who are the principal beneficiaries—the present and future Boy Scouts—and they owe a debt to this conservation work through the years.

The five flood prevention and sediment control dams in this watershed, of course, are the most visible part of the project. They will provide eloquent testimony to the effectiveness of such conservation measures. We have a miniature watershed project which will provide effective sediment control as well as flood protection. Lake Brooks is one of the best protected watersheds I believe you will find anywhere.

But there is more. In this watershed, which covers more than a thousand acres—actually 1,065—we have a blend of woodland, cropland and grassland, as well as areas for housing, roads and recreational facilities.

More than 180 acres of woodland have been improved. Wildlife habitat has been developed, and trees planted on 37 acres where they were needed. A time-honored erosion control measure—terraces and other conservation measures, such as grassed waterways and field border plantings, have been installed as part of the land use program. Conservation cropping systems and pasture planting have also been important measures.

All of this conservation work will constitute a virtual classroom to teach our Boy Scouts about watershed development, flood prevention, and conservation measures applied to the land.

This is an excellent example of people working together—teamwork—to accomplish a shared objective. The North Central Piedmont Resource Conservation and Development project, and particularly the Guilford County RC & D Water Resources Committee deserve much of the credit. The General Greene Council, Boy Scouts of America, and Ben Ussery, Scout executive have done a great job. The Guilford Soil and Water Conservation District has of course made an important contribution, and I am glad that we in the Soil Conservation Service could provide technical and engineering assistance to help with this fine effort.

When we give a natural watershed area like this one a new lease on life—and that is no exaggeration—I firmly believe that we have made a major contribution to the quality of the environment and the quality of life in America.

We can all be proud of what has been done.

NECESSARY AMENDMENTS TO THE TRANS-ALASKAN PIPELINE CONFERENCE BILL, S. 1081

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the trans-Alaskan pipeline conference bill contains several nongermane Senate amendments; two of which are unconstitutional, and another which would destroy the controls we have over governmental requests for information from the public. These poorly thought-out amendments have never been considered in the House, nor were they the subject of any hearings in the Senate. The House must insist that these provisions be either appropriately amended or deleted from the bill.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Section 404 of the bill as reported by the conference would require Senate confirmation of the Director of the Energy Policy Office. Section 405 would require Senate confirmation of the head of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration. Whether appointments to these two offices should be subject to Senate confirmation is not the issue here, for the language does more than just require Senate confirmation. First, the incumbents are removed from their offices upon enactment of this bill. This happens, because the incumbents would not qualify for their offices once Senate confirmation of their appointments is required. Second, if an incumbent is nominated to fill his present office, he could be removed at any time by a majority vote of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this conference bill must be viewed as exceeding the constitutional bounds of congressional power. Under our Constitution, only the President has the power to remove purely executive officers. There have been previous attempts by the Congress to force the removal of officers in the executive branch, but they have never been successful. On several occasions, the Supreme Court itself has struck down congressional attempts, saying that the President has the exclusive right to remove executive officers. The Congress recently has avoided overstepping its constitutional bounds. In 1965, the House refused to pass a bill which would have removed Sargent Shriver from one of the two appointments he then held. In 1968, legislation to make the FBI Director subject to Senate confirmation was consciously worded so as to take effect only after the termination of the service of the incumbent.

An important principle is at stake here—whether the Congress may at any time and by means other than are to be found in the Constitution, act so as to remove an executive officer. In 1965, Attorney General Katzenbach wrote an opinion for President Johnson which clearly makes this point.

Congress may impose reasonable qualifications, applicable prospectively, upon those who would hold executive posts it has created. But if Congress could impose qualifications retroactively, thereby ousting the incumbent, it could remove any officer whose performance, however satisfactory to the President, was unsatisfactory to it. The Constitution is certainly not susceptible to any such interpretation.

I think members from both parties should carefully consider the advisability of establishing a precedent whereby Congress is able to remove executive officers by means other than those provided in the Constitution.

These two provisions could have been worded to apply only to future appointments to these offices. That is the constitutional way of adding the qualification of Senate confirmation to an appointment. I hope if the conference committee feels strongly that these two officers should be subject to Senate confirmation, that they will recommit, amend this language so that we can stay within our constitutional bounds.

At this very difficult hour in American history, we in the Congress must show that the Government can function within the rule of law. It would be most unbecoming and damaging to our system of

government for the Congress to strike out beyond the Constitution. These provisions amount to the unconstitutional removal of legally appointed officeholders.

Section 409 of this bill would allow the regulatory agencies to collect whatever information they desired from businesses or individuals. I think this provision would be most unwise, and should be deleted from this conference bill.

This provision, another of the nongermane Senate amendments, was never considered by the House. I doubt any of the conferees of the Interior Committees have ever studied this issue, since the Federal Reports Act which is being amended is within the jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committees. I am familiar enough with the issues involved to say to my colleagues that you would be opening Pandora's box by allowing this provision to go through.

The Federal Reports Act of 1942 sets up a system whereby agencies wishing to collect information from the public are required to justify their requests to an outside agency, the Office of Management and Budget. This review was required, because we found the agencies often were collecting not only duplicative, but also unnecessary information. Since this review system has been established, my committee has been called upon to amend the law on several occasions. But we have always been called upon to further limit the number of information requests made by the Federal Government.

I can say to my colleagues that I have never been told that the present system allows too few requests for information. If Members have seen problems in the reports control system, they have always been that too many requests are permitted. Business, in particular, is going bankrupt trying to respond to all the requests for information being submitted by the Federal Government. Section 409 would only increase the burden imposed on business.

I read the debate in the other House as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 23883-23887 and 24083-24086. The burden of the remarks on those pages is that OMB is holding up the work of the regulatory agencies, in particular that of FTC, by its review of the Commission's proposed data collections. Now this would be a legitimate problem; but then I looked at the Record a little more closely. Here is what I found:

There are 46 reports used by the Federal Trade Commission. Forty-two of these were approved by OMB in 15 days or less. Only two of them took more than 30 days to clear. These were revisions to existing reports, so there was no interruption to the data collection process. That does not look as though OMB is interfering with FTC's conduct of its own business.

But there is one report that OMB did hold up; let me tell you about the FTC line of business report which has attracted so much attention. It has been before OMB for almost 3 years. But is it because of OMB delay?

The record shows that after a public meeting in January 1971, at which the proposed report was severely criticized, FTC agreed that it had to revise its pro-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

posal. It agreed to have it ready for OMB review by the fall of 1971; but no proposal was officially received by OMB until August 1973. Throughout the period from January 1971 to August 1973, OMB was urging FTC to get a proposal ready for clearance. OMB even went so far as to include \$400,000 in FTC's 1973 budget for a line of business survey. Was OMB hindering FTC? Or is FTC using OMB as a convenient scapegoat when explanations are hard to make and even more difficult to believe?

I do not mind criticizing OMB when it deserves it, but the evidence just does not support the charge that OMB is using the Federal Reports Act to stifle the regulatory agencies. If Members feel this is the case, I would be the first to insist that hearings be held on OMB's stewardship of this reports control function.

If OMB is no longer adequately performing this function, we should consider fundamental changes in the system. Certainly, though, I doubt very much my committee would recommend developing two duplicative bureaucracies to perform the function of determining whether reports would be duplicative. Nor do I believe my committee would recommend that this executive function be given to the General Accounting Office, which is an arm of the Congress. I understand the Comptroller General realizes the folly of this and recommended this provision not be adopted. I have attached a letter from the Comptroller General arguing against this provision. Changes may be necessary in the reports control function, but not the changes made by this conference bill.

The Federal Reports Act was intended to control the paperwork burden laid on the public by Federal agencies. The regulatory agencies want to be free to do as they wish, ask what they wish, of whom they wish, in any way they wish. If we allow them to do so, we will be creating a huge loophole in the reports control system. Soon we will have other agencies asking for exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, this provision amounts to pulling down the barriers to a paperwork avalanche.

The letter follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Washington, D.C. September 18, 1973.

Hon. HAROLD T. JOHNSON,

House of Representatives.

DEAR BIZZ: I have followed with much interest the floor debate on the amendment to the trans-Alaska Pipeline legislation which would place in the General Accounting Office the responsibility for reviewing questionnaires and other information requests by the regulatory agencies, a responsibility now placed in the Office of Management and Budget.

I am frankly disturbed about the provision because it would establish an executive function in the General Accounting Office. In the past the Congress has avoided placing operating responsibilities of this type in the GAO because of our responsibility for advising the Congress as to how the executive agencies carry out their responsibilities. We cannot carry out an operating function and, at the same time, provide the Congress with an evaluation of it which would be considered as objective and unbiased. I believe that is the situation we face in connection with this amendment.

I have two suggestions which may be use-

ful and which would avoid the problem which I foresee.

First, we would be happy to undertake, either at the request of the Congress or on our own initiative, a review of how the OMB has carried out its responsibilities under the Federal Reports Act with respect to regulatory agencies. I am aware of the criticisms which have been voiced on the subject and I believe that we could develop specific recommendations as a result of such an audit.

Second, it occurs to me that the central purpose of the amendment would be accomplished if the Federal Reports Act of 1942 were to be amended to make the OMB review advisory in nature. The OMB has the experts in this field. It has had long experience. However, the essential point is that whether the responsibility is continued in the OMB or placed in the GAO, the amendment makes the review advisory only and I should think that an advisory type of review for the regulatory agencies could be as well performed in the executive branch as it could in the legislative branch.

If the Congress, however, should decide to leave the responsibility with the GAO, I would urge most strongly that the provision become effective at a future date to enable us to obtain the staff which would be required to carry out the responsibility. We do not have the staff capability to carry on this function at the present time and it would be necessary for us to recruit additional people for this purpose.

Our views on this subject are set forth in greater detail in testimony presented last week before the Senate Government Operations Committee on S. 1812, a bill to improve the coordination of Federal reporting services. This statement is attached.

Sincerely,

ELMER B. STAATS.

VOLUNTEER ARMY—CAREER VIEW

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted into the RECORD the first half of a recent Soldier magazine article on Volunteer Army improvements. The second half of that article dealt with career attitudes toward the Volunteer Army.

Many within the Army have claimed that the military is less effective because of changes that have been made. One who disagrees with this is Brig. Gen. Edward Greer, Deputy Commanding General of Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. He believes commanders who claim the people-oriented changes have caused disciplinary problems are making excuses for their own failures.

General Greer has said the All-Volunteer Army will work—

If we don't blow it. We raised the standards. We're now getting a better cross section of American youth. But we can blow it by being antiquated in our thinking, training, and facilities.

If more military officers and enlisted men share this feeling and this awareness, the Volunteer Army will succeed. The views of General Greer and others are included in the following piece:

VOLUNTEER ARMY—CAREER VIEW

As the advertising began to pay off with more enlistments and Project VOLAR programs were implemented on post after post, how did career members already in service react?

November 7, 1973

Many saw the changes as a "permissiveness kick" which would increase disciplinary problems a hundred-fold. They saw the elimination of the pass form, a sign-in and sign-out sheet and reveille formation as a loss of control. With the placing of beer machines in the barracks they were convinced the Army had pulled out all the stops.

Disciplinary problems did increase but not all of them resulted from MVA/VOLAR programs.

The Vietnam War was winding down and thousands of Vietnam returnees wanted only to shed their Green Suits after pulling time in Nam. Some didn't adjust to garrison life and courts-martial and board actions increased significantly.

With rapid reduction in Army strength hundreds of Vietnam-related MOSS became surplus. Many soldiers were unhappy when they were reclassified.

The Early Release Program in 1971 aggravated the problems by causing extreme shortages in some skills.

Many career members blamed these problems on MVA/VOLAR. A particular target of their criticism was the paid radio and television advertising primarily aimed at getting young volunteers. Careerists didn't understand why large sums were being spent on advertising for recruits while Army strength was being reduced by officer RIFs, early releases and denying reenlistment to NCOs under the Qualitative Management Program.

MVA/VOLAR did generate its share of problems. Many volunteers listened to only part of the advertising message: The travel, adventure and changes in life-styles. They were not prepared for the realities of basic training. When the going got tough they went AWOL.

"The high school drop-out generally proved to be emotionally immature," MG Henion said. "He dropped out of high school and when the going got rough he dropped out of the Army. He went AWOL."

"We don't exclude non-high school graduates but our recruiters are now only given credit for three non-grads in every ten persons enlisted."

Sergeant First Class Lemuel Morris, a senior drill instructor at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., puts it another way: "There's really no excuse for a man not getting a high school diploma today. I consider the dropout to be a quitter."

Colonel George W. Orton, commander of the 3d Basic Combat Training Brigade at Fort Leonard Wood, has noticed a reduction in the number of disciplinary problems since restrictions were placed on the number of non-high school graduates allowed to enlist. "I'm beginning to feel much better about that situation. Non-graduates among the MVA enlistees we received in 1971-72 did cause disciplinary problems but I see definite improvement with each cycle we put through."

Command Sergeant Major Dillon Harlow of the Fort Leonard Wood Reception Station feels that some of the changes have adversely affected discipline. "I personally feel discipline was much better when we had reveille formations every morning. It was a matter of control."

"Now the first sergeant has to depend on the section chief to tell who's present for duty. And with no pass form and no requirement for a man to sign in or out it's impossible to control the men, especially since no one checks him at the gate anymore."

POINTS OF VIEW

Sergeant William J. Kelley, another Fort Leonard Wood drill instructor, believes there are good and bad points in the changes. "Getting rid of harassment was good but we shouldn't try to give the volunteer everything on a silver platter. We have to make sure he knows his job and its importance."

"Many of these youngsters have some pretty good ideas and we've got to let them know we're interested in those ideas."

Private First Class Richard R. Kupp, a

draftee with 11 months service, most of them as company clerk of Company E, 4th Battalion, 3d Basic Training Brigade, is happy to see the passing of "Micky Mouse" practices. "I don't think the length of my hair has anything to do with my ability as a soldier. I like the way we're allowed to fix up our barracks and I don't need a reveille formation to get me to work on time."

Kupp concedes that some of the initial MVA enlistees did cause problems. "I saw some of those enlistees. Many of them were disillusioned. They heard about the good life and relaxed rules but weren't prepared for the rigors of basic training. When they couldn't take it they bugged out."

"I'm not hung up on a high school diploma as an end in itself. I just think a man who drops out of high school today shows he lacks maturity and the will to stick to a task until he completes it."

First Sergeant Otis Walker, also of E-4-3, thinks elimination of Saturday morning work in TOE units is one of the smarter changes. "We really didn't get that much accomplished in a half-day," he recalls.

Another attempt to eliminate irritants from Army life was letting company commanders decide whether or not to conduct formal barracks inspections. "When we let up on our own barracks inspections," said First Sergeant John C. Kramer, Fort Leonard Wood Reception Station, "cleanliness and maintenance took a nosedive. So we walk through every morning and if one man's area is not up to standard we go after that man. If an entire barracks doesn't measure up we hold an inspection for the entire barracks."

Other commanders and NCOs agree with 1SG Kramer. "We had the same problem in Europe," 1SG Walker says. "Instead of re-inspecting the entire unit we leaned on the barracks that didn't measure up."

"That's the way we're going to build a disciplined All-Volunteer Army. We have to treat the soldier as an individual, then come down hard on him—as an individual—when he fails to do what's required of him."

PFC Kupp agrees. "I want an officer or NCO who knows his job and demands that I know and perform mine. I like to see a leader, officer or NCO who says 'I'm in charge here'. I want them to let me know what to expect when I break the rules. Don't misunderstand me. I don't mean a leader should growl at you or hassle you all the time but I do respect him when he lets me know who's in charge."

DISCIPLINE

SFC Morris believes application of discipline and punishment isn't consistent enough. "When two soldiers, given the same set of circumstances, commit the same offense they should receive the same punishment."

"I see too many instances where a soldier from one company messes up and gets the book thrown at him while his buddy in the next company does the same thing and gets his wrist slapped. I'm not talking about a case where one soldier had been on the carpet for the same thing before, I'm talking about all circumstances being equal."

"When soldiers see inconsistencies it confuses and angers them."

Specialist 5 Robert Fletcher, recent re-enlistee at the General Leonard Wood Army Hospital, believes discipline is necessary as long as it's applied fairly and firmly. "Any intelligent person wants to know what's expected of him on his job. I want to be required to know my job and perform it well."

"Our generation doesn't want someone looking over our shoulders. We want to be trained, given a job and left to do it. We want someone around when we have a problem but otherwise let us do our jobs. When we goof up, come down on us."

QUALITY AND STABILITY

Specialist 4 David D. Bessell of General Leonard Wood Army Hospital recently re-enlisted for microwave radio repair school.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"The Army has improved in a lot of ways. On my first hitch I saw a lot of officers and NCOs who didn't know their job and tried to fake their way through."

"We have some pretty good officers now. They know what they're doing and let you get your hands on the equipment. They take care of you better than before and if you need something or some advice they try to help."

"The quality of NCOs has also improved since the Qualitative Management Program (QMP) started eliminating the foot-draggers. I thought this QMP thing was just a lot of talk at first but now that it's being used it's going to improve the NCO Corps a lot."

Bessell also wants more job stability. "I want to be given a job and left on that job. I see too many people who have their jobs changed too often."

Specialist 4 Mark Kirk, a medical corpsman at the General Leonard Wood Army Hospital, sees it this way: "I think most of the changes were for the good but some of them came too fast. I was a Specialist 5 when discharged. I decided to come back in and my recruiting sergeant said I had plenty of time to tie up the loose ends. Well, I quit my job and went down to re-enlist and the recruiter said they had changed the regulation the day before and I had to come back in as a Specialist 4."

"Other than that, the Army is generally a pretty good deal. I do think recruiters should tell the young guy about the job challenges rather than all the glamor stuff."

Brigadier General Edward Greer, Deputy Commanding General of Fort Leonard Wood, believes commanders who claim the people-oriented changes have caused disciplinary problems are making excuses for their own failures.

"Show me a commander who says he's lost control and I'll show you a commander who hasn't been able to come up with an imaginative, stimulating program. The commander still has the tools of command."

Talk to members of the 902d Float Bridge Company, 11th Combat Engineer Battalion at Fort Belvoir, VA, and you get similar answers.

Says Specialist 5 George Floyd, a heavy equipment mechanic on his second hitch. "I like the changes but we need more trained supervisors. I want to learn my job and see every other man skillfully trained in his."

"As far as discipline goes, the Army seemed better off a couple of years ago. The NCOs knew their jobs better and when they told you to do something you did it because they knew what they were talking about. They can't tell me what to do if they don't know it themselves."

Specialist 5 Herbert L. Edwards is a senior crane operator in the 902d. "It's good they got rid of reveille and some of the other 'Mickey Mouse' stuff but I see a difference between that and good discipline. When I came in the Army 5 years ago it wasn't 'brown shoe' but it was a lot better because when you told a guy to do something he did it."

"The 8-hour-day and 5-day-week are good but I often put in more hours than that—and I don't complain as long as I know the job is important enough."

"The All-Volunteer Army will eventually work but you've got to put a man on a job and let him learn that job. We have too many people assigned out of their primary jobs right now."

Specialist 4 Larry Leeper is a heavy equipment operator. "I was drafted and enlisted for 3 years to get into the heavy equipment field. Although I don't plan to make the Army a career it has been a good deal for me."

"I do the best job I can and have really enjoyed it working with the guys in this company. My only complaint is that there are too many guys assigned out of the jobs for which they were trained."

Private First Class John Howell is a heavy equipment operator with 1 year of service. "I was about to be drafted so I enlisted to get into this field. My recruiting sergeant went right down the line with me and I got what I asked for. I've been thinking about making the Army a career and expect to eventually make sergeant."

"I'll learn my job and help the other people in my section learn theirs. My method will be to treat them like men when they do their jobs and sock it to them when they don't."

Specialist 5 Jimmy Jones also enlisted after receiving his draft notice. "The changes are good and the All-Volunteer Army can work."

"We already can see some improvements in the 902d. When I first came to this company you couldn't communicate with anyone unless he was your grade or maybe one grade higher. The officers and NCOs seem to take an interest in you now and we can communicate with any of them."

"If I say in the Army I want to be the best trained person in my field, I want to fully prepare myself and go as high as possible."

Second Lieutenant Jim White is a platoon leader in the 902d. "I really don't see how we are going to get the manpower for an All-Volunteer Army. If we do get that manpower, though, we're going to have to work on the individual soldier and make his job more attractive. We have to give him more responsibility and listen to his ideas. The Army is becoming more people oriented—that's good. We also have to become professionals all along the line."

ALL-VOL PROS

How professional will the All-Volunteer Army be?

Colonel Alexander M. Weyand, Chief of the Volunteer Army Office, DA, puts it this way: "When we say 'professional' we mean it. All of us have had to reinforce our thinking in that direction. The recruiting force is now being finely tuned to get the quality enlistee we want."

"Once we get him it's up to the career people to lead, train and motivate him. It can only be done with a professionally competent career force. Enlistee quality, careerist quality; that's what our Recruiting and Qualitative Management Programs are all about."

"A man entering the Army 20 years ago could automatically assume he had the right to remain for 20 years. That day has passed."

Colonel William E. Weber, Chief, Enlisted Division, Directorate of Military Management, puts it another way: "A person can no longer assume the right to spend 20 years in the Army without producing. We're going to make sure that a careerist wearing the uniform is a true professional. Our Qualitative Management Program is helping us to do that."

"Officers have had such a program for years. It was up or out. The NCOs have reached the same point. Look, we're talking about bringing a young man or woman into the Army and saying 'Make a career of it. You can go to the top if you can hack it'. But there has to be room at the top and so we have to constantly weed out the non-producers—the deadwood."

"We've denied re-enlistment to a relatively few people but we haven't been through the complete system yet."

QMP VIEWS

It's a key feature and energizer of the All-Volunteer Army, so how does the career soldier—the man most directly affected—view the Qualitative Management Program?

CSM Harlow feels it has some good and bad features. "It's done one good thing—it's made some NCOs get out and do something about their formal education."

"I know some senior NCOs you couldn't drag down to the education center before GMP started but after a few were denied re-

enlistment the word got around. It also makes an NCO keep abreast in his career, too, but there are some problems there. The screening boards are held without ever seeing the man. They look at a Sergeant First Class and say, "You haven't made master sergeant within 27 years so you're out." Well, the man might not have worked in his MOS in 10 years through no fault of his own. There are a lot of NCOs in that situation."

"We consider all these things," COL Weber said. "From a man's records we try to create a picture of the whole man. We look at his MOS test scores, his commander's evaluation, his military and civilian education and his achievements. We look at the whole man."

"If he's performed satisfactorily in any assignment, his records will reflect that. So he's out of his field: Has he taken an extension course to stay abreast of the changes in that field?

"We don't want an NCO who knows how to do only one job. While we look at his past record, we are also looking at his future potential. He got paid for the jobs he's done in the past and we're not going to keep him around if he can't grow."

"Of the 40,000 E-7s, 8s and 9s screened in a 2-year period, we only denied reenlistment to 1,200. On top of that about another 2,800 were separated or retired under the years-of-service-in-grade provision."

"It's the same way with promotions. We don't promote as a reward for having done a good job. We promote because the individual has demonstrated he can handle a bigger job. His records should indicate that. Here again, we look at the whole man—his physical condition, military and civilian education, conduct—the entire thing."

"But you can be sure that we're not going to promote or retain a man who doesn't measure up."

"He knows," COL Weber explains, "because he receives a copy of his evaluation and his MOS test scores. There's no excuse for him not being able to come up with a fair assessment of his own performance."

"We've had those standards for officers for years. NCOs are going to have to measure up, too."

LOOKING AHEAD

Will the All-Volunteer Army work?

"It will if we don't blow it," says BG Greer. "We raised the standards. We're now getting a better cross section of American youth. But we can blow it by being antiquated in our thinking, training and facilities."

"We have to make training interesting and challenging. We're headed in that direction with our 'hands-on' and adventure training. Once a man gets on the job, he has to be given responsibility and a sense of participation. We have to take his life-style into account and also make his off-duty life better. We're improving his living conditions, recreational and educational facilities and his career chances."

"We've made gains in providing him with a reasonable salary. But we have to demand that he lives up to his end of the bargain."

COL Weber concedes that the system is not infallible. "We've had to develop a lot of new programs in a relatively short time. We made some mistakes. But more of our time is spent on problems of the individual soldier than one would imagine."

"True, we do have people working out of their MOBs. But requirements change, jobs within career fields change. That's why we now require every career soldier to be qualified in at least two jobs. The young man or woman coming into the Army today can be assured of making it to the top if he or she measures up. But no one is going to have a free ride."

What does the young soldier say?

"Tell it to me straight."

"Give me a job and require me to master that job."

"Make me toe the mark but don't hassle me."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 7, 1973

"Give me leaders who know what they're doing and who trust me—and I'll back it."

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE: THE THREAT OF LAND USE CONTROL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Council on Environmental Quality has called land use control legislation "the quiet revolution." Land use has also been referred to as "the most dangerous and destructive piece of legislation ever to pass the Senate."

This past June, the Senate of the United States passed one of the most far-reaching and potentially destructive pieces of legislation in the history of the United States. It received little attention in the national press, yet this legislation could prove to be the most damaging blow ever dealt to our traditional concept of the rights of private ownership of land. I am referring to the Federal Land Use Policy and Planning Assistance Act, which swept through the Senate by an overwhelming 64-to-21 vote. The House version of the bill possesses the same destructive provisions found in the Senate version.

Regulations limiting the uses that owners can make of their land are nothing new. In fact, zoning laws go back to the days of early Rome, and most people see that there is a definite need to properly zone and restrict land use within our cities. In the early days of the American colonies, and later the new nation, zoning restrictions were put into force by the local governments. It should be noted that the power over zoning was vested in the local government—not the State or the Federal Governments. The fact is that our Founding Fathers were so concerned over the possibility of a powerful Federal Government gaining control over the private lands that they adopted the fifth amendment of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution. This amendment specifically prohibits the taking of private property by the Government without just compensation.

But this, in essence, is what is done by the current land use control regulations being considered by Congress, and those recommended by the President. They severely restrict an individual's use of his private property without compensating him for the loss—the damage or impairment.

Clearly, if private property is seized—expropriated—by Government, then the property owner must be paid for the loss.

However, restrictions placed on the use of property, by government bodies, also reduces property in value. A critical issue here is how far the use of property can be restricted without compensating the owner for the diminished value. A provision in this bill which has already passed the Senate specifically prohibits States from expending any grant money to compensate owners for the loss of property value.

The supporters of the measure, however, do not care to publicize these re-

strictions. These provisions are carefully tucked away in the massive 55-page, 10,000-word bill. As a result, a surprising number of the Members of Congress who may normally be expected to oppose extending government restrictions over our citizens are in favor of this bill.

The supporters of land-use legislation maintain that the bill is merely a "voluntary" grant-in-aid program intended to encourage States to develop comprehensive plans within the States for use of the land. They would have us believe that the plan is not an attempt to force a standardized program on the entire Nation. States are promised millions of dollars in Federal aid if they set up their own land-use programs which must be approved by Washington. If State officials agree to this, they can soon expect to be acting as agents of the Federal Government, rather than carrying out their own zoning plans.

The price tag attached to the scheme is high—more than one billion dollars. If we look at what the taxpayer can expect to get for the dubious distinction of turning over his right to determine how local land will be used, the price is indeed high.

Some \$10 million per year will be used to set up and operate a couple of new Federal agencies to make sure that the planned society crowd's dictates are carried out. This sum is for the administrative costs only. An additional \$106 million dollars a year will go to the States to set up a State bureaucratic power pyramid. These funds can only be used to pay salaries, expenses and to fund various studies. Other administrative costs will run the tab up to more than \$1 billion over the first 8 years of the act. It must be pointed out that none of this money is to be used in any productive manner or to contribute to our economy. It merely goes to pay the cost of expensive "planning specialists," who are supposed to know more about what is best for the people of a local community than they themselves or their elected officials.

In addition, the taxpayers would be forced to shell out even more money in the form of 25 percent matching funds. Then too, the bill would reduce local revenue by lowering the market value of local property. As one Member of Congress pointed out the other day:

Not only do we tax away the value of a citizen's property, but we tax him to death at all three levels of government.

This is the same old "big-carrot-big-stick" approach that the Federal Government has used so many times in the past to entice local and State governments into accepting Federal edicts, despite local needs or wishes. The "big carrot" is millions of dollars in promised grants that States badly need. They need the money because local money has been taken away from them by the Federal Government through excessive Federal taxes. The Federal Government cannot give States anything without first taking something away. The "big stick" in this case is the political threat of withholding funds from those States who do not play ball with the social planners.

Under the current proposal, States would be promised Federal grants-in-aid to develop and implement comprehensive land-use programs acceptable to the

Washington establishment. A State which fails to develop acceptable proposals for the Washington bureaucrats will find the "big stick" waiting near by. Up to 21 percent of a State's Federal grant funds for highways, airports, and conservation could be withheld from those States. This money that States are entitled to under other arrangement with the Federal Government—and never made dependent upon compromising private land rights.

As we have already experienced in the case of schools, business-industry, and all programs where the Federal Government offers the State money on a so-called voluntary basis, strings on the use of that money lead into other controls, sometimes in unrelated areas. Those States which hold self-determination—fear of the citizens—in higher regard than they do the demands of unelected Government employees and political appointees stand to lose a sizable portion of their money for airports, highways, and land and water conservation.

That the land use bill is obviously expensive and completely unnecessary are about the only good things that can be said in its behalf.

There is vastly more to this piece of legislation than appears on the surface. Let us look at some of the provisions for land use in the bill.

Each State's planning process is to be reviewed by Federal agencies to be sure that they conform with Federal guidelines. Machinery is set up to demand that each State have a State planning agency with authority to carry out the will of the Federal Government as outlined in the bill. In order to conform to Federal regulations, and thus get the money, States must adopt a program to regulate private land sales and development projects. The real clincher, and the one that is being used to drum up blind support from various special interest groups, involves environmental considerations. The Secretary of the Interior is given a blackjack to use to insure that States restrict the use of all "areas of critical environmental concern which are of more than statewide significance."

The courts have long held that the Federal Government has jurisdiction over matters that cross State boundaries, and thus are said to become of national interest. Regulation of commerce between the States, navigable waterways and interstate commerce are at least mentioned in the U.S. Constitution.

But the definition, spelled out in this land use bill is "areas of critical environmental control." The areas of control by the Secretary of Interior are any geographical areas whose development might substantially impair the historic, cultural, scientific, or esthetic values or natural systems or process within fragile or historic lands. This is so widely drawn that almost any land could be considered subject to federally dictated zoning restrictions. The decision to be made by Washington bureaucrats.

No thinking American wants to see the land desecrated. Certainly we must take every reasonable precaution to see that the vast lands we inherited from our forefathers is passed on to our children as unspoiled as possible. However, we

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

must not allow overreaction for the environment to overshadow our concern for human rights and basic freedoms including the right of private ownership and control of property. This is precisely what this collectivist concept of Federal land control seeks to do.

This land use concept is being pushed by some of the most powerful people in this country including the President of the United States. The President, in his September 17 message to Congress said:

... I am also convinced that Federal legislation is needed now both to stimulate and to support the range of controls that states must institute.

Administration officials realize that it will be no easy task to shove this concept of land control down the American people's throat, if all the facts are known.

The Secretary of Interior recently noted that opposition to the Federal guidelines covering land use is so intense in many State legislatures that many States may forgo the Federal funds in order to not be entangled in the Federal land takeover. This is the reason that these dangerous measures are being promoted at the national level through Congress. The people must be forced into the new American revolution of socialized land reform whether they want it—whether needed and whether legal or not.

Decisions involving any land use and zoning must remain the responsibility of local governments. These bodies are closer to the needs and wishes of the people whose land is directly affected. They know better than some bureaucrat at the State capitals or in some Federal agency in Washington what is best for their community. And this is the way it must remain. This is what America is all about. This is why the American system has been successful. It is our birthright.

REPORTER DICK STROUT HAS SEEN PRESIDENTS, SCANDALS COME AND GO

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

MR. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there follows a fine article on a great reporter:

WITNESS TO HISTORY: REPORTER DICK STROUT HAS SEEN PRESIDENTS, SCANDALS COME AND GO

(By Ronald G. Shafer)

WASHINGTON.—Reporter Dick Strout doesn't have to dig through the history books for parallels between the Senate Watergate hearings and those into the old Teapot Dome scandal. He was there—50 years ago this fall—sitting in the same Senate caucus room and writing as he does today, for The Christian Science Monitor.

Obviously, some things have changed, Mr. Strout notes. For one thing, the subject is campaign dirty tricks instead of oil leases and bribes. And there's the conspicuous presence of that newfangled medium called television.

But "except for the hot lights, you would almost think you were back in 1923," reminisces the 75-year-old newsman.

Thanks to Watergate, Richard Lee Strout's ringside perceptions of history are in fresh demand. But his reputation is built on far more than longevity. He has covered more major news events than any other reporter in the Monitor's 65-year history. And for 30 years now, he has also been probably the most influential anonymous columnist in the business—for Richard Strout is the author of the column called "TRB From Washington" in *The New Republic* magazine.

As a result, Dick Strout's reputation "is very high indeed, because he's got a combination of qualities that very few people have," says James Reston of *The New York Times*. "First of all, the guy is a beautiful writer. And he must have an extra gland because he still runs around like a kid."

Admirers agree that Dick Strout has a rare ability to explain complex issues with clarity, insight and homespun humor. He writes with the descriptive style of a novelist. People in Strout stories come alive with "owlish" faces, "fierce" mustaches, "carbuncle" noses and "spidery" frames.

About two decades ago he wrote a critical column about a man with a creased-leather face and an ego as big as the Washington Monument. The man's name was Lyndon B. Johnson, and he promptly hauled Mr. Strout into his ornate Capitol Hill office to complain. The Senate majority leader was seated behind "the biggest desk in the world, with pushbuttons like an organ," Mr. Strout remembers, "and every time he pushed a button, someone would appear."

AN IMAGINARY BABY

For an hour, TRB received the full LBJ treatment. At one point Johnson complained that he was being treated "like a motherless child," and suddenly, the columnist recalls, "he jumped out of his chair and strode up and down the room, rocking an imaginary baby in his arms." Mr. Strout left unconvincing that he was strong but amazed that a powerful politician "would waste an hour of his time trying to convert me."

As the episode indicates, Dick Strout is a tough-minded but unassuming newsman. He is—as he might put it—a tall, lean and lively man with fierce bushy eyebrows, an unfierce gray mustache and a weathered bald head. He speaks with a gruffness in his voice, but there is a twinkle in his eye. "Beneath that crusty exterior is a real softie," confides a friend, "but we'd never tell him that."

Mr. Strout was born in Cohoes, N.Y. After graduating from Harvard, he worked for a while on newspapers in England, then began his American journalism career with the old Boston Post in 1921. After two days, he switched over to the Boston home office of the Monitor. And about two years later—having by now picked up a Harvard M.A. in economics—he was driving his Model T Ford down to Monitor's Washington bureau.

"All of a sudden, there I was over there in that big house," Mr. Strout says with a wave of his hand at the White House as he sits dining on his daily liverwurst sandwich and milk shake on a park bench across the street. And there was President Harding, dressed in knickers and telling reporters assembled for a press conference: "Take it easy on me, boys. I want to get out and play some golf."

BACK IN THE CAUCUS ROOM

Since then, reporter Strout's career reads like an on-the-job history course. He has attended the press conferences of nine Presidents. He was on one of the first cross-country airplane flights. He reported from Normandy Beach during the D-Day invasion. He accompanied Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev when he toured the U.S. in 1959. And he wrote the Monitor's front-page story when Spiro Agnew resigned as Vice President.

But the U.S. Senate, and particularly its historic hearings in the cavernous caucus

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

room, have provided some of Mr. Strout's biggest stories. Teapot Dome, the Kefauver hearings into organized crime, the Army-McCarthy hearings, the Bobby Baker inquiry—he has witnessed them all. Now it's Watergate, and Mr. Strout is back in the caucus room again.

He sees similarities to Teapot Dome: "Letters to the editor in 1924 charged that the press was carrying things too far," and "readers shrugged and said both parties were alike and it was all just politics." But he is outraged by what perceives as a crucial difference.

Watergate "is more disturbing and dangerous" because it "is a special kind of corruption without greed," he wrote in a TRB column. "No sex, no dollars. Just power. It doesn't strike at oil leases, it strikes at democracy."

The weekly column provides Mr. Strout—who, as one press scholar puts it, "shows no hint of his own leanings" in news stories—an outlet for his personal views. He took it over in 1943 from Kenneth Crawford, who later became a *Newsweek* columnist. "He told me it would be easy," Mr. Strout says. "All you have to do is get mad at somebody once a week and spit in their eye."

Mr. Strout inherited the column signature, TRB. It was dreamed up by a New Republic editor who simply reversed the initials of the subway line that then carried copy to a Brooklyn printer—the Brooklyn Rapid Transit (BRT). But Mr. Strout still refers to TRB as "The Rover Boys" because the column sometimes was—and on occasional weeks still is—written by more than one man. The New Republic pays him \$175 a column.

Even today many New Republic readers don't know the identity of the man behind the initials. In September TRB received a letter from a reader who, assuming the current writer took over only about five years ago, wrote reassuringly to say "how much better your prose is" than at first, and how "it has been especially in the last year that your writing has seemed to solidify."

Under Mr. Strout, "TRB from Washington" has become The New Republic's most-read feature, and now it also is syndicated in 35 newspapers. The column reflects Mr. Strout's generally liberal views, though he steers an independent course. In 1968 when the magazine refused to endorse Hubert Humphrey for President because of his ties to Johnson administration war policies, TRB—an early war critic—backed HHH anyway.

"In the past 10 years or so, I've let myself go more about using the first-person singular," says Mr. Strout. And he often uses personal recollections to make points, as in this TRB column of a few years ago:

"When I was a child at my grandfather's farm, they used to kill pigs in the fall. They tied them up by their hind legs shrieking and squealing before they slit their throats. Once we children bitterly protested, but the hired man was reassuring.

"They like it," he said firmly.

"Today he's in Congress, voting against the poverty program."

Such views spark strong reactions from conservatives. A few write nasty letters like: "You sewer rat, may you be cursed with all plagues." But most are more respectful.

"I disagree with most" of TRB's columns, says conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick. "But I follow his stuff regularly. There's a good deal of wisdom there. He always puts it pleasantly, with just enough lemon juice."

So far, nobody is being groomed as Mr. Strout's successor. "He's unmatched, I don't think we'll ever find anybody quite like him," says Gilbert Harrison, The New Republic's editor-in-chief. "But I'm not concerned about it. I think he'll live forever. If anything, his writing is livelier than it ever was."

Whether as TRB or as a Monitor reporter, Mr. Strout has been an eyeball-to-eyeball observer of Presidents for more than 50 years. Each, he says, had his own style.

Calvin Coolidge, for example, answered only written questions. So one time Mr. Strout and 11 other reporters tried to pin down the President by craftily submitting identical questions: Would he be a candidate in 1928? "Coolidge looked at the first question and put it aside," recalls Mr. Strout. "He went from the second to the 11th. At the 12th, he paused, read it (silently) and went on dryly—I have a question on the condition of the children in Poland." The President answered the nonexistent question and, with that, concluded the press conference.

Mr. Strout has his private presidential evaluations. "I rate Roosevelt first without a doubt," he says, and President Truman "was as brave as they come," Lyndon Johnson "in many ways was a [redacted], but he had a compassionate heart." The latter is evaluation favorably colored by Mr. Strout's lasting admiration for LBJ's "We Shall Overcome" voting-rights speech to Congress in 1965.

A WILLINGNESS TO AGGRANDIZE

Mr. Strout is reluctant to evaluate President Nixon yet. But his writings make it clear he's no fan of the man he has called "the most aloof President in history."

He worries that "presidential power has grown enormously"—largely because Congress has been "too lazy" and Presidents only too willing to aggrandize their office. "There's a feeling that once you sleep in Lincoln's bed, you become deified," he says, "It's a dangerous thing."

Mr. Strout, who is not a Christian Scientist but a Unitarian, works out of a small office in the modern, fortress-like Monitor headquarters here. Despite the modern decor, he continues to use a wooden roll-top desk he inherited from a former Monitor Washington bureau chief. The task has an indented pearl button on its right-hand side. "When you push it," he explains, "nothing happens."

He continues to put in a full workweek at the Monitor, with the understanding that he is free to write his TRB column there on Wednesdays. Nowadays, he specializes in "color," or feature, stories for the Monitor itself, and maintains that he's still there only because "I've become sort of a holy cow." He suggests that this article merely report: "The old reporter says modestly that all he has been is a good competent hack."

His co-workers disagree with that assessment. "He's still here because he pulls his weight as well, or better, than anyone in this office," asserts Godfrey Sperling, the Monitor's Washington bureau chief. "He can move fast on a story. Boom."

"He can on occasion be grumpy, too," says an ex-Monitor staffer with a chuckle. "If he thinks somebody is putting forth 'utter claptrap,' he'll get up and leave."

SHUNNING THE SOCIAL CIRCUIT

Instead of personal contacts, Mr. Strout relies on reading everything he can get his eyes on, then attends congressional hearings and makes "first-hand observations" for additional material. He shuns the Washington social circuit; for relaxation he attends plays or reads aloud to his wife, Ernestine.

Mr. Strout used to drive to work in his Model T, which he parked on the ellipse behind the White House. Nowadays he commutes by bus from his four-bedroom home in Northwest Washington. The house was purchased over 30 years ago with proceeds from his 1939 best-selling book, "Maud," based on his mother-in-law's diary.

The house seems somewhat empty now since the five Strout children have grown and scattered around the world. They include a son and two daughters by Mr. Strout's first wife, Edith, who died in 1932. He mar-

ried Ernestine in 1939, and they had two more daughters. None of the children have gone into journalism, but they have "enough degrees to start a university," he says proudly.

Journalism isn't a career that Mr. Strout recommends lightly. He advises young people to "stay clear of it unless they have a passion and dedication. The pay is not very good, and the excitement is apt to pall after a while. The sustaining element is the commitment, the feeling that you are doing some good in the world."

After more than a half-century on the job, friends say Dick Strout has lost none of his passion and that he still gets as excited as a cub reporter over big news events. At a 50-year anniversary celebration two years ago, when the Monitor presented Mr. Strout with a round-the-world airplane ticket, Godfrey Sperling summed up his colleague this way: "He is the Monitor's oldest reporter; he is also the youngest."

THE HOUSING CRISIS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure each of my colleagues knows, there is a serious housing crisis developing in this country.

Housing starts are down 30 percent from January; mortgage interest rates are at an all-time high. The result has been that millions of Americans have been unable to fulfill their dreams or their plans. An article in the October 22, 1973, issue of *Time* magazine on housing, "Inflation Nightmare," provides a clear and concise explanation of the causes of and rationale for this crisis. The article follows:

HOUSING—INFLATION NIGHTMARE

Willie Roberts, a 38-year-old chef who owns a small house on Chicago's West Side, recently decided to buy a bigger home for his wife and four children. He applied to a savings and loan association for a new mortgage—but in the three weeks he waited for the deal to be closed, the down payment jumped from 10% to 25% and the closing costs from 4.5% to 11%. Roberts could not meet those terms, so his family is still living in cramped quarters.

For millions of Americans from Maine to California, the cherished dream of buying a home of their own has become an inflationary nightmare. In most states, mortgages now carry towering interest rates of between 9% and 9 1/2%—up from a national average of 7 3/4% in the first half of 1973. Down payments have at least doubled in the past few months; 40% is now common in some parts of the country. Worst of all, at some S and Ls and savings banks, the prime sources of residential mortgage money, new loans are unavailable on any terms whatever. Laments Boston Realtor Jack Conway: "This is the granddaddy of all mortgage droughts."

The cause of most of the shortage can be traced to the Federal Reserve Board's effort to combat inflation by severely tightening the money supply and letting interest rates soar. That policy was designed to discourage borrowing but has also dragged up mortgage fees. More important, it has started an unintended flood of money out of S and Ls and savings banks; depositors are pulling cash out of passbook accounts that pay only 5 1/4%

annual interest and buying Treasury bills, bank certificates of deposit (CDs) and other investments that sometimes yield more than 9%. Through early 1973, S and Ls were taking in savings at an average net rate of more than \$1 billion a month, but they suffered a net outflow in July; in August a staggering \$1.2 billion was withdrawn, the third largest monthly loss on record. Since then, the situation has improved little, if any.

By no coincidence, the outflow began when Washington granted financial institutions permission to sell so-called "wild card" CDs. The wild cards, sold to savers who will keep at least \$1,000 on deposit for at least four years, yield interest at whatever rate the issuer chooses to pay; Manhattan's First National City Bank last week was offering CDs yielding 9.59% for this quarter. S and Ls can and do sell wild cards, but their ability to do so is severely limited by a rule specifying that the total amount of wild cards an institution offers cannot equal more than 5% of its reserves. Commercial banks, which have much larger reserves than S and Ls, are offering the rich-yielding CDs in far greater amounts. Mortgage lenders charge that the commercial banks are thus draining huge sums out of the housing market. In Washington, the mortgage lenders are lobbying hard to have the wild cards discontinued.

Closing the Window. Meanwhile, some S and Ls, strapped for funds, have stopped making new mortgage loans altogether. They include Sun Federal in Portland, Maine's largest, and First Federal in Chicago, the biggest in Illinois. Others are keeping their mortgage windows open a mere crack by granting loans only to long-time depositors, and in some cases actually demanding that a home buyer maintain a savings-account balance equal to the size of the mortgage loan he seeks. The market is tightest in states like New York, and Illinois, where usury laws keep mortgage-interest rates below 9%, making loan officers reluctant to accommodate any but the best-heeled home buyers.

Builders and real estate brokers, scratching for business, are resorting to some far-out tactics to keep on selling houses. Realtors in the Jean Burgdorf firm in Summit, N.J., have taken out personal loans, pledging their own assets as collateral, and then re-lent the money on short terms to would-be house buyers who could not get mortgage financing elsewhere. Witkin Homes in Denver guarantees buyers who balk at today's high interest rates that they can refinance their mortgage once within the next three years if rates drop. Homewood Corp. of Columbus will give a buyer free paint for his new house, then deduct from the down payment the labor cost of spreading it on the walls.

Even so, builders and real estate men are taking a painful hammering. Atlanta Developer Lindsey Freeman reports his condominium sales down 50% in the past two months alone. Nationwide, the pace of housing starts dropped from a record 2.4 million in 1972 to an annual rate of 2,000,000 in August, and that by no means measures the full extent of the trouble; permits for new construction have dropped 29% during the same period. Some analysts expect next year's housing starts to plunge to a three-year low of 1.5 million or so.

Mortgage men hold out a bit more hope for 1974 if the Federal Reserve loosens up on the money supply and loan demand diminishes. Joseph T. Benedict, president of the Worcester, Mass., First Federal Savings and Loan Association, predicts that mortgage rates could come down as low as 8% by mid-year. Even if he is right, though, many would-be house buyers have to write off the rest of 1973 and mutter "Wait until next year." Meanwhile, they have to live somewhere, and that necessity provides the only

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

bright spot in an otherwise dreary housing picture. The once sluggish rate of apartment rentals, from Manhattan to Los Angeles, is picking up briskly.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT: BACKGROUND AND NEED

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been renewed interest in the Bricker amendment, the proposed constitutional amendment of the 1950's which would subject treaties and executive agreements to the limitations of the U.S. Constitution. The amendment has been introduced in this session of Congress by a number of Members. I would like to bring to your attention an interesting article on the Bricker amendment and its background by M. Stanton Evans, entitled "Back to the Bricker Amendment," which appeared in the publication *Human Events* in the November 3, 1973, issue:

BACK TO THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

(By M. Stanton Evans)

Congressmen and senators concerned about the expansion of presidential power in the realm of foreign policy have a ready answer available to them—if they will use it.

The answer has been lying around for 20 years, disparaged and bitterly opposed by the very liberal spokesmen who nowadays are so vociferous in demanding that the power of the presidency be curtailed. It is encapsulated in the so-called "Bricker Amendment," named for former Sen. John W. Bricker of Ohio and first introduced in 1952 as a method of curbing the dominant power of the presidency in the conduct of the nation's foreign affairs.

Sen. Bricker's concern and that of the numerous conservative organizations which supported his initiative was twofold: The possibility that American domestic institutions might be altered in obedience to treaty commitments, and the growing tendency of American foreign and defense policies to be shaped by executive agreements arrived at by the President, without consultation in or approval by Congress. Both apprehensions were grounded in fact and fully justified by the course of events since the era of Franklin Roosevelt.

The dangers of "treaty law" stem from a 1920 Supreme Court decision written by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, asserting that treaty commitments were not required to follow the dictates of the Constitution and that domestic constitutional arrangements could be up-ended in obedience to a treaty. As Holmes put it, "acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States."

Carried to extremes, this interpretation of the relevant constitutional language would permit state laws, the division of government powers, and individual guarantees of rights and privileges to be overridden by the terms of a treaty, irrespective of what is stated elsewhere in our fundamental law. Similar interpretations have been applied to executive agreements, made without concurrence of Congress, which in 1942 were declared by Justice William O. Douglas to be "final and conclusive on the courts."

Conduct of foreign policy through execu-

tive agreements has been a major feature of modern liberal statecraft.

As revisionist historians have pointed out, President Roosevelt successfully maneuvered to involve the United States in World War II despite neutrality legislation by Congress—using executive agreements as one of his principal weapons. His efforts in this respect have been much applauded by liberals as a necessary challenge to congressional isolationism, and set the pattern for liberal foreign policy approaches ever since.

The record fully justifies the assertion of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, that the "executive agreement attained its fullest development as an instrument of foreign policy under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, even at times threatening to replace the treaty-making power, if not formally yet actually, as a determinative element in the field of foreign policy."

At the time of Bricker's original motion, it was estimated some 1,500 executive agreements had been put into effect. In the intervening two decades, the growth rate has been truly exponential. As of Jan. 1, 1973, there were 4,589 such agreements on the books, compared to 910 treaties. Some 846 of these executive agreements had been put into effect by President Nixon, compared to 65 treaties—a ratio of 13 to 1.

In his effort to preserve the rights of Congress from continued erosion, Sen. Bricker at one point mustered 60 votes in its behalf on the floor of the Senate—one less than the two-thirds majority required to send it on its way to ratification. Conservatives generally backed the amendment, while liberals strenuously opposed it in keeping with their general view that the power of the presidency should be made supreme in foreign policy.

Now that the liberal intelligentsia is reassessing its attitudes on presidential power, and promoting limitations on the President's war-making authority, it has occurred to a number of conservative lawmakers that the time is right to revive the Bricker Amendment and put the liberals to the test. A new version of the amendment has been dropped into the hopper by Rep. Steve Symms of Idaho (H.J. Res. 704), Rep. Bill Archer of Texas (H.J. Res. 778) and another by Rep. John Ashbrook of Ohio (H.J. Res. 765) the latter with 16 co-sponsors, including Rep. John Rhodes of Arizona. Text of the amendment reads as follows:

"Section 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"Section 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate the rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

"Section 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

"Section 4. All executive or other agreements, between the President or any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

"Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Reaction to this proposal by liberal spokesmen should be interesting in view of their new-found enthusiasm for limitation of presidential powers. The "war powers" bill vetoed last week by President Nixon—places

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a 60-day time limit on the deployment of U.S. forces in global trouble spots, but does nothing to alter the executive diplomacy which usually precedes such action and often presents the Congress with a fait accompli—as in World War II, Korea and Vietnam. The Bricker Amendment would go after these preliminary and frequently decisive involvements.

Equally to the point, the wideranging powers of the executive are involved in a great many things besides explicit war-making, most notably a series of compromises, concessions, trade deals and other initiatives advanced in the asserted cause of "peace" which are potentially injurious to American security. Secret arrangements of this type urgently need to be dragged out into the light.

When the Bricker Amendment was originally proposed, it was massively attacked by most of the liberal organizations in America, including Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, the United World Federalists, the CIO, and so on. Sen. J. William Fulbright, now such an ardent foe of executive power, described supporters of the amendment as "liars," "boors" and "louts." The liberal pitch in those days and until fairly recent times was all power to the President—and woe to such as Sen. Bricker who tried to curtail that power.

So intense was the liberals' opposition that they demanded—and got—the scalp of Dean Clarence Manion, who served under President Eisenhower as chairman of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Manion was a principal spokesman for the Bricker Amendment, and his official status was galling to the ADA, the New York Times, the Washington Post and other outposts of liberal opinion. Eisenhower yielded to the hue and cry and in February 1954 dismissed Dean Manion from his position.

These events suggest a convenient test for liberals currently lamenting the excessive power of the presidency: They can prove their bona fides by coming out four-square for the Bricker Amendment—and staging a testimonial dinner for Dean Manion.

THE FILTH PUBLISHERS ARE
FIGHTING BACK

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the Association of American Publishers—AAP—is calling for repeal of all laws, Federal, State and local, which prohibit the sale, exhibition or distribution of "sexually explicit" printed materials to adults.

In other words, the members of this association want to get their filthy business back. They boast that they publish 85 percent of the books in the United States and thus, as a group, they have been, the largest purveyors of the pornographic materials which flooded our society before the Supreme Court ruled against them last June 21.

This court decision obviously has them in a passion as marked as were some of the subjects dealt with in their books. They claim, in their association statements, that the Supreme Court was wrong in its findings, that Chief Justice

Burger provided "absolutely no proof whatsoever" when he held sexually explicit materials were dangerous, and that our rights of free speech have been infringed.

All this, of course, had been the porno position through the years when confusion over the matter allowed these publishers to reap their profits. But the court's decision has clarified things. Local anti-obscenity laws have been upheld and, I am glad to say, are being enforced in case after case across the country.

It is interesting to me as a Congressman, who had long been concerned about this, to see that the porno profiteers, the salacious materials, are heading up the fight against the court ruling. They are telling us, perhaps, more than they might have intended.

They talk, in their press releases, in terms of the first amendment and, in the past, have excused their dirty books on the grounds that they did have some artistic or literary merit. But who are these defenders of our freedoms and what really is their motive? They are the people who have made the money out of pornography. They are the venal corrupters who, in words of Chief Justice Burger, were turning out stuff as perilous to the Nation as "unregulated access to heroin."

It is a height of absurdity that these people should expect the American public to heed them now in their high-flying arguments. Who are they to sit in judgment on the Supreme Court? If there actually were a threat to our freedoms in curbing them, then the issue should be raised by true libertarians, and not by an association of publishers whose members have cashed in on the filth and demands the opportunity to do so again.

Also, we need not be fooled by their careful pointing out that the licentiousness they want restored is for "adults only" and not for the Nation's youth. The association's statements insist that its members have nothing against and would not oppose any "carefully drawn" legislation which would ban distribution or display of sexual materials to young people. But the publishers certainly know, and their cash books can tell them, that widely circulated filth cannot be kept out of the hands of youngsters. Their stated willingness to forego the youth market is as phony as their hand wringing over our supposed freedoms.

DO WE REALLY NEED A GRAIN
RESERVE?

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz will address the opening of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Rome November 10-29. Officials will be

November 7, 1973

meeting to discuss the possibilities and problems connected with working toward the creation of a world grain reserve program. Mr. Butz has stated, and I fully concur, that American farmers must remain free to respond to the demands of domestic and export buyers for increased farm production.

A hard-hitting editorial in the November issue of the Farm Journal points to the shortcomings of such a proposal. I wholeheartedly agree that if such a program were established, Americans would be called upon to fund it. In addition to this request, the United States would be trading away its most precious resource and bargaining tool—food.

I commend this very excellent editorial for the information of my colleagues:

DO WE REALLY NEED A GRAIN RESERVE?

Three months ago in this space, we predicted a renewed effort to set up a strategic reserve of grain—this time by people worried about a food shortage.

Well, a proposal has now been made. In his maiden speech before the United Nations, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger proposed a World Food Congress, its main purpose to create a world food reserve. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D, Minn.), made the same suggestion before the International Agribusiness Forum in Atlanta, Ga., last month.

It's an idea we in agriculture should oppose with every resource at our command. As Clarence Palmby, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, said from the same Atlanta podium, "A world food bank is unworkable because the United States would be called upon both to fund it and to fill it. We would be negotiating away our greatest resource."

Increasingly dependent as you are on exports, you have a more immediate reason for opposing it: Such reserves could and would be used to beat down prices abroad, just as they have been in this country. Farm Journal asked the Atlanta panel: "Does anyone have any idea how we could set up a reserve so it couldn't affect prices?" The answer: a unanimous "No!"

Why do they feel we need a reserve? Is it because they fear a natural disaster in the U.S.? We recall all during the 1950s and 60s how our national leaders talked about our stored surpluses as "disaster insurance." The only disaster was what those surpluses did to farmers by depressing grain prices.

A natural disaster is possible, we suppose. But the United States is a big country with an excellent transport system. Drought or floods strike somewhere every year, but we now have a highly developed system of providing disaster relief with a variety of programs.

Besides, as every farmer knows, modern practices have taken much of the risk out of farming. A lot of what we used to call "drought damage" was really nitrogen deficiency. Pesticides save entire crops once lost to grasshoppers or root worms. Dams protect millions of acres that used to flood. Irrigation guarantees top yields from once chronic drought areas.

Is it because they fear foreign countries can't anticipate their needs? Nonsense. If Japan and Western Europe are so concerned about a dependable supply of soybeans and feed grains, let them contract for that supply a year ahead, rather than waiting and hoping they can buy on the cheap market during a harvest glut. Many of the countries we've been helping for 30 years are big kids now. Let them anticipate their needs and tell us in time so we can produce it.

Grain keeps overseas as well as it does here. If the Russians expect to lose one crop

out of five, let them put more rubles into grain and less into armaments.

If we feel our Food for Peace program is not adequate to take care of the world's needy, let's expand it on a continuing basis. Surely we've had enough experience with famine in India, wars in Biafra and floods in Bangladesh to have amassed some sort of track record. We have had enough of fuzzy-minded appeals to produce more just in case somebody may need it.

Or do they want a reserve because they fear the uncertainties of a free market? We don't wonder that our foreign customers would like to see our market controlled like that in every other country. Naturally they prefer a mound of surpluses they can count on.

We suspect that some of our own U.S. businessmen feel the same way. In spite of their self-proclaimed love of competition, some don't relish the idea of getting out, beating the bushes and bidding up for the grain they need. They've spent too many years in the comfortable warmth of Uncle Sam's stockpile.

No doubt there are even farmers who would prefer the certainty of \$1.10 corn and a government check to the uncertainties of \$2.50 corn.

All of us have a lot of learning to do, a lot of responsibilities to fulfill to keep our market free. But also we have in our memories some powerful incentives to make a free market work.

AMSTERDAM NEWS BACKS IMPEACHMENT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Amsterdam News, the leading newspaper in my community of Harlem, has endorsed the drive to impeach the President if Mr. Nixon fails to resign.

There has been a groundswell of support for impeachment, based on the President's diverse and repeated illegal activities while in office. Thousands of letters have poured into my office calling for impeachment. The American people have had enough of White House deception, flim-flam, coverup, and unlawfulness.

The investigation being conducted by the House Judiciary Committee will thoroughly cover all charges of malfeasance, misfeasance, and criminal conduct made against the President. The support of our constituents for such an investigation will be a constant reminder to the committee of its awesome responsibility to the people and to the Nation to guarantee that no stone is left unturned in our probe.

The Amsterdam News editorial follows:

CRISIS OF CREDIBILITY

Labor leader George Meany said it all a few days ago when he said that the lack of confidence of the American people in President Nixon has made it impossible for him to continue as a viable leader of this nation. What else is there to say.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The White House, which should represent the pinnacle of truth and honesty to the American people, has been caught in so many lies that even the most patriotic American can no longer believe what is said by anyone connected with it.

To put it another way, we have a crisis of credibility at the very top of our government which makes it impossible for that government to govern.

And the person most directly responsible for that crisis is Richard Milhouse Nixon.

Nothing more needs to be said at this time.

It's time to act.

And if there is any love or patriotism in Richard Nixon for his country and the American people, he should be the first one to act.

And he should act by resigning from the office he holds as a first step toward putting an end to the crisis he has created.

Finally, if Richard Nixon does not have the patriotism for his country to act in this crisis, the only remedy left is for the Congress to act.

Thus, if Nixon won't resign, the Congress should impeach him.

A PITIFUL HELPLESS GIANT

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a popular song of yesterday counsels us in its lyrics to "Accent the positive and eliminate the negative."

This is good advice under any circumstance; however, it is particularly suitable today when too much of the negative is being accented and too much of the positive eliminated.

Just recently I received a copy of a letter that was sent to the editor of the Wall Street Journal by Mr. F. E. Masland, Jr. Mr. Masland is a resident and prominent citizen of Carlisle, Pa., my congressional district.

Because this letter makes some timely and meaningful observations, I insert it into the RECORD and recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

CARLISLE, PA.
November 1, 1973.

EDITOR,
Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I just finished reading your editorial "A Pitiful, Helpless Giant."

Don't you think there is a place in the present order of things for "Good News"?

Don't you think it is about time that responsible news media began to emphasize the positive?

While it is true that the nation is demoralized, I do not believe polls. In our company's office we have upwards of a hundred employees—a vast majority support Nixon. I live in a farming community. I have yet to find a farmer who does not support Nixon and Butz. In a group the other day one of them said "We have the best President and Secretary of Agriculture we have ever had" and all agreed.

I believe a substantial segment of the populace supports Nixon and would welcome editorial comment of a constructive nature. I believe that the country as a whole vitally

needs the substance that could be drawn from constructive comment.

It is to be expected that the cynical, deliberately destructive television broadcasters would create a demoralized nation. The situation is analogous to that in Germany under Hitler when news media were controlled. When our Founding Fathers guaranteed Free Speech and a Free Press they had no idea that television would appear on the scene.

In spite of Watergate, this nation, has more to be thankful for than any other on the face of the earth and included is the fact we have Mr. Nixon in the White House.

Unfortunately, it is human nature for people to forget the positive and remember the negative. Under the constant barrage of negative propaganda the public fails to recall that Mr. Nixon got us out of Viet Nam, that he has attempted to clear up the welfare mess and made some progress and that to a major degree it is the fault of a spendthrift Congress that we still have inflation with us, that the President's policies have improved the balance of payments situation, that during the past five years we have enjoyed unparalleled prosperity ranging through the whole spectrum, including blacks and whites and that Mr. Nixon played a major role in bringing about a cease fire in the Middle East. Certainly no President has exercised greater influence in the international arena.

There was no cry for impeachment when Franklin Roosevelt deliberately catapulted the United States into World War II, or when John Kennedy involved us in the most unwise, disastrous war in our history or when the Johnson Administration was rocked by the Bobby Baker scandal or when Harry Truman fired his Attorney General for the way he handled a scandal in his Administration.

The public has a short memory. Television broadcasters are taking advantage of that fact.

There is much of a positive, helpful nature that can be emphasized in an effort to counteract the effect of broadcasters and to avoid the total demoralization which may otherwise result.

We cannot afford a weak government at a time when militarily we are in a weak position vis-a-vis Russia. Mr. Nixon has demonstrated that even when all the forces of the opposition are arrayed against him he is capable of exhibiting that determination which alone Russia respects.

At this moment in history responsible news media are confronted with an almost unparalleled responsibility. There is little likelihood that the airwave will pursue constructive measures. It is up to responsible publishers to decide whether or not they will pursue a policy that will enable our nation to avoid results so disastrous that their impact may be permanent.

Lenin contended that the U.S. would destroy itself from within, and "fall like a ripe apple". News media will play a major role in proving him a true or false prophet.

Very truly yours,

FRANK MASLAND.

GERALD R. FORD: TRADITION AND CIVILITY

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carries

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

an excellent appraisal of our great friend and colleague, Vice-President-designate GERALD R. FORD.

Columnist David S. Broder extols JERRY FORD for his leadership, his character, his outstanding reputation as a statesman of integrity, humanity, and humility. These Ford characteristics have long been recognized on both sides of the aisle in the House. Five times we Republicans have毫不犹豫地 entrusted him with the highest honor we can bestow on a colleague, the minority leadership.

Our country is crying for the strong, steady virtues of a JERRY FORD. Wherever these tumultuous, unpredictable times may take him, even to the highest office in the Nation, Americans can depend on GERALD R. FORD. He will never let his country down.

The column follows:

GERALD FORD: TRADITION AND CIVILITY

(By David S. Broder)

In this season of troubles in Washington, welcome reassurance is coming from the personality and performance of that comfortingly familiar figure—Gerald R. Ford.

As the Vice President-designate and heir apparent to a severely beleaguered President, the gentleman from Grand Rapids is the man on the spot. He is the key figure in an unprecedented experiment, testing whether a government of divided partisanship can make an untried provision of the Constitution operate in a climate of pervasive public distrust.

His conscientious preparation, his evident cooperativeness and his candor are making his confirmation hearings an occasion in which the country can not only learn something of the character of its new Vice President but relearn the value of one of its oldest traditions—the tradition of civility.

Ford's second sentence to the Senate Rules Committee was: "I feel that I am among friends." That is a rather remarkable thing for the Republican leader of the House to say to a committee of the Democratic Congress, which is not only sitting in judgment on him but is taking preliminary steps to remove from office the Republican President who appointed him.

But it is a statement that springs naturally to Ford, who operates, under any circumstance, in a tradition of civility, of mutual accommodation, of respect for persons and institutions.

This unwritten tradition underlies the written Constitution, but it has been badly battered in these recent years, as one President lashed out at opponents of his war policies and his successor compiled an "enemies list."

Whatever his shortcomings, in intellect, oratory, or wit, Jerry Ford is one of the most decent human beings in Washington. He is not a hater, nor is he under a constant compulsion to prove his own worth by dominating and downgrading others.

The qualities he has displayed in his confirmation hearings—and in 25 years in Congress—may be just what the doctor ordered for this badly battered Republic. A congressman's wife who watched his testimony on television remarked that he reminded her of Eisenhower. He lacks the personality and the smile that made it so easy to "like Ike," but that flat Midwestern voice and that open face encourage trust.

When he says, as he did, that "my platform, gentlemen, is always to support truth and intelligent compromise," you know that is the authentic Ford credo—and not a line some public relations adviser furnished.

A House colleague, enlisting support for his confirmation among Democrats, says he has been surprised to learn how many members of the opposition "really do consider Jerry a personal friend." Such friendships are rare among congressmen of opposite parties, and particularly among those whose leadership roles require them to operate, as Ford has, in a highly partisan fashion.

But Ford does not let partisanship carry to the point of personal enmity. It is inconceivable that his office would compile an "enemies list." As remarked previously here, his style of leadership in the House has been genuinely open and consultative. As Vice President or President, he testified, he would continue to make himself accessible to members of Congress and the press.

Even in the stress of this current situation, he has deliberately reached outside his own circle for guidance. In advance of the hearings, he sought out a group of certified "eggheads" and told them he was concerned that his reputation as a non-intellectual not be taken by them as a sign that he was anti-intellectual. He seemed genuinely relieved at being told that the very fact that he had sought such a meeting went a long way toward establishing the point he wanted to make.

A colleague in the Republican leadership says, "We learned very quickly that Jerry does not like to make decisions alone." A Ford administration would be an exercise in collective leadership.

Those members of Congress who know him best are unanimous in their belief that, should Ford become President, he would seek to continue the main lines of the Nixon foreign and domestic policy—detente abroad and decentralization at home.

He would try to keep Henry Kissinger and Melvin Laird as his chief foreign and domestic policy lieutenants, knowing full well that both men are more guileful and sophisticated than he is himself.

What Ford would bring to such a government is the simplicity and honesty and openness and benignity that have been missing so long from the White House.

As the awareness of those qualities in him has sunk in, the hunger for their restoration in national leadership has grown. "The sooner the better" doctrine now applies, not just to Ford's confirmation for the vice presidency, but to the step beyond.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT RESIDENCES

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months some sad and unfortunate things have happened within our Government. It is not my intention to point an accusing finger nor to defend anyone or anything.

Indeed, it is a foolish man who does not try to learn a lesson from mistakes—his own and others. It is in this spirit that I make these comments for my colleagues' consideration.

While the examples I cite today are current, this problem and practice has existed for many years and through many administrations.

November 7, 1973

Mr. Speaker, I would be the last man on this Earth to quibble over the necessity of providing tax dollars to provide security and efficiency of Government for the top two political offices in our system. Certainly, we cannot emotionally nor politically afford a repetition of the fate of the Kennedy brothers or our neighbor from Alabama. If it takes money to prevent such tragedies then we must provide that money.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to this Congress that our sense of responsibility, direction of purpose, and pragmatic equilibrium has become muddled and distorted.

I am referring to the national responsibility of providing appropriate living accommodations and security for our President and Vice President.

Recently, it was revealed that more than \$10 million has been spent "securing" Presidential residences in California and Florida. Within the past 6 months more than \$140,000 was spent on the home of a former Vice President and within a few months the taxpayers are going to have to cough up a similar or possibly a greater amount on another Vice-Presidential residence. No one but the President and the Vice President and perhaps the subsequent buyer of his home benefits from this tax money. I do not think this is prudent spending even though I do believe the security of the President and the Vice President is a top responsibility of the citizens of this country.

The taxpayers of this country have provided a Presidential retreat at Camp David. I have been told that there is presently nothing that can be added to that facility in the way of safety and comfort for the President, his family and staff that is not already there. Several weeks ago the late Marjorie Merriweather Post willed an estate to the Government for a Presidential retreat in Florida.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that two Presidential retreats—one a mountain resort and the other a seaside resort—should be more than adequate to serve a man and his family for any 4- or 8-year period.

Some years ago Congress passed a bill authorizing the construction of a Vice-Presidential residence on the grounds of the Naval Observatory. As my colleague from Texas pointed out several weeks ago, we are still without an official residence for the Vice President.

I would hastily remind my colleagues that my prime concern over this is one of economy of tax money. I wonder just how many millions of tax dollars have been spent over the years on the different Vice Presidential homes.

I would, Mr. Speaker, urge that this body take immediate steps to produce proper legislation restricting any President's personal property being converted at taxpayer's expense to a retreat or satellite White House.

I would also urge this body to take immediate steps to carry out the act passed some years ago and provide suitable living facilities for the Vice President at

a location readily accessible to the center of Government and where he can be adequately protected without the reoccurring expenses of the past.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this Congress, as a condition of releasing appropriate funds for the Florida property for the President's retreat and a Vice Presidential residence, sit as a watch dog to see that accommodations appropriate to the position be provided, but that they be provided within prudent spending guidelines. Congress must take a firm stand and stop spending by overzealous protectors of the President and Vice President in matters of health, safety, and comfort.

It would be in the best interest of the country and the taxpayer if we make a final "one-time" expenditure for this purpose and not have to spend fantastic sums of money every 4 or 8 years to adequately secure homes for our President and Vice President.

ABUSE OF COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Gene S. Feves, is a former journalist with great experience in the news media field.

He recently called my attention to a letter he has submitted to the editor of several newspapers, with the expression that he doubted it would be printed. As I would like my colleagues to have the benefit of Mr. Feves' views, I insert the text of his letter at this point in the RECORD:

ARLINGTON, VA., October 27, 1973.

To: Gentlemen and Ladies of the Third Estate.
From: Gene S. Feves, Former Journalist Who won a National Award for Outstanding Work in the Field.
Subject: The Use and Abuse of Media and/or Communications Systems.

One doesn't hear the term Third Estate very often in these 1970s and while I'm wondering why not, I answer my own question. It is no longer a grouping of individuals dedicated to objectively reporting the news. It is now a grouping of individuals acting as physiologists, dramatists, analysts, and robbers of individual thoughts and reactions (otherwise called brainwashers). The communications specialists now dedicate themselves to criticizing American leaders. They are bold enough to analyze the motivations, words, and thoughts of the President of the United States, who knows what he wanted to do for the country and is doing it, but the critics impose their subjective reactions only upon the public. A public which is tired of hearing them misquote the President.

These individuals create discord by shocking the American public with their own thoughts and motivation and then say it is the President who is sending out shocks—the man the public elected as its leader. A man, who, being a normal individual, exercises his right to talk back—which hurts the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sensitive (sic) feelings of the analysts, etc. who figuratively cry, via television, on the shoulders of the American people.

These discord artists, etc., are motivated in the spirit of competition—financial gain—as good employees for the competitive media—newspapers, television, and, to a slight degree, radio. Each television newscaster tries to outdo other newscasters in order to gain his own ends—become popular and hold down a job. Newspapers have aligned themselves with political parties and divorced themselves from the public and its interests as well as needs.

Who do you think is to blame for shocking the American people; for their loss of self-confidence; feeling of assurance and spirit of unity?

To date it is the Gentlemen of the Third Estate and not the Ladies of this former class as each man raising questions at press conferences with the President appears to be in competition with the President. They don't even give the ladies a chance to speak up. This is a time for less competition and more cooperation between the American People and the electronic-delivered visitors who charge into their homes and lives repeatedly, day and night in and out. Too many Americans are being forced to forego a vehicle that should be enlightening instead of vicious—and turn off tv sets content with a trusty radio.

GENE SEMENOV FEVES.

NOAA SEEKS CONSERVATION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WHALES

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are aware that the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, with certain exceptions, places an immediate moratorium on the taking and importation of all marine mammals and marine mammal products. This act makes the Secretary of Commerce responsible for protecting whales and other marine mammals. On November 30, 1972, the Secretary of Commerce delegated authority for the functions prescribed by the act to Dr. Robert M. White, who is the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA.

Since that time, Dr. White and NOAA have aggressively sought international cooperation in the conservation of endangered species of whales. A recent editorial in the Washington Post highlights the efforts of Dr. White who leads the U.S. delegation to the International Whaling Commission, to gain international compliance with the Commission's recommendations to ban the killing of seven species of whales which are severely depleted.

In addition, Dr. White has sought compliance by Japan and the Soviet Union with the current moratorium on the killing of fin whales. The fin whale is estimated to have a population of only 70,000—well below the optimal level of 200,000 to 250,000 in order to assure its survival.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Washington Post editorial in the RECORD at this point:

CAN THE WHALES BE SAVED?

Few of the some 900 species of endangered or threatened animals have received as much international attention as the whale. It is among the most majestic and intelligent creatures of the sea, and the blue whale is said to be the largest animal that has ever lived. For decades, however, destruction of whales has been systematic and large; as a result, five of eight species of great whales are currently in danger of extinction.

Although a long time was needed for this message to get across, a number of whaling nations finally agreed to put away the harpoons and end the slaughter. The problem is that not all nations are willing to stop. Japan and the Soviet Union still go to the high seas to kill whales. Their defiance of a moratorium—to which 12 other nations adhere—is such that the U.S. Department of Commerce is now strongly protesting. In continuing to ignore the moratorium on fin whales, for example, Japanese companies cite a demand for whale meat in Japan. But Dr. Robert M. White, administrator of the Commerce Department's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said that the protein yield from fin whales amounts to an insignificant contribution to the meat requirement of Japan.

In going its own way, Japan and the Soviet Union are flouting the authority of the International Whaling Commission. The commission—which met last June in London—recommended a worldwide ban on killing blue, gray, bowhead, humpback and right whales, and urged strict quotas on several other species. A coalition of conservation and wildlife groups—who correctly see that by eliminating these Leviathans the fragile balance of oceanic life may be irrevocably damaged—are now so alarmed that they are calling for a boycott of Japanese products in the U.S. marketplace. The membership of such groups hopes to exert the kind of economic pressure that international political pressure has not yet done.

Killing whales might be understandable if the dead beasts had any serious social uses. But they do not. Such frivolous purposes as dog, cat and mink food, automobile lubricants, cosmetics and food additives all have easily available substitutes. It is exactly the opposite for whales; once they vanish, they will not be back.

VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Howard H. Callaway, Secretary of the Army, addressed the Association of the U.S. Army a few weeks ago on a subject of interest to everyone in this Nation. He brought out several important aspects of the new "volunteer Army."

The Secretary's remarks should be of interest to Members of Congress and the general public. I recommend them to you.

The speech follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 7, 1973

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 ad-

junct 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 opportunities for continued education and training, young men and women can look upon 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're more mature. The Army has trained them, given them each a mission, and then hold 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 re-enlisted 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 programmed 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 new 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 offenses 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 re-

strain 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 expert 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 purposefully 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 public support. We need your help as we plow new

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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.

WHY THE LEVITT CLINIC?

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, noted members of the Long Island community joined with State and Federal officials to dedicate the Levitt Clinic of the North Shore University Hospital. The occasion marked not only a great improvement in the care available to the community, but also a new, money-saving and effective method of care and treatment of ambulatory patients. The clinic, in its new handsome five-story building, has the most modern equipment in the 130 examination and treatment rooms. The clinic is named for Hospital Trustee William J. Levitt, well-known builder and philanthropist whose financial assistance made it possible. I would like to insert the following remarks about this important facility from the dedication program at this point in the RECORD:

WHY THE LEVITT CLINIC?

North Shore University Hospital was founded in 1945 with one basic aim—to bring the best possible medical and health care to the people it serves and to do so with warmth, compassion and understanding. We always are aware that the patient is a person whose own dignity, sense of worth and desire for privacy demand respect. We seek to treat not only the illness that a patient happens to have, but also the person who happens to have an illness. Above all, we seek not only to make people well, but to keep them well.

The Levitt Clinic opens its doors to provide the Hospital with a strong new arm in fulfilling that purpose. It is dedicated to providing comprehensive ambulatory, diagnostic and preventive health care of the highest quality for the residents of Long Island.

In the Clinic's five-story, 80,000 square-foot building, containing 130 treatment and consultation rooms, there is centered a full range of expert staff supported by the most modern and sophisticated facilities and equipment available to medical science. The Clinic thus makes service both more efficient and more convenient for the patient; further, it was planned so that the Hospital can easily add new services and facilities as the need for them arises. The Clinic is highly unusual, perhaps unique, in that comparable facilities are rarely found in suburban areas, tending rather to be parts of major medical centers located in large cities.

The Levitt Clinic's doors are open to all. The sole requirement for service is the need for medical attention. All patients are treated with one standard of care: they are seen by appointment and receive the same courtesy, attention and respect they would be accorded in the private office of the most considerate physician. The Clinic is open to the father with his little son who has had an accident and to the old person who has no family doctor, but who needs help with his arthritis.

And to all of Long Island, the Clinic is a

highly sophisticated referral center. The family doctor takes care of about 90 percent of our medical problems in his office and most often he sends us away happier and feeling better. But sometimes he finds problems that require elaborate tests and highly specialized skills and equipment. In such instances, he now has a resource in The Levitt Clinic; he can refer his patient to the Clinic for diagnosis, and for consultation if he wishes.

Early diagnosis can head off much disease. Many ailments can be cured easily in early stages, but present much more difficulty later on. The principal theme of The Levitt Clinic is to keep the patient on his feet and out of a hospital bed. It costs less but, even more important, it is better medicine.

The doctor who refers a patient with a diagnostic problem will receive a full report promptly, usually within 24 hours of his patient's visit. If hospitalization is indicated, the patient and his physician will select the hospital. If they choose North Shore University Hospital, the patient's own doctor will have access to his hospitalized patient, through the cooperation of the hospital staff's physicians, whether or not the referring doctor is formally affiliated with the Hospital.

Behind The Levitt Clinic stand the full resources of North Shore University Hospital—more than 500 physicians and surgeons, some 600 nurses, nearly 1,500 employees, more than 1,000 volunteers, and our Trustees and Associate Trustees. In addition, numerous community agencies help us to reach out into the communities we serve.

And behind the Clinic and the Hospital stand the full resources—both medical and scientific—of Cornell University Medical College, of which we are a teaching center.

WILLIAM J. "BILL" HUNT

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 29, 1973, the citizens of the city of Gardena, Calif., will honor Bill Hunt, the copublisher of the Gardena Valley News, by presenting him with the coveted "outstanding citizen award." It is my privilege today to join with the city of Gardena in paying tribute to this veteran newsman and truly distinguished citizen.

From a beginning as a newspaper delivery boy in Santa Monica at the age of 10, Bill Hunt has devoted his life to achieving the highest ideals of his profession. He has worked on newspapers from the Alaskan frontier to the heartlands of southern California, always combining his love for journalism with an overwhelming and abiding respect for the foundations and the enforcement of the law.

His interest in narcotics control and rehabilitation dates from days when few people paid much attention to this growing problem, and his efforts in this area have brought him deserved nationwide recognition. He was the first chairman of the Los Angeles County Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Commission and to this day remains a member of that important organization. A delegate to President

John F. Kennedy's White House Conference on Narcotics, he also continues as a member of the President's Commission for the Suppression of Illicit Drugs and Narcotics.

Bill Hunt recently won what he terms "the greatest battle of my life," a 10-year fight to wipe out many peculiarly drawn and overlapping jurisdictional boundaries in Los Angeles County. Because of the confusion of these boundaries, accident victims have often been left bleeding and helpless in the street just 6 inches the other side of the Gardena City boundary and inside the limits of the city of Los Angeles' "shoestring strip."

Typical of Bill Hunt's concern for his fellow man, he began a battle which many said he could never win. He was the spearhead behind "Operation Humanity," asking simply that, regardless of boundary lines, all local accident victims be taken as quickly as possible to the nearest medical facility.

Often discouraged at the slow progress of this campaign, he nevertheless would not give up and on May 9 saw his efforts rewarded. From now on, because Bill Hunt fought many city halls, suffering accident victims will be treated immediately, regardless of where in the Gardena area they were hurt.

Also illustrative of this man's humility and concern for his fellow man was his remark upon learning of his victory:

From here on out, we won't have to worry about those six inches.

All of the citizens of Los Angeles have this newsman to thank for the triumph of "Operation Humanity."

Again, it is my privilege to join with the citizens of the city of Gardena in saluting Bill Hunt, a truly fine human being.

IMPEACHMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following:

CONGRESSMAN LEE HAMILTON'S
WASHINGTON REPORT

IMPEACHMENT

For the first time in 105 years a serious effort is underway to impeach a President of the United States. Most Americans, who dimly associate impeachment with the only U.S. President ever to be impeached, Andrew Johnson, have cringed from it, tried hard to avoid it, but the events of recent weeks have forced consideration of it upon the people and the Congress.

These events (like the dismissal of Special Prosecutor Cox and the White House plan to burglarize and wiretap dissenters from the President's policies) have stirred and angered the people and prompted the talk of impeachment. Even so, the latest Gallup Poll finds only 28 percent of the people favor impeachment, 55 percent oppose impeachment and 17 percent have no opinion.

The seriousness with which these charges are brought, together with the impeachment resolutions now pending in the Congress,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

should prompt all of us to review the impeachment process.

What is impeachment? The founding fathers drew upon their experience with English monarchs and four hundred years of English history of impeachment when they provided for impeachment in the Constitution, as a means of controlling the excesses of Presidents, Vice Presidents and other high federal officials and protecting the people from executive power. Congress, as the representative of the people, was given the power and responsibility to impeach and remove high public office holders from their positions, upon conviction, for public misconduct and violation of the public trust.

What is an impeachable offense? An impeachable offense is one that subverts the political principles on which a system of government is based. In wording the grounds for impeachment, the framers of the Constitution were deliberately brief, choosing flexibility over narrowness. The impeachable offenses they named were treason, bribery, and "High Crimes and Misdemeanors," a technical English term relating to abuses of public trust and not limited to ordinary criminal acts. The Constitution leaves it up to the Congress to decide if a public official's misconduct falls within the scope of the offenses which would undermine the Constitutional system, but injury to the nation was the essential part of the offense.

Has any President been impeached? Yes. The only impeachment of a President, Andrew Johnson, was over a century ago in 1868 in the aftermath of the Civil War. Johnson, who had become President upon Lincoln's assassination in 1865, was accused of attempting to remove the Secretary of War in violation of a hastily passed law. Johnson's claim that he had the right to discharge his subordinates prompted the House to impeach him. The Senate subsequently acquitted him by a narrow margin of one vote.

Is impeachment a criminal process? No. Although Congress can remove public officials from office for criminal acts (treason and bribery are just two statutory crimes mentioned in the Constitution), impeachment does not carry any criminal punishment. The penalty for impeachment is limited to removal and disqualification from office. Most Constitutional experts agree that violation of the public trust, not a crime in the normal sense, and including a President's failure to oversee and control the conduct of his subordinates, are impeachable.

What is the procedure for an impeachment? Charges initiating the impeachment process, which must originate in the House of Representatives, can be made by Representatives, by transmittal from the President, by state legislatures, by grand juries, or on the basis of committee investigations in the House. In an impeachment proceeding, the House, functioning like a Grand Jury, hears evidence of alleged public misconduct by a federal official and can "impeach" him or her (much like returning an indictment) by adopting so-called "articles of impeachment," which specify the grounds of accusation.

Once an official has been "impeached," the case moves to the Senate which considers the charges of alleged misconduct prosecuted by Members of the House known as "managers." When the President is on trial, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presides, and the President may appear personally or by counsel. The proceedings are similar to, but more flexible than, those in a court trial. Both sides may present witnesses and the accused has the right of cross examination. At the conclusion of the trial the members of the Senate vote to acquit or convict the accused. Only the House can impeach, but only the Senate can convict. A two-thirds vote of the Senators present is required for a conviction, which removes the official from office.

November 7, 1973

TRIBUTE TO DALE STAFFORD

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, over 13 years ago, as I launched my congressional career, one of the first individuals that I wanted to meet with was the publisher and editor of a small but outstanding daily newspaper, Dale Stafford. From that initial meeting early in 1960, I have been proud to count him as a good friend.

It was with great sadness and shock that I learned last night of his passing. Dale Stafford was more than just a tremendous newspaperman, he was an outstanding individual—a man involved in his community—a man who cared—and a man of great integrity.

For nearly 50 years, Dale Stafford was a practicing journalist. As I think of his great newspaper career in Michigan, I am reminded of the famous comment that Thomas Jefferson once made before he became President. Mr. Jefferson was quoted as saying:

Were it left to me to decide whether we should have government without newspapers, or newspapers without government, I should not hesitate for a moment to prefer the latter.

The Dale Staffords of the newspaper industry give great credence and substance to Mr. Jefferson's comments.

I relied greatly on Dale Stafford's judgment and counsel. He had the traits of all great newspapermen—to listen, ask prodding questions, and brush aside irrelevant points to get to the heart of the matter—quickly, concisely, and firmly.

Since the congressional redistricting in Michigan in 1964, I have not represented Montcalm County and Greenville, Dale's home since 1951 when he left the post of managing editor of the Detroit Free Press to become editor and publisher of the Greenville Daily News. That separation did not affect our friendship nor my reliance on his wise counsel.

Dale Stafford and his Greenville Daily News won many State and National honors, but I believe Dale cherished most of all the title of newspaperman.

To his wife, Vivian, and son, John, my wife, June, and I convey our deepest sympathy. We are very grateful and privileged to have known him and to have counted him as a good friend.

I am inserting at this point an article which appeared in the November 5, 1973, edition of the Detroit News, Detroit, Mich., on his passing. It reads as follows:

NEWSMAN DALE STAFFORD DIES

Dale Stafford, longtime publisher and editor of the Greenville (Mich.) Daily News, and former managing editor of the Detroit Free Press, is dead at 65. He died yesterday in Blodgett Memorial Hospital in East Grand Rapids.

Services were scheduled for today in the Brown-Teamer Funeral Home, Greenville. Burial is in Forest Home Cemetery, Greenville.

Born in St. Louis, Mich., Mr. Stafford began his newspaper career as a correspondent for the Lansing State Journal while still a high school student.

During his years at Michigan State University, he was a sports writer and became the school's first athletic publicity director. Mr. Stafford, along with George Alderton, then sports editor of the State Journal, has been credited with dubbing Michigan State teams as "Spartans."

A sports writer and editor for the Pontiac Press, Mr. Stafford joined the Detroit office of the Associated Press in 1937 as a rewrite man and was considered an expert on sit-down strikes. He became sports editor for the Free Press in 1941 and four years later was appointed managing editor of the newspaper.

In 1951, he left the Free Press to become editor and publisher of the Greenville Daily News.

A former president of the Michigan Associated Press and of the Inland Daily Press Association, Mr. Stafford was a charter trustee of Grand Valley State College, and national president of the Michigan State University alumni organization.

He is survived by his wife, Vivian; his son, John, currently publisher of the Greenville Daily News, and three grandchildren.

COOPERATION BETTER THAN FORCE

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the full impact of the Occupational Safety and Health Act upon the small business community throughout our Nation is yet to be measured. There is no doubt, however, that a visit from the OSHA inspector is awaited with fear and dread by most of them. They are all aware of what the consequences of such a visit can bring; they are at a loss to begin to comprehend, much less comply with the myriad of standards they are faced with. Editor Harold Jones of the Redfield, S. Dak., Press discussed this recently in an editorial which I believe merits the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues.

The article follows:

COOPERATION BETTER THAN FORCE

If there ever was a time when business, industry and government should cooperate in making a new law work for the benefit of employees and the general public, the time is here and now.

In 1970, Congress passed the Occupational Health and Safety Act with the praiseworthy purpose of reducing job-related accidents and sickness. It has taken since then to organize the bureaucracy, and employers are just now beginning to feel the full crunch of governmental enforcement. The trouble is that the law is many, many pages long and it has generated complicated rules and regulations that, it is said, would fill a 17-foot bookshelf.

Large companies with legal staffs and safety experts have been busy trying to interpret what they have to do to live up to the regulations. Small and medium sized companies depend on the general advice of their trade associations and wait in trepidation for the O.S.H.A. inspectors to show up for a surprise visit.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The inspectors have the power to levy stiff fines on the spot and even close down plants found in violation—needless to say a traumatic experience for employer and employee alike which benefits no one.

There is a sensible proposal introduced in Congress for amending the law so that employers can consult with O.S.H.A. inspectors in advance about violations which need to be corrected. This would give firms a chance to know specifically what they are expected to do and to make the necessary changes before the O.S.H.A.-man starts levying fines and stopping work.

GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 11212, the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Commercial Act of 1973. Joining me as cosponsors were Mr. OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, and 21 other members of the Science and Astronautics Committee. This bill is designed to develop the necessary technology to make presently unconventional geothermal energy resources available for commercial use within 6 years. It establishes a combined National Science Foundation and NASA research, development and demonstration program to produce commercially competitive electricity from new types of geothermal energy.

H.R. 11212 is intended as a companion measure to the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1973—H.R. 10952. These two bills are designed to provide the optimum realistic development of these two new energy sources, solar and geothermal, on an economically competitive basis, while providing full environmental protection. It is our belief that this can be accomplished before the end of this decade.

Geothermal energy is not new. We have all been aware of geysers and underground deposits of steam and hot water. In the United States, as well as in several foreign countries such as Iceland, New Zealand, and Italy, steam and hot water are being used for the production of electricity and for heating.

However, H.R. 11212, the Geothermal Energy, Research, Development, and Commercial Act of 1973, which we are now sponsoring, deals with demonstrating two new sources of geothermal energy which have not yet been exploited; and which, in fact, have scarcely been explored at all. These two are hot dry rock and geopressed zones, either of which may provide far greater quantities of commercially competitive electrical energy than any source of geothermal energy that has been developed to date. There is every reason to believe that development of these resources can have a significant impact on the energy picture of this country by the early 1980's if an aggressive program to develop them is initiated at once.

We do not know for certain what the research and development programs for these new sources will tell us, but it is important that we find out without further delay. This is the purpose of our bill.

"Hot dry rock" is a term for the heated bedrock lying beneath the surface of the Earth at depths of 12,000 to 20,000 feet. It is believed that electric power can be generated from steam produced by injecting water through holes drilled into these hot rock formations.

The research and development program to explore such a potential source of energy is, in concept, simplicity itself. Several holes similar to those drilled for oil wells would be drilled into suspected hot rock formations. Attempts would be made to fracture the rock in the vicinity of the holes, using several known pressurizing techniques. Water of any quality could then be pumped into this hot rock and, hopefully, dry steam would be blown to the surface through another hole. The steam should be clean and available for driving turbines, and thus electric generators. This is "quick and dirty research." We know what needs to be done; we know what we are looking for; it does not take a great deal of finesse or a long time. It does require a mission-oriented program and adequate financing. This will be provided by H.R. 11212.

Hot dry rock at temperatures greater than 250° C—or 2½ times the boiling point of water—underlies about 17 percent of the area in the Western States, and also occurs at somewhat lower temperatures in eastern areas. Our research programs should develop efficient methods for transforming this heat into electrical energy, whether it is from the lower temperature granite underlying the Eastern States or the higher temperature rock formations of the West. H.R. 11212 includes provisions for this research.

The second unconventional source of geothermal energy—large geopressed zones—are presently known to exist at great depths on the gulf coast and may exist in certain other areas. They have been encountered during deep exploratory drillings for oil and gas along the Louisiana and Texas coast where very high pressures and temperatures were encountered. The dangers associated with these high pressures and temperatures made oil or gas wells unusable, but what was once considered a failure may prove to be the source of new energy in the near future.

The Resource Appraisal Panel of the National Science Foundation Conference on Geothermal Energy estimated in September 1972 that geopressed zones may contain nearly 2,700 trillion cubic feet of natural gas—an amount equal to three times our known reserves of natural gas—dissolved in the heated water. I prefer to treat this as an optimistic estimate, but if it is only approximately true, and if this natural gas can be recovered, it will have a most significant and favorable impact on our energy resource base during the 1980's. The water in these geopressed zones is trapped and not circulating, and much of it may

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

be potable, and thus valuable for domestic or agricultural purposes. In addition, since the trapped water is held under extremely high pressures, it may be utilized directly to drive turbines to produce cheap electricity. Thus, we may have three sources of energy from this one geothermal phenomenon—the heat and the pressure from the water, and the natural gas.

The application of technology to the problems of hot dry rock and geopressed zones can make them viable commercial sources for electric power generation, sources whose potential is great enough to have a significant impact in meeting our national energy needs from the 1980's onward.

H.R. 11212 will provide the necessary research and development of pilot plants to demonstrate technical feasibility, and, after review of the progress, provide for the construction of a small, commercially competitive demonstration plant exploiting each source.

Concurrent with this objective will be the necessary development of new techniques to extract energy more usefully from the existing sources of geothermal steam such as those being developed in California. However, this work, and the development of the hot water resources of California, will, we believe, be accomplished by the utility industries of that area under the land leasing provisions of existing law.

The proposed legislation would authorize an \$80 million, 6-year research, development and demonstration program by the National Science Foundation and NASA, designed to demonstrate the feasibility of producing electric energy from geothermal heat and pressurized water, with the possible added benefit of exploiting much needed additional gas resources.

Mr. Speaker, although the original bill has already been submitted, we have invited, and are now inviting, other Members of the House to join us in cosponsoring identical versions of this measure. I believe it is important that the Congress of the United States demonstrate that it has the courage, the sense of responsibility and the perspective to initiate constructive programs which will help solve our energy crisis in a timely manner and which will help us move toward energy self-sufficiency at the earliest possible date. I believe that the solar energy bill which we sponsored 2 weeks ago, and the geothermal bill which we are now sponsoring are two such measures; legislation of which we may be proud, and which the people of the United States will recognize as responsible.

We intend to hold hearings on the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Commercial Demonstration Act of 1973 as soon as markup is completed on the solar energy bill. If Congress remains in session during the month of December it is our intention to report this bill out of committee before the end of the year.

The bill follows:

H.R. 11212

A bill to further the conduct of research, development, and commercial demonstrations in geothermal energy technologies,

to direct the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research relating to geothermal energy, and to direct the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to carry out a program of demonstrations in technologies for commercial utilization of geothermal resources including hot dry rock and geopressed fields
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Commercial Demonstration Act of 1973".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—
 (1) the Nation is currently suffering a critical shortage of environmentally acceptable forms of energy;

(2) the inadequate organizational structures and levels of funding for energy research have limited the Nation's current and future options for meeting energy needs;

(3) electrical energy is a clean and convenient form of energy at the location of its use and is the only practicable form of energy in some modern applications, but the demand for electric energy in every region of the United States is taxing all of the alternative energy sources presently available and is projected to increase; some of the sources available for electric power generation are already in short supply, and the development and use of other sources presently involves undesirable environmental impacts;

(4) the Nation's critical energy problems can be solved only if a national commitment is made to dedicate the necessary financial resources, and enlist the cooperation of the private and public sectors, in developing geothermal resources and other nonconventional sources of energy;

(5) the conventional geothermal resources which are presently being used have limited total potential; but geothermal resources which are different from those presently being used, and which have extremely large energy content, are known to exist;

(6) some geothermal resources contain energy other than heat; examples are methane and extremely high pressures available upon release as kinetic energy;

(7) some geothermal resources contain valuable byproducts such as potable water and mineral compounds which should be processed and recovered as national resources;

(8) technologies are not presently available for the development of most of these geothermal resources, but technologies for the generation of electric energy from geothermal resources are potentially economical and environmentally desirable, and the development of geothermal resources offers possibilities of process energy and other non-electric applications;

(9) much of the known geothermal resources exist on the public lands; and

(10) Federal financial assistance is necessary to encourage the extensive exploration, research, and development in geothermal resources which will bring these technologies to the point of commercial application.

FUNDING OF GEOTHERMAL ENERGY RESEARCH
 BY NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1862) is amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) The Director shall initiate and support basic and applied research relating to geothermal energy development, as provided in section 3(b) of the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Commercial Demonstration Act of 1973."

(b) The Director of the National Science Foundation is authorized and directed to initiate, support, and fund basic and applied

November 7, 1973

research activities related to geothermal energy in support of the objectives of this Act. These research activities shall, insofar as practicable, support the new geothermal energy technologies demonstrated or to be demonstrated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration pursuant to section 4 of this Act. For these purposes the Director of the National Science Foundation is authorized to utilize funds appropriated to the Foundation pursuant to law or transferred to it from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or other Federal agencies.

COMMERCIAL GEOTHERMAL ENERGY DEMONSTRATIONS BY NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) Section 203 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2473) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The Administration shall initiate and carry out commercial demonstrations and conduct related activities (including research and development) in geothermal energy technology, as provided in section 4(b) of the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Commercial Demonstration Act of 1973."

(b) (1) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Administration") is authorized and directed to undertake and carry out a program, as provided in this subsection, for the development and demonstration of the commercial use of geothermal resources for the production of energy in support of the objectives of this Act.

(2) The program under this subsection shall encompass research, development, commercial demonstrations, and related activities involving geothermal resource bases such as hot dry rock and geopressed zones.

(3) (A) In carrying out the program under this subsection, the Administration is authorized to establish with respect to each geothermal resource base involved a separate demonstration project, which shall include, as appropriate, all of the exploration, siting, drilling, pilot plant construction and operation, commercial demonstration plant construction and operation, and other facilities and activities which may be necessary for the generation of electric energy and the utilization of geothermal resource byproducts.

(B) Plants and other real property utilized or involved in any such project may be purchased, leased, constructed, or otherwise established or obtained by the Administration either directly, through its own facilities and personnel, or under appropriate contracts or arrangements with other public or private persons or agencies.

(C) Basic and applied research needed for or in connection with any demonstration project under this paragraph, and related research and development activities, shall be conducted or performed by the Administration but shall be coordinated to the maximum extent possible with related activities of the National Science Foundation (particularly those provided for in section 3(b) of this Act), the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other appropriate public agencies and private entities.

(4) (A) During the conduct of any demonstration project under paragraph (3) the Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary to dispose of all the electric energy and other geothermal resource by products of such project, in such manner and on such terms and conditions as the Administration may determine to be feasible and in support of the objectives of this Act.

(B) To the maximum extent possible the disposition of byproducts under subparagraph (A) shall be accomplished through

the sale of such byproducts for commercial utilization, on such terms and conditions and in accordance with such plans as the Administration may prescribe or develop.

(5) At the conclusion of the program under this subsection or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, the Administration shall, by sale, lease, or otherwise, dispose of all projects undertaken pursuant to paragraph (3) (including mineral rights therein) on such terms and conditions as it determines to be reasonable, or, if the disposition of any such project or any part thereof on reasonable terms and conditions is not possible or feasible, shall under appropriate contracts or other arrangements provide for the disposition of all of the electric energy and other geothermal resource byproducts of such project or part thereof.

(6) In the conduct of its activities under this subsection, the Administration shall place particular emphasis upon the objective of assuring that the environment is effectively protected and that such activities do not threaten the safety of persons or property; and the program under this subsection shall include such special research and development as may be necessary for the achievement of that objective.

(7) (A) The Administration shall submit to the President and the Congress at least every six months during the period of the program under this section a full and complete report of its activities under this section, including such projections and estimates as may be necessary to evaluate the progress of the program under this section and to provide the basis for as accurate a judgment as is possible concerning the extent to which the objectives of this Act will have been achieved by the close of such period.

(B) No later than one year after the close of the period of the program under this section, the Administration shall submit to the President and the Congress a final report on its activities under this section, including its recommendations with respect to any further legislative, administrative, and other actions which should be taken in support of the objectives of this Act.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration, for the first six fiscal years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, such sums, not exceeding \$80,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out this section.

WE NEED A NEW MINIMUM WAGE BILL

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, representatives of several labor organizations have taken pen in hand of late to chastise those of us who voted to sustain the veto of the minimum wage bill. The vetoed bill, according to them, was 100-percent perfect. They find it incomprehensible that 164 Members of Congress could have found a single fault with it.

Our objections have been enumerated time and time again. There is room for compromise, which, after all, is the well-spring of good legislation.

Those on the other side, however, have been adamant all along. They fought compromise last year, and now they spend their time and energies writing letters of protest, instead of encouraging

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

our General Labor Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. DENT, to negotiate and to compromise.

The message they convey is that they still prefer a political issue, not a realistic bill. If these leaders of big labor are sincere, if they truly want wage increases for the unskilled, they will put an end to the rhetoric and join me in urging the prompt reporting of a sensible, workable minimum wage bill. That may not provide the sense of satisfaction howling apparently does, but we could get a good minimum wage bill. That is what the legislative process is all about.

THE INFLATION FED

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of inflation continues to bedevil us all. My strong view is that controls will not solve the problem, and the experience we have had to date appears to confirm my view. Deficit spending by the Federal Government is a major culprit. Recently, Milton Friedman discussed the role the Federal Reserve System is playing in trying to right our economy and found it wanting. It seems that controls and direction of the economy by the Government has accomplished little in overcoming inflation. Mr. Milton Friedman's article that appeared in *Newsweek* of August 27, 1973, follows:

THE INFLATIONARY FED
(By Milton Friedman)

"Seldom has promise diverged so widely from performance as it has in recent monetary policy . . .

"Listen to the words that emanate from the Federal Reserve System and you will conclude that the Fed is a bastion of defense against inflation . . .

"Look at the Fed's actions, and you will reach precisely the opposite conclusion . . .

"The plain fact is that inflation is made in Washington, in that stately and impressive Grecian temple . . . that houses the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

Tragically, these words are no less relevant today than when they first appeared in this space in 1969.

I then attributed the divergence of promise from performance to misunderstanding. The men who run the Fed, I wrote, have "taken the behavior of interest rates rather than the quantity of money as their guide—and this mistake has led them far astray from their intended path."

BETTER UNDERSTANDING

That explanation is not valid today. In January 1970, the Fed gave primacy in its policy directive to "monetary aggregates" rather than interest rates. In February 1971, chairman Burns testified to Congress: "We know . . . that while a high rate of growth of narrowly defined money may well be appropriate for brief periods, rates of increase above the 5 or 6 per cent range—if continued for a long period of time—have typically intensified inflationary pressures." He went on to "reaffirm the assurance that I gave this committee and the nation a year ago—namely that the Federal Reserve will not become the architect of a new wave of inflation."

The rates of monetary growth specified by chairman Burns are too high. Yet, even so, actual monetary growth has been substantially higher.

The standards

In not a single one of the 216 months from January 1948 to January 1966 did the year-to-year growth in the narrowly defined money supply (M_1) exceed 6 per cent. These eighteen years included the Korean inflation, yet M_1 rose at the average rate of only 2.4 per cent per year; consumer prices, of 1.7 per cent; wholesale prices, of 1.2 per cent.

The two years 1966 and 1967 set the stage for the subsequent burst of inflation. Yet the year-to-year growth in M_1 exceeded 6 percent in only four out of 24 months. M_1 rose at the average rate of 4.3 percent; consumer prices, of 3.4 percent; wholesale prices, of 1.3 percent.

The evidence therefore supports a "3 or 4 percent range" rather better than Burn's "5 or 6 percent range."

Performance

In the three and a half years since January 1970, the year-to-year growth in M_1 has exceeded 6 percent in 25 out of 42 months, and has averaged 6.7 percent. Moreover, monetary growth has been speeding up, averaging 7.3 percent since January 1971, 7.8 percent since January 1972. Consumer prices rose at an average rate of 4.6 percent, wholesale prices, of 6.7 percent.

Over short periods, many factors other than monetary growth affect the rate of inflation. But, as chairman Burns implied, over long periods, monetary growth is dominant.

It takes several years for monetary growth to exert its full influence on prices. As a result, we have so far experienced only the early effects of the nearly 8 percent rate of growth of the past year and a half. That rate of monetary growth, probably even now, and certainly if long continued, implies that inflation in consumer prices will reach something like 7 percent per year after full adjustment.

When the Fed changed its directive in January 1970, those of us who had long been urging such a change confidently expected steady monetary growth at a noninflationary rate—especially after chairman Burns stated in a May 1970 talk, "In recent years, growth rates of major monetary aggregates have been permitted to vary over an extremely wide range . . . There has been much loose talk of 'fine tuning' when the state of knowledge permits us to predict only within a fairly broad level the course of economic development and the results of policy actions."

WORSE POLICY

Our hopes have been shattered. Monetary growth has been both higher and more variable in the past three and a half years than in any other postwar period of equal length.

What now explains the divergence between the Fed's promises and its performance? Why does the Fed remain an engine of inflation? I confess that I am baffled.

H.R. 10937

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10937, which I introduced on October 16, 1973, deals with a matter of great national im-

* See my "How Much Monetary Growth?," Morgan Guaranty Survey, February 1973.

portance and utmost urgency. The June 5, 1972, grand jury of the District Court of the District of Columbia, the so-called Watergate grand jury, will expire on December 4, 1973, unless the Congress acts to extend its term.

The Watergate grand jury has been sitting for 16 months, receiving evidence and testimony related to the Watergate break-in and coverup. It has worked hard and compiled many pages of transcript. The grand jury is acquainted in detail with the many facets of the matters it has had under consideration. It would be extremely unfortunate if this grand jury were to expire and the country to lose its services.

The alternative to extending the Watergate grand jury is to let it go out of existence and to let another grand jury take up the Watergate break-in and coverup. This alternative course of action will result in a waste of time and resources. If the prosecutors do not recall the witnesses who previously testified, they will have to read or extensively summarize the transcripts of the witnesses' testimony. Considering the scope of the grand jury's work to date, either course of action will be needlessly time-consuming, costly, and inefficient.

H. R. 10937 will by statute extend the term of the Watergate grand jury until June 4, 1974, a period of 6 months. The District Court for the District of Columbia is empowered to extend the term for an additional 6 months if it finds that the grand jury will not have completed its business by June 4, 1973. Should the district court fail to extend the term, the grand jury is authorized to apply to the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for the extension. However, H.R. 10937 provides that in no event shall the term of the grand jury extend beyond December 4, 1974. The Committee on the Judiciary has been assured by the Justice Department prosecutors in charge of the Watergate matters that they will be able to complete all of their work by December 4, 1974.

H.R. 10937 will promote the just and efficient administration of justice. The legislation will permit a highly knowl-

edgeable grand jury to continue to hear testimony and receive evidence. This will protect the interests of possible defendants, and interests of the prosecutors, and the interests of the public, for it will insure that people who are intimately acquainted with all the facts will be deciding whether to return indictments, and, if necessary, against whom to return them. This will, in turn, help restore public confidence in the efficacy and integrity of our judicial system. I urge the House to pass this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the vote today on the previous question on the rule for the bill, H.R. 11104, the debt limit bill, I should like the RECORD to show that I intended to vote "nay." Because of trouble with the electronic voting machine, my vote was inadvertently recorded as "aye," and under the 15-minute rule there was unfortunately no time available to me in which to change my vote.

DEFICIT SPENDING

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to address my colleagues about one of my pet peeves—the deficit spending practices of our Government.

The word "inflation" is on the tip of the tongue of every person in this country. Volumes have been written and spoken about the inflation problem but little, if anything, has been done to stop it.

I think it is long past due that the Con-

gress be honest with itself and put the blame where it belongs—on the Congress and its apparent approval of the Government's deficit spending. The inflation is the direct result of more than 30 years of deficit spending.

The only way to begin an earnest battle against inflation is not more Government spending at the expense of increased taxes but less taxation and less Government spending.

It is a fact of life, Mr. Speaker, that there is no such thing as a free lunch either in Government or the private sector.

Our Government—with the approval of the Congress—is and has been spending \$1 out of every \$5 circulated in this country. That practice is not economically healthy. In fact, it is deadly.

It is not the individual earnings or the so-called tax structure causing our financial problems. The full blame must be put on the Government's policy of deficit spending. The present inflation is the price this Nation is paying for more than 30 years of unbalanced budgets. There are many Government economists who have elaborate explanations of its causes, but the explanation is very simple—for too long we have continued deficit spending, of never balancing the budget.

Yes, we can expect deficit spending during years of emergency, but our annual deficits are now greater than during wartime.

If a family or business spends more than it takes in, it soon goes broke, but the bureaucrats are trying to find a whipping boy to blame for the economic trouble—the taxpayer. I maintain that it will not work.

It is very simple to figure out that if Congress will stop deficit spending, the economy will right itself. But Congress must take the initiative.

We are obligated to every citizen and taxpayer of this country to do so. We can no longer afford, financially or morally, to continue this way. I urge every Member of the Congress to give serious thought to this problem and give it top priority in all decisionmaking. We must begin to mend our ways now—we cannot afford to wait.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, November 8, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Monsignor Louis W. Albert, pastor of St. John the Evangelist Church, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

FOR THIS DAY

Eternal God, we praise and thank You for your presence with us here and now.

From our preoccupation with fear, prejudice, and pain, we turn to You, everlasting God.

You give us life.

And beyond food to eat, water to drink, and air to breathe, You give us faith to bring us to the truth, hope to keep us going, and love to make it all worthwhile.

Create in us again this day and this hour the quality of life which is eternal, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. 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 having proceeded to reconsider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 542) entitled "Joint resolution concerning the war powers of Congress and the President," returned by the President of the United States with his objections to the House of Representatives,

in which it originated, and that the said joint resolution pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

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

H.R. 5874. An act to establish a Federal Financing Bank, to provide for coordinated and more efficient financing of Federal and federally assisted borrowings from the public, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 5874) entitled "An act to establish a Federal Financing Bank, to provide for coordinated and more efficient financing of Federal and federally assisted borrowings from the public, and