Maj. Charles V. Blair, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Emiel T. Bouckaert, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Charles R. Bradley, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Wayne R. Brendel, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Richard A. Brockway, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Alfred P. Bunting, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. John E. Carleton, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. John A. Carter, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. James W. Chapman, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Kenneth J. Costa, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. David E. Culver, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. James H. Estep, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. James R. Felix, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Stanley Gavac, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Adolph P. Hearon, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. John B. Holmgreen, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. James G. Jolly, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. James M. Kees, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Thomas L. Kincaid, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Ritchie K. Kunichika, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. David L. Ladd, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Elliott W. Lambert, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Paul W. Lindemuth, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Gilbert Popez, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Richard J. Marx, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Donald L. Masuret, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Elden I. Maxwell, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Juan J. Mayol, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. William B. McDonald, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. David A. McLaughlin, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Robert L. Monson, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Dale E. Moses, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Joseph Naddeo, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Billy J. Nichols, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Robert W. Odle, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. George C. Radzak, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Dale H. Reinecker, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Dan A. Robar, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Kennith L. Robinson, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Clarence H. Ryherd, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Harold S. Schindler, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. William C. Seeds, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Richard H. Sotherland, xxx-xx-xxxx xxx-... FG.
Maj. Elvin E. Stambaugh, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. John P. Syribeys, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Donald R. Tonole, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Thomas J. Turnbull xxx-xx-xxxx G.
Maj. Samuel A. Wilson, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Roger T. Winn, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Kenneth L. Wolfe, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Stanley A. Worsham, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Ward H. Zelhart, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Maj. Allan D. Davidson, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.
Maj. Duane F. Mabeus, xxx-xx-xxxx FG.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

S. 1868: AN INDUSTRY VIEW

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 9, 1973

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, on September 6, Mr. Martin N. Ornitz, president of the Stainless Steel Division of the Crucible Materials Group for Colt Industries, Inc., filed a statement with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for the record of the committee's hearing on S. 1868, legislation to reinstate U.S. participation in the United Nations sanctions against the importation of metallurgical chromium ore and other materials from Rhodesia.

Mr. Ornitz was one of a number of persons who had expressed a willingness to appear before the committee in person, but was requested not to do so because of time. Instead, he was asked by the committee to submit a statement on the understanding that it would be included in the printed volume of the committee's hearing. Later, a decision was made to include in the printed volume only the statements of those persons who actually appeared before the committee.

Therefore, I would like to bring the statement by Mr. Ornitz to the immediate cause of time. Instead, he was asked by attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF MARTIN N. ORNITZ

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee. I am president of the Stainless Steel Division of the Crucible Materials Group of Colt Industries Inc. The specialty steel industries—stainless, alloy and tool steels—are the major consumers of chromium in the United States and overseas.

I thank you for the opportunity to submit this statement to your Committee. I want to take advantage of the opportunity by bringing two points to your attention.

One is the economic consequence for the American citizen of shutting off the United States from access to any source of metallurgical chrome, at a time when worldwide demand for chrome is rising and America must compete for it with a host of other countries.

The second point is that the Committee's consideration of chrome opens the way for you to help find a solution for the problem of the raw materials shortage that besets the United States. Instead of adding to the shortage, as the pending bill would, I urge that you begin the positive search for means to assure the continuing availability of raw materials, particularly chrome. I do not intend to address political aspects of the legislation, about which the Committee is in a position to know more than I, but it is obvious that the narrow and negative approach of the pending legislation will not long—if ever—help the people of Africa in whose interest the legislation was drafted. For Africa is not going to benefit from a "have-not" United States. Africa deserves better than that. The United States deserves better than that.

Regarding the economics, the legislation before you creates a serious immediate problem for the American public. If the legislation is enacted in present form, it will reduce the amount of chromium ore, i.e., chromite, and ferrochrome—a steel making alloy made from metallurgical chromite—available to the United States. All usable chromite is mined overseas. This reduction of chrome will threaten the stainless steel industry with reduction in output. As a matter of law as well as a matter of consumer preference, stainless is used in many applications that are critical to our way of life and the public health. The dairy industry, for example, uses much stainless steel in the interest of public health, from the milking of the cow, to vats used in cheese-making, to tank trucks that haul milk to the dairy and the dairy equipment itself. Stainless is employed in the making of tractors and a variety of other agricultural machines. Our country needs and the world needs the American farm. Perhaps the relationship between the farm and chrome was overlooked in the advocacy of this legislation.

Furthermore, stainless is one of the specialty metals essential to national defense. It is important in the reduction of air pollution. There are many other uses, which I list later in this statement, including the manufacture of automobiles, airplanes, and railway equipment. I know that the legislation is not aimed by intent at dairymen, at the environmentalists or at national defense or American transportation. But they are the "innocent bystander" targets of the legislation. It takes chrome to make stainless. There is no escape from that reality.

In summary, the situation is:

The production and consumption of stainless steel and other chrome-bearing specialty steel has increased substantially since 1970 in the United States. Each individual type of market for stainless in the U.S. (except aircraft) has increased since 1970. It has gone from a total domestic consumption of 802,000 metric tons in 1970 to 941,000 metric tons in 1972. The consumption for 1973 first six months is 29 percent greater than in first six months of 1972.

The worldwide demand for the same steels and their production also has increased substantially since 1972. The market for stainless produced in all countries increased by 15 percent from 1971 to 1972, and is further increasing in 1973.

The result is rising demand and worldwide competition for available chromite and ferrochrome from sources outside the United States. Hope for a domestic ore is dashed by the fact that ore identified in Montana is not economically practical in filling ferrochromium requirements. Ferrochrome production in the United States is down due to the problem of chromite availability, cost of compliance with environmental laws, and change in requirements for the type of ferrochrome used resulting from changes in melting techniques.

The change in type of ferrochrome needed results from increasing usage of the new AOD process to make stainless steel. This process greatly increases usage of charge chrome and reduces use of the more expensive low carbon ferrochrome. Crucible believes that the AOD process is a key element in keeping us competitive against foreign made stainless steel. In addition to lowering costs, the process also provides higher quality stainless. Crucible has put in operation a 100-ton AOD unit, which is the largest operating vessel in the world. My company bought practically all of its ferrochrome in the United States until it became almost impossible to do so. The United States is competing with many countries for the available ferrochrome—Japan, Great Britain, France, Sweden, Austria, Belgium, West Germany, Italy, Soviet Union, People's Republic of China, Spain, Brazil, Canada, Australia, Mexico, and Norway. Cost as well as availability is a fundamental consideration. If it happens that the only way the United States can obtain chrome is to pay a premium price, the national struggle against inflation is set back.

The specialty steel industry in the United States must have assurance of adequate supplies of ferrochrome. Given the worldwide demand situation, no country can afford the elimination of Rhodesia as a source of chromite for making ferrochrome unless Rhodesia is replaced by assured access to a substitute source. Geologists have not found new supplies in the earth that are being worked. Chromite is mined in several countries, but that fact can be misleading.

For example, it has been pointed out that the Philippines are a source of chromite. That means nothing to the stainless industry in the United States. The Philippine metallurgical chromite desirable for steel-production goes to Japan. The Philippine exports to the United States consist of ore for the refractories industry and is not suit-

able for steel-making purposes. Philippine chromite production increased from 1968 through 1971 (*Metal Statistics* 1973, a publication of Fairchild Publications, Inc.), along with increases in the production of South Africa, Turkey, U.S.S.R., Albania, India, Iran, Greece, and Rhodesia. As with the Philippines, not all those sources are available to the United States, because of established commercial relationships, long-term contracting, etc. And not all chromite mined goes into international trade; the U.S.S.R., a major steel-maker, consumes part of its own chromite production.

The world increase in chromite production 1968–71 was 27 percent. The world increase in stainless production 1968–1972 was 24 percent—nearly parallel. At present the ferrochrome supply is so tight that American producers of stainless are on allocation—rationed. Production of stainless cannot be sustained at required levels if one source of chrome is removed without another source of comparable quality and quantity being provided.

An additional problem of sourcing is that not all furnaces used in making ferrochrome can convert all types of ore. Some of the furnaces in South Africa can convert only Rhodesian ore. The character and quality of ores vary. Poor quality ores are included in the statistics of world production, but are not commercially suitable for use.

The National Materials Advisory Board in May 1970 published the report, *Trends in Usage of Chromium*, which states about chrome quality:

"For the largest application (61% of total consumption), ferroalloy additions to stainless and alloy steels, a high quality ore is desired.

"Quality considerations include the physical nature (hard lump), a high CR_2O_3 content (48% or better), a CR/FE ratio of over 3/1, and are MGO/AL_2O_3 ratio of 1.8 or below. These factors significantly affect the grade of ferroalloy produced, the conversion cost, and the output of the ferroalloy facility. In times of emergency lower quality ores could be utilized but at a significant sacrifice in facility output of both the ferroalloy and steel furnaces and a substantial increase in cost."

The report of the National Materials Advisory Board adds these words about quality: "Of the Free World's supply of high-grade ore, 70 percent of the reserves in this quality are found in Rhodesia."

This report is available from the Clearinghouse of Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Virginia, 22151 and it contains many facts which clarify the importance of chrome to the future of our country.

Bearing further on the problem of cost and inflation, I would like to comment on recent correspondence between me and members of Congress, some of which was printed in the Congressional Record—Senate, July 16, 1973.

1. World deposits of chromium ore. As stated above it is true that there are deposits of chromium ores in countries other than Russia, Rhodesia, Turkey and South Africa. It is true that there are chromium ore bodies in the United States. I respectfully submit, however, that we must look at this on a practical basis. Ores from many sources cannot be economically or practically used.

2. When I say there is no effective substitute for chromium, I mean no practical substitute. We could, of course, substitute titanium for stainless steel in many applications—or gold or silver for that matter. But not on a practical cost basis.

It has been stated that Turkey might mine more chrome ore "if the United States, Japanese and European consumers were willing to assist them". But why should the Japanese and Europeans subsidize Turkish mines if they are to share the output with their American competitor?

It has been stated that the price of chrome has gone up, not just because of the embargo on Rhodesia but for other world economic reasons. Naturally, laws of supply and demand still govern. But a U.S. buyer of chrome ore cites the following prices he paid, F.O.B. shipping point:

Russian ore—1966 (before sanctions), $26.24 per ton.

Russian ore—1971 (after embargo), $55.50 per ton.

Russian ore—1972 (after Byrd amendment), $45.72 to $47.25 per ton.

Rhodesian ore—1972, $39.50 per ton.

Gentlemen, the specialty steel industry in this country is having a hard enough time staying afloat, what with imports, high expenditures to comply with new laws governing pollution of air and water, rising costs of energy—without having to pay more for chromium than other nations with whom we compete, many of which also signed the U.N. agreement on Rhodesian.

The British Foreign Secretary told Parliament a year ago, "A lot of Rhodesian exports are going to countries which are members of the United Nations and which are supposed to be supporting sanctions."

This hearing is taking place at a time when the problem of supply of chrome is far more critical than it was when the embargo on Rhodesian chrome imports went into effect and in 1971 when the embargo was removed.

The U.S. Bureau of Mines' Mineral Industry Surveys report of August 7, 1973, on "Chromium in May, 1973," shows that consumption of chromite by the metallurgical industry increased by 46 percent in the first quarter of 1973 compared with the first quarter of 1972.

The comparative figures are 150,788 short tons in January-March 1972; 221,547 short tons in January-March 1973.

The chrome steels made in the United States are shipped to every State. They are indispensable to farming, to transportation, and to the safeguarding of health.

Alloy steels are used in the manufacture of farm equipment, trucks, buses, earth-moving equipment, mining machinery, oil country goods, hand tools, machine tools, power generation equipment, aircraft and space vehicles.

Stainless steels are used in dairy, hospital and restaurant equipment, food processing, oil refineries, power plants, home appliances, automobiles, airplanes, chemical plants, paper mills, and many other vital industries.

Tool steels are used to machine or form the alloy steels, stainless steels and all other materials of construction such as aluminum, copper, plastics and the like.

The catalytic converter which is scheduled to be included in the exhaust system of some 1975 model cars and all 1976 model cars will use approximately 30 to 60 pounds per car of steel containing about 12% chromium. We have been advised by the automotive industry that the requirements for the 1975 model will be around 150,000 to 175,000 tons of this stainless steel. For the 1976 model year this demand can be up to 250,000 tons of 12% chromium stainless steel which would mean the consumption of up to 50,000 tons of ferrochrome per year. An estimate of 20,000 tons made for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace does not fit the requirement.

As for the dairy industry, the *General Specifications for Dairy Plants Approved for USDA Inspection and Grading Service*, effective May 16, 1967, as published by the Dairy Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture states (page 27):

"The product contact surfaces of all utensils and equipment such as hold tanks, pasteurizers, coolers, vats, agitators, pumps, sanitary piping and fittings shall be constructed of *stainless steel* or other equally corrosion resistant material."

The *General Specifications* are replete with other references to stainless steel, requiring that a wide range of equipment including tank trucks meet the 3–A sanitary standards. These standards are set by the International Association of Milk, Food and Environmental Sanitarians, United States Public Health Service and the Dairy Industry Committee.

The 3–A standards for homogenizers are:

"All product surfaces shall be of stainless steel of the AISI 300 series or corresponding ACI types . . . or stainless steel that is non-toxic and non-absorbent and which under conditions of intended use is equal in corrosion resistance to stainless steel of the AISI 300 series or corresponding ACI types."

The only exceptions are for valve parts, valve seats, impact rings and parts used in similar applications, and gaskets and seals.

The regulatory literature in this area has a wide embracive extent, and includes practices in all the great dairy states. States notable in the manufacture of dairy equipment are Minnesota, Wisconsin, California, Missouri, Pennsylvania, New York, Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana.

Regarding poultry, standards are under consideration for adoption for the handling of liquid or dry egg product.

Pending E–3–A Standards have been formulated by the International Association of Milk, Food and Environmental Sanitarians, United States Public Health Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Institute of American Poultry Industries, and the Dairy and Food Industries Association. Under the heading "materials," the proposed standard states:

"All product contact surfaces shall be of stainless steel of the AISI 300 series or corresponding ACI types or equally corrosion resistant metal that is non-toxic and non-absorbent." Exceptions listed permit use of rubber, plastic or glass for certain parts of the equipment.

The foregoing examples of use of stainless in American society make it obvious that the Congress would be recklessly disruptive if it diminished the ability of the United States to produce stainless in required quantities. Jobs are at stake. The specialty steel industry is an important employer of skilled workers. Investments are at stake, on the farm and in stainless-using industries.

To cut down the availability of chrome would make it impossible for the United States to halt its decline in the share of the world production of metals. The *Second Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior Under the Mining and Minerals Act of 1970*, dated June, 1973, points out that the U.S., which produced 47 percent of steel in 1950, now produces 19 percent. The report notes the problem of the U.S. in obtaining raw materials abroad:

The American "relative role as a world consumer of mineral raw materials . . . has shrunk.

"Consequently, the United States is encountering steadily increasing competition in the acquisition of non-domestic mineral raw materials as other industrialized countries also seek reliable sources of reasonably-priced mineral raw materials."

The report contains a chart showing that all of the chromium used in the U.S. comes from foreign sources. For those sources we are in competition with all the countries producing stainless and alloy and tool steels.

Mr. Chairman, S. 1868 will intensify the problem noted in the report of the Secretary of the Interior. The majority population in Rhodesia cannot benefit from a weakened America. The sacrifice which the enactment of S. 1868 would require of America will only benefit our country's industrial competitors abroad. If our stainless production goes down from lack of chrome, foreign production can continue to rise. Chrome is to stainless what feedgrains are to livestock and poultry. The feedgrain requirement is

rising. The chrome requirement is rising. Stainless needs chrome as a hog needs corn.

As long as no replacement source is clearly available to the United States for Rhodesian chrome and for ferrochrome made from Rhodesian chromite, I urge the Committee to reconsider its interest in the pending bill.

I am not urging any particular source of supply of chrome ore or ferrochrome. The point is that the sources must be adequate to meet the need, and they must be continuingly available as the need grows.

Distinguished men have said that an embargo on chrome from Rhodesia could be offset by use of the chrome in the American stockpile. But that stockpile is not accessible in adequate quantity. Legislation is required to release from the stockpile sufficient quantities to satisfy the increasing requirements. Enactment of a law cutting off Rhodesian chrome without concurrent existence of a law releasing chrome in large quantities from the stockpile would result in shortages that are bound to harm the interest of the many Americans who rely on stainless steel in their daily life and work. The stockpile promises only short-term relief, since its stock of metallurgically useful ore and of ferrochrome is limited. Resort to the stockpile could intensify the problem of the United States when the stockpile is exhausted. Lines of trade from ore-producing and ferrochrome-producing countries to stainless-producing countries can become so fixed for fulfillment of needs of other countries that it will be difficult for the United States to find sources after the stockpile days.

So the stockpile solution is a solution that leads in time to the aggravation of the American raw materials problem.

But if the Committee is morally determined that it will prohabit American access to Rhodesian chrome, it would be shortsighted to do so before Congress legislates full access to the stockpile.

The law removing the embargo which the Congress passed in 1971 is not designed to benefit the Government of Rhodesia but to lend economic support to the United States in the era of the race for raw materials which the Secretary of the Interior incisively describes. We need materials. Don't shut the door on Rhodesia until you have opened another one of equal utility.

QUESTIONNAIRE REVEALS VIEWS ABOUT MATTERS FACING CONGRESS

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, as the people's Representative from the Fourth District of Kentucky, I periodically seek their views on matters facing the Congress and/or our area I feel that the results of a September questionnaire would be of interest to my colleagues for the people I represent are a good cross-section of pure, unadulterated, God-fearing Americans.

Results of questionnaire follow:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Are you generally satisfied with the way economic and wage price controls are working?	8.4	88.7	2.9
2. Should the President impound funds appropriated by Congress if he feels they are excessive and "budget busting" to the point of requiring that taxes be increased?	58.3	35.8	5.9
3. Do you favor Federal strip mining regulations that will assure reclamation of the land?	88.9	4.5	6.6
4. Do you favor Federal tax credits to reimburse parents for part of the cost of private and parochial school tuition?	36.1	62.5	1.4
5. Do you favor extending financial aid for the reconstruction of Indochina (Laos, Cambodia, North and South Vietnam)?	12.9	83.3	3.8
6. In view of the possibility of critical motor fuel shortages, should the Government step in and allocate supplies?	55.8	36.1	8.1
7. Would you approve giving oil companies more tax incentives to increase oil and gas production?	36.1	59.3	4.6
8. Do you favor the recent Supreme Court ruling making abortions permissible?	45.5	51.3	3.2

9. Who do you think is to blame for the Watergate affair?

	Percent
The President	36.0
White House staff	35.8
The Committee to Reelect the President	46.1
The Republican Party	6.4
All politicians	28.6

10. What effect will the Watergate affair have on the Kentucky election in 1974?

	Percent
A great deal	26.6
Some	32.1
None	13.2
Too early to tell	17.6

11. What do you think is the most important issue facing the country?

Now, Mr. Speaker, on question No. 11 over 57 percent of those who responded indicated that the economic situation—that is, inflation, wages, cost of living, and prices in general—is the most important issue facing the country. Second, 17 percent felt that the most important issue was the credibility of government and elected officials. Diverse other issues made up the balance—that is, law and order, drugs, ecology, excessive Federal spending, welfare waste, morality, the energy crisis, defense, food shortages, the news media, big business, big unions, big government, Federal subsidies, education, health, housing, faith in God, population control, abortion, Mideast conflict, and a variety of personal issues.

THE EAGLE IS OUR SYMBOL—NOT THE CHICKEN

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 9, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on October 13, I was privileged to address the annual convention of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, assembled in San Francisco. On that occasion, a fine American was installed as the 30th president of the AAPS.

No doubt some of my colleagues have only a hazy idea of the goals and purposes of the association which Dr. Donald Quinlan now serves as its new president. The AAPS is a nationwide organization of independent physicians devoted to the principle that the best medicine for the American people is medicine practiced in freedom, without political interference.

This remarkable organization of doctors is dedicated to the protection and preservation of the private practice of medicine, free from all kinds of third-party intervention.

What they ask seems simple enough—freedom to use their best ethical professional medical judgment solely for the benefit of their patients. These doctors do not take Federal subsidies; they realize that Federal subsidies inevitably mean Federal controls. They just want to be left alone to practice the best medicine they know how in the best interest of their patients.

On the occasion of my visit with this distinguished group of men and women, the new president of AAPS delivered some eloquent observations to his colleagues. I asked that I be sent a text of those remarks, so that Dr. Quinlan's message might be shared with Members of this body.

Mr. President, when Dr. Quinlan warns of the dangers of socialized medicine, he knows what he is talking about. Dr. Quinlan practiced under the British National Health Service before coming to the United States 15 years ago.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Quinlan's remarks be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE EAGLE IS OUR SYMBOL—NOT THE CHICKEN

(By Donald Quinlan, M.D.)

I think you will all agree that it makes about as much sense to have a beef shortage or an oil shortage in this country as it does for Cuba to have a sugar shortage. These shortages are due to government interfering with the private enterprise of citizens and the same is true of inflation. In recent years, the proponents of government intervention in medical care have been alleging that there is a doctor shortage. If the government succeeds in taking over the control of medicine, then that myth of a doctor shortage will become a reality—another government created shortage. This organization is not about to let that happen.

The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons is today *the* major nationwide organization which is fully determined to prevent another government takeover. Like McNamara's band, although we are smaller in number, we are the best band in the land.

We do not concede that the rape of the profession and of our patients is inevitable. It is inevitable only if you believe it is inevitable. We don't believe it. Let me tell you, I would pit any one member of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons against a thousand of the other kind. The

proud eagle is still our national symbol—not the chicken.

One man with principal constitutes a majority. Yes, the odds are great, but look once more at the minutes of the previous meetings. Remember David and Goliath? Remember the tiny Royal Air Force in 1940 in Britain after France had fallen and before the United States had entered the war? The R.A.F. withstood the mighty German Luftwaffe and Churchill said, "Never had so much been owed by so many to so few."

AAPS is composed of informed physicians because they have taken the trouble to inform themselves. AAPS is a grass roots organization. The power comes from the bottom up and not from the top down. This is the true American way. This is what Alexis de Tocqueville wrote about in his "Democracy in America".

Do you know of any other national medical organization where it is possible for an immigrant, a naturalized American to become President just 15 years after he sets foot in this country? There is no self-perpetuating elite running things here. There is no lay bureaucracy—God knows there is no lay bureaucracy—running the doctors, no tail wagging the dog.

These coming months will test our strength and resolve as never before. But we shall hold fast. Nobody can shake us because truth is on our side. The lawsuit AAPS has filed to outlaw PSRO is important because the principle involved runs deeper even than the Public Law 92-603 PSRO Amendment itself. A victory for us here will cut into the core of government interference with the rights and freedoms of the American people. It will go a long way toward stopping those who have thus far succeeded our freedoms one by one by the process of circumventing the Constitution and the Congress by executive orders and by the use of the Federal Register.

Politicians in Congress will be stopped in their tracks. They will no longer be able to promise you something for nothing—the tax and tax, spend and spend habit will no longer work like it did. The right to privacy and confidentiality will be restored to a large measure. Our fight against empire-building bureaucrats in hospital administration who wish to control doctors as their agents has not reached the court decision stage, and, therefore, I must be careful not to comment too much on this at this time.

However, I can tell you this—we are the only ones who are fighting this battle. I can also say this—even before the Court has made its decision in the PSRO suit, amazing things have happened because we stood up for what is right and in defense of the private practice of medicine. You see, if no one opposes these thieves of freedom, they continue their tortoise-like gradual and steady advance, trampling over the rights of patients and of doctors. They bank on the Fabian philosophy of the "inevitability of gradualism". However, if even one person stands up to them and refuses to be intimidated, like all bullies, they are cowards at heart and back down.

So, ladies and gentlemen, you and I know there is a war on, and we are committed to win it. We do not even consider defeat because the truth is invincible. Let us spread the Gospel. But preaching is not enough. Let our actions speak for us. As we win more and more battles in this war, our successful defense of principle and integrity and truth will speak for itself. This world of ours didn't just happen by accident. There is a Creator up there who is in charge, who knows what is going on better than we do. He will help us if we ask for help. "Ask and you shall receive". That wasn't a politician's promise—it was God's promise, and, therefore, infinitely reliable and guaranteed. Let us resolve to start every day henceforth with a prayer to our Creator to help us in our fight for truth and freedom and for the strength to be humble in our victory in the sure knowledge that without God we are nothing and have no rights at all. Our fundamental right of freedom is God given, not a gift of government.

THE ENERGY CRISIS AND THE PRESIDENTIAL STYLE OF LIFE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has called for national cooperation for a program to conserve our national fuel resources. The President has asked us to conserve energy in a number of ways which add up to a rather fundamental alteration in our national lifestyle. I think it only fair that the American people, asked by the President to make substantial sacrifices to save fuel, know how much fuel the President consumes and what he intends to do to cut down on his own fuel consumption.

It is one thing to freeze the White House thermostats at 68° and talk about turning lights off early at the White House, it is quite another thing to find out how much energy will be saved at Camp David, Key Biscayne, and San Clemente.

I think it only fair that the American people, asked by the President to make substantial sacrifices to save fuel, be told by the White House how much fuel the President consumes when he decides to fly away from the White House for a weekend in Key Biscayne or Camp David or a longer stay in San Clemente.

The question is whether it is any longer responsible for the President to fly off to Florida and California every time he has a whim to do so. The Presidency, accompanied as it is in movement by a fleet of jetliners, helicopters, limousines, and yachts, is entirely too wasteful of our precious energy resources.

We need to know what the President intends to do to cut down on his own wasteful use of energy as an example to the Nation before we ask the poor, the very young, and the elderly to suffer through a winter without adequate heat.

On Monday, October 29, 1973, the Washington Post editorialized on the wastefulness of the Presidential style of life. In the context of our national energy crisis, it is particularly important that we in the Congress turn our attention to curbing the excesses of luxury that have become a part of the modern Presidency:

THE PRESIDENTIAL STYLE OF LIFE

The issue is much broader than the lawns of San Clemente or the beaches of Key Biscayne. The $10 million or more that has been poured into furnishing those two compounds is only a fraction of the total spent to maintain the chief executive's establishment. In the October issue of Fortune, Dan Cordtz tots up the perquisites which comprise "the monarchial style of life to which U.S. Presidents have become accustomed." He concludes that the official White House budget of under $13 million "ludicrously understates" the actual cost of the White House and its staff, the presidential courtiers, Camp David, entertainment, the presidential fleet of jetliners and helicopters, Mr. Nixon's array of offices, and the protection and communications required wherever the President may be. According to one budget analyst cited by Mr. Cordtz, the "true cost of running the presidency could be as high as $100 million a year," with most of the monies buried in the accounts of other federal agencies.

What makes all this so unseemly is the absence of restraint. Public money is spent too casually on little frills—a shuffleboard court of black-and-white terrazzo tile instead of concrete, a fence of redwood instead of wire and mesh. Presidential aides and documents are whisked about the country by government jet instead of less costly commercial flights. Expenditures have been ordered in Mr. Nixon's behalf by friends such as Herbert Kalmbach, with the bills sent to GSA. It adds up to a style devoid of modesty, proportion or thrift.

Congress has aided and abetted such extravagance by granting Presidents virtually unlimited access to public funds for the upkeep of their offices and establishments. Representative Brooks has outlined some reforms which the Congress should now enact. His list includes full disclosure of all spending for presidential security and support, the adoption of "orderly operating and accounting procedures" by the Secret Service and GSA, and legislation to prohibit outside parties from ordering items for the chief executive and billing the government. The congressman is interested as well in setting limits on the amounts which may be spent on the private property of Presidents. But the most important item on his agenda is also the one that cannot be legislated—a requirement that the President himself "show more responsibility" in his demands on federal agencies and public funds. The point of such reforms is not primarily to save money or tidy up the books, but to restore to the conduct of the presidency a sense of proportion and propriety which has been lost along the way.

THE MAN WHO STARTED IT ALL

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 9, 1973

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently the American Oceanic Organization, headquartered in Washington, D.C., was host to Dr. Arvid Pardo, Malta's Ambassador for Ocean Affairs to the United Nations.

During a luncheon meeting, he discussed the law of sea negotiations which are now, as they have been for several years, pending before the United Nations. His statement is particularly significant because Dr. Pardo started it all in the U.N.

The only definition of the seaward boundaries of coastal nations is contained in the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf, which was ratified by the U.S. Senate in 1960.

In the words of this treaty, the term Continental Shelf means "the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast, but outside the area of the territorial sea, to a depth of 200 meters or beyond that limit to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas."

Dr. Pardo questioned this limit of exclusive national jurisdiction before the United Nations in 1967. Then he proposed the drafting of a new treaty to prevent national appropriation of the seabed, to define more precisely the limits of the Continental Shelf, and to reserve seabed assets primarily for the benefit of the developing countries.

Two years later the United Nations created the Committee on Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.

There may be those who will argue Dr. Pardo's facts. Others may disagree with some of his conclusions. But all those sincerely interested in the question of who owns two-thirds of Earth will share his belief that time is running out.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Pardo's statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY A. PARDO

I feel honoured to have been asked by the American Oceanic Organization to say a few words about the law of the sea negotiations which are taking place at the United Nations.

At the same time I despair of my ability to explain in a meaningful manner in 15 or 20 minutes the dozens of major issues which will have to be decided at the conference which the United Nations is convening next year. I hope, therefore, that I shall not disappoint if, instead of dealing with the various issues which are being negotiated, I take this opportunity to explain my general view of the question of ocean space.

Water is essential both to the creation and to the maintenance of life; without the oceans we literally could not exist.

Ocean space covers nearly three quarters of our planet; it comprises the seas, the seabed and its subsoil. The land underlying the sea has all the features of emerged land—the greatest mountain ranges of our planet, the vastest plains, the deepest canyons are in ocean space.

Although since the dawn of history the seas have served as hunting-grounds for fishermen and highways for vessels, it is only recently that we have been able increasingly to explore the oceans in all their dimensions and to begin to appreciate the immensity of the benefits which we can obtain from them. What are these benefits?

First: space. In an increasingly congested world, the oceans offer us space for our activities. Already habitats, petroleum storage tanks, pipelines, even nuclear reactors are being built on the seabed. There are plans to build deepwater offshore terminals and airports out at sea: it is even planned to construct artificial islands to which industrial activities can be transferred from congested and polluted areas on land. Within the course of the next couple of decades the oceans will become a part of man's living space at least to the same extent as some parts of the earth such as the Arctic.

Second: a convenient and cheap medium for international trade. Ocean transport is cheaper than either land or air transport: the oceans are open to everybody and there are no artificial obstacles to trade in the form of customs barriers.

Third: Ocean space offers mankind water and resources both living and mineral. Everybody is familiar with the interesting and provocative booklet "The limits to growth" which predicts the collapse of our industrial society within a century or little more because among other things of insufficient agricultural land, insufficient food production for increasing populations and exhaustion of most key minerals. The vastness of ocean space and the development of its immense living and mineral resources can frustrate such gloomy forecasts.

Fourth: security. In a period of competitive armaments, it is the existence of the oceans in which nuclear submarines lurk that assures second strike capability and the balance of terror.

Fifth: Waste disposal. The oceans are the ultimate dustbin of the world; in the oceans wastes and pollutants are diluted and degraded; without the oceans it is probable that by now we would be dying in the midst of our own wastes.

The oceans are one ecological system or better a complex of closely inter-connected ecological systems; fragile perhaps, but also flexible to a degree. Ocean space can receive, dilute and absorb immense quantities of wastes without suffering irreparable or even serious harm provided that certain gross limits are not exceeded. Nobody really knows what these limits are, but there is a cause for legitimate concern. A few black spots have appeared where marine pollution is such that the waters can sustain the life of neither plant nor fish; in larger areas particularly along the coasts of industrialized countries there has been loss of amenities; the sea has become dangerous to the health of bathers and can sustain the life only of relatively few species of fish and plants. There are increasingly numerous reports of contamination of fiish by a variety of pollutants and of areas of the Atlantic by oil, plastics, and miscellaneous contaminants. Increasing world industrialization, exploding populations and multiplying activities in ocean space suggest that if effective measures of control are not taken we may aproach the gross limits to which I have referred with regard to the capacity of the oceans to dilute and degrade pollutants.

Fish too are being subjected to increasing pressure owing to the advance of technology, growing demands for fish and growing fishing effort. The production of fish has trebled over the past thirty-five years; it is virtually certain that an increasing number of stocks are being over fished. Many of the intergovernmental fishery commissions appear unable to resolve the problems of fishery management and allocation. Although there still remain under-exploited stocks of fish, it is likely that within ten years or less the world catch of conventional fish will generally speaking have reached the maximum sustainable yield under the present legal framework. Here again more effective measures are needed to conserve fishing stocks and regulate their exploitation and to provide a rational legal framework which will reduce the enormous, indeed scandalous, economic inefficiences of international fisheries and permit fisheries to develop from the hunting to the farming stage. This would substantially increase the productivity of fisheries while at the same time avoiding the danger of overfishing.

Finally, ocean technology is rapidly advancing and is becoming increasingly powerful; ocean uses are multiplying and require harmonization and regulation.

Pressure on fisheries, multiplying ocean uses, increasing accessibility of ocean mineral resources, and the increasing danger of marine pollution particularly near coasts are bringing about a collapse of traditional law of the sea.

Up to the present the law of the sea has been based on the two concepts of sovereignty and freedom.

Sovereignty of the coastal State is recognized over internal waters (i.e. waters landward of baselines) and over a narrow belt of sea either three, six, or 12 miles wide near its coast (called the territorial sea). Sovereignty over internal waters is absolute; sovereignty over territorial waters is limited by the right of innocent passage of foreign vessels, that is passage not prejudicial to the peace, good order or security of the coastal State.

Beyond this narrow coastal zone, the seas have been traditionally governed by the principle of freedom subject to a reasonable regard to the interests of other States, but this criterion is so vague that States in practice have used and abused the high seas for any convenient purpose.

In the inter-war period States began to claim sovereignty or jurisdiction for various purposes beyond the territorial sea.

The 1958 Geneva Conventions recognized: (a) the concept of a zone in which the coastal State may exercise the control necessary to prevent infringement of its customs, fiscal, imigration and sanitary regulations; (b) the concept of a legal continental shelf in which the coastal State exercises sovereign rights for the purpose of mineral resource exploration and exploitation; (c) the special interest of the coastal State in the maintenance of the productivity of the living resources of the sea in areas adjacent to its coast.

The 1958 Geneva Conventions, however, did not define the limits of these areas with any precision.

The scientific and technological explosion of the past two decades which is making offshore mineral resources increasingly accessible and exploitable and which is subjecting living resources to intolerable pressures has been accompanied by vast extension of coastal State claims in ocean space.

The negotiations at the U.N. have made it clear that coastal State claims together now extend to some 80% of ocean space and to almost all its resources.

In short, it would appear that the oceans are passing from a regime of almost total freedom over virtually the entire oceans to a regime of virtually total sovereignty over virtually the entire oceans.

The reasons for this development are complex, but, in part at least, rather clear: increasing dangers of abuse of the so-called freedom of the seas to the detriment of the coastal State; increasing accessibility of immense quantities of raw materials from petroleum to copper and nickel in a world where the supply of these materials is either controlled by tightly knit oligopolies or is becoming increasingly uncertain; pressures on coastal fisheries; security reasons; desire to prevent situations which might cause serious marine pollution.

Perhaps the fundamental reason for extension of coastal State claims is the need for recognized authority to ensure rational management of living and non-living resources; to contain marine pollution and to ensure harmonization of ocean space uses in areas where uses are both intense and multiple.

This development, which establishes the sovereignty of States over ever wider areas of the oceans, relieves competition for fishing resources and permits rational management of mineral resources. The military, political and economic consequences, however, could be literally incalculable and would almost certainly lead to acute conflict.

A virtual division of ocean space while assuring better than the present regime of freedom the economic interests of States, would irremediably prejudice their other interests. Scientific research which is the essential prerequisite to resource management and development would be at the mercy of coastal State regulations; maritime commerce could, indeed almost certainly would, be harassed and hampered by the conflicting laws of 100 different States regu-

lating transit. The mutual balance of terror, which now maintains the peace of the world, would be compromised if nuclear submarines were not able to roam the greater part of the seven seas. Furthermore if coastal States, as several of them claim, can, in the exercise of their sovereignty suspend or subject to crippling restrictions passage through straits, petroleum importing countries might soon find themselves in the midst of acute economic crisis.

In this situation, the question inevitably arises whether, in contemporary circumstances, freedom and sovereignty are still viable principles on which to base a regime for the 5/7ths of our planet which are covered by water. Both have irremediable deficiencies: sovereignty subjects to the arbitrary control of coastal States vital activities which by their nature are transnational; while freedom makes rational resource management impossible and permits abuses which, with our increasingly powerful technology, are becoming intolerable. It would appear, therefore, necessary to regulate by international treaty the exercise of some of the privileges of sovereignty and of some of the rights of freedom in the interests of all States and of mankind as a whole. This, however, can only be achieved if the international community agrees to replace the traditional concepts of sovereignty and freedom by a new basic concept as foundation of a new law of the sea adapted to the new conditions of ocean use.

It is important in this connection to keep in mind that the over-arching objective of a new law of the sea must be to establish an agreed and viable—and to be politically viable, it must be perceived as equitable—legal framework that will permit not merely resource exploitation, but maximum beneficial use of ocean space for all peaceful purposes by all States, whether developed or developing, landlocked or coastal, in a situation where ocean uses are multiplying and where possible misuse of increasingly powerful technology creates dangers for all.

So far the only new fundamental concept which has been proposed and generally accepted during the current negotiations at the United Nations is that the seabed and ocean floor and its resources beyond national jurisdiction are a common heritage of mankind. Most coastal States appear content to extend their sovereignty over most of ocean space, declare a small area of the seabed a common heritage of mankind and leave substantially untouched the freedom of the waters above the international seabed area. This is quite inadequate and will in practice lead within a decade or two to the total division of ocean space.

The seabed is only part of the marine environment; the only access to the seabed is through the superjacent waters; use and exploitation of the seabed necessarily affects uses of the waters above; pollutants normally reach the seabed through the superjacent waters. Finally, technological advance and new uses of ocean space link ever more closely the waters and the seabed.

In these circumstances, the concept of common heritage of mankind must clearly be extended not merely to the waters above the international sea, but also to ocean space as a whole. Only in this manner is it possible to avoid a division of ocean space, to reconcile mineral resource exploitation with other uses of ocean space such as navigation and to organize effective action against ocean pollution.

Extension of the concept of common heritage to ocean space as a whole would permit curbing both sovereignty and freedom by the creation of agreed international standards of ocean use. The coastal State would no longer have sovereignty in ocean space but jurisdiction, that is to say control subject to treaty defined limitations designed to protect the general interest. There would be no longer freedom beyond national jurisdiction but open access and non-discriminatory use subject again to treaty defined limitations. Subject to international standards, resource exploitation would be regulated by the coastal State within its jurisdiction and by the organized international community in the international area; living resources that move from the area under State control to the international area would be exploited in agreement between the State or States concerned and the international community.

Thus adoption of the common heritage concept as the basis of the new law of the sea would protect transitional uses of ocean; would protect the interests of coastal States by permitting rational resource management both within and outside national jurisdiction and in addition would provide a principle which could be used by the international community (a) to effect some sharing of the benefits derived from resource development (b) to provide a legal and moral foundation for effective international cooperation in the protection of the marine environment and (c) to provide an agreed foundation for the peaceful adjustment of conflicts between States in the marine environment.

The concept of common heritage requires for its practical implementation the establishment of international machinery. Most States in this connection are thinking in terms of an agency within the United Nations system to administer the rather scanty resources of the rather small seabed area which is likely to remain outside national jurisdiction. This, I feel, is likely to increase the unfortunate lack of credibility of the present international system.

What is required is not a new United Nations agency but a new international institutional system for ocean space linked to, but not necessarily part of the U.N. system.

The new institutional system would provide a permanent forum in which questions relating to ocean space could be examined in all their political, legal, economic, social, ecological, scientific and technological aspects. The system would exercise recommendatory and research functions, similar to those of the U.N. system with regard to ocean space as a whole. In addition, it would exercise some new and important powers, which are becoming necessary in the general interest, such as:

(a) general and non-discriminatory standard setting in respect to major uses of ocean space;

(b) protection and regulation in ocean space of activities which are of vital international interest such as scientific research and navigation;

(c) resource management and conservation beyond national jurisdiction and equitable sharing of benefits derived from these activities;

(d) provision of a mechanism for the effective access of all countries to advanced marine technology relevant to their needs;

(e) provision of a credible mechanism for the compulsory settlement of disputes;

(f) provision of such services to the international community as may be considered desirable.

Existing U.N. agencies dealing with the oceans such as IMCO, IOC, the Fisheries Department of FAO and perhaps some sections of WMO could usefully be consolidated in the new international machinery. In view of its important, novel functions, finally, the new institutions would need to be balanced in such a manner as to avoid the possibility of decisions being taken which are not supported by States representing the majority of the world's population.

All this may be necessary, but is it really possible to believe that the international community will accept in the foreseeable future the extension of the common heritage concept to ocean space as a whole and that it will establish an entirely new international institutional system with the wide functions outlined? This would indeed be a political event of the first magniture and a revolutionary change in international law.

Despite everything, I am reasonably confident of the future since the concepts of absolute sovereignty of the coastal State and of absolute freedom are based on assumptions which no longer correspond to reality and are bringing about imminent collapse of minimum international order in the oceans. Because of this I see no possibility of viable agreement at the forthcoming law of the sea conference if the international community continues to assume that these hoary concepts are still valid.

States face a clear alternative; either acceptance of the common heritage concept for ocean space as a whole or anarchy in the seas and sharply increased world tensions.

DIRECT LINK SEEN BETWEEN WATERGATE AND NIXON ANTICONSUMER POLICIES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the same big business forces that financed the Nixon's administration's Watergate scandals are still operating to defeat the establishment of an independent Federal Consumer Protection Agency.

Had there been a Consumer Protection Agency monitoring the performance of Federal regulatory agencies during the last election, the sale of Government decisions to wheat exporters, carpet manufacturers, milk producers, and other corporate campaign contributors would have been stopped cold, and Watergate might have been averted.

The special interest money used to finance the Nixon campaign's domestic intelligence operations—including Watergate—was available only because the donors had a reasonable expectation of receiving favorable Government decisions in return for their money.

That money would not have been forthcoming if the contributors knew that Government decisions favorable to them would have been challenged in court by the CPA as being harmful to consumers.

Maurice Stans, Mr. Nixon's chief fund raiser in two Presidential campaigns, collected nearly $100 million largely by urging business and industry barons, in Stans' words, to make an "investment" in Richard Nixon "to insure that the executive branch of Government is in the right hands."

The independence of the CPA and its consumer adovcate is as important to the integrity of future governmental consumer decisions as the independence of the special Watergate prosecutor is to the integrity of the Watergate investigation. In a very real sense, the CPA is a permanent independent prosecutor charged with rooting out collusion between campaign contributors and Government decisionmakers in this and future administrations.

The Nixon administration's negotiators on the consumer agency bill are at this moment attempting, through the threat

of Presidential veto, to force on Congress a CPA bill that would place the proposed agency at the mercy of the White House and its Office of Management and Budget.

More than 100 Members of Congress are sponsoring my bill to establish an independent Consumer Protection Agency, H.R. 14. Ralph Nader has termed it the most important legislation ever to come before the Congress. Hearings have been completed in both the House and Senate and mark-up will begin shortly. The CPA has met extremely strong opposition from industry groups and the White House, which would prefer no bill at all.

This agency will represent the American consumer in all proceedings before the departments and agencies of government. It would, for the first time, give consumers equal clout with business when Federal decisions are made affecting the health and economic well-being of the public.

The Nixon administration was for sale to the highest bidders, and the American consumers were the victims of this closed-door wheeling and dealing.

Some of the deals were:

THE ITT AFFAIR

The giant conglomerate ITT won a favorable out-of-court settlement on a major antitrust suit after the President personally intervened in the Justice Department action. At about the same time, ITT Sheraton agreed to underwrite $400,000 toward the cost of the Republican Convention in San Diego.

THE MILK DEAL

One day after their industry group donated $10,000 to the President's reelection, 16 milk producers met with the President to discuss the price support for milk. The next day $25,000 more was donated and the day after that the President reversed his Agriculture and Treasury Departments, his Council of Economic Advisers and the Office of Management and Budget by ordering a large increase in milk price supports. That decision cost American consumers $500 to $700 million in higher milk prices. Donations from the dairy producers ultimately exceeded $400,000.

THE WHEAT DEAL

In its haste to conclude a sale that would reap a rich election year harvest for the President in the farm States. the Agriculture Department failed to evaluate intelligence on the Soviet wheat harvest, misused the export subsidy program to the multimillion dollar benefit of large grain exporters, insulted our regular trading partners and let the Russians get off with "bargain basement" prices. There was very strong evidence of collusion or at the very least special treatment for the large grain exporters and of conflicts of interest by Agriculture Department officials. Taxpayers were stung for $300 million in price supports; farmers lost millions by unknowingly selling their crops below what they could have gotten had they known the magnitude of the sale; and consumers are still paying billions more in higher prices for meat, bread, cereal, milk, and many other essential commodities. The grain dealers and exporters showed their gratitude by making hefty campaign contributions to Mr. Nixon's reelection campaign.

THE CARPET DEAL

In an effort to see that strong flammability standards were not imposed on the carpet industry, representatives of the manufacturers met secretly at the White House in the summer of 1972 with Maurice Stans and Charles Colson. They won the delay and the Nixon campaign collected $95,000.

At the heart of the CPA concept are the very issues which lie at the heart of the Watergate corruption: Improper influence by special economic interests over regulatory decisions affecting consumers; infiltration of regulatory agencies by special interest representatives, and pro-industry settlement of court cases.

These are all issues in which the Consumer Protection Agency could have intervened to forestall corruption induced by campaign financing.

NUNS TELL POPE ATTACK BY ARABS IS SACRILEGIOUS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the condemnation of the recent attacks on Israel has come from people of many religious faiths. I insert in the RECORD the following article about the views of the Leadership Conference of Women Religious for the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

NUNS TELL POPE ATTACK BY ARABS IS SACRILEGIOUS

The Leadership Conference of Women Religious, which represents 180,000 Catholic nuns in the United States, cabled Pope Paul VI Sunday calling on him to "speak to the peoples of the whole world to condemn the Arab attack on Israel which they described as "a sacrilegious act."

The nuns said they were "shocked and saddened at the carefully planned and blasphemous attack of the Arabs of Egypt and Syria upon the Jews of Israel in violation of their most holy day. Yom Kippur."

The nuns denounced the attack as an "incredible defamation of a religious group" and said it was "not only against the Jews but against the sanctity of all religions." They added that "not only Catholics but people of the whole world are awaiting your condemnation of this infamy."

The cable was signed by Sister Francis Borgian Rothluebber, president, and Sister Rose Thering, secretary of the Conference.

Christian leaders meeting at the American Jewish Committees national headquarters Tuesday deplored the attack by Egypt and Syria on the right of Israel to live in peace and security and termed the attack not only a threat to Israel but to world peace.

The Catholic and Protestant clergymen who were meeting to discuss the Committees new Christian visitors to Israel tour, expressed their determination to work for dialogue and mutual recognition between Israel and the Arab peoples, particularly the Palestinians. They declared they would not be deterred from their determination by the present conflict.

The comments were made at a news conference by Rev. Charles Angell, director of the Christian Unity Center of the Graymoor Fathers. He said his views were shared by the Rev. Dean Goodwin, director of communication of the American Baptist Churches, and Dr. Bryant George, a United Presbyterian minister and director of the Federation of Southern Cooperative Programs for the Ford Foundation.

Angell, a leading Catholic ecumenist, said "at this particular moment in history, when the Jews in Israel are faced with aggression and Jews everywhere are confronting terrorism, I think it is important for Christian friends not to scuttle into the woodwork. My concern is for all the people of the Middle East, but the cause of Arab Christians and Muslims is not served by beating war drums nor in fostering the illusion that somehow Israel will disappear from the earth."

Arabs and Israelis must recognize their respective right to existence in peace and security, and there will be no solution to the present conflict until the Arabs and Jews talk together and work out their coexistence."

WORLD PEACE AND THE NEED FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the United Nations to world peace and security was convincingly reiterated in a letter to the editor in the New York Times of November 7. Mr. Murray B. Woldman, staff consultant for Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, notes that during the Middle East crisis, the United Nations provided an indispensable forum through which superpower confrontation and the risks of widened violent conflict were effectively scaled down.

Too often, U.S. foreign policy places the United Nations near the bottom rung of the priority ladder. The result, too often, is a weakened United Nations blamed unfairly for failure to solve problems which were submitted to it too late to find a workable solution. The lesson we should learn from the United Nations' performance in the Middle East crisis, as Mr. Woldman points out, is that—

If our foreign policy-makers can demonstrate a greater commitment to the United Nations and if we can turn increasingly to it to forestall problems rather than solve them, we just might find that independence of action is not nearly as important as defusing conflicts before they explode in our faces.

The full text of Mr. Woldman's letter follows:

LETTER

To the Editor:

Since the China vote of 1971, we have heard a great deal of criticism of the United Nations and its inability to deal effectively with threats to world peace and security. Many have suggested that if the UN cannot act to head off conflict, it is no longer capable of carrying out the tasks for which it was established after the Second World War.

Yet we have seen this week that the UN is indeed alive and well. The war in the Middle East has threatened to draw this Nation and the Soviet Union into a dangerously escalating situation. On October 25, the Security Council demonstrated that the UN remains the only international forum we have for the quiet resolution of superpower involvement in potentially explosive regional conflicts. With the active cooperation of

eight of the nonaligned nations American foreign policy too often takes for granted, a resolution was introduced and passed. It would not be overstating the case to stress that this development has moved us back from a dangerous exercise in brinkmanship, however necessary it might have been which could have brought us into armed confrontation with the Soviet Union.

This exercise in international diplomacy underlines the central role the UN can play in our foreign policy when it is given the chance. It is highly doubtful whether the parties to the conflict could have among themselves achieved the consensus and set the guidelines for monitoring what we hope will be an equitable and just peace in the Middle East. United Nations peace-keeping procedures, the sorest point in our differences at the UN with the Soviet Union, have a new lease on life as a result of the agreement, however tentative, being orchestrated now at the UN (Editorial October 27).

We should not expect miracles. Failure is possible at any point. But the UN has pulled through. The member states who make up the UN have shown that international cooperation matters to them and that concern for peace can bring nations with great differences together to work out solutions to their problems.

Might not this experience provide an object lesson to our policymakers? The UN was created to keep peace in the world. Peace has many faces. They are economic, social and legal as well as political and military. If our foreign policy-makers can demonstrate a greater commitment to the United Nations and if we can turn increasingly to it to forestall problems rather than solve them, we just might find that independence of action is not nearly as important as defusing conflicts before they explode in our faces.

MURRAY B. WOLMAN.

WASHINGTON, *October 26, 1973.*

CRIME CONTROL NO. 6

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article from the Baltimore News American to be placed in the RECORD for the benefit of those who have been confused by the constant clamor of gun control lobbyists about the putative heinousness of guns and the alleged necessity for removing such weapons from the hands of private citizens. If we are to remain a free people, and if criminals are not to be allowed complete license to plunder and kill without commensurate resistance from their intended victims, then further gun control laws must not be passed and those on the books that restrict the private, noncriminal, ownership of guns should be repealed.

INTRUDER SLAIN BY YOUTH, 18—NO CHARGES MADE; BODY UNIDENTIFIED

Police said yesterday they would not prosecute an 18-year-old East Baltimore youth who, they say, shot a still unidentified burglary suspect who broke into the youth's home early yesterday morning.

Sgt. Darrell R. Duggins, of the Eastern district, said Ernest L. McNeil, Jr., of the 2200 block East Preston street, shot and killed the suspect about 2 A.M. as he was attempting to flee from the youth's home after having beaten the youth's mother. Sergeant Duggins said the killing has been ruled a justifiable homicide.

According to police the burglary suspect broke out several panes of glass in one of the kitchen windows and opened the kitchen door. He then removed a television set from the living room and placed it on a kitchen chair.

Young McNeil told police he was awakened by his mother, Martha A. McNeil, 54, who suddenly began screaming his name. He said that moments later his mother rushed into his room pursued by an unknown man.

"I started to grab him," the youth said in an interview. "But I froze and then remembered my mother kept a gun under her mattress."

The youth told police that when he returned with the gun he found the suspect in his bedroom beating his mother. He says he fired one shot from the .22-caliber pistol, but missed as the suspect headed for the stairs.

He says he fired two more shots at the man as he ran down the stairs. The man's body was found by police lying near the kitchen door. He was pronounced dead at the scene.

Police said late yesterday that the body had been taken to the Morgue but that they still had no clue as to its identity.

Mrs. McNeil and her son, a recent graduate of Dunbar High School, were alone in the house at the time of the incident. Her husband, Ernest L. McNeil, Sr. is a steelworker at the Bethlehem Steel Company's Sparrows Point plant and does not usually return home until after 6 A.M., she said.

This was the second instance in less than a week in which the victim of a crime had killed the suspect.

Last Wednesday a 22-year-old rape victim fatally shot her assailant in her bedroom as the man threatened her 2-year-old son after raping her in the presence of the boy and the boy's younger brother. The woman pulled a gun from under the mattress while the man's attention was distracted, and shot him in the chest and both shoulders.

FEDERAL OIL SHALE PLANT SUBSIDY?

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, all my colleagues would be interested in an article published in the Sunday Denver Post on October 21. Written by Dick Prouty and entitled "Federal Oil Shale Plant Subsidy Possible," the article was derived from questions put to John C. Whitaker, Under Secretary of the Interior, when Mr. Whitaker was in Denver.

Mr. Whitaker told Mr. Prouty that a Federal subsidy program was possible in order to start a 250,000 barrel/day commercial oil shale operation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a startling development. The costs of just a 100,000 barrel/day commercial oil shale operation are estimated to be about $450 million by the Interior Department's Oil Shale Office. We could probably expect a 250,000 barrel/day operation to cost over $1 billion. Naturally, at today's skyrocketing crude oil prices, the products of such an operation would potentially bring a fat profit to the private oil companies that were helped to the feeding trough by the Government subsidies.

In addition to the Government's financial supports, the oil industry stands to reap these new oil shale profits from public lands. Over 70 percent of the known American oil shale resources are on Government owned, public property. So a taxpayer subsidized industry is going to make profits, from the public, on lands that belong to the public: a profit from the sale of public resources to the public.

The rationale for Government subsidized commercial oil shale development was explained to my office in several conversations—and is most remarkable. The Department of Interior explained that there is a possibility of an Arab States turnaround—where instead of holding oil off the market and denying it to countries that refuse to submit to their political demands, the Arab States would flood the market with their crude oil. That would cause prices to dive, and profits by American companies would collapse.

Continuing with the Interior Department's reasoning, the profit slump resulting from the oil flood would not allow the American oil industry to develop, with their own capital, commercial oil shale operations. Thus the reason for a Government subsidy: a flood of Arab oil.

The Interior Department says that the Government subsidy is only one of many alternatives that they must prepare for, but I am afraid that instead of prudent planning, what we are seeing is the beginning of another Government shelter for the oil industry at the public's expense—at the same time that oil companies have reported, embarrassingly, profits this quarter of up to 90 percent over the same quarter last year.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will be able to read the portion of the article that follows, and give some extra thought to the situation that is developing in the oil shale industry.

Personally, I believe it is time that we consider the possibility of public ownership and development of our Nation's oil shale treasure. Public development could insure rapid production with a maximum of environmental safeguards. More importantly, it would guarantee that the oil would be produced at fair prices—not monopoly prices—and could provide a "yardstick" for future private development in the oil shale industry.

The idea of a subsidy to the same industry that has brought us the energy crisis is ludicrous. The situation must not be allowed to degenerate to a point where the public interest is not at the forefront of our considerations.

A portion of the story by Mr. Prouty follows:

FEDERAL OIL-SHALE PLANT SUBSIDY POSSIBLE

(By Dick Prouty)

The U.S. Interior Department is considering a federal subsidy program to get a 250,000-barrel-a-day oil shale plant into operation, John C. Whitaker, Interior Under Secretary, said Saturday.

The subsidy idea is "only a possibility" and it would be limited to the department's prototype oil-shale leasing program announced in August for Colorado, Wyoming and Utah, he said.

Since the richest shales in the program are in the Piceance Creek Basin, northwest Colorado most likely would be site of proposed oil shale operations 10 times the size of present experimental private ventures.

Whitaker was in Denver to meet with department regional officials and William Rogers, recently appointed to personally represent Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton in the mountain-prairie West.

SEEKING OPTIONS

"We are looking at all the options we can think of" Whitaker said. "Oil shale is only one part of the energy situation. Unlike the Alaska oilfields where time to get the oil out is the major consideration, in oil shale we have the time factor and an unproven technology along with serious environmental considerations."

Whitaker, a geologist, said saline waters associated with oil shale formations "are bothersome" as technical and environmental problems. The challenge is to control the salt water in shale mining operations. With no proven technology, the time factor when oil is available from shale is difficult to forecast, he said.

Morton has listed six 5,100-acre sites, two each in Colorado, Wyoming and Utah, upon which the petroleum industry will be asked to submit bids late this year for development of a 250,000-barrel-a-day oil shale plant. The sites are on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, an Interior Department agency.

BOOST TO INDUSTRY

A subsidy would encourage industry to invest the $300 million needed for a prototype operation. Industry has been reluctant to invest that much money in an untried technology which would provide costly lessons to the advantage of competing firms.

THE CASE FOR IMPEACHMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the AFL–CIO News of tomorrow's date will contain a full-page declaration, in large, boldface print, that is of tremendous interest and importance to every Member of Congress. I am therefore inserting the entire text in the RECORD at this time, and I urge every one of our colleagues to read this impressive statement most carefully.

WHY RICHARD M. NIXON MUST BE IMPEACHED—NOW

On October 22, the AFL–CIO at its convention unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the resignation of President Richard M. Nixon.

The resolution said that Mr. Nixon's resignation was necessary for the restoration of our badly battered democratic institutions.

If Mr. Nixon does not resign, the resolution said, "we call upon the House of Representatives forthwith to initiate impeachment proceedings against him."

Since then, Mr. Nixon has announced that he does not intend to resign.

The AFL–CIO therefore calls for his immediate impeachment.

As we said in the convention resolution, "Impeachment is not a prospect we contemplate with pleasure. No decent American can derive any partisan satisfaction whatever from the misfortune of his nation. And surely the American labor movement is not interested in aiding any reckless attacks on the Presidency. We are especially concerned about the office of the Presidency in these times of grave danger on the international front.

"But the cause of peace and freedom in the world cannot survive a discredited Presidency. Our allies' best hope—mankind's best hope—lies in the strength of our democratic institutions.

"Justice must be done, the risks of not doing it being more than democracy can safely bear."

Richard M. Nixon must be impeached—now—because:

He has caused an erosion of public confidence in our democratic system of government.

He instituted in the name of national security a plan which violated civil liberties through domestic political surveillance, espionage, wiretapping, burglary, eavesdropping, opening of mail, and military spying on civilians.

He created a special and personal secret police, answerable only to the White House, to operate totally outside the constraints of law.

He and his subordinates interfered with the freedom of the press—which our Constitution guarantees—by means of wiretaps, FBI investigations, and threats of punitive action.

He secretly recorded conversations in his office without advising participants in those conversations that they were being recorded. He then sought to deny the evidence on those tapes to the courts.

He has violated the Constitution of the United States and his sworn obligation to see that the laws "be faithfully executed."

He has used the office of the Presidency to attempt to put himself above the law.

He has consistently lied to the American people.

He has, by his actions and through the actions of his subordinates—for which he has accepted responsibility—brought dishonor on the office of the Presidency.

He has repeatedly promised the American people full revelation of the facts in the Watergate affair—and he has repeatedly sought to keep those facts from the public, from the courts, from the Congress, and from the special prosecutor.

He has used the office of the Presidency for personal enrichment.

He secretly curtailed the FBI investigation of the Watergate break-in.

He involved the CIA in the coverup of the Watergate affair.

He sought to suppress—and for a time did suppress—the facts of the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist from the judge in the Ellsberg trial.

He interfered with the administration of justice by offering this judge the directorship of the FBI.

He intervened in the antitrust suit against International Telephone and Telegraph to impose a settlement agreeable to the corporation, after which the corporation agreed to underwrite $400,000 of the cost of the 1972 Republican National Convention.

He and his subordinates sought to use the power of the White House, the Justice Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the Securities and Exchange Commission and other government agencies to punish a list of political enemies.

Officials of his campaign committee and his personal attorney extorted illegal campaign contributions from corporations which were dependent on maintaining the good will of the government.

Officials of his campaign committee received large campaign contributions from the dairy industry, which was seeking and later received lucrative dairy price support increases and dairy import concessions.

Until Richard Nixon is removed from office, we will not be able to get Watergate behind us. We will not be able to proceed with sober and constructive solutions to our economic and social problems at home or to the dangers of war in the world.

The first step in the impeachment process already has been taken: resolutions calling for the impeachment of the President have been introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the House Judiciary Committee. The next step is for the committee to investigate. If it recommends impeachment, the committee sends to the House floor a resolution and articles of impeachment which specify the charges against the President.

If the House by majority vote approves the articles of impeachment, they are sent to the Senate for trial. If two-thirds of the Senate, with the Chief Justice of the United States presiding, find the President guilty of any of the charges, he is removed from office.

What is now necessary is that the House of Representatives and the House Judiciary Committee be made aware of the need for urgency in voting the impeachment of the President. Toward this end, each union member should now write his Congressman AND Chairman Peter Rodino of the House Judiciary Committee—at the House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515—and urge their support of impeachment.

UNCLE SAM GETS THE COLD SHOULDER

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, we have seen in the events of recent weeks how well our policy of spending the hard-earned money of the American people to buy friends and increase our influence abroad has succeeded.

Where are these friends which cost us hundreds of billions of our dollars? What has become of the U.S. influence abroad? The answer was shown in the cold shoulder given to us when we asked help and cooperation for our policy in the Middle East.

Portugal was the only member nation of the NATO—our supposed allies—which permitted us to use its territory for stopovers by our planes in our efforts to resupply the Israelis as the war in the Middle East progressed. Other NATO members, when asked for similar rights, turned us down cold.

West Germany, where our troops stand guard, even protested formally against our planes taking off from that country for assigned missions to Israel. Turkey, which has received billions from us, let the Soviet Union fly arms for Egypt and Syria over its land but refused our request to do the same for Israel.

The rationale for this snubbing of Uncle Sam is that the NATO "partners" feared for their oil shipments from the Arab States. But the fact is that all of us—Europeans, Japanese, and Americans alike—are faced with the same oil crisis and that the vaunted cooperation of the Free world Nations, when the chips were down, failed to materialize.

The State Department admitted as much in these words:

We are struck by the number of our Allies going to some lengths to separate themselves publicly from us.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, if this is not the appropriate time, with all this new evidence of policy failure before us, to undertake corrective action? Why should we continue to pay millions upon millions annually to maintain U.S. forces in Central Europe for the defense of West Germany and other nations when these nations are not, in fact, allies, but free wheelers with no sense of gratitude or obligation to us? Let us bring our soldiers home.

Why, too, should we continue our multibillion-dollar aid programs, scattering our dollars over the globe, when we see so dramatically, how little our generosity means to our "friends" when we asked them for assistance. Even now the aid recipients, past and present, are refusing to join with us in plans to meet Arab oil cut-offs. Allied cooperation thus has turned out to be a myth—a very costly one to the American taxpayers.

It would be irresponsible on our part as Congressmen if we did not take time now to assess the meaning of this historic collapse of the basic premise of our foreign affairs—the notion that, by sharing our substance with others, we would fulfill the role of Free World leadership. It has not worked out and yet that illusion cost us billions which, if kept here, could have provided a good home for every American family, cleaned our air, solved our transport problems, rebuilt our decaying cities, furnished adequate medical care to everyone, raised our educational standards and filled other urgent needs.

I insist that the time is now for us to direct our thinking and our spending to our own problems—to place the American interest first and to write off as one of history's worst failures the idealistic, impractical foreign policy which we have followed so long and which now has flunked out so miserably.

THE ENIGMAS OF OUR POLICY TOWARD GREECE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, when Greek Army leaders seized power illegally on April 21, 1967, the United States had an opportunity to reassert the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as an alliance of democracies. We lost that opportunity by accepting a specious assumption that the military and strategic advantages of maintaining close ties with a dictatorial Greek regime outweighed our long-term interests in seeing democracy restored in the country. The proof of our policy, the President indicated last July in a press conference, came in our conviction that "without aid to Greece and aid to Turkey you have no viable policy to save Israel."

The Greek Government's answer to our recent request through NATO for support in the Middle East crisis came in a public statement in Athens by Foreign Minister Palamas on October 15 in which he reaffirmed that "Greece's friendly relations with Arab countries exclude any participation either direct or indirect, in an eventual action against them."

If our policy of friendly relations with the Greek dictatorship is confounded by that government's behavior in the Middle East, what is the explanation? A disturbing possibility which emerges regularly is the role of certain American business interests in maintaining good relations with Greece where they have considerable private investments. And a key person in that Greek-American business community is Thomas A. Pappas who has also served as an official of the Republican Finance Committee and an important fund-raiser and contributor to the Republican Party at least since 1968.

Seth Kantor, of the Detroit News, has recently written an article outlining some of the associations between Pappas, the Nixon reelection campaign of 1972, and several Greek citizens who allegedly made sizable contributions to the President's reelection last year. I include that article below.

The Subcommittee on Europe, which I chair, has been aware of the foreign policy implications of these domestic political activities for some time. During our hearings in 1971 on "Greece, Spain, and the Southern NATO Strategy," the subject of the Pappas role in our foreign policy toward Greece was discussed. A memorandum was also submitted for the hearing record on Pappas' role by one of our witnesses, Mr. Elias P. Dematracopoulos.

The Subcommittee on Europe's interest obviously is directed to and limited by the foreign policy implications of any domestic political events. I have asked the subcommittee staff, in this respect, to continue to follow the production of additional information of the kind developed by Mr. Kantor in this important story.

There are still enigmas to be traced in the strange policies we continue to pursue toward Greece and I find these investigative efforts very helpful in our study.

The article follows:

GREEK CONTRACTOR'S DONATIONS TO NIXON VOTE FUND FACE PROBE

(By Seth Kantor)

WASHINGTON.—An influential Greek citizen made donations to President Nixon's reelection campaign last year, both before and after receiving a multimillion-dollar U.S. defense contract.

Contributions totaling $25,000 were made by the late Nikos J. Vardinoyiannis. They were in apparent violation of a federal law outlawing campaign funds from federal contractors.

Motor Oil Hellas Lube Oil Refinery of Athens, headed by Vardinoyiannis, was awarded a $4.7 million contract to refuel the U.S. Sixth Fleet. The Pentagon picked the Greek firm over several American bidders. A spokesman for the Navy at the Pentagon refused to say whether the Greek firm was the low bidder.

Sen. Philip A. Hart, a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has asked the Justice Department and General Accounting Office (GAO) to investigate the legality of the Vardinoyiannis transaction.

Hart also said he was disturbed that election campaign funds in America can come from foreign sources. The Michigan Democrat said he intends to turn over the findings of the Justice Department and GAO to Watergate probers and to the Senate Rules Committee, which handles campaign reform legislation.

Privately, GAO officials are concerned over an unpublicized Justice Department decision earlier this year to permit powerful foreigners to funnel cash into American political campaigns. The Justice Department said it made the ruling in April after receiving several inquiries during the 1972 political campaign about a U.S. law that prohibits contributions from foreign "principals."

The Justice Department quietly ruled that the term "principals" does not apply to foreign individuals, but rather means countries or companies.

Several contributions were made to the Nixon reelection campaign in 1972 from Greece-based industrialists.

Hart said in a statement that "by permitting foreign sources to contribute to political campaigns, we could open some large loopholes in laws governing political contributions, particularly with the growth of international corporations."

A key figure in the campaign gifts from Greece appears to be Thomas A. Pappas of Athens, who holds dual American and Greek citizenships. Pappas is on intimate terms with leaders of the Nixon administration, is a personal friend of the President and was one of the original eight members of the executive committee of the Committee to Reelect the President (CRP).

CRP reported that Pappas personally contributed $1,000 to it after April 7, 1972—the date a new federal law went into effect, forcing public disclosure of the names of contributors.

Before April 7, though, the CRP received $100,673 in undisclosed personal contributions from Pappas.

Subsequently, a federal lawsuit filed by Common Cause, the citizens' lobbying group, forced the CRP to make public the names of those who had made pre-April 7 contributions.

Among the names on that long list was Vardinoyiannis. CRP records show he donated $15,000 to the Nixon reelection campaign on Jan. 31, 1972.

Later in the year, Sept. 25, Motor Oil Hellas won the contract to refuel U.S. fighting ships in Greece. Then, on Nov. 10, 1972, just after Mr. Nixon's reelection, the CRP reported receiving another $10,000 from Vardinoyiannis.

Vardinoyiannis, 42, suffered a heart attack this summer and died. He had been a friend of Pappas, who was a major fund-raiser for the CRP.

Pappas, 74, was born in Greece and brought to Boston as a small boy. He became an American citizen and grew wealthy in the food and liquor importing business.

A decade ago Pappas returned to Greece to become a leading industrialist there. His investments are in oil, steel, cattle, chemical plants, shipping and the sole franchise to distribute Coca-Cola in Greece.

Another business associate of Pappas—Spyros A. Metaxa—did not think his name would be made public as a foreign national helping to re-elect President Nixon. Metaxa gave $10,000 to the CRP on April 4, 1972, just before the public disclosure law went into effect in the United States.

Metaxa is an operator of the company that produces a well-known brandy that bears his family name. The Pappas company in Boston is an importer of the Metaxa brandy.

Reached in Kifissia, Greece, by telephone, Metaxa, a Greek citizen, refused to answer questions about why he contributed to the American political campaign.

"Send me a letter on official stationery and I will ask my lawyer what I can answer you," said Metaxa.

The letter was sent on Oct. 4, but no answer has been received.

Though it is not presently known whether Pappas brought foreign contributions to the CRP from abroad, he made seven round trips by plane between April 27 and Dec. 13, 1972, from Athens to Washington on CRP business. In addition, Pappas was in Paris and Switzerland on CRP business only a week before the 1972 election in America.

Hart believes that political contributions from foreign sources should be prohibited by law.

"I tend to think they should (because) the test of a candidate's viability to run ought to rest on support from domestic sources alone," he said.

From information provided him by The News, Hart has posed a series of questions to be explored by Acting Atty. Gen. Robert Bork and by Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats of the GAO.

Staats is overall director of the GAO's watchdog Office of Federal Elections.

After advising Bork and Staats about the defense contract to Vardinoyiannis, Hart asked them to recommend "what changes in law would be required, if any, to prohibit such contributions (to American political campaigns from foreign sources) in the future?"

Specifically, Hart asked why Section 611 of the U.S. Criminal Code does not already cover cases such as the one involving Vardinoyiannis.

That's the section prohibiting contractors with the federal government from contributing to federal political campaigns. The penalty is a maximum of five years in prison or a fine of $5,000, or both.

Section 601 also makes it illegal to knowingly solicit contributions from contractors, which could bear directly on fund-raisers such as Papas, if he solicited such funds for the CRP.

Hart said that depending on the answers he gets from the Justice Department and GAO, he might pass on the information to newly-appointed Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski and to the Senate Watergate Committee.

Concerned that large loopholes in the law could allow international businesses to secretly make illegal corporate donations through foreign sources to U.S. political candidates, Hart also said he might refer the matter for study to the Senate subcommittee on multinational corporations.

ORGANIZED LABOR LAUNCHES DRIVE FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, once again, as has occurred so often in our history, the Nation's workers are providing the cutting edge of our national conscience. Recognizing that the President has in large measure forfeited his right to national leadership, the AFL–CIO has launched a nationwide campaign for the impeachment of President Nixon. As Members of the body to which this campaign will be addressed in the days and weeks ahead, we all should carefully consider the reasons which underlie this call by our Nation's largest labor union body. I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the attention of my colleagues, the AFL–CIO position on why Richard M. Nixon must be impeached—now:

WHY RICHARD M. NIXON MUST BE IMPEACHED—NOW

On October 22, the AFL–CIO at its convention unanimously adopted a resoultion calling for the resignation of President Richard M. Nixon.

The resolution said that Mr. Nixon's resignation was necessary for the restoration of our badly battered democratic institutions.

If Mr. Nixon does not resign, the resolution said, "we call upon the House of Representatives forthwith to initiate impeachment proceedings against him."

Since then, Mr. Nixon has announced that he does not intend to resign.

The AFL–CIO therefore calls for his immediate impeachment.

As we said in the convention resolution, "Impeachment is not a prospect we contemplate with pleasure. No decent American can derive any partisan satisfaction whatever from the misfortune of his nation. And surely the American labor movement is not interested in aiding any reckless attacks on the Presidency. We are especially concerned about the office of the Presidency in these times of grave danger on the international front.

"But the cause of peace and freedom in the world cannot survive a discredited Presidency. Our allies' best hope—mankind's best hope—lies in the strength of our democratic institutions.

"Justice must be done, the risks of not doing it being more than democracy can safely bear."

Richard M. Nixon must be impeached—now—because:

He has caused an erosion of public confidence in our democratic system of government.

He instituted in the name of national security a plan which violated civil liberties through domestic political surveillance, espionage, wiretapping, burglary, eavesdropping, opening of mail, and military spying on civilians.

He created a special and personal secret police, answerable only to the White House, to operate totally outside the constraints of law.

He and his subordinates interfered with the freedom of the press—which our Constitution guarantees—by means of wiretaps, FBI investigations, and threats of punitive action.

He secretly recorded conversations in his office without advising participants in those conversations that they were being recorded. He then sought to deny the evidence on those tapes to the courts.

He has violated the Constitution of the United States and his sworn obligation to see that the laws "be faithfully executed."

He has used the office of the Presidency to attempt to put himself above the law.

He has consistently lied to the American people.

He has, by his actions and through the actions of his subordinates—for which he has accepted responsibility—brought dishonor on the office of the Presidency.

He has repeatedly promised the American people full revelation of the facts in the Watergate affair—and he has repeatedly sought to keep those facts from the public, from the courts, from the Congress, and from the special prosecutor.

He has used the office of the Presidency for personal enrichment.

He secretly curtailed the FBI investigation of the Watergate break-in.

He involved the CIA in the coverup of the Watergate affair.

He sought to suppress—and for a time did suppress—the facts of the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist from the judge in the Ellsberg trial.

He interfered with the administration of justice by offering this judge the directorship of the FBI.

He intervened in the antitrust suit against International Telephone and Telegraph to impose a settlement agreeable to the corporation, after which the corporation agreed to underwrite $400,000 of the cost of the 1972 Republican National Convention.

He and his subordinates sought to use the power of the White House, the Justice Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the Securities and Exchange Commission and other government agencies to punish a list of political enemies.

Officials of his campaign committee and his personal attorney extorted illegal campaign contributions from corporations which were dependent on maintaining the good will of the government.

Officials of his campaign committee received large campaign contributions from the dairy industry, which was seeking and later received lucrative dairy price support increases and dairy import concessions.

Until Richard Nixon is removed from office, we will not be able to get Watergate behind us. We will not be able to proceed with sober and constructive solutions to our economic and social problems at home or to the dangers of war in the world.

The first step in the impeachment process already has been taken: resolutions calling for the impeachment of the President have been introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the House Judiciary Committee. The next step is for the committee to investigate. If it recommends impeachment, the committee sends to the House floor a resolution and articles of impeachment which specify the charges against the President.

If the House by majority vote approves the articles of impeachment, they are sent to the Senate for trial. If two-thirds of the Senate, with the Chief Justice of the United States presiding, find the President guilty of any of the charges, he is removed from office.

What is now necessary is that the House of Representatives and the House Judiciary Committee be made aware of the need for urgency in voting the impeachment of the President. Toward this end, each union member should now write his Congressman AND Chairman Peter Rodino of the House Judiciary Committee—at the House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515—and urge their support of impeachment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, November 12, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

With righteousness shall the Lord judge the world and the people with equity.—Psalms 98:9.

Eternal Father of our spirits, we thank Thee for the refreshment of sleep and the restoration of soul our rest provides