

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Stuart Nash Scott, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Louis M. Thayer, of Florida, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the term expiring December 31, 1978. (Reappointment)

THE JUDICIARY

Richard Owen, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York vice Edward C. McLean, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William A. Quick, Jr., of Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Virginia for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment)

Donald E. Walter, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment)

Ira De Ment, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Alabama for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment)

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration:

To be lieutenant commanders

Kenneth E. Lilly, Jr. Joseph A. Sowers
Richard S. Moody, Jr. Ludvik Pfeifer
Lloyd K. Thomas James C. Bishop, Jr.

To be lieutenants

Bradford B. Meyers Stephen A. Young
Christopher B. Lawrence Bruce L. Crumley
James E. Newcomer Richard P. Moore
Robert B. Zider Robert C. Hoge
Larry L. Minter Richard A. Zacharia-
son
Frank B. Arbusto, Jr. James A. Wexler
Stephen D. Whitaker Charles L. Kureth, Jr.

Joseph D. Wilson Kent P. Dolan
Patrick L. Wehling, Jr. Steven R. Birkey

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert J. Schmidl Burl L. Westcott
Brent G. Harris James L. Warner
Michael C. Meyer James H. Hartzell
Alan J. Potok Theodore C. Kaiser
Richard D. Black Nelson K. H. Lau
George W. Jamerson Richard W. Permenter
James D. Servais Sydney R. Withers
Richard H. Daly, Jr. Keith F. Freese
Jeffrey P. Calebaugh Alton W. Payne, Jr.
David L. Stockwell James W. Davis
Michael R. McCaslin

To be ensigns

Fred L. Kleinschmidt Deborah A. Astle
Evelyn J. Fields Terrance D. Jackson
James D. Sarb Karen L. O'Donnell
Richard W. Ellis Gary M. Albertson
Edward D. Gullekson Mary M. Zoeller
Michael E. Ziolkow Howard T. Langeveld
Cheryl A. Cavin Benjamin M. Root, Jr.
James H. Bennett, Jr. David H. Peterson
Christine S. Carty Constantine E. Mericas

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE POTENTIAL OF SOLAR ENERGY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, as the Senate considers emergency legislation to deal with critical shortages of fuel supplies, I think it is important that we bear in mind that these are only short term solutions at best.

In the long run, the only hope for maintaining a strong economy is for the United States to develop its own resources in order to achieve independence of unreliable foreign governments.

This point was made eloquently in an editorial by Paul Miller in The Times-Union of Albany, N.Y. Mr. Miller emphasizes the need for research programs, and cites in particular the potential of solar energy.

I feel that Mr. Miller's views should be considered by the Senate. Paul Miller, chairman of the Gannett newspapers, is one of the Nation's ablest newspapermen.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Develop More U.S. Energy Sources And Solar Power To Meet Demand," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

DEVELOP MORE U.S. ENERGY SOURCES AND SOLAR POWER TO MEET DEMAND

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Times-Union, Nov. 3, 1973]
(By Paul Miller)

It's hard to believe that America is no longer the land of easy natural plenty, but across the country from Florida to Oregon and Washington a traveler now finds rising awareness and alarm at the energy crisis.

All sorts of local measures are being tried or planned to save fuel, light and power. Unfortunately, all these temporary measures together will not be enough.

Short-term, year-round Daylight Saving Time should be adopted.

Short and long-term, there must be (1) development of more energy from available U.S. sources—and more about that later; and (2) a program comparable to that in

space to take greater advantage of the sun for more energy on earth, just as man obtained many earthly benefits by going to the moon.

As for DST, even before the energy shortage many motorists, public safety officials and others deplored Standard Time's shortened daylight hours in the afternoon. On a gloomy winter day in the Northeast, lights must be turned on as early as 4 p.m. Renewed emphasis is being given it now.

A Rand Corporation study estimates that "daylight saving time could conserve anywhere from 0.5 to 1.5 per cent of the nation's total winter energy needs."

Insignificant? Not when the overall energy shortage this winter is estimated at 3 per cent. So DST could make the difference between cold and warmth in some homes and buildings, or the difference between ample power and cutbacks in some communities.

There are objections—for example, nobody likes to go to work or school in the dark. But year-round DST deserves at least a trial. This is proposed in a bill by Sen. Adlai Stevenson 3rd (D-Ill.), among others. It also is being urged by the White House.

Well, it worked during World War II and is still being used in parts of Europe. Besides, DST would make a good start on other, even more productive energy conservation measures that also will be needed.

... BALANCE NEEDS

Current shortages arose because the development of additional sources has lagged behind rising demand.

Government price and tax policies have discouraged development of new petroleum and natural gas sources. Environmental objections have slowed or halted construction of new nuclear power plants and development of new U.S. oil and gas resources—in Alaska, for example, or off-shore in the oceans. Similarly, environmentalists have blocked full usage of America's most abundant energy resource—coal.

On top of that came the Middle East war and the Arab nations' shut-off of up to 10 per cent of America's oil supplies because of U.S. policy supporting Israel.

It all hit at once while U.S. energy consumption was increasing by more than 4 per cent a year. The immediate, inevitable result is higher prices and cutbacks in supplies, perhaps to the point of rationing some fuel.

America now must develop more energy from more domestic sources. Although conservation measures are necessary, there's no substitute for an abundant U.S. supply of energy for U.S. needs.

Most experts agree that adequate U.S.

sources are available IF the nation adopts policies needed to exploit them. But that will require much money, both private and public. And a better balance must be struck between the need to protect the environment and the need to obtain more oil and gas from sea, shale and Alaskan sources, more coal, more nuclear power.

... A 'CRASH' PROGRAM

Beyond that, potential energy sources that once appeared "far out" no longer seem so bizarre. They include nuclear fusion—and solar energy.

Scientists have the know-how to use the sun for electric power, fuel production, heating, cooling, de-salting of sea water and other energy purposes. Solar batteries have already provided power for Skylab and other space vehicles.

The big problem, say the experts, is to produce and store enough solar power or heat to compete with conventional energy sources in quantity and cost.

Overcoming that problem seems even more important to America than exploring the moon. So wouldn't it be in order to get going on a "crash" program to develop solar energy, like the mighty effort of the 1960s that sent a man to the moon?

James E. Webb, who directed NASA during the years the moon flight program hit its peak, has some reservations. Just pouring a lot more money into research wouldn't necessarily solve the problem, he explains.

Even so, Webb supports stepped-up efforts to develop solar energy, as contemplated in a bill sponsored by Rep. Mike McCormack, D-Wash., chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Energy subcommittee.

McCormack's bill, which has more than 100 co-sponsors, calls for a \$50-million, five-year program to find practical ways of harnessing solar energy to heat and cool buildings. Included would be demonstration units in several thousand residences on military property and elsewhere.

Within a decade, McCormack predicts, one in 10 homes could be built with primary heating and cooling energy provided by the sun.

Other experts envision even faster and broader progress than that.

One is A. J. Eggers of the National Science Foundation, who says use of solar energy as a "practical option" to other types of fuel is "in sight."

Another is Aden B. Meinel, professor of astronomy and optical sciences at the University of Arizona who participated in one of the University of Rochester's Joseph C. Wilson Day panel discussions this week.

Dr. Meinel believes solar energy can be commercially available in three years for heating and cooling and can provide electricity on a large scale in 10 to 15 years.

He agreed that will be costly. But he added: "With the way the cost of all energy is going up, solar energy might become economically feasible faster than any of us realize!"

A TIME FOR POSITIVE THOUGHTS

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, upon the conclusion of our deliberations and debate today when your gavel signals the end of our first 10½ months of the 93d Congress' first session, we will have several days to reflect upon what we have accomplished, or failed to accomplish, here in the House. Of equal importance, we will have an opportunity, if we seize it, to reassess not only where we stand but the direction we will take when we reconvene later this month.

The Reverend John H. Moore once said:

The real test in golf, and in life, is not in keeping out of the rough, but in getting out after we are in.

This is the test facing the Congress in the weeks and months ahead.

As we approach Thanksgiving, one of the most meaningful American holidays, some would have us believe that we live in a climate where everything is doubtful. Strongly imprinted in the minds of many people are recent events which, on the surface, seem to predict a dismal future for our Nation.

We must face the fact that unfortunate recent events have depressed countless citizens who now take a negative view toward almost everything. But, on the other hand, we must realize that we have the alternative to "accentuate the positive" if we will but do so.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman, I do not pretend to have all the answers to our Nation's problems. Under no circumstances must my remarks here today be construed as criticism of my peers, or anyone's reactions to our so-called crisis. In truth, I am only marshaling the long, long thoughts of my lifetime relative to the power of thought culminating in attitudes which build or destroy. There are already too many people prone to "nitpick" and drag us down to negative levels of thought. I refuse to compound that injury. I also refuse to concede that our country is going to hell, and that all politicians are crooks, as some people seem to think.

When we look upon the positive side, a different picture emerges.

We realize adversity is not without hopes. I am sure that many of my colleagues would concur that adversity has the effect of eliciting our best talents which otherwise might have lain dormant. As a body of 435 human beings, invested with the power given to us by the people whom we represent, we possess the capability of surmounting any problems confronting our Nation.

To think otherwise, is to ignore history.

To countless Americans, the word "Watergate" is synonymous with "cesspool." This connotation has come out of the depths of that deep trough we call "public opinion." Public opinion has given it life and duration. Public opinion can also give it death and cessation.

I would like to advance the thought that out of the shock of Watergate there could arise a resurgence of integrity in Government such as we have never before witnessed. This is a positive attitude toward past events which we cannot change. True, Watergate has brought with it tribulations which have drained our emotions, and cast doubts upon the integrity of our Government. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that out of Watergate there will emerge a stronger and more unified nation.

Thus, during our recess, I think we, as representatives of the people, should dwell upon what future effects Watergate might have on our Government, and the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I think Watergate can bring about a renewal in the political life of our country. Who among us can deny that Watergate has dispelled apathy across the Nation—most particularly at the grassroots level. We have every reason to believe, despite the cynics, that in the future people who have never before been actively involved in political elections, voted, or cared about the outcome, will let their presence be felt. They will realize that citizens who refuse to take an interest in their Government take the chance of living under oppression. They will recognize that oppression can be just another name for irresponsible power.

I also believe the people will exercise greater prudence and selectivity in their choice of candidates for public office. The first question in the minds of many of the electorate in the past has been: "Can he be elected?" In the future, they will ask: "Should he be elected?" They will ask themselves: "Are we giving the reins of power to a politician who will only think of the next election—or are we giving the reins of power to a potential statesman who will look to the next generation?" "Is he a politician who looks only to the success of his party, no matter what—or is he a statesman who will represent all of his constituency and work for their best interest, and the best interest of our country?"

Mr. Speaker, I truly think that because of Watergate the image of what a candidate should be may undergo sweeping revisions. In the future, he is not going to be the "wheeler-dealer" who serves private interests. He, or she, is going to be one who can bring the most integrity to government—one whose philosophy is rooted in the traditional belief of government "of, for, and by the people." The degenerating process of instability will be checked, and government will again become a government of laws and not of men.

I earnestly hope the experience of Watergate will attract, rather than repel such entries into the political arena of our country. I hope those who, heretofore, would never have given serious consideration to advancing themselves as candidates will appear upon the political scene. I would further hope people will come to realize that the profession

of political life is essential to the welfare of the Republic, and many who have not had previous experience in politics, but have the desire and ability to serve their fellow man, will come forth and receive the endorsement and support of the electorate.

It is my hope that the attitudes of the American people, so vividly displayed during the months surrounding discussion of the Watergate affair, are such so as to make it clear to all in public office that anything less than total and complete honesty will not be tolerated.

On the other hand, I would sincerely hope that the disturbing attitude—unfortunately on the increase in America—that a public official is guilty until proven innocent, and most likely guilty even if proven innocent, will not cause the mothers of America to abandon the dream that their son might some day be President of the United States. Likewise, I would hope that this same disturbing and increasingly suspicious attitude toward public officials will not cause a wife to discourage her husband from entering public life, or dissuade from political life the very kind of public servants the events of recent date indicate we so badly need.

Mr. Speaker, as we go into recess, it is my Thanksgiving prayer that when we reconvene we do so with renewed spirit to work wholeheartedly together in a positive manner to correct those inadequacies in our system which have permitted the events that have brought so much embarrassment to America, and take the necessary steps to cause Americans to again have confidence and pride in their country, their Government, and those who govern—and that we do it in such a way so as to build and not tear down.

THE PRACTICALITY OF WIND POWER

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, many Westerners have long been aware of the practicality of wind power. Since the energy crisis is upon us, wind power is beginning to receive the attention it has long deserved.

An excellent article on the subject by Wilson Clark appeared in the November issue of the Smithsonian Magazine. I ask unanimous consent to insert the article, "Interest In Wind Is Picking Up As Fuels Dwindle," at this point in the Record.

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

INTEREST IN WIND IS PICKING UP AS FUELS DWINDLE

(By Wilson Clark)

Windmills may seem spindly, even silly things to suggest when the engines of civilization appear to be running out of fuel. But when you compare the wind to a pile of dead plants, which seems more reliable? For the moving force of our modern, "high-energy" civilization is the massive—but finite—numbers of plants that decayed several hundred

million years ago into great organic storage pools in certain regions of the earth.

Ninety-six percent of the energy of the United States is now provided by the fossil fuels—oil, coal and natural gas—and each year we are using up what took nature one million years to produce. The real energy crisis for our civilization is one of survival: We cannot begin to replenish the stored energy of the earth quickly enough to meet future energy use levels.

High-technology alternatives, such as nuclear fusion, are far from proved and, even if they were available today, they would only extend the dependence of civilization on nonrenewable energy stocks.

A growing number of scientists seek to harness the constant, dependable renewable energy of the sun, to heat and cool buildings as well as to produce electricity. And one concentrated by-product of solar energy is the wind.

A committee appointed jointly by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has suggested that by the year 2000, less than three decades away, a major American development program in wind power could result in an annual yield of 1.5 trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity. That is equal to the total electricity consumed in the United States in 1970.

There is nothing new about tapping this great supply of energy. The oldest and most widespread application of wind power was to drive sailing vessels. With the advent of cheap and abundant fossil fuels in the 19th century, however, the great sailing ships were soon replaced by faster, more dependable coal- and oil-burning vessels. But Basil Greenhill, the director of Great Britain's National Maritime Museum, believes that a bold new era is now in store for sail. At the School for Naval Architecture at the University of Hamburg in West Germany, a fleet of "Dyna-Ships"—modernized four-masted clipper ships—is on the drawing board. Credit for the design belongs to 72-year-old naval engineer and former Shell Oil Company designer Wilhelm Prölss. The sail on the square-rigger extend from the center of the 200-foot masts on curved steel yard-arms; they are to be trimmed by remote control from the bridge.

Tests at the University have shown that winds in the North Atlantic would propel the ship at speeds up to 20 knots 72 percent of the time. Auxiliary engines would be used for windless stretches of ocean and for maneuvering in harbors: A fully automated 17,000 ton Dyna-Ship would consume only five percent of the fuel required by the standard contemporary freighter. Rudolf Zirn, wealthy Bavarian lawyer and environmental activist, has recently commissioned the construction of the first Dyna-Ship.

WHAT TO DO WHEN THE WIND STOPS

On land, the interception of wind energy by the blades of a windmill has served as a basic source of mechanical power for centuries. By 1850, the use of windmills in America represented about 1.4 billion horsepower-hours of work, the equivalent energy produced by burning 11.8 million tons of coal. But by 1870 the amount of power produced by the windmills had been cut in half. The steam engine, driven by fossil fuels, had come to stay in America.

The American windmill industry remained a thriving business, however, into the early 20th century. In the 1920s companies began to develop wind-powered electric generators, but in the 1930s the death knell was sounded for wind machines of both the water-pumping and the electricity-generating variety when the Rural Electrification Administration was established by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The picturesque prairie windmills began to fall into disuse.

A question about wind power asked by Depression-ridden farmers in the Thirties is the same one asked now on TV commer-

cials by a large oil company: What do you do when the wind stops blowing? How do you store the wind? Today's wind generator enthusiasts have several answers.

In a home-sized wind power plant producing direct current (dc) power, storage is accomplished by charging batteries. In a large system designed to feed electricity into the power lines of an electric utility, energy can be stored mechanically (or hydraulically) by pumping water or air into a reservoir, then releasing it at a later time to drive an engine operating an electric generator.

Another storage device is a flywheel, similar in principle to the familiar spinning top or toy gyroscope. Like a gyroscope, the flywheel can be spun by the input of energy (in this case, wind-generated electrical power) and storage is in kinetic energy—that is, motion. In a system designed by Florida engineer John Roesel Jr., the blades of a wind generator turning a shaft at 120 revolutions per minute might be stepped up to 24,000 rpm to spin a flywheel. While spinning, the flywheel stores energy that could later be tapped as it "runs down" after the wind stops.

A properly designed flywheel, made perhaps of pressed bamboo and enclosed in a vacuum chamber to minimize friction (the main energy loss in the system) is not only much more efficient than battery storage, but is potentially cheaper. Compared with lead-acid batteries which store only 8-10 watt-hours of electricity per pound of material, the envisioned bamboo flywheel would store more than 20 watt-hours per pound. Such a wind-power system for a home would be capable of storing enough energy to provide electrical power for a week of windless days.

Yet another "storage" technique is the production of a synthetic fuel—hydrogen. Hydrogen has many of the fuel properties of natural gas (see *SMITHSONIAN*, August 1972) and can be produced by the electrolysis of ordinary water. A wind generator could furnish the electrolyzer with electricity to break the water molecules down into their constituent parts—hydrogen and oxygen. The hydrogen would then be compressed and stored for later use as high-grade fuel.

This "modernistic" approach to the energy storage problem was first applied in connection with wind power before the turn of the 20th century. In the 1890s Danish professor and wind-power pioneer Poul La Cour produced hydrogen and oxygen fuel by using wind-generated electricity to electrolyze an aqueous solution of sodium hydroxide. The local high school at Askov, Denmark, where La Cour taught, was illuminated by "Drummond Light," which was an oxygen-hydrogen flame directed on a zirconium element, causing it to emit a brilliant light.

In addition to these proposals and methods for various forms of wind-energy storage, a number of researchers have suggested the direct coupling of wind plants into a regional utilities grid to avoid the necessity of storage altogether. Ernst Cohn, manager of Solar Chemical Power Systems for NASA has summarized the arguments for this approach:

"Pick the areas in the U.S. where they have the right kind of wind velocity, and the right kind of wind durability, and put your windmills up and feed their power into a grid. You use them as base power, with no storage. . . . On a day when you have no wind—which will probably not happen for all windmills anyway . . . you use conventional fossil fuel power if you need to." Such a system, Cohn predicted, "would prove competitive today."

There have been schemes for large-scale use of wind power in the past. During World War II, a massive 1,250-kilowatt wind electrical station was operated at "Grandpa's Knob" in the mountains of central Vermont. Things went smoothly for about 16 months, until a main bearing in the generator failed in February 1943. Because of wartime shortages, the company was unable to replace the bearings for more than two

years, during which time the blades were locked in place and subjected to continuous buffeting of the wind, with accompanying stress on the machinery and blades. After the bearing was finally replaced, the wind station operated for less than a month. On the morning of March 26, 1945, cracks widened in the spars of one of the machine's eight-ton blades which suddenly gave way and was hurled 750 feet through the air, landing on its tip. It was never repaired, and the nation's first experiment with wind-generated commercial electricity was ended.

Interest in the large-scale production of wind power in America was renewed in 1970 by William E. Heronemus, professor of civil engineering at the University of Massachusetts. Over the past three years, he has proposed wide-ranging networks of huge wind generators in numerous U.S. locations to provide virtually all the nation's electricity.

For example, Heronemus proposed a wind system as a substitute for the nuclear power plant now scheduled for construction in Shoreham, New York (and a similar system for New England; see drawing, p. 73). The first of two networks of floating wind-power stations would be emplaced off Long Island, beginning in 1975. The wind stations would be mounted either on towers planted in the relatively shallow shoal waters, or on 500-foot by 200-foot semisubmersible platforms. Each station would support three wind towers, each of which would in turn house two 200-foot diameter wind turbines. The two-blade turbines are based on the Grandpa's Knob model, as refined by a study performed after World War II by New York University. Six hundred and forty of these wind stations would be linked together along 16 north-south lines. The wind generators would produce electric current for powering electrolyzers, machines which convert water to hydrogen and oxygen. The oxygen might be released to the atmosphere, while the hydrogen gas would be pumped into underwater tanks and stored for later use.

Heronemus believes that power from the offshore system would be economically competitive with future conventional electric power costs in New England. He also points out that due to the decentralized nature of wind technology, the loss of a single wind turbine would not cripple the electric service area with a huge blackout. For example, the April 1973 blackout affecting 150 miles of Florida's "Gold Coast"—from Fort Pierce down into the Florida Keys—was caused by a single nuclear plant failure. "One wind station disabled would mean one-thirteen thousandths of the system capacity would be lost," Heronemus says, as opposed to the complete system loss that can be precipitated by a nuclear station failure.

There are other efforts under way. Scientists at the NASA Lewis Research Center in Cleveland, Ohio, hope to build a 100-kilowatt wind machine there in 1975. A later version of the generator may be emplaced on the Island of Culebra off Puerto Rico under a contract with the National Science Foundation.

NASA officials believe that with mass production, electricity generated by wind power will be available at capital costs which a decade from now will be competitive with nuclear plants. Dr. Joseph Savino, technical director of the NASA Lewis Wind Energy Program, contends that "there's enough energy in the winds to supply all our electrical needs. If the Danes could get 200,000 kilowatts of electricity from the winds back in 1908, we should be able to get the power we need right now."

Another way to get power we need from the wind may be to think small. Availability of wind power in local areas has historically been a factor in the location of homes and buildings because architecture was based to a large degree on the relationship of buildings to the winds. Only the last few decades of massive exploitation of fossil fuels have

caused the window to become essentially a repository for air conditioners rather than a device for opening the interior of structures to the cooling winds. As the availability of cheap fossil fuels decrease, perhaps windows will once more assume a functional meaning.

An important asset of wind energy is its free distribution over the seas and continents. The energy which currently powers our country is transmitted as liquid fuel or as electricity in pipelines and power lines, which are costly transport systems. The small-scale use of wind power would eliminate the costs of transmitting electricity from central facilities.

Scientists at the Brace Research Institute at McGill University in Montreal, a leading international center for research into natural energy sources, have worked with wind generators for small-scale use in agricultural areas and low-energy societies. The Brace windmills have a variety of uses, from water pumping to electricity production. One unique design is the Savonius rotor, named after Finnish engineer S. J. Savonius, who designed wind plants in the 1920s. The Brace version calls for cutting two 45-gallon oil drums in half lengthwise and welding them to form troughs that scoop up the wind and keep the rotor turning.

An enterprising group of young communards in Wisconsin, calling themselves "Windworks," have built a number of small electric wind generators, including a unit designed for Buckminster Fuller, who has provided some financial support for their Spartan efforts. Led by graduate aeronautical engineer Hans Meyer, the group has designed several innovative wind plants which can be built cheaply with easily attainable materials. One can be built for less than \$200.

Near Albuquerque, New Mexico, Robert Reines and the Integrated Life Support Systems Laboratories built the world's first dome structure powered totally by wind and solar power.

Their first wind generator was installed in February 1972. The remainder of the year was spent rebuilding two other used wind generators and making a solar heat collector for use in heating the dome and for domestic hot water. In all, it cost them more than \$12,000 over a ten-month period to plan and build the home, which they named "Prototype I" in anticipation of more sophisticated designs (see pp. 74-75).

A FULL RANGE OF APPLIANCES

Electricity for the dome is supplied by one reconditioned wind generator, the equivalent of more than five kilowatts of installed electrical capacity. (The other two generators supply other equipment.) A bank of 16 heavy-duty batteries store 22,000 watt-hours of current which supplies a full range of appliances, including a hi-fi set, tape recorder, television set, refrigerator, electric fan, pumps, mixers and an electrically operated chemical toilet. Reines is convinced that solar-heated, wind-powered domes can be produced for \$15,000-\$20,000 each.

The only commercial distributor of home-sized electric wind generators in the United States is the Solar Wind Company of East Holden, Maine, which sells Swiss and Australian wind generators. Henry Clews founded the company when he attempted to purchase a wind generator for his home in Maine but found that he had to import a machine all the way from Australia.

Yet another approach is the use of medium-sized wind generators of 15 to 20 kilowatt capacity (perhaps as high as 100 kilowatts). These would produce electrical power in favorable locations for small communities. As the needed generating units increase in size, costs decline somewhat, so that the projected investment per person in such a scheme might drop to 20-50 percent less than the costs of individual house generating units. The central drawback is the nature of the wind's energy.

Smaller generators would be more expen-

sive per person, but due to the variations in available wind power in most locations, a community network of wind generators might extract more overall power than one large machine.

Such wind stations might operate in combination with solar-energy equipment to fulfill total energy requirements, but the solar equipment in most places would remain on rooftops, not in central facilities. Only in sunny areas with high solar values could solar collecting equipment be centralized for redistribution to individuals in the system.

The technical aspects of building wind generators are remarkably well understood. French engineer Louis Vadot, who chaired the sessions on wind-power generation at the United Nations' 1961 Rome conference on new energy sources, noted that: "... It is now generally agreed that the design of wind-power plants with capacities ranging from the lowest levels to far beyond 100 kilowatts no longer presents any fundamental problems... our knowledge is sufficient to be usable in a more or less routine way and without need to be on guard against surprises." Given the potential of wind power as a renewable future energy source with minimum pollution, it is surprising that the federal government and private industry show so little interest in its development. The National Science Foundation intends to spend \$1.25 million in 1973-74 to assess the development of wind power. The funds will come out of the administration's request to Congress for \$872 million for energy research and development. While the director of the program, Louis Divone, is enthusiastic about the merits of wind power, the sum hardly seems a serious commitment.

On the other hand, Basil Greenhill of Britain's National Maritime Museum, has described the pitfalls of not developing wind power for shipping, and his analysis may well hold true for power plants as well.

Suppose the energy crisis forces a shortage of conventional fuels necessary to build modern wind-powered ships. "Such a situation," Greenhill says, "would mean virtually a return to a man- and animal-powered wood-fired industry. There would not be the resources ashore to build a sophisticated vessel of the type I have described.... Perhaps the design and experimental work on the development of modern merchant sailing vessels should be begun soon, before the crisis is actually upon us."

As is the case with wind-driven ships, the penalties for delay in developing wind power and all other natural energy sources are great. The technologically rich nations are right to be alarmed about fuel shortages but the answer may not lie underground. It may be, as the song says, blown' in the wind.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOEL T. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA ON A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 WITH RESPECT TO THE DEDUCTION FOR MOVING EXPENSES OF MEM- BERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the deduction for moving expenses of members of the Armed Forces. The main thrust of this legislation would eliminate five significant areas of inequity as they relate

to the Armed Forces. Specifically, I make reference to the tax treatment of "in-kind" reimbursement of moving expenses under section 82, title 26, United States Code; the application of the so-called 39-week rule; the application of the 50-mile rule; the tax treatment of expenses of moving household goods to a place to which dependents may be moved when dependents are not authorized to accompany the member on a tour of duty outside the Continental United States or in Alaska; and tax treatment of expenses incurred for meals and lodging at the old and new permanent duty station when the member and his dependents are temporarily required to reside at hotel or hotel-like accommodations due to unavailability of Government quarters.

"In-kind" reimbursements require that there shall be included in gross income any amount received or accrued, directly or indirectly by an individual as a payment for or reimbursement of expenses of moving from one residence to another residence which is attributable to employment or self-employment. Where members of the Armed Forces are concerned, the exact amount allocable to an individual move is not always ascertainable, particularly where transportation of the member, his dependents, household goods and automobile is provided by Government-owned or Government-procured facilities, such as Military Airlift or Military Sealift Command. In addition, the cost of nontemporary storage of household goods in a Government or Government-procured facility also presents a problem in allocating and accounting for exact cost of individual shipment. To further compound this problem is the fact that there is not now a system in existence within the Department of Defense for collecting this data which must be reported to the Internal Revenue Service, with the costs of installing such a system not only considerable but prohibitive when consideration is given to the fact that virtually no tax revenue to the U.S. Treasury will be realized through implementation of this system.

Under the so-called 39-week requirement, no deduction is allowed for moving expenses unless during the 12 months immediately following the taxpayer's arrival in the general location of his new principal place of work, he is a full-time employee in such general location during at least 39 weeks. This situation is directly applicable to a member of the Armed Forces who knows in advance that he will not be at his duty station for at least 39 weeks due to interim orders assigning him to a school which is a normal procedure in many instances prior to reporting to a new permanent duty station. Under certain circumstances, the expenses of making such moves are not deductible as moving expenses although the income, including any reimbursement or transportation provided in kind, or otherwise, is reportable as income in the member's tax return.

Under existing law where the 50-mile rule applies, no deduction for moving expenses will be allowed unless the member's new principal place of work is at least 50 miles farther from his former residence than was his former principal

November 15, 1973

place of work or he had no former principal place of work, is at least 50 miles from his former residence. Application of this so-called 50-mile rule is particularly severe upon enlistees who undergo basic training within 50 miles of their homes and would be required to report any income incident to reporting for basic training, including "in-kind" items, but would not be entitled to any deduction on their income tax returns for such expenses. In addition, this situation would apply to members with a permanent change of station who must live on the local economy close to their new duty station. When public quarters become available they are ordered to move on base. Any expenses incident to such moves are at Government expense, but the member involved must report these expenses as income but is not permitted under existing law to deduct these expenses incident to such move.

With respect to members of the Armed Forces who are assigned to "short" tour areas outside the continental United States or Alaska, normally for 12 to 24 months, dependents are not normally authorized to accompany the member. However, in these instances, the member's dependents and household goods may be moved at Government expense to a place approved by the Secretary of the service concerned and, upon reassignment of the member, from his "short" tour, the dependents may be moved from that place to his new permanent duty station. However, any payment or reimbursement received incident to the move of the dependents to the place approved by the Secretary concerned as well as payment or reimbursement incident to the move from that place to the member's new duty station are included as income, but these expenses are not deductible.

Current law defines "moving expenses" to include meals and lodging while occupying temporary quarters in the general location of the new principal place of work during any period of 30 consecutive days after obtaining employment. However, current law does not recognize that members of the Armed Forces are often required to vacate public quarters prior to actual departure from their old permanent duty station, often not of their own choosing but at the convenience of the Government. Thus, members and their dependents must depend upon hotel or hotel-type accommodations for short periods of time, accumulating "moving expenses" at both new as well as the old permanent duty station.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I introduced today will resolve the foregoing areas of inequity to members of the Armed Forces as follows:

Eliminates the requirement of the service reporting to the Internal Revenue Service, or the member including as income, amounts paid by the service directly to carriers, warehouses, et cetera, incident to a permanent change of station; exempts members of the Armed Forces from the 39-week requirement and the 50-mile rule; permits members to deduct otherwise proper moving ex-

penses where the member serves an unaccompanied tour outside the continental United States or in Alaska and his dependents move to a location approved by the Secretary of the service concerned; and it extends existing provisions of law relating to expenses of meals and lodging while occupying temporary quarters at the new duty station to also apply to such similar expenses incurred prior to departure from the old duty station.

Mr. Speaker, the changes which my bill would make were, in part, necessitated by the Tax Reform Act of 1969 and the administration has sought to obtain these changes since the enactment of that law. In the interim, the Internal Revenue Service has extended a moratorium on the implementation of some of the 1969 act provisions pending congressional action on the necessary amendments. The Commissioner of the Internal Revenue has indicated that the moratorium will not be continued after this year. Therefore, legislation to accomplish this purpose is urgent and long overdue. I strongly urge enactment of this measure which I have proposed today.

UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS FOR
ACADEMIC ORDER INVITE SAK-
HAROV TO UNITED STATES

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, one of the real yardsticks of freedom in any society is the freedom to travel, both within one's country and outside it. We are all too familiar with the fact that various prominent Soviet citizens are usually unable to travel abroad to receive recognition of their achievements and that those who openly oppose the policies of their government are never allowed to travel without being subject to losing their citizenship. Therefore, it will be interesting to see their reaction to the invitation of the University Professors For Academic Order to Sakharov to address their national convention in San Diego next January. The announcement follows:

UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS FOR ACADEMIC ORDER
INVITES SAKHAROV TO ADDRESS CONVENTION

University Professors for Academic Order, a group of university professors dedicated to preserving the traditional ideal of the university as a place of learning, research, and instruction, has cabled an invitation to noted Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov to address its fourth national convention in San Diego on January 5-6, 1974. UPAO Executive Director Charles A. Moser announced today that he had suggested the topic "Academic Freedom in the Soviet Union" to Academician Sakharov, but added that "we would be pleased to have him speak on any topic he chooses so long as it has something to do with higher education." Professor Moser, whose own field of specialization is Russian language and literature, went on to say that "Academician Sakharov could make a

distinguished contribution to our convention program if it proves possible for him to come. We have within our own universities, unhappily, some of the same problems which Soviet universities must face, and we would certainly benefit from Sakharov's insight and especially his intellectual courage, which is all too frequently lacking in American academic circles."

Whether or not Academician Sakharov is able to attend, the fourth national convention of UPAO will discuss several of the most pressing problems facing American higher education from the perspective of the traditional idea of the university.

HONORABLE ROBERT EWING
THOMASON

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, 55 years ago, I was a student at the University of Texas. I ate my meals at a boarding house near the capitol on Congress Avenue. At that boarding house, one of the patrons was the Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives, a young man named Robert Ewing Thomason. I greatly admired him. The next year, he ran for Governor. At that time I was a sophomore at Baylor University. I supported him and kept his picture on the bulletin board in the University Library. I had numerous altercations with my friends as the president of the board of trustees of Baylor University, Honorable Pat M. Neff, was also a candidate, the successful candidate, incidentally. I later practiced law with Pat Neff, Jr. and came to know Governor Neff well. I respected him very highly, but I never thought the less of Ewing Thomason.

I went to the Texas Legislature in 1925. A few years later Mr. Thomason was elected Congressman from the El Paso district. When I came to Congress in 1937, Mr. Thomason was a senior member of the Military Affairs Committee. He received me with every courtesy. Indeed, he selected an office for me on the fourth floor of the old, now Cannon Building. I was next door to Albert Thomas of Houston and, some months later, Lyndon Johnson of Austin was assigned an office across the hall from us. Mr. Thomason was most helpful to all of us young Congressmen. He was a distinguished, honorable and friendly Member.

In 1947, he was appointed Federal Judge of the western district of Texas. He served in this capacity for the rest of his life and was quite active until very recent years. Of course, I never appeared in Judge Thomason's court, but he built a great reputation as a fine and fair judge. He served his State ably and long. Texas was fortunate to have his services.

Although the Judge is no longer with us, his influence will continue. His wife, Abbie, was a devoted and effective helpmate and I join in extending to her, and to the other members of his family, my heartfelt sympathy.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH H. SEYMOUR

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Waldo Emerson, the noted 19th-century essayist, said:

The only reward of virtue is virtue.

Most often, those who undertake projects for the benefit of humanity do so fully realizing that personal aspirations, sacrifice, and long hours—with little recognition—are in store. Instead of striving toward personal gains, they work for the ideals of relieving human suffering, pain, and ignorance and for improving the quality of life of our fellow human beings.

One such individual, who has dedicated his life to helping others, is Joe Seymour, the business manager of Operating Engineers Local Union No. 12.

MAN OF THE YEAR

On December 1, Mr. Seymour will be recognized by the City of Hope for his distinguished service to the community as the "Man of the Year."

A native Californian, he first became a member of the International Union of Operating Engineers in 1946, following his service in the Navy during World War II.

Less than 4 years later, after serving as a steward and becoming known as a leading advocate and spokesman for union ideals, Joe Seymour became a business representative for Local No. 12 in 1950. In this capacity, he served the membership in the Imperial Valley and the San Gabriel Valley.

Recognizing his leadership abilities and potential, the union selected Mr. Seymour to attend the Harvard University trade union program where he was graduated as class president with the highest honors in 1952. Later he was elected trustee of Local 12 for two 3-year terms.

In 1961, he was elected the local union's business manager and has since been reelected for four additional 3-year terms—a record unprecedented in the history of Local 12, the second largest in the IUOE.

In addition, Joe Seymour has served as an executive board member of the Western States Conference of Engineers since November 1961, and as vice president of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, since April 1965. He is also a trustee of the general pension fund of the IUOE, a member of the executive board of the California State Building and Construction Trades Council, and a vice president of the California Conference of Operating Engineers.

In 1967, Mr. Seymour was the recipient of a gold lifetime membership card—the only such card ever issued an active member—presented by Local 12's executive board and membership.

GENERAL VICE PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL

Another honor came to Local 12 and Joe Seymour in November 1969, when he was elected general vice president of the

International Union of Operating Engineers, and he was reelected to that post in April 1972.

Among his civic activities are membership in the district attorney's advisory council, the attorney general's advisory council, the American Arbitration Association, Town Hall, the Harvard Club, the American Legion, the National Rifle Association, the Civil Defense and Rescue Group, the Footprinters, and the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Seymour has led a full and beneficial life, and in addition to his own abilities, he has had the good fortune of having an understanding and inspiring partner, his wife of 32 years, Laura.

The proceeds from the testimonial dinner which will honor Joe Seymour as "Man of the Year" will help establish the Joseph H. Seymour research fellowship at the City of Hope—a medical center specializing in patient care, medical research and education in the diseases of cancer, leukemia, and other catastrophic diseases of our time.

I think it is entirely appropriate that Mr. Seymour receive this signal honor from such an outstanding organization. Indeed, his ideals and efforts on behalf of humanity are closely related to the goals and aspirations of the City of Hope.

It is with great honor that I pay tribute to Joe Seymour and applaud him for the contributions he has made to our society.

REPRESENTATIVE WALDIE INTRODUCES A BILL TO ASSIST FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO GET BETTER HEALTH CARE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which would appreciably assist Federal employees in obtaining and paying for needed health care.

At the present time, Federal employees who are covered under the Federal employees health benefits program are able to receive payment for covered services provided by licensed or duly certified social workers only if such services are provided as part of a mental health team which must include a physician, or upon referral by the physician.

Under the bill I am introducing today, payment would be made for services of qualified social workers which are now covered under any of the program's health plans, but without the necessity of these requirements. As a result, this bill would not increase the scope of services covered under the Federal employees health benefits program.

Direct access to needed and proven health care serves two purposes: one, it saves money in that the cost of a physical examination as a prerequisite to the covered care is avoided where the examination is not medically necessary; second, it encourages necessary competi-

tion in the health care market—something we desperately need in these times of skyrocketing health care.

Mr. Speaker, social workers in the United States are a growing, necessary, and absolutely competent portion of this country's providers of health care. The services they render range from counseling to the use of applied psychotherapy and are absolutely essential in today's modern society.

The full text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 11544

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8902 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(J) If the contract benefits include payment or reimbursement for a service which may be provided by a social worker who has a master's degree in social work, and two or more years of supervised experience in a clinical or hospital setting, and is licensed and/or certified as such under applicable state or Federal statutes, then the Federal employee beneficiary, annuitant, or family member covered by such social worker of his or her choice, shall have direct access to same, without supervision or referral by another health practitioner and shall be entitled under such contract to have benefits paid to him or her on his or her behalf for such services. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to group practice prepayment plans."

OVERWHELMING RESPONSE TO CONSTITUENT QUESTIONNAIRE ON WATERGATE CRISIS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the dismissal of Special Watergate Prosecutor Cox and the subsequent resignations of Attorney General Richardson and Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus, I prepared and mailed to each of the 174,000 households in the 18th District I represent, a questionnaire to gauge the depth of their mood and reaction to these events.

I felt that these actions had plunged our Nation into an extremely serious confrontation and was convinced that difficult decisions faced me and my colleagues in the House of Representatives in the near future.

The response was swift and overwhelming. Almost immediately, the completed questionnaires began to be returned. To date, nearly 36,000, representing nearly 70,000 responses, since both "his" and "hers" opinions were asked for, have been tabulated by my staff.

Additionally, nearly 2,500 letters, telegrams and phone calls were also received by both my district office in Pittsburgh and here.

I find it particularly significant that 54 percent of those responding to the questionnaire were Republicans, as opposed to 42 percent Democrats and 3 percent "other," this in a district which

has a registration edge of 50,000 Democrats and independents.

But what is more significant is what the responses revealed to me, and I would like to share these responses with my colleagues. I was particularly impressed by the fact that 99 percent said they would vote in the 1974 general election, and that figure must include the 14 percent who admitted having no trust in any elected official and the 63 percent who said they trusted "some."

What this tells me is that our constituents will indeed go out to the polls next November, and they will be watching incumbents very closely. In light of this, the choice of candidates by both parties will be crucial in order to bring out our citizens.

The tabulations of all 10 questions posed in the questionnaire will be released to my constituents by way of my December newsletter, but in the hopes that my colleagues will find this information of value, I am here with reprinting these results now:

[Answers in percent]

1. Did you vote in the 1972 Presidential election?	
Yes	93
No	7
2. Would you vote if a national election were held right now?	
Yes	96
No	4
3. Do you intend to vote in the 1974 General Election for a governor, U.S. Senator, and U. S. Representative?	
Yes	99
No	1
4. What is your political registration? (Republican, Democrat, Not Registered, Other).	
Republican	54
Democrat	42
Other	3
5. Which of the following best describes your political views? (Check one)	
Conservative	36
Moderate	56
Liberal	8
6. Do you feel that the office of the President is above the law under any circumstances?	
Yes	10
No	90
7. With the abolition of the office of the Special Prosecutor, would you favor action by Congress to establish a Special Prosecutor's Office to pursue the Watergate grand jury investigation?	
Yes	74
No	26
8. Which of the following best expresses your feelings about the President's actions to dismiss Special Watergate Prosecutor Cox and force the resignations of Attorney General Richardson and Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus? (Check one)	
Strongly approve	18
Mostly approve	13
Mostly disapprove	10
Strongly disapprove	56
No opinion	3
9. How would you feel about impeachment proceedings if the President refuses to obey a court order to turn over Watergate tapes, telephone logs and other relevant documents?	
Strongly favor	42
Mostly favor	17
Mostly opposed	10
Strongly opposed	26
No opinion	5

10. How would you describe your attitude toward elected public officials? (Check one)	
Trust all	1
Trust most	22
Trust some	63
Trust none	14

UNITED NATIONS PRACTICES DOUBLE STANDARDS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, it comes to my attention that attempts are once again being made to repeal the Byrd amendment which permits U.S. imports of chrome ore from Rhodesia. I cannot understand the double standard that exists over trade with the murderous regimes in Soviet Russia and Red China as opposed to the sanctions against the anti-Communist nation of Rhodesia. It is even more appalling to me that the arguments being advanced against trade with Rhodesia are centered around their alleged discrimination against blacks. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, what do these people think is going on in Russia? Are the stories about Sakharov and Solzhenitsen and the problems encountered by Russian Jewish people desiring to emigrate falling on deaf ears? I simply cannot understand this kind of raw hypocrisy. It seems to me that Henry Kissinger has put us in a trap "détente-at-any-price." The administration is certainly not going to have my support in their efforts on behalf of the liberal Democrat move to repeal the Byrd amendment.

Mr. Bill Hewes of Gonzaga University in Spokane, Wash., sent me an article he wrote on this very subject. I would like for my colleagues in Congress to have the benefit of Mr. Hewes comments. The article reads as follows:

"PEACEFUL" U.N. PICKS ON RHODESIA

(By Bill Hewes)

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee last month approved Senator Humphrey's bill to repeal the Byrd Amendment. The Amendment, adopted in 1971, allows the U.S. to import goods from Rhodesia if the same items are also being imported from Communist countries.

Thus the U.S. sensibly imports chrome from Rhodesia, despite the United Nations' boycott of the Ian Smith regime.

Chrome, used in steel production, is a strategic material for which the United States relies on imports.

Senator Humphrey charged that by violating U.N. sanctions we have violated basic principles of U.S. foreign policy, namely "the defense of human rights and self-determination," and our "commitment to the non-violent resolution of conflict" (May 22, 1973 Congressional Record, p. 16397).

SCEPTICISM NOTED

One should avoid a whitewash of the Rhodesian government, of course, but one must also be skeptical of the dark, bleak picture of Rhodesia given by Senator Humphrey. The Senator says the situation is almost one of no freedom, only government-imposed order.

Susan L. M. Huck, however, reported in 1972 that although the 750,000 whites were allocated half the land, as many as half of the 4 million blacks were living "... on farms in the European-owned area, or in African areas in and near all Rhodesian cities. ...

"... these Africans can support their families and send money to relatives in the tribal lands of Malawi" ("Accepting Rhodesia's Independence," Jan. 12, 1972 Review of the News, p. 46).

Senator Humphrey claims that the United Nations has imposed sanctions on Rhodesia to "let Ian Smith know that his nation would not be recognized as a member of the world community until these people (the black Africans) had a share in determining how they were governed."

RUSSIA SPEAKS

Here we have a classic example of the pot calling the kettle black. For example, in November, 1971, the Soviet delegate to the United Nations urged the U.N. to reaffirm the need to take steps to insure that Rhodesia adopted a "democratic system, in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the population" (Dec. 1971 UN Monthly Chronicle, p. 54).

That's right.

Russia, that land of the free, wants Rhodesia to be democratic.

Rhodesia's neighbor Zambia got in to the act, too, by asserting that Rhodesia should become independent of Britain only after "majority rule" had been established (Dec. 1971 UN Monthly Chronicle, p. 51).

That's right. Zambia, now a one-party Communist state, has chastised Rhodesia for being undemocratic.

BLOODY SERIOUS

If the situation were not so bloody serious, I'd choke from laughter. The United Nations is supposedly opposing Rhodesia because the latter is not democratic. Yet many or most of the U.N.'s member states are dictatorships, and the worst of them lead the pack against Rhodesia.

Rhodesia has difficulties with the United Nations, not because it is undemocratic or racist, but because it is anti-Communist. The U.N. record bears this out.

The best example is that if Katanga, which tried to secede from the Congo in the summer of 1960. Earlier that year the Congo had become independent of Belgium.

A Congolese central government was set up under Patrice Lumumba, who on Sept. 15 issued to the heads of the Congolese provinces the directive that his government would have total power.

Measures to be taken were to include the establishment of "an absolute dictatorship" and "Terrorism, essential to subdue the population" (Situation in the Republic of the Congo, report of the U.N. Conciliation Commission for the Congo; quoted in G. Edward Griffin, *The Fearful Master, A Second Look at the United Nations, Western Islands, Boston, 1964*, p. 20).

Katanga, led by anti-Communist Moise Tshombe, seceded from the Congo. The pro-democratic United Nations, which never intervenes in any nation's internal affairs, backed Lumumba and invaded Katanga.

The U.N. forces in Katanga engaged in a number of peaceful activities. According to the 46 doctors of Elizabethville, U.N. forces bombed clearly marked hospitals, murdered unarmed civilians, fired on ambulances, and in general made a shambles of a previously peaceful state.

This is the organization which Senator Humphrey thinks should take care of Rhodesia.

U.N. OPPOSES PORTUGAL

Since Katanga, the United Nations has maintained its commitment to peace,

through its backing of the terrorists working to undermine Portugal's affiliates, Angola, Mozambique, and Portuguese Guinea. Last year the U.N. gave prestige and international status to the terrorists by inviting them to send observers to its session.

Communist-led, African terrorists have long worked for peace. In their 1961 invasion of Angola they smashed babies against trees in M'Bridge and then used the dying infants as soccer balls. They tied the white people of Luvo to logs and sawed them to pieces in a sawmill.

Non-whites got a piece of the action, too, as blacks and mulattos were massacred along with whites, according to Thomas J. Haas, who as of early 1972 was the only American to have visited the former terror zones in Angola (Haas, "Inside The African 'Terror Zones,'" Feb. 2, 1972 Review of the News, 31-48).

Thus the United Nations has sided with the terrorists against the black and white Portuguese citizens in Africa.

That is the organization which Senator Humphrey says should work out a peaceful, just settlement for Rhodesia.

We must realize the existence of different definitions for the word "peace." Most Americans probably think of peace as meaning good will or a state of friendly relations.

But there is also the typical dictator's definition of peace: absence of opposition to the dictator. The United Nations, judging from its record, follows this latter definition with respect to Communist dictatorships.

Former U.N. Secretary-General U Thant admitted as much in 1970 when he declared that Lenin's "ideals of peace and peaceful co-existence . . . are in line with the aims of the U.N. Charter. . . ."

BASIC QUESTION

The basic question in the controversy over Rhodesian imports is whether the United States should obey the United Nations.

If we obey the U.N., regarding it as the arbiter, we cannot remain a free and independent nation. There is no way around it. I propose that we remain free and independent.

The United Nations, with its Leninist concept of "peace," hardly deserves our support. The Byrd Amendment does deserve our support.

REPRESENTATIVE MARAZITI SUPPORTS SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE FOR RECIPIENTS

HON. JOSEPH J. MARAZITI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. MARAZITI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill providing a two step, 11 percent increase for social security recipients to become effective in March and June of 1974.

Older Americans living on modest fixed incomes simply cannot cope with the fast rise in the cost of living to meet the most basic essentials of food, housing, medical care, and transportation.

The Ways and Means Committee has reported that the seasonally adjusted annual index for the cost of living over the 3 months of July, August, and September for food alone has risen at a rate of 28.8 percent.

This is particularly tragic for older Americans because the funds from their food budget is usually the only place

they have from which to pay increased housing and medical care costs. It is a documented fact that the Nation's elderly suffer from malnutrition, and we have over 20 million elderly in this Nation.

When you compute the rise in the cost-of-living from December 1972 through September 1973, it comes to an overall 6.8 percent increase. When you break it out in four basic areas affecting retired Americans, it comes to a 3.6-percent increase in rent, a 17.7-percent increase in food costs, a 2.9-percent increase in medical care costs, a 4.1-percent increase in housing costs, and a 0.7-percent increase in public transportation costs over the same 10 month period.

It concerns me that our Nation's elderly must suffer the greatest impact of inflation. It concerns me that too many proud older Americans in New Jersey are going hungry in order to try and keep a roof over their head. It also concerns me that we obviously have not found the needed keys to holding inflation down, despite the efforts of the Congress and the administration to do so.

For these reasons I am supporting this benefit increase for 29 million social security recipients which would provide a flat 7 percent social security benefit increase for March 1974 which would be a partial advance payment of a permanent 11 percent benefit increase effective for June 1974.

It is needed, Mr. Speaker.

TERMINATE ALL EXPORTS OF PETROLEUM

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill cosponsored by many Members of this body, which would in effect terminate all exports of gasoline, distillate fuel oil, and propane gas until the President has determined that the present energy crisis no longer exists in the United States.

I am advised by my colleagues that in excess of 50 million gallons of fuel oil is expected to be exported during the current calendar year, and that this volume is almost three-fold the quantity of distillates exported during 1972.

In response to this legislation the Department of Interior is disclaiming these figures, but by their own admission indicate that some 1.5 million barrels of distillates have indeed been exported during this calendar year to the following countries:

	Barrels
United Kingdom	421,834
Mexico	323,345
Netherlands Antilles	195,812
Denmark	154,160
Netherlands	148,688
Venezuela	112,236
Japan	61,299

The Department of the Interior further indicates that the above quantities have

already been shipped, and of course, there is no mandate of any sort indicating that this quantity or even a larger quantity of precious fuel supplies might not leave this country again in the forthcoming 1974 year.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that when you compare the above shipments against domestic consumption in the United States approximating 1 billion barrels, that we are really talking about something less than 1 percent of the total U.S. demand. Be that as it may, however, I do not see how the Congress, nor the administration, can in good conscience suggest gasoline rationing and even additional taxation on the average gasoline buyer at service stations throughout the length and breadth of this country without plugging up the above overseas shipments.

To me it is totally ridiculous that in a time of national crises that we should permit any quantity whatsoever of heating oil, kerosene, diesel fuel, or any other distillate fuel to leave the continental United States. Charity indeed begins at home, and I hope that this above legislation can be considered by the Congress within the earliest possible time frame.

OFFICE OF PETROLEUM ALLOCATIONS LAUDED

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an excellent record of service being compiled by the newly formed Office of Petroleum Allocations—formerly the Office of Oil and Gas.

My contacts, as well as those of my staff, with the Office of Petroleum Allocations—OPA—here in Washington and in the field have been most rewarding. Never have we been faced with less than a superb effort. It is readily apparent that the OPA staff is faced with a most difficult task, a task that often goes without the simple "thank you" it so richly deserves.

I am fully aware that this staff is made up of professions whose reward is the knowledge of a job well done. Yet, as I offer this praise, I must also call attention to a tremendous shortage of staff personnel, facilities and office accommodations.

There are 12 regional OPA offices set up throughout the Nation, and the staff at each numbers only 6 to 10. These offices on peak days receive as many as 500 cases. The normal load is 200 to 250. This is truly an impossible assignment under present conditions.

Here in Washington, the Congressional Liaison Office of OPA has but two telephone lines, making it impossible for this staff—despite its sincere efforts—to adequately serve the 435 House offices and the 100 Senate offices.

I have been advised that OPA staff workers here in the Capital begin their

days early and work into the late night hours. I sincerely commend them for their hard work despite the many hurdles they face in performing their jobs.

Since the "energy crunch" is going to be uppermost in the minds of all Americans in the weeks and months ahead, it is my deepest hope that the administration provides the Office of Petroleum Allocations with the personnel, the equipment and the facilities it needs to adequately perform its assigned task of serving the Nation in this time of need.

MOBILE HOMES SAFETY BILL

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, over 7 million Americans are presently living in mobile homes and their number is increasing at the rate of 1.5 million people annually.

Concurrent with the dramatic increase in the market for economical mobile homes, there has been rising concern over the need to establish Federal safety standards to reduce insurance costs, property damages, personal injury, and death resulting from mobile home accidents. Consequently, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 10901, which provides for the establishment of practical Federal safety standards for mobile homes in interstate commerce; authorizes mobile home safety research and development; and encourages and provides financial assistance for the development of State mobile home safety programs.

I believe that H.R. 10901 is a reasonable and practical bill which will be acceptable to advocates of Federal standards and mobile home manufacturers. I urge my colleagues to acquaint themselves with the provisions of my bill and the position which manufacturers of mobile homes have taken on this legislation. I would like to insert in the Record the statement which Mr. John M. Martin, president of the Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, will present before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee when hearings are held on mobile home safety bills:

STATEMENT SUPPORTING H.R. 10901 BY JOHN M. MARTIN, PRESIDENT, REPRESENTING MOBILE HOMES MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, TRAILER COACH ASSOCIATION, AND SOUTHEASTERN MANUFACTURED HOUSING INSTITUTE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, my name is John M. Martin, President of the Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, P.O. Box 201, 14650 Lee Road, Chantilly, Virginia. I am also presenting this statement on behalf of the Trailer Coach Association, 3855 East LaPalma Avenue, Anaheim, California, and the Southeastern Manufactured Housing Institute, 348 E. Paces Ferry Road, Atlanta, Georgia. Together, our Members produce approximately 75 percent of all the mobile homes manufactured in the United States each year. In addition, we represent approximately 3,000 dealers from coast to coast.

We support the principles embodied in H.R. 10901 by Congressman Stephens. While our

industry is not totally convinced of the need for Federal control of the mobile home construction, we find ourselves in a position which the majority of American industries find themselves today; that is, faced with an ever-increasing burden of Federal involvement. While several mobile home "safety" bills have been introduced in the last year and a half, we feel very strongly that none of the proponents of that legislation had made a particularly compelling case establishing the need for Federal mobile home safety standards. Nevertheless, if Federal regulation is to be mandated by the Congress, we feel certain minimal requisites should be included. This bill does that job.

One of the strongest points in this legislation is that it would achieve reciprocity among states for our homes and would also create uniformity of inspections to a degree far beyond that which we have been able to develop through individual state by state legislation. At the current time, 42 states have adopted the American National Standards Institute Mobile Home Standard A 119.1. We have actively sought enforcement legislation in each state and have consistently offered the technical experts in our Standards Division as a resource to the states to assist them in training and developing inspection capabilities. This has apparently not been sufficient for Congress in view of the number of mobile home safety bills which have been introduced recently.

Mr. Chairman, you have before you a good bill, and it merits your recommendation for passage. We encourage your affirmative vote for the following reasons:

The bill's definition of a "mobile home" is the new uniform description which separates our dwellings from recreational vehicles and it covers all mobile home product-types, including "double wides".

The bill does not ignore current progress toward uniform standards that are already developed, as it recommends that the new Federal standards be reasonably consistent with existing standards of American National Standards Institute. The ANSI mobile home construction standard, A 119.1, has been enacted into law in 42 states.

It also recommends consideration of the experience in mobile home standards of National Fire Protection Association and various state and governmental agencies—thus assuring that a great reservoir of know-how is not overlooked.

The requirement for broad membership on the proposed National Mobile Home Safety Advisory Council is good, because all interests are represented: government, technicians, the public, and the industry.

It is wise that this bill gives full authority to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, since HUD is the housing department and mobile homes are a part of the housing industry.

The bill protects the consumer and at the same time is not punitive to the manufacturers and dealers.

H.R. 10901 would accomplish the long-time goal of a single national uniform performance standard under which all mobile homes will be built.

It will bring reciprocity between states which will facilitate production and retailing by removing the varying state provisions. At the same time, though, the bill enables states to do the inspections. Many states already have strong enforcement systems in operation.

In conclusion, may I say a few words about mobile homes and the great new industry that they have spawned.

The mobile home is the greatest innovation in the history of human shelter since the invention of the saw and the trowel. Using American ingenuity and assembly line techniques, we build a house in a factory, then tow it to the buyer's lot. It is the most economical way to provide a decent,

modern residence ever devised. Compare our prices, about \$7,000 for the average mobile home versus around \$29,000 and up for traditional site-built houses. And mobile homes come equipped with most of the essential appliances and furnishings! That is why over seven million Americans now live in mobile homes and around 1½ million people are choosing this form of shelter annually. Our industry houses the poor, the low and middle-income people, military and construction personnel, and a growing number of resort dwellers and second home owners.

The mobile home industry can be a partial solution to America's housing shortage if current economies of production are allowed to continue and if the efficiencies of our factories are not curtailed by needless regulations. While the Stephens' bill may increase our costs of manufacturing somewhat, it provides the advantages of nation-wide uniformity and reciprocity, and is, therefore, beneficial.

For years, the Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, along with the Trailer Coach Association and the Southeastern Manufactured Housing Institute, have tried to improve our product by encouraging the states to enact tie down laws and the ANSI construction standards.

Since H.R. 10901 is in line with our long-time policies, we urge your Committee to recommend its passage.

JEWISH CITIZENRY AND IMMIGRATION

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the case of the Galperin family, Jewish citizens of the U.S.S.R. Tamara and Anatoly Galperin and their teenage daughter, Eugenia, who reside in Moscow, applied in November 1971 to emigrate to Israel; their applications have repeatedly been denied. Anatoly Galperin worked as a mathematician, but when he applied for an exit permit was forced to leave his job and now works in a bank. Tamara Galperin works as a translator. Her brother was allowed to go to Israel, and her elderly parents also received permission to leave but declined to depart without Tamara and her family. Tamara's father recently died and her mother now suffers from a serious illness. The plight of the Galperin family and of many others like them who must suffer continued harassment and persecution is very much in my mind at this time and I appeal to the Government of the Soviet Union, in the interests of equity and humanity, to extend the spirit of detente within its own borders.

As a Member of Congress and as a concerned citizen I continue to be dismayed by reports from the Soviet Union of the persecution of its Jewish citizenry, whose only crime is that they desire to emigrate to the country of their choice. Even as we see Arab-Israeli repatriation of prisoners of war, a state of affairs for which the spirit of detente between the U.S.S.R. and the United States is largely responsible, the continued Soviet denial of the right to emigrate does

little to further detente. I sincerely hope that the Soviet Government will relax its harsh line with regard to its Jewish people, and will allow such families as the Galperins to rejoin those relatives who have received permission to go to Israel.

**RIISING PENSION EXPECTATIONS—
WILL PLAN TERMINATION INSURANCE
BE A BUST?**

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, private pension plans are a huge success. They have proved their worth by providing adequate supplements to social security for the 6 million retirees now drawing pension benefits. Persons covered by private pension plans have increased greatly over the past 20 years. Today, private pension plans cover nearly 50 percent of the full-time work force in private industry. Private pensions can increase their role only if the proposed Federal pension legislation encourages, rather than deters, the incentive for growth of present plans and birth of new pension programs.

The fiduciary, vesting, and funding provisions of H.R. 2, the pension bill approved by the Education and Labor Committee, will strengthen the system by assuring that a larger proportion of persons now covered will in fact receive a private pension.

**NEW DISINCENTIVES FOR DEFINED BENEFIT
PENSIONS**

Proponents of the controversial pension bill feature which would establish a plan termination insurance program insist this is the key to pension reform. There can be little dispute, however, that this imposing scheme cannot possibly bring about great expansion in the number of pensions paid to plan participants. The opposite result is virtually certain: a new shrinkage in the number of people covered by defined benefit pension plans. The reasons for this unintended reduction in pension coverage are several.

Plan termination insurance is the most complex feature of the impending legislation. It is too bad that this provision has not been well thought out—has not been given the study it deserves.

A recent joint Treasury and Labor Department study showed that about 8,500 vested participants were in pension plans which terminated in 1972. These workers suffered an average loss of \$4,100. The study also showed that most employers terminating their plans were financially unstable.

This gives rise to a serious question: Would employers facing financial difficulties elect to continue their defined benefit plans in the face of the new obligations imposed by Federal legislation? There are indications that they would not, that they would cut short their pension programs before the start of a termination insurance program, and that many workers would lose their benefits as a result.

Termination insurance as proposed in H.R. 2 and in the Senate-passed bill, H.R. 4200, would change the legal structure of pension plans by making the employer liable for benefits—even though not funded—when the plan is terminated. This raises a constitutional question: In setting up a pension plan, an employer promises to make contributions to the plan. Can Congress, by law, change this promise to a pledge of the employer's assets to pay pensions?

If termination insurance as now proposed were to pass, and if this part of it were ruled to be constitutional, large balance sheet liabilities would be created for employers who grant past service credits and retroactive benefit increases.

Defined benefit pension plans have been adopted by employers (and encouraged by employees) because of their efficiency in meeting the inflationary pressures facing today's workers. That efficiency is likely to be hampered if new burdens were placed upon it by law. If we in Congress weigh carefully the advantages and disadvantages of plan termination insurance, we may find that as many workers will be harmed as helped by it.

The nature and positive direction of the private pension system might be drastically changed.

Termination insurance would tend to make employers abandon defined benefit programs in favor of money-purchase arrangements. These are, essentially, savings accounts; and they provide generally smaller pensions.

This feature would serve as a deterrent—perhaps a stiff deterrent—to the establishment of new defined benefit pension plans and the improvement of plans already in being. The probable losers would be older workers, the very workers this legislation is supposed to help.

MORE NEW PROBLEMS, PLUS OLD ONES

The plan termination insurance provisions now contained in major legislative proposals may create more problems than they may reasonably be expected to solve. Besides the disruptive influence on employers who must pay the pension bill, there would be another consideration, namely, the level of the premium or tax required to finance the insurance. The premium may prove to be burdensome, especially to new plans.

Here is a sample of this burden:

A new plan generally will take into consideration a worker's past service to the employer. In doing so, it creates unfunded vested liabilities. If the vested liabilities are about 10 times the annual contribution to the plan, the termination insurance premium may be 30 to 40 percent of the fund's income from investments in the early years of operation.

Surely, this burden—a front end load, of sorts—would discourage employers from starting new pension plans. They would see the insurance premium as an added cost which would not benefit their employees.

Some, and perhaps many of them, would look for other kinds of retirement benefits which are unfettered by plan termination insurance complications. As a result, the insurance losses

would be levied against a diminishing group of plans, which would foster higher premiums, which would further discourage new pension plans.

By forcing pension plans into this downward spiral, Congress may one day be called upon to bail out the residue of a system which, until now, has been an increasingly successful voluntary arrangement to provide pensions to retiring workers.

A dilemma has always faced those who have tried to solve the problems of pension plan terminations. Unless significant safeguards are written into the law, the plan termination insurance scheme will encourage unduly liberal pension benefits, more speculative investments by pension fund trustees, and weaker funding levels.

Can these abuses be prevented without suffocating pension plans by over-regulation? The Treasury and Labor Department study found no workable solution, and recommended more study.

For years, management and labor have been evolving a variety of private pension plans. There have been few legal controls, a condition which has encouraged the rapid growth of pensions.

Now, however, there is a consensus that some legal restraints can be added to this voluntary system without discouraging their continued growth—restraints having to do with disclosure, reporting, funding, vesting, and the like. If we are careful, these will increase the cost only a little for most plans.

Add plan termination insurance, however, and we lose the flexibility that has been one of the delights of our private pension system.

Item: A maximum would have to be set, by law, on insured benefits. Otherwise, owner-employees could milk their pension funds and line their own pockets at the expense of other well-managed plans.

Item: Unless limits are placed, by law, on benefit increases, management of a company facing imminent insolvency could grant themselves a pre-bankruptcy windfall at the expense of the termination insurance fund.

Item: Distributions from a pension plan's assets would have to be controlled, by law, in order to prevent a drain in payment of uninsured benefits—a drain which would mean greater terminal losses. Those losses, in turn, would be a drain on the insurance reserves.

Item: Actuarial assumptions would have to be controlled, by law, in order to avoid underfunding.

Item: A plan's investment policy would have to be regulated, by law, in order to minimize investment losses.

Item: Employer liability would have to continue after termination, else a plan could be started, could promise—and pay—handsome benefits, and then be closed out at the expense of the termination insurance fund.

Finally: The plan termination insurance agency would have to be given legal authority to terminate any plan which appeared to the agency to be risky.

These controls—Federal legal controls—can only be termed excessive and burdensome. They would have to apply

to all defined benefit pension plans, those which are well run as well as those on the ragged edge of solvency. The controls would limit the insurance coverage to only 60 or 70 percent of all vested and nonvested benefit losses. The regulatory and other costs imposed by the termination insurance program might well exceed the benefit payments themselves.

AN ALTERNATIVE

The risk of creating an unworkable and disruptive program of plan termination insurance is so great that Congress ought to consider an alternative. In H.R. 2, there are provisions, apart from the termination insurance title, which reduce markedly the problems and abuses implicit in plan insurance proposals. These provisions would not confront employers with liabilities and over-regulation which could only discourage creation of new pension plans and limit the expansion of existing plans.

A company with a pension plan would be faced with added responsibility, but would not be required to pay premiums which would not benefit its own employees.

H.R. 2, apart from its insurance title, approaches this problem as follows:

First. It recognizes that the minimum funding standard ought to assure progress each year in reducing the unfunded liability for vested benefits. The funding standard contains a simplified calculation which would automatically take care of the remaining unfunded vested liabilities over a period of years.

Second. Increases in pension benefits would be prohibited until all minimum funding contributions to the plan have been made.

Third. Preferential treatment of employees who resign would be precluded by a requirement that lump-sum distributions be made only to the extent they have been funded.

Fourth. The merger of two plans—as in the consolidation of two companies—could not result in a reduction of benefit security to any plan participant.

Fifth. In the event of termination, a pension plan would have to allocate its assets in an equitable manner with these priorities defined in the bill:

(a) Contributions by employees would be returned;

(b) Retired persons receiving benefits and those who could voluntarily elect to receive benefits;

(c) Those other than in (b), to the extent of their vested benefits; and

(d) All others, including the non-vested benefits of those in (c).

Benefit increases within 5 years prior to termination would trigger an allocation based on the prior benefit formula; and any remaining assets would be distributed on a basis of increases in more recent benefit formulas.

(e) Investment income attributable to employee contributions would be distributed pro rata to the employees' accounts.

(f) Those benefit liabilities incurred solely as a result of the plan termination would get last priority, and

(g) Any remaining assets could be returned to the employer, if the plan provided for that.

This approach would not prevent all of the benefit losses that might be covered by termination insurance, but it would prevent most of them. More to the point, the costs of this approach would not be borne by companies with stable, well-funded pension programs. This approach would not, therefore, cause employers to restrict coverage or forego improvements.

CONCLUSION

The beneficiaries of our private pension plans, present and future, have every right to expect Congress to act wisely in safeguarding their retirement years. Plan termination insurance is held out by some as the ultimate in pension reform. Care and further study should be encouraged before the full effect of this proposed strong medicine is prescribed for a relatively healthy patient.

Our constituents are filled with rising pension expectations. Let us keep in mind, however, that an ill-conceived termination insurance program might limit improvements in retirement benefits, might restrict pension coverage, and might precipitate employer bankruptcies. We can avoid these pitfalls, and we should.

PRICE CONTROLS

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, the evidence is piling up that wage and price controls have outlived their usefulness.

I doubt that there is a single Member of Congress who is not now personally familiar with the terrible burdens that price controls have created for various industries.

One of the most serious of current problems is the pulp shortage facing large consumers of paper.

The Cost of Living Council has imposed a domestic ceiling price on pulp. This ceiling comes at a time when there are no export restrictions on pulp. In a period of tremendous demand for pulp, domestic producers are holding their supplies or exporting them to other countries, while foreign producers are declining to export their supplies to the United States. Large consumers of paper who do not have their own supplies of pulp are caught in the middle and are feeling the pinch.

An example of the problem can be found close to home. The Joint Committee on Printing, through its able and distinguished chairman, Senator HOWARD CANNON of Nevada, has complained to the Cost of Living Council that the Federal Government finds itself unable to purchase the paper it needs.

In an October 4, 1973, letter to Dr. John Dunlop, director of the Cost of Living Council, Senator CANNON wrote:

Today we find ourselves in the untenable position of having several paper properties, critically important to the Government Printing Office capability to fulfill vital Congressional printing requirements, at the seriously low inventory level of three to five weeks supply.

In a second letter, dated October 24, Senator CANNON wrote:

One of our serious immediate problems involves our inability to get the necessary paper tonnage to publish the next edition of The Congressional Directory.

Senator CANNON concluded:

Very bluntly, you should be aware of the fact that failure of the Cost of Living Council to take immediate steps to relieve the paper making pulp price impasse will contribute significantly to an ultimate serious impact on internal printing services for the Federal Government, as well as having a very damaging effect on our nationwide program of competitive commercial procurement of Federal printing and binding needs.

I associate myself with the Senator from Nevada in strongly urging the Cost of Living Council to lift the ceiling price on domestic pulp in order to relieve the current shortage.

The complete Cannon-Dunlop correspondence follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,
October 4, 1973.

Mr. JOHN DUNLOP,
Director, Cost of Living Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DUNLOP: The Joint Committee on Printing, United States Congress, is charged by law with the responsibility to establish standards of paper for the different descriptions of public printing and binding and to procure, in concert with the Public Printer, the quality and quantities required for the public printing.

For at least six months, we have been experiencing increasing difficulty in being able to purchase the necessary tonnage to fulfill important Federal printing needs. For example, in our regular April, 1973 quarterly paper bid opening we received only 68.725 percent coverage on the quantity solicited, the first time in almost a quarter century that we did not get one hundred percent coverage.

In our July, 1973 quarterly opening the response was significantly worse with only 51.576 percent coverage. Since then, efforts to obtain lacking tonnage via repetitive open market procurement invitations have been consistently characterized by very minimal results.

All of this has happened despite many steps which we have taken, e.g. relaxed specification standards, relaxed delivery time schedules, consideration of bids based on a combination of items and/or foreign sources, etc., to encourage paper industry response to our needs.

Nevertheless, today we find ourselves in the untenable position of having several paper properties, critically important to the Government Printing Office capability to fulfill vital Congressional printing requirements, at the seriously low inventory level of three to five weeks supply.

Based on a careful, comprehensive analysis of the overall paper market situation, it is our view that the single most critical factor impeding our ability to get paper is the current domestic ceiling price on paper making pulp, as contrasted to the non-controlled ability of pulp producers to export pulp.

Consequently, in the light of the factors outlined herein, you are urged to give immediate, serious consideration to amending the domestic ceiling price on paper making pulp to the degree that internal American printing requirements, including those of the Congress, may be fulfilled. The Joint Committee will be pleased to hear from you on this matter at your earliest convenience.

Very sincerely yours,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
Chairman.

COST OF LIVING COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1973.
Hon. HOWARD W. CANNON,
Joint Committee on Printing, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CANNON: I appreciate your recent letter of concern on behalf of the Joint Committee on Printing, and the decreasing availability of paper to supply the needs of the Public Printer.

The Cost of Living Council is aware of the critical shortages in the paper industry. The greatly increasing demand for all paper products has created a worldwide shortage of paper-making wood pulp, and prices have been bid up to an extremely high level on the world market. In addition, paper mills domestically are working at peak capacity to fill U.S. needs. However, even at full capacity the demand is far outstripping the supply.

To ensure the needs of paper mills to increase capacity, but at the same time bearing in mind the Administration's anti-inflation goals, the Cost of Living Council recently granted a number of prenotified price increases to the paper industry, based on hearings held during the week of September 17. This action should help relieve the shortages we are experiencing, but they will not alleviate all problems associated with the strong worldwide demand.

You may rest assured that we will continue to closely monitor the wood pulp situation and the entire paper industry, and to work with the Department of Commerce Exports Division to stabilize the domestic supply.

Thank you for your interest in this major area of the economy.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. DUNLOP,
Director.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,
October 24, 1973.

Mr. JOHN T. DUNLOP,
Director, Economic Stabilization Program,
Cost of Living Council, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. DUNLOP: I regret to advise that your letter of October 19, 1973, received on October 23, 1973, replying to my letter of October 4, 1973, includes nothing in the way of a practicable solution to the steadily worsening situation with respect to adequate supplies of writing and printing papers for important Federal printing needs.

Your belief that the prenotified price increases granted to the paper industry "should help relieve the shortages we are experiencing" is simply not a fact in the light of the paper procurement experiences we are having. Their only result to date is to assure that we continue to pay higher prices for the insufficient quantities we are able to buy.

It would be interesting to know how higher domestic prices on finished paper products could alleviate a shortage of paper making pulp brought about in significant part, at least, by the fact that the subject pulp is afflicted with a domestic price control, but can be exported with no other controls than world market prices for a world commodity.

Graphic proof that the cited price increases have not helped is the fact that, since your October 2, 1973 announcement, we have tried four times for an aggregate quantity of 32,758,623 pounds, with an aggregate response of only 16,442,000 pounds, approximately one half.

Repetitively we are being advised by several of our long-time paper suppliers that they would gladly respond to our invitations if they could obtain the necessary pulp. Being non-integrated mills they must rely on the domestic market availability of paper making pulp and that has not been forthcoming. One of our serious immediate problems involves our inability to get the neces-

sary paper tonnage to publish the next edition of The Congressional Directory.

Very bluntly, you should be aware of the fact that failure of the Cost of Living Council to take immediate steps to relieve the paper making pulp price impasse will contribute significantly to an ultimate serious impact on internal printing services for the Federal Government, as well as having a very damaging effect on our nationwide program of competitive commercial procurement of Federal printing and binding needs.

Very sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. CANNON,
Chairman.

WILKES COLLEGE TO DISPLAY CATLIN WORKS BEGINNING NOVEMBER 25

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, beginning on November 25 and continuing for a 6-week period, the new Sordoni Art Gallery at Wilkes College in Wilkes-Barre will place on public display 36 paintings of the works of George Catlin from the Smithsonian Institution's National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Gallery.

George Catlin was born in Wilkes-Barre in 1796, was educated in the law, but gained international fame and recognition as a portrait painter and a miniaturist and is especially known for his great paintings of the American Indian and Indian culture.

I fully intend to visit Wilkes College and view these outstanding works of art and I hope that many of my constituents will do the same during the 6-week period that it will be on display.

George Catlin will always remain through his art one of Wyoming Valley's most famous sons and is most deserving of the recognition that he will receive through this upcoming period when his works will be on display in the city in which he was born and reared.

The Beacon, the Wilkes College newspaper, in its edition of November 1, 1973, had two articles on George Catlin, both of which I wish to insert at this point in my remarks.

The article follows:

WILKES TO DISPLAY CATLIN WORKS

NEW SORDONI ART GALLERY PLANS APPROPRIATE EXHIBIT

Thirty-six paintings from the seldom-circulated national collection of works by George Catlin will be placed on public display by Wilkes College for a six-week period beginning November 25 at the Sordoni Art Gallery, which is included in the new \$6-million Stark Learning Center on the campus.

The collection will be brought to Wilkes College on loan from the Smithsonian Institution's National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Gallery.

Catlin, who was born in Wilkes-Barre in 1796, gained international acclaim as a portrait painter and a miniaturist, but is best known for his paintings of the American Indian. His works date back to almost a century and a half, and represent his work

with both North and South American subject matter.

Wilkes College President Francis J. Michelini called the planned presentation of Catlin paintings "a most appropriate selection as the opening exhibit in the new Sordoni Art Gallery, which marks one of the greatest contributions ever made to the cultural wealth of not only the college, but the people of Wyoming Valley and Northeastern Pennsylvania."

Commenting on the origin of the new gallery, A. J. Sordoni III, president of Sordoni Enterprises, issued the following statement:

"The Sordoni Art Gallery was given to Wilkes College by The Andrew J. Sordoni Foundation, Inc., to encourage the appreciation of art. The Gallery is dedicated to displaying and preserving works of art and to serve as a teaching aid.

"In the future, the Gallery will be the home of a substantial portion of the Sordoni family's collection. Shows and exhibits will be featured at the Gallery for the benefit of students and the general public. The donors hope that the Gallery will be a source of pleasure and inspiration to everyone interested in fine arts."

A private showing of the Catlin paintings will be held on Saturday, November 24, at 8 p.m. At this time there will be a formal dedication of The Sordoni Art Gallery and a reception opening the exhibition of the works by George Catlin.

The exhibit will be open to the public from Sunday, November 25, through Saturday, January 5. Hours for viewing will be Sunday from noon to 5, Monday through Friday from 10 a.m. to 9 p.m., and Saturday from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

The new gallery, which is under the direction of Vivian Varney Guyler, is expected to become one of the major educational and cultural points of visitation for school groups of all levels and the public in general.

It was deemed extremely fortunate that the first exhibition is that of locally born George Catlin, who has become familiar to regional people of all ages and particularly to young people during the study of American history.

Catlin remained in the Wilkes-Barre area from the time of his birth until 1823, when he gave up the practice of law and moved to Philadelphia to devote his full time to painting. Catlin set up as a miniaturist in that city, where he worked until 1825.

In the year 1830, a painter of miniature portraits named George Catlin left his comfortable Philadelphia home and set out on a hazardous journey through the West. His goal: to paint the portraits of every Indian tribe in North America.

His friends warned him that it was an impossible task. He would never come back alive. The "savages" would butcher him before he could set up his easel. But after eight hard and dangerous years, George Catlin returned with a pictorial record of Indian life that has never been equaled.

The story of Catlin's travels is fascinating—his first trip with William Clark (who 25 years earlier had helped Meriwether Lewis open the West)—his journey with the French-Canadian fur traders—and his later adventures alone. He visited the treaty councils of the Sioux and Iowas. He met the Sacs, the Kansas and the Blackfeet, the Otes and the Mandans. Wherever he went, he painted the chiefs and talked with tribal members. The Indians of the Far West, he wrote home enthusiastically, "are undoubtedly the finest looking, best equipped, and the most beautifully costumed of any of the Continent. Amongst and in the midst of them am I, with my paint pots and canvas."

The more he traveled among the Indian peoples, the deeper grew Catlin's admiration, and the greater his sense of urgency to cap-

ture their way of life on canvas. For as the rush of settlers, miners and ranchers forced the Indians off their lands, Catlin saw that the red man's final destruction was not far off. He wanted at least to preserve them in his paintings, so future generations could see what had been lost.

When he returned East, crowds of people flocked to see "Catlin's Indian Gallery," and to hear the artist tell of his adventures. Kings, princes and great men of many nations admired the handsome paintings, but few paid attention to Catlin's words of warning about the fate of the Indian. In England as well, people were eager to hear his tales of exciting adventure, but greeted Catlin's somber predictions with the same indifference as the Americans.

Congress debated the purchase of the Gallery. Daniel Webster and Jefferson Davis also spoke on behalf of a bill to buy it for the American people, but the bill was defeated. Catlin, however, continued throughout his life to display his Gallery, and to plead for understanding of the red man.

The story of Catlin's life and his work is one of adventure and hardship—his days among the Indians—the years he spent pleading on their behalf—his later travels in the Amazon jungle, painting the South American Indians. It is an exciting tale. And it is a sobering story, too, for it was more than a century until Americans finally acknowledged his paintings as the magnificent documents they are, and recognized the rightness of his words.

THE LIFE OF GEORGE CATLIN

George Catlin was born in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, July 26, 1796. His interest in Indians began as a young boy listening to his mother tell of her experiences as a captive of the Indians in the Wyoming Massacre of 1778. Catlin practiced law three years in Luzerne, Pa., but a stronger passion, that of painting, called him, and he abandoned his law books for a paintbrush.

In 1823 he went to Philadelphia determined to make painting his life's profession. Entirely self taught, Catlin developed skill as both a miniature painter in watercolors and as a portrait painter in oils. In 1824 he was elected as an academician of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, a select group of artists of the day.

In 1830 Catlin arrived in St. Louis where he gained the friendship of William Clark who with Meriwether Lewis had made the famous expedition to the Pacific Ocean from 1804 to 1806. Clark was Superintendent of Indian Affairs at St. Louis from 1813 to 1838. Catlin's introduction to painting the Indians of the plains came as a result of arrangements Clark made for him.

Catlin spent from 1830 to 1836 among the Indians of the West, travelling many times at the danger of his life in order to paint their portraits, their villages, their ceremonies. What he saw he recorded, visually and in writing. He was upset by the plight of the Indians and knew that the days of the red man were numbered. In addition to an "Indian Gallery" of his paintings, he conceived for himself a social and political mission—to become a spokesman for the redman whom he held in deep respect. He proposed a National Park west of the Mississippi where the Indians and buffalo would be left alone to roam, where there would be no white fur traders to exploit them, no missionaries, no smallpox and other white man's diseases, no whiskey and no cheap trinkets the white men used in exchange for skins.

Catlin set up his "Indian Gallery" of 494 paintings and numerous types of Indian clothing and artifacts in New York City in 1838. Later, he travelled with his Gallery to Washington, Baltimore and Boston. Catlin later took his Gallery to England and to France, where it was enthusiastically received.

His dream, however, was to have the U.S. Government purchase his paintings. He was never to see this realized in his lifetime despite a number of strong spokesmen such as Daniel Webster and Henry Clay. His original collection was given to Joseph Harrison, a wealthy American, head of the Harrison Boiler Works in Philadelphia who paid off Catlin's European debts. After Catlin's and Harrison's deaths, the collection which included 445 paintings was given by Harrison's widow to the Smithsonian Institution, (twenty of this group are part of the Sordani Art Gallery's opening show.)

In his late fifties, Catlin spent part of his time in the reading room of the Bibliotheque Imperial in Paris. There he met another frequenter of the library who had delved into old Spanish volumes describing lost gold mines in the Crystal Mountains of Brazil. Catlin decided to go in search of the lost gold. When the search proved futile and his miner's tools were lost and broken, he began to paint Indians. Although the South American Indians were less friendly to him, he did succeed in painting 30 different tribes and numerous landscapes. (A number of this South American series, on loan from the National Gallery of Art, Paul Mellon Collection, is also to be seen at the Sordani Art Gallery.)

THE NIXON NETWORK NEUROSIS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks Congressman TORBERT H. MACDONALD delivered earlier today at the National Press Club. Congressman MACDONALD's remarks, entitled "The Nixon Network Neurosis," were made in response to the attack on the press made by Mr. Nixon at his last news conference, and they focus on this administration's efforts to use Government agencies to bring pressure to bear on the major television networks to influence the reporting of news.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Communications, Mr. MACDONALD provides an important perspective on this serious problem. I commend him for speaking out at this time:

THE NIXON NETWORK NEUROSIS

(By the Honorable TORBERT H. MACDONALD)

Any of you who has covered the Congress, or even sat in the Visitors Gallery, knows the traditional question, "For what purpose does the gentleman rise?"

Today, I rise in support of a free press.

But you will not get from me quotes from Thomas Jefferson or an impassioned history of John Peter Zenger. I'm sure you could deliver those remarks from memory yourselves.

I have a more specific subject today, that segment of the free press called TV network news. This new journalistic giant seems to be the President's favorite lightning rod. To my knowledge, I believe that both bodies of the Congress have been remiss in not coming to the defense of this sometimes beleaguered medium. I feel it fitting and proper that the man who occupies the Chair of the House Communications Subcommittee should do so. My committee is charged with responsibility for the television and radio broadcasters of the nation, and I know that I speak for that committee when I pledge to

you that so long as we occupy the position we do, there will always be defenders of the free press to check and balance any attempted government interference in electronic journalism.

I am not appearing here as an apologist for the television industry, for even though I approve so highly of the way TV news does its job, it doesn't mean that my approbation stretches over the whole spectrum of television programming. The medium's proclivity for exaggerated sex and violence is a source of concern to me, and I am certainly not alone in this feeling.

The title of my talk, as you saw in your publication, is "The Nixon Network Neurosis". I plead guilty to quoting myself; I used that phrase in a speech to the California Broadcasters last January, when the pattern of hostility and calculated intimidation toward the television networks was only a sketchy outline. By now, thanks to the revelations produced by a group of investigators who refused to give up, that outline has been fleshed out to a point where its significance and its ruthless purpose are obvious to all citizens of our country.

(In passing, I must point out that only a small portion of that dogged investigative reporting has been done by television, and I hope that things will improve on that score.)

Is "neurosis" too tough a word? Certainly I have no intention of playing amateur psychologist here. The dictionary defines neurosis as "any of various functional disorders of the mind or emotions, involving anxiety, phobia, or other behavioral symptoms." Well, we all know about anxiety from time to time, and we sympathize with it. But "phobia" is defined as "a persistent, abnormal, or illogical fear of a specific thing or situation". And here we have a shoe that fits.

The "thing" that Mr. Nixon and his associates seem to fear is an institution known as the television network, with its unprecedented and unparalleled ability to speak to millions of Americans every night. The "situation" that provokes their fear is precisely the situation that the TV networks have brought about: a lot of people getting a lot of truth.

Let's back up a bit here and look at the pattern of this Administration's neurosis.

The date of the Magruder memo to Halde-man is probably a good starting point. That was October 17, 1969, less than a year into Mr. Nixon's first term. You all know that memo, revealingly titled "The Shotgun versus the Rifle". It listed 21 specific instances where the President was annoyed at his press treatment, and it recommended how each one should be taken care of. Specific approaches to individual commentators and columnists are recommended—"counter Dan Rather", "demand equal time to counter John Chancellor", "contact Howard K. Smith", and so on.

It may surprise you to learn that I have no particular objection to this. Even when the operator says, "It's the White House calling", I would think that the network newsmen don't dissolve. They're experienced, they're professional, and they know the name of the game. There are twosides, at least, to every story; and if one side wants to press its case and be heard, that comes under the heading of normal adversary proceedings. There has always been an adversary relationship between government and the press, especially between Administrations and the media; and as far as I'm concerned, there always should be. But to go back to the dictionary and look at the word "adversary": it has two meanings—opponent, and enemy. An opponent is defined as "one that opposes another in a battle, contest, controversy, or debate". Fine. That's what sports and politics and business competition are all about. We all want to win, and we all like to give it our best shot.

But the other definition—"enemy"—means "one who manifests malice or hostility toward, or opposes the purposes or interests of, another". That gets to be something quite different. I'm afraid the evidence has piled up overwhelmingly to indicate that this Administration considers its adversaries enemies, not opponents. And that is evidence to me of an unhealthy atmosphere.

It's the kind of atmosphere that leads an over-eager man like Jeb Magruder to step over the line of adversary proceedings and suggest that mechanisms of government be brought into the game—parade the FCC power before them, shake them up with an antitrust suit through the Justice Department, go through their income tax returns, and "they" will come around.

Well, this Administration tried it all, and I for one am satisfied that they didn't bring "them" into line.

Take all the memorandums that have surfaced in the past few weeks and lay them aside—Magruder's ridiculous suggestions, Haldeman's instructions to him to "concentrate on NBC and give some real thought as to how to handle the problem they have created in their almost totally negative approach to everything the Administration does", Colson's self-serving and self-deluding report on how he left the three network presidents trembling with fear, and all the rest—and consider along with me a memorandum that hasn't surfaced, may never surface, in fact may not even exist.

Picture a meeting of those White House aides who are agitated about the treatment they imagine they're getting on the network news. All the pressure they've been hinting at hasn't produced the results they want. How then to bring the networks into line?

Well, one of them might have said, "Why not set up a White House office that will have some clout with the FCC and really get those boys shaped up? After all, that's where the pressure point is: if the FCC makes noises about those money machines those fellows operate in the major markets, those owned-and-operated stations, we're liable to see some different results. We can't say we're going to do that, of course, we'd have to fuzz it over with a high-sounding name and a mission that can't be attacked—but wouldn't it be helpful to us?"

Maybe such a meeting never took place, and maybe no eyes-only, confidential memos were exchanged—but I give you the following circumstantial chronology:

On February 29, 1970, three weeks after Haldeman told Magruder to concentrate on NBC, four months after Magruder's shotgun and rifle memo went up to Haldeman, three months after the Vice President's attack on the media, the Congress received a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan Number One of 1970, proposing the establishment of the Office of Telecommunications Policy in the White House.

Sure enough, it did seem to fulfill a need. It would "help formulate policies and coordinate operations for the Federal Government's own vast communications systems". It would help "formulate government policies concerning a wide range of domestic and international telecommunications issues". It would help to "meet the security needs of the nation".

But then came the innocent-sounding sentence that started all the trouble: "The new Office would enable the executive branch to speak with a clearer voice and to act as a more effective partner in discussions of communications policy with both the Congress and the Federal Communications Commission."

Looking back on the events that have transpired since the OTP was established in 1970, this Chairman of the House Communications Subcommittee can testify to

two things: one, there was never any discussion of communications policy with the Congress, and two, the new office certainly did enable the Executive Branch to speak with a harsher voice.

You all hear the voice, in varying degrees of volume, from the OTP's director, Clay Whitehead. It was raised to divide and conquer the public broadcasting system, it was heard on such topics as network re-runs and prime-time access, and it brought to our vocabulary those electrifying phrases "elitist gossip" and "ideological plugola". From those same friendly folks who brought you "nattering nabobs of negativism", and that marvelous word "inoperative".

The sound of Mr. Whitehead's voice brought forth a number of other voices, including my own. I fought him on public television, I fought him on meddling in the private contracts of broadcasters, I fought him on attempts to influence the FCC, and I fought him on his own peculiar version of broadcast station license renewal policies.

I don't like to say I beat him, but some combination of voices and circumstances brought him back to reality. He was a different, more conciliatory man when he appeared before our committee this year. He will be a different man when the fiscal 1974 budget goes into effect, for approximately half the amount of money he'd asked for from the Congress was granted. And last Friday we saw two Senators introduce a bill calling for the abolishment of the Office of Telecommunications Policy in its entirety. If such a bill should become law, the Nixon Administration may have learned one more lesson: the instruments of government are not to be used for political purposes.

I won't take up your time reciting the litany of how, where, and when the Administration mounted its attack on the press in general and the TV networks in particular. The activities of Whitehead and Haldeman and Buchanan and Colson and Magruder are common knowledge by now. Even the most reasonable member of the White House hierarchy made advances to television news directors, encouraging them to substitute hundreds of local judgments on national and international news for the networks. To me it was a very clear pattern.

Is there a missing master memo spelling out this coordinated plan of attack? I don't think it really matters, because the plan obviously existed in the minds of its planners. And I'm convinced that while they were trying to pull the teeth of all unfriendly press, or what they considered unfriendly—which I guess includes everyone who doesn't give total approval of everything they do—the White House group had their Public Enemy Number One, the television networks.

It's incredible to me how they never give up, facts notwithstanding. We see survey after survey, year after year, showing how more and more people get their news from the TV networks, and how they believe them more each year. Yet Mr. Buchanan can write, as he did in last week's New York Times, about "the massive decline in public confidence in America's communications cartels". It would seem that alliterations are more important to him than facts.

In that same article, Mr. Buchanan pulls out the so-called "evidence" that led Mr. Nixon to use the words "vicious, outrageous, distorted, frantic, hysterical pounding" in his press conference.

He says the networks ran 19 separate attacks on the President on the Monday after he fired Mr. Cox and lost two good men from the Justice Department, balanced by only two unvarnished defenses. The fact is that no official would appear to defend the incredible action, although each anchorman for the networks personally assured me that their production people invited and solicited some responsible spokesmen to appear.

Exhibit B of Mr. Buchanan's "evidence"

suggests that the networks should set the firing of Archibald Cox in some sort of perspective. What can "perspective" do to the bald, unvarnished fact that the President of the United States broke his word to the Congress and fired the man he had pledged would have complete freedom to accomplish his mission? I'm not a journalist, but certainly there can be no doubt of the unique and compelling newsworthiness of that story.

Exhibit C takes to task one of the venerable enemies, NBC, for using certain questions and answers of Secretary Kissinger instead of others. To me, that's a professional news judgment, open to question as hundreds are on each newscast, but surely a judgment that belongs to professional newsmen and not to government flacks and sycophants.

Exhibit D refers to a "worshipful Walter Cronkite"—that old alliteration routine again. Mr. Cronkite didn't appear worshipful to me in that interview with Mr. Cox, but I can understand how he may have appeared that way to Mr. Buchanan.

Exhibit E complains about the CBS three-part story on Mr. Rebozo. All I can say is that the story interested me. We don't get too many hard facts about the President's closest friend.

And the final clincher in Mr. Buchanan's mind is the five-day coverage of Mr. Dean versus less of Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and Mitchell. The simple answer to that alleged anti-Administration decision by the networks is that Mr. Dean is the only one of the four to have been on the stand five days.

Is that all there is? Where are points G through Z? Is this weak group of exhibits enough to make the President lose his cool in front of nationwide TV coverage? Or did he have a master plan even for that? People thought I was too suspicious when I questioned the spontaneity of that blowup, but I have heard that a CBS producer heard the President say, "Cronkite's not going to like this tonight . . . I hope."

After this kind of a recital of what the Nixon Administration has tried to do to the TV networks, the question that begs to be answered is, "Did they succeed?"

The answer in my mind is loud and clear—hell, no.

I've taken testimony on the record from the heads of all three networks and of the Public Broadcasting Corporation, and I've talked on the phone during the past week with the anchor men for each of the three nightly network news programs. The only instance that could possibly be interpreted as a concession to Administration pressure was the decision five months ago on the part of CBS to do away with instant analysis of Presidential addresses on television. But as you all know, on Monday CBS rescinded that experiment, and we will now get the benefit of their thinking when the President again chooses to preempt our public airwaves.

In my mind, the most important assurance I got in my investigation of the TV networks' response to Mr. Nixon's threats and bluster was John Chancellor's flat-out statement, "Our product has not been altered in a single instance by the Presidential attack." Howard K. Smith said the same thing in different words, and Walter Cronkite repeated to me what he said on the air: no pressure of any kind ever reached his desk.

There's another element in this equation that must be added if the people are to have a real understanding of what's at stake here. It's not only the White House versus the networks versus the FCC. It's not threats and bluster that will lead to inhibition of network news. It's not speeches by the OTP that will threaten television station licenses, and it's not FCC raised eyebrows that will get broadcasters into line.

It's the Congress that makes the laws. It's the Congress that calls the FCC up to explain its decisions. It's the Congress that stands

between the broadcaster and the heavy hand of government.

What are they all so worried about? If I have a single message to send to the bosses of all the television and radio newsmen in the country, network and stations alike, it's this: there's nothing the Executive Branch can do to or for you. Your job is to see to it that the news is reported accurately and fairly, by professional journalists, period.

And to the newsmen themselves, I say keep on calling it as you see it. No matter how much people in public life may dislike hearing the unpleasant things you have to report, we know in our hearts that they must be reported. And I, for one, will fight for your right to report them.

I'm not being so naive as to believe that the attacks from the White House will stop. I'm afraid that Mr. Nixon's network neurosis is too far advanced for that. I was particularly amused to read that Mr. Clawson at the White House says that the attacks are therapeutic for the President—I guess that means they make him feel good, and these days he can use a little of that. I'm glad they make somebody feel good.

What makes me feel good is my confidence in the integrity and the courage of the press. I think they know that their troubles go with the territory.

I'll close with a quote from one of those network newsmen who are not to be found on the invitation-to-dinner list at the White House, Bill Small of CBS. He said in a speech to the Radio-Television News Directors recently, "When a single reporter hesitates because his next sentence might offend a powerful source or a single broadcaster pauses to listen for the footsteps of government behind him, then free speech has already been seriously compromised."

I'm confident that it hasn't been seriously compromised yet, and I'm even confident that if you in the media stand fast, and are joined by us in the Congress, it never will.

Thank you.

TO THE LAST MAN

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, November 11, the real Armistice Day in my heart, I attended an affair in my home city of Perth Amboy.

Many years ago a Last Man's Club of Post 87 was formed with 100 members. There are 12 World War I veterans still living from this wonderful club.

I thought others would enjoy a poem presented by Dr. Charles Calvin, of Edison, N.J. The poem follows:

TOAST

Are we keeping faith with those Comrades
Who sat in these empty chairs?
Can we say we are doing all we can
And not expect unbelieving stares?
Can we dare to believe we could meet these
men
On the streets of tomorrow and say
We are leaving no single stone unturned
To guarantee our American Way?
I believe we can, and believe we will
In the future continue to give
Just a little bit more than we've given before
For the right of free men to live.
So let's drink to those gone before us
Who even as you and I

Had a share in the grand occupation
Of keeping Old Glory on high.

Somehow I cannot help thinking
That the boys who no longer are here
Are somewhere around on the side lines
All set to let go with a cheer.
We will keep the faith with these Comrades
And as men we will always be free
For Legionnaires are the rightful heirs
And guardians of Liberty.

"To the Last Man."

C.H.C., 1970.

NATIONAL FAMILY WEEK—1973

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, next week marks the second anniversary of the observance of National Family Week. Planned to coincide with Thanksgiving, that traditional time in America when families are rejoined to give thanks for the blessings which have come to us as individuals and as a nation, National Family Week has drawn support from every section of the country.

It has been 4 years now since Mr. Sam Wiley, highschool guidance counselor at Whiteland High School, first discussed with me his idea for a special observance honoring the family. We found we share a mutual feeling of respect for the family institution and a concern about its role in today's society. We worked together for 3 years building support for the idea and last November Congress approved my resolution establishing the observance and President Nixon declared the first National Family Week.

In the past 2 years at least 39 States have declared their support of National Family Week, including Indiana where Governor Otis Bowen issued a proclamation establishing Family Week in Indiana. More than 70 Members of Congress, more than for any previous special observance, joined as cosponsors of National Family Week. Organizations such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Boy Scouts of America, the Jewish Right, Family Service Association of America and the General Federation of Women's Clubs have helped promote the nationwide observance.

Our goal is to restore the family to its rightful place in society by enlisting the millions of American parents and children in an effort to understand the significance of the family in the development of this Nation.

Our Nation's freedom was born in the families that formed the 13 colonies.

Our systems of justice, government, education, and worship are all grounded in the family.

Unity without uniformity, courage without recklessness, faith without blindness and hope without dependence are all products of the American family. We did not create them. We discovered and applied them.

In the American family lie the seeds

of greatness. In the present tide of attacks upon the sanctity of the family and home lie the roots of our destruction.

If wars are ever to become past history and peace the light of day, the families of this Nation will have seen to it. If poverty is truly abolished, it will be because families cared about others. If illiteracy finally is banished, it will be by families who fear ignorance. If harmony is to return to our land, it will come only because families have practiced tolerance, patience, understanding, and affection to their own and to others. If prosperity is ever to be a natural part of our daily living, it will emerge first from homes where the spirit flourishes and where materialism is of second importance.

National Family Week is a positive response to those who have rendered the verdict that the family is no longer of any value; has no purpose; and is useless in today's society.

The President's proclamation said it well:

No institution can ever take the family's place in giving meaning to human life and a stable structure to society; indeed, as a wise philosopher observed thousands of years ago, "the root of the state is in the family." The pressures of our modern age make this a time of challenge for families in America, but every community has its inspiring examples of families which have risen to the demand and made the time of challenge a time of glory.

We have no illusions that the promotion of National Family Week each year will in itself strengthen the family institution. It does serve as a focal point which we hope will lead to sustained action on the part of Americans throughout the year.

I urge you to join with us next week in honoring the American family.

THE 110TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the announcement of a public reading of President Abraham Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" on the 110th anniversary of its delivery:

PUBLIC READING OF LINCOLN'S "GETTYSBURG ADDRESS"

Chaplain P. G. Cook Camp No. 223, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, and Co. D 100th Eagle Regt. N.Y. Vol. Inf. cordially invites you to a Public Reading of President Abraham Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" on the 110th Anniversary of its first delivery November 19, 1863, dedicating Gettysburg Battlefield as a National Cemetery to the Civil War Soldiers slain in the battle of Gettysburg—Monday Morning, November 19, 1973, 10:30 A.M.—By Lincoln's Statue, Buffalo & Erie Co. Historical Society Museum, 25 Nottingham Court—Buffalo, N.Y., and 12:00 Noon—By World's Largest Granite Monument

to a Speech, Elm lawn Cemetery, Delaware Ave. at Brighton Rd.—Town of Tonawanda, N.Y.

IMPEACHMENT TIME: NOW—IT'S UP TO CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith a significant article written by the distinguished historian and author Mrs. Barbara Tuchman.

This article entitled "Impeachment Time: Now—It's Up to Congress" is reprinted from the Boston Sunday Globe of November 4, 1973.

Mrs. Tuchman is the author of several books including "The Guns of August." Her characteristically perceptive style is reflected in the following article on impeachment:

IMPEACHMENT TIME: NOW—It's Up to CONGRESS

(By Barbara Tuchman)

"Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom," wrote Tom Paine, "must undergo like men the fatigue of supporting it."

In the affairs of a nation founded on the premise that its citizens possess certain "inalienable" rights, there comes a time when those rights must be defended against creeping authoritarianism. Liberty and authority exist in eternal stress like the seashore and the sea. Executive authority is forever hungry; it is its nature to expand and usurp.

To protect against that tendency, which is as old as history, the framers of our Constitution established three co-equal branches of government. In October 1973, we have come to the hour when that arrangement must be called upon to perform its function. Unless the Executive is brought into balance, the other two branches will dwindle into useless appendages. The judiciary has done its part; by defying it the President brought on the crisis. The fact that he reversed himself does not alter the fact that he tried, just as the fact that he reneged on the domestic surveillance plan of 1970—a fundamental invasion of the Bill of Rights—does not cancel the fact that he earlier authorized it, nor does withdrawing from Cambodia cancel the fact of lying to the public about American intervention.

The cause for impeachment remains, because President Nixon cannot change—and the American people cannot afford—the habit of illegality and abuse of executive power which has been normal to him. Responsibility for the outcome now rests upon the House of Representatives which the framers entrusted with the duty of initiating the corrective process. If it does not bring the abuse of executive power to account, it will have laid a precedent of acquiescence—what the lawyers call constructive condonement—that will end by destroying the political system whose two hundredth birthday we are about to celebrate.

No group ever faced a more difficult task at a more delicate moment. We are in the midst of international crisis; we have no Vice President; his nominated successor is suddenly seen, in the shadow of an empty presidency, as hardly qualified to move up; the administration is beleaguered by scandal and criminal charges; public confidence is at low tide; partisan politics for 1976 are in everyone's mind; and the impeachment proc-

ess is feared as likely to be long and divisive and possibly paralyzing. Under the circumstances, hesitancy and ambivalence are natural.

Yet the House must not evade the issue, for now as never before it is the hinge of our political fate. The combined forces of Congress and the judiciary are needed to curb the Executive because the Executive has the advantage of controlling all the agencies of government—including the military. The last should not be an unthinkable thought. The habit of authoritarianism, which the President has found so suitable, will slowly but surely draw a ruler, if cornered, to final dependence on the Army. That instinct already moved Mr. Nixon to call out the FBI to impound the evidence.

I do not believe the dangers and difficulties of the situation should keep Congress from the test. Certainly the situation in the Middle East is full of perils, including some probably unforeseen. But I doubt if the Russians would seize the opportunity to jump us, should we become embroiled in impeachment. Not that I have much faith in nations learning from history; what they do learn is the lesson of the last war. To a would-be aggressor, the lesson of both world wars is not to count on the theory held by the Germans and Japanese that the United States, as a great lumbering mush-minded degenerate democracy, would be unable to mobilize itself in time to prevent their victory. I am sure this lesson is studiously taught in Russian General Staff courses.

Nor should we be paralyzed by fear of exacerbating divisions within this country. We are divided anyway and always have been as any independently minded people should be. Talk of unity is a pious fraud and a politician's cliché. No people worth its salt is politically united. A nation in consensus is a nation ready for the grave.

Moreover, I think we can forego a long and malignant trial by the Senate. Once the House votes to impeach, that will be enough. Mr. Nixon, I believe, will resign rather than face an investigation and trial that he cannot stop. If the House can accomplish this, it will have vindicated the trust of the founders and made plain to every potential President that there are limits he may not exceed.

JAMES LANIER RECEIVES AWARD

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently, Tennessee State Representative James Lanier from Crockett and Dyer counties, Tenn., was presented an award resulting from his sponsorship of the "Local Property Stabilization Act of 1973." Passage of this act provides for the greatest financial assistance legislation for a single year ever provided to local government by the State of Tennessee.

Jim Lanier was honored with this award by the Tennessee County Services Association for his assistance toward relief of local property taxes.

A framed certificate was presented to Representative Lanier by Maury County Judge John Stanton for his understanding, dedication, and devotion to local government in the State of Tennessee.

In 1973, the State returned to local governments, a portion of State moneys

to be used for roads, streets, and welfare totaling over \$23,000,000. In my view, this is a step in the right direction for allocation of State funds into the hands of local authorities to be used for local projects.

Jim Lanier is a conscientious and hardworking legislator and it is indeed a pleasure to know and work with this fine representative in Tennessee State government.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—NOW!

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the current effort in Congress to increase the debt ceiling is the fifth time in the last 2 years we have been asked by the administration to permit a greater level of public debt. A year and half ago, the debt limit stood at \$430 billion; we were asked this fall to raise that ceiling to \$480 billion. In June of 1972, our public debt stood at about \$428 billion. After a year and a half of economic prosperity, we are now in hock to the tune of \$463 billion. There is no end in sight to this escalation of public indebtedness.

What is going on here? Should the Congress not abide by the same standards of financial responsibility which it expects of its citizens? Is the credibility of our Federal Government at stake?

To these two questions, I say "Yes." The Government should be expected to be financially responsible. It is time that we in Government recognize these facts and that we take to heart their importance. We must devote ourselves to finding and implementing measures which will assure that fiscal responsibility will once again be a national hallmark. It is time that we restored the public's trust in its Government.

Fiscal responsibility can be established or destroyed, recaptured or further banished from our public ethic, by two institutions: The President and the Congress. To this point in time, both institutions have contributed to our budgetary quagmire. However, it is too late for charges of fault. We must take positive steps to correct current inadequacies. We in Congress have a heavy responsibility to bear in our authority to approve the spending of public funds. In order to exercise this authority with integrity and a real sensitivity to national needs, we need to consider more adequately the overall impacts of each of our financial moves. We need to have a more complete vision of where we are, and where we are going. We must be seriously willing to recognize that we simply can no longer afford to do whatever we want in the way of spending. And we must be willing to compromise the desires of special groups or constituencies when the national interest will be more beneficially served through such denial.

I believe that Congress has begun to take steps in these directions. Many bills

and resolutions calling for reform of the budget process have been introduced during this session of Congress. Much committee time has been spent in trying to fashion a measure which will assure that Congress maintains a perspective on overall budget conditions while working on individual budget matters. These proposals are long overdue. It is my hope that we will redouble our efforts in the next month to adopt some effective reforms so that we may begin next year with an effective system of budget control. My support and best efforts shall certainly go toward gaining approval of the best possible budget control program.

I would be falsely optimistic if I were to expect that changes in the budget process will come easily. Almost as quickly as reform proposals have emerged this year, opposition has crystallized to the proposals. I say to my fellow Congressmen, "We can no longer afford to deny reform out of petty political preferences. We are beyond the point of necessary change." I believe that we, and the country, will be better off if we in Congress determine that we will work together to make the best possible changes, and that we will commit ourselves to making these changes work.

The public has a right to expect a government which will go into debt only when absolutely necessary, and which will repay its debts during periods of national prosperity. To this end, I say, "Fiscal Responsibility—Now."

BOLLING-ANACOSTIA PROVISIONS IN CONFERENCE REPORT DISAP- POINTING

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to just offer a few comments on the conference report on S. 2043, the military construction authorization bill. I am very disappointed that section 609 was retained by the conferees. That section operates to permit the construction of military facilities at the Bolling-Anacostia Complex contrary to the decision of the National Capital Planning Commission and contrary to the National Environmental Policy Act. Additionally, the new date inserted by the House allows the Department of Defense to retain the ban on a land transfer in excess of the original 1975 date which was imposed by Public Law 89-188, as amended.

The District of Columbia is in desperate need of an engine of economic growth and development in the Anacostia section. Had the conferees sought to respect the agreement made at the May 31, 1973 meeting of the National Capital Planning Commission, both the city and the military would have had adequate resources for their essential needs. The military could have constructed what it needed and the city could have provided jobs, housing, and community facilities.

Except for the fact that the conferees have adopted some impliedly prohibitive language, the military could now move to construct facilities which will prove detrimental to the economic well-being of the Nation's Capital if it had funds.

Additionally, let me point out the fact that while Congress can amend any decision of the National Capital Planning Commission, the recommendations ought to come to the floor from a committee which has jurisdiction—in this case, the District Committee. This action is unprecedented and if it should become a precedent, it will result in a "mish-mash" of Government sponsored construction projects done without reference to any kind of plan. One of the reasons that Americans love to visit in Washington, D.C., is to observe the generally thoughtfully laid out city and its monuments. These exist because the residents and the Nation's representatives have tried to assure that each project is adequately served with roads, water, schools, employment, housing, and public transportation. To disrupt the planning process—however faulty it is at times—is to destroy the hope that this city can be maintained as the "city beautiful."

Finally, let me just comment on one other facet of the report. There is a suit against the Department of Defense to prevent the Navy from proceeding to construct certain facilities because of the failure to file a proper environmental impact statement. I am not certain what effect this legislation has upon this or other similarly situated suits; but, I can assure you that it represents an unwarranted intrusion into the judicial process. I am sure that the Members did not intend it to be that way. Yet, I cannot conceive that the parties will ignore the actions taken. I had hoped that the committee would have at least left the matter in the same position—perhaps with just an extension of time—until the suits were resolved.

Fortunately, the conferees did agree in their report to hold hearings early next year. I hope that these will commence in January and that, in the meantime, the department attempt to take no action which would be contrary to the expressions of the conferees.

I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the distinguished gentleman from New York for obtaining the general leave by which I have made these comments.

A RESOLUTION TO COMMEND THE PRESIDENT ON THE CEASE-FIRE AGREEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many of us in this chamber during the past few months who have been quite critical of the President's actions on the domestic scene. Though I have

been disappointed about the turn of events in some instances, I feel that many of our questions will soon be answered.

And again, many of us have supported the President's foreign policy actions. The new détente with Russia and China have already provided us with real dividends in the current crisis in the Middle East. For this the President certainly deserves credit.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution for myself and many of my colleagues which commends the President for his efforts toward obtaining a cease-fire in the Arab-Israeli conflict. In this specific instance I am particularly pleased about the reaction I have obtained from my colleagues. I invite more of my colleagues to join with me in sponsoring this resolution. The text of the resolution follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby commends the President of the United States for his successful efforts toward the stabilization of the ceasefire agreement in the Middle East, especially his efforts through the United Nations to create the atmosphere in which the negotiations could take place and his dialogue with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to seek to reduce tensions, all of which have produced conditions which can lead to the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

TRIBUTE TO BILL HUNT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Robert Whittinton, in describing the nature of Sir Thomas More, said:

More is a man of angel's wit and singular learning; I know not his fellow. For where is the man of that gentleness, lowliness, and affability? And as time requireth, a man of marvelous mirth and pastimes; and sometimes of as sad a gravity; a man for all seasons.

That description of a man, who was later canonized by Pope Pius XI, could apply to very few individuals, as few individuals can combine intellect, wit, and genuine compassion, and humility.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my years, I have been very fortunate to meet and know many admirable and great people—people who are supremely intelligent; people with a keen wit; with a sincere love and empathy for their fellow human beings; and people who are humble despite their public acclaim. But none have exceeded my friend, Bill Hunt, in combining these attributes; none have been able to unite these ingredients as has Bill Hunt.

A newspaperman for practically his entire life, he began delivering papers for the Santa Monica Outlook when he was 10. Later, at age 19, he was the circulation manager for the Venice Evening Outlook; and then, in succession, he worked for the San Mateo Times, the San Francisco Call-Bulletin, and the Hanford Journal.

During the depression years, Bill Hunt worked for newspapers ranging from Santa Ana, Calif., to Fairbanks, Calif., with stops in Texas, Oregon, and Washington in between.

THE GARDENA VALLEY NEWS

After returning to California around the mid-century, Bill joined the Gardena Valley News where he has been ever since.

As publisher of this outstanding newspaper, Bill Hunt has been the leader of many fights to correct inequities and eliminate injustice. Perhaps the best known of these crusades for which he gained national prominence was his battle to keep narcotics and drugs out of the hands of children.

Recognized as a leader and expert on drug problems, Mr. Hunt became the first chairman of the Los Angeles County Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Commission. And he served on several White House conferences called by the President of the United States to help solve this problem.

OPERATION HUMANITY

In addition, Bill established "Operation Humanity" in order to eliminate the jurisdictional boundaries that prevented ambulances from taking seriously injured persons to the closest hospital.

Always available to help a person in need, Bill Hunt's office in the Gardena Valley News could well be termed the "Chaplain's Office," because it is always open to those who need a friend.

Of course, Bill Hunt has been blessed with a steady and consistent partner in life who has given him support and inspiration throughout his career. He and his lovely and gracious wife Martha were married in 1933 and they are the proud parents of Bill, Jr.

A member of St. Anthony of Padua Catholic Church in Gardena, Bill Hunt has been active in civic and social affairs, as well as a crusading and vigilant newspaper publisher and humanitarian.

On November 29, Bill will receive another signal honor as the recipient of the Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award selected by the Gardena Outstanding Citizen's Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to honor and pay tribute to my friend, Bill Hunt, and to join with his many friends in saluting him for his host of outstanding contributions to our society.

Bill Hunt is, indeed, a man for all seasons.

BRYANT COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, too often in the crush of national events and the current atmosphere of crisis we fail to notice the contributions of individuals whose dedication to moral values and idealism have made America a great country. The American creed has had an immense ef-

fect upon American life and nowhere is that effect more evident than in the Nation's school system.

I know a man in Ann Arbor, Mich., who has been a friend to thousands of schoolchildren—my own included—who cares a great deal about the public good. For his dedication, Ann Arbor has saluted Clifford Bryant by naming its newest elementary school in his honor. The new school is the first among Ann Arbor's public school buildings to be named in honor of a former custodian.

The Bryant Community Elementary School boasts all the latest equipment for use in the "open plan" concept. Carpeting and a special ceiling keep the noise level down. The \$1.7 million facility includes classes separated by brightly colored partial partitions rather than permanent walls, a theater stage, amphitheater, and play space in the kindergarten area.

It is indeed fitting that this wonderful facility carries the name of a man so highly respected by his fellow citizens. Clifford Bryant grew up in Perry, Kans. and was born in Nowata, Okla. After World War II he came to Ann Arbor and served as custodian for the old Ann Arbor High School from 1946 to 1956 and at Pioneer High School from 1956 to 1960.

He served at Dicken Elementary School from 1960 until 1971 when it was my honor to take part in the ceremonies marking his retirement. Now Clifford Bryant can dedicate more time to his gardening hobby and the pleasures of being a grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater tribute for a citizen than to have the respect of his community. Clifford Bryant is respected and loved by those who have been enriched by the gift of his friendship.

I. W. ABEL WARNS THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the news media has made much in recent days of the "uniqueness" of a situation in which U.S. Steelworkers President I. W. Abel appeared with a message addressed to the American people in advertisements of United States Steel Corp. in six nationally circulated magazines.

The ad, the media points out, is a "first"—in the words of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette:

It is believed the first time in the history of the American labor movement that the president of a major international union has appeared in a corporate ad for a big company.

Be this as it may, the Abel message, in my estimation, is far more important to the people of this Nation than any innovation in the advertising business or the published evidence, fine as it may be, of a new spirit of union and management cooperation.

Mr. Abel is concerned over lagging

productivity in this country and, in the advertisement, calls upon every one of us to do what we can to improve it. He says:

Nothing less is at stake than our jobs, the prices we pay, the very quality of our lives.

He points out that, between 1960 and 1972, the annual average productivity rise in the United States was 3.1 percent while that of a number of foreign countries was double or more. He also cites the fact that 18 percent of the steel used here last year was made abroad at a high cost in American jobs and lowered living standards.

"What happened?" he asks and then answers the question himself in this way:

Things have been so good for so long that we've become wasteful and inefficient. So wasteful that, incredibly enough, many firms nowadays actually expect to scrap 20 percent of what they produce!

Let me be blunt: I believe we are standing at a pivotal point in our history. If we adopt a don't-give-a-damn attitude, we risk becoming a second-class economic power.

What can be done? Mr. Abel wants the efficiency of each worker stepped up by the cutting down on excessive absenteeism, tardiness, turnover, and overtime. He says the morale of the workers must be improved too by more effective work incentives—"and really listening to the man at the work-bench." All the brains in our economy, he stresses, are not in the executive suites.

I quote further from Mr. Abel's prescription:

By improving our technology and really using the technology we already possess. Let's put our brainpower to work to create more efficient manufacturing processes and better equipment. But then let's use them.

Important steps are being taken in other ways, Mr. Abel points out, and the public, I know, is well aware of one of them—the new "no-strike" contract which his union signed with the major steel producers. Also, the joint advisory committees on productivity, which the union and industry have set up at each plant, can contribute mightily toward solving the problem.

Mr. Abel ends his advertised message in this way:

Like Oliver Twist, labor has always sought "more"—more wages and benefits. But labor also knows that to obtain more, we must produce more. Together we face a great challenge. Together, I am certain we will succeed.

I might add to this that I, too, am certain that, in due time, our workmen and industries will resolve this matter and get our country out front again in productivity so it can resume its historic role as the world's most progressive manufacturer. And the solution will come, because we do have men of vision like Mr. Abel and corporations of concern such as United States Steel that realize the problem is a common one demanding united action.

Mr. Abel's appearance in a United States Steel Corp. advertisement not only constitutes a "first." It shows the kind of new thinking we badly need in all sections of American business and industry.

COMMUNITY OF FROSTBURG, MD., RALLIES TO HELP FIRE VICTIMS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, at 5:30 p.m. on Saturday, January 13, 1973, a fire erupted in the business district of Frostburg, Maryland. Despite a valiant effort by area volunteer firemen, five businesses and four apartments were completely gutted.

The fire left the four families who occupied the apartments homeless. Trying to alleviate the plight of these victims, the local radio station WFRB broadcasted an appeal for funds to help replace the families' losses.

Within 3 hours of the first broadcast over \$3,000 had been pledged. By 5:15 p.m. the listeners had pledged \$6,900. By sign-off time, 11 p.m., the total amount of money pledged by the WFRB listeners for the fire victims was an amazing \$11,570. On January 22, 1973, at ceremonies at the Frostburg National Bank, over \$16,000 in cash was presented to the families.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the community of Frostburg for its humanitarian efforts on behalf of these families who lost their personal fortunes in that damaging and destructive fire. It is heartening to know that in this day and age the communal spirit of helping one's neighbor has not been extinguished. The empathy shown by the listeners of WFRB, exemplifies the true spirit of generosity this Nation has been noted for.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I cite a passage written by a newspaper reporter who was covering the incident, "The human kindness well can never be empty."

I enclose for the RECORD an article written by The Evening Sun on this incident:

HUMAN KINDNESS WELL CAN NEVER BE EMPTY
(By John Schullian)

FROSTBURG, Md.—The burned-out buildings on Main street keep reminding Carl Loughry of the happy story he wishes he had never had a chance to tell.

It took the fire that left four families homeless Saturday to prove that people still care about each other, the stocky, bespectacled radio station owner was saying yesterday.

That's the sad thing about the \$15,000 he hopes to divide among the fire victims Monday.

TOO BUSY PEOPLE

"People used to be a lot more neighborly than they are now," Mr. Loughry said. "Even in a small town like this (population 7,500), they're too busy running and doing all the time to be much bothered with each other."

"But when they saw the trouble these folks were in, they did respond. I have to think that makes them the greatest people in the world."

Mr. Loughry put out the call for help Monday between the generous helpings of Merle Haggard and Waylon Jennings that come from his countrified station, WFRB.

FIRST TO KICK IN \$100

"I said I was kicking in with the first \$100," he recalled, "and it wasn't five minutes be-

fore a man walked through the door and said he'd give \$100."

Mr. Loughry had almost \$10,000 in hand by yesterday afternoon. It was far more than Mrs. Mabel McKenzie Fisher or the Gilbert Hostetters or the Raymond Shumakes or the Michael Shumakes ever thought possible.

"All I could think about during the fire was that I had nothing to show for 20 years' work," said Gilbert Hostetler, who lost his bakery as well as the home he and his wife had made over it.

"A lot of people we don't even know are giving money," said Mike Shumake, who grew up in one of the apartments the fire ravaged and was living with his wife and 2-year-old daughter in another of the unfortunate ones.

The good neighbors have been big companies, such as the Kelly-Springfield Tire Company, of Cumberland, which contributed \$200 from its emergency fund, and little people, such as Mrs. E. Oldeker, of Wiley Ford, W. Va., who sent the last \$5 from her January Social Security check.

Two of the littlest people to send the fire victims money were Sue and Jeanette Watkins, of Eckhart, Md., who sent this neatly printed note along with their \$2:

"This is part of our allowance. We want to give it to the people burned out in the fire. We are 7 and 9 years old."

FIRES IN THE FARMS

That means the Watkins sisters probably aren't old enough to remember what used to happen when the farms scattered among the tree-covered hills around Frostburg lost their barns to fire.

"Folks would get together and we'd have an old-fashioned barn-raising," said Ralph M. Race, the president of the Fidelity bank and a farmer who has been to more than one barn-raising. "That's what this gathering money for the fire victims is like."

Even with the apparent decline in neighborliness, people suffering hard times aren't forgotten in this Allegany county town. Everyone's favorite example is a high-school boy named Eddie Elchhorn who underwent a kidney transplant a few years back with money raised by a waitress and a housewife.

FIVE STORES SHUT

Though the families put out on the street by the fire have gained the most attention, the five stores that they lived above and that now stand shuttered tight aren't going to be forgotten either.

Mr. Loughry has promised the store owners a free remote broadcast and 200 free advertising spots apiece once they reopen their doors.

There is a very legitimate question about how soon they will be able to do that, said John C. Durst, the town fire chief, who estimated the damage to them "in excess of \$100,000."

GRIM REMINDER

So Wehler's Paint Store and the Kiddie Town toy shop and Super Shoes and Hobing Men's Store and the Frostburg Bakery stand as a grim reminder of the fire that took 180 men, 20 pieces of equipment and 5 hours to control.

"Oh, Gil, it's so hard to watch them taking the debris down," Martha Hostetler told her husband as she looked out the window of the two-room apartment they have taken temporarily.

It is directly across from the bakery they ran. Mr. Hostetler, looking gray and tired, admitted that he isn't sure he wants to face the job of bringing it back to life.

FACING THE FUTURE

The good neighbors' contributions may make him feel more like facing the future. At least he and his wife will be at the Frostburg National Bank to accept them.

Most of the fire victims don't really know what they are going to do with whatever money they get. The Hostetters, for instance,

have already been given furniture, and one day after the fire, Mrs. Fisher, the retired manager of Super Shoes, had a closet full of friends' clothes.

The Michael Shumakes are an exception. "We've always wanted a trailer," Mike's wife Carolyn said. "I guess we'll just use the money for a down payment on one."

CHRISTMASTIME CONSERVATION

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, while we in Congress are grappling with the many problems of energy conservation and searching for ways to adequately conserve our resources, the holiday season in fast approaching with all its glitter of lights and displays greeting us at each shopping center and street corner.

It has long been a tradition to decorate our homes with lights and pageantry as we join in the Christmas spirit. This year, however, each citizen is being asked to make sacrifices in whatever way possible to make energy conservation programs successful. One Chicagoan has come up with an idea which I would like to share with my colleagues. It is a worthwhile suggestion and one which deserves our attention. The text of the letter follows:

CHICAGO, ILL.

Representative MORGAN F. MURPHY,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For more years than I care to remember it has been the custom, in Chicago, to decorate the outside of a private home and a good portion of the landscape with electric lights during the Christmas Season. This originated in the Beverly Hills area and during the years has spread to less affluent neighborhoods. At the present time, at least in my immediate vicinity, there is a nightly display for a three or four week period.

Down through the centuries, man has tried to appease, honor, and offer thanks to his particular gods in many strange ways. Celebrating the birth of Jesus Christ in a lowly stable by entering into a contest with your next door neighbor or the fellow across the street to outdo him in total lights and illuminated plastic figures must belong in this strange category.

I believe that it is the patriotic duty of every American homeowner to forego these garish displays during the current Energy Crisis. If he can find it in his heart to use the substantial amount of money saved to bring joy to the hearts of poor children with gifts of food and toys, or to donate this money to his favorite charity, they will truly commemorate the birth of the Infant Jesus.

I bring this to your attention because I do not know if this outside lighting is a nation-wide custom. In any event, a man in your position can give my idea wider publicity.

Our Lord, Jesus Christ, is a God of infinite understanding, compassion and generosity and He is never outdone by man. I am certain that anyone who brightens the heart of a child instead of the outside of his home will have a better Christmas than ever before.

Thank you,

WALTER E. SCHMITZ.

KENT STATE: TOWARD JUSTICE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the struggle to achieve some form of justice in the Kent State killings has now reached its crisis stage: its point of no return.

Those of us who have consistently called for a Federal grand jury investigation into the shooting of 13 Kent students have had to go up against and put up with those who would stifle and squelch such a search for the truth—John Mitchell and Richard Kleindienst and behind them, Richard Nixon.

Our hopes rose last August, however, when Attorney General Elliot Richardson announced the reopening of the Justice Department investigation into Kent. The convening of a Federal grand jury seemed imminent.

But now, it is possible that the potential for Kent State justice lies ruined in the rubble of the Saturday night massacre, when Mr. Richardson found that he could no longer serve under President Nixon. If we sit back complacently, Richardson's resignation and WILLIAM SAXBE's nomination might also have been the surrendering of a commitment to a Kent State investigation.

If the nomination of a former Ohio National Guardsman, Senator SAXBE, is confirmed, it must come only after he has given his solemn promise to pursue a Federal investigation of the Kent State killings. We have fought too hard and come too far to let anyone or anything disrupt the progress that has been made. I fervently hope that the Senators who sit in judgment of Senator SAXBE's nomination will seek that promise. We owe the victims of Kent State that much.

I respectfully submit into the RECORD a New York Times editorial of November 15, entitled "Saxbe and Kent State" for the attention of my colleagues.

SAXBE AND KENT STATE

The still-tentative promise by Assistant Attorney General J. Stanley Pottinger that the Justice Department may convene a Federal grand jury to hear evidence on the 1970 tragedy at Kent State University should swiftly be turned into a full commitment. The killing of four students and wounding of nine others by gunfire of Ohio National Guardsmen must not remain unfinished legal business.

Even though the Federal Bureau of Investigation raised serious questions about the Guard's action and John N. Mitchell, then the Attorney General, declared in 1971 that he found the gunfire "unnecessary, unwarranted and inexcusable," the Justice Department at that time decided inexplicably against further Federal investigation. The exoneration of the Guard was thus left to the same Ohio grand jury that indicted twenty-five of the demonstrators.

It was not until June, when Elliot Richardson, then the Attorney General, ordered the Justice Department to take "a fresh look" at the Kent State case that hope was revived in the Government's interest to get at the truth. What makes Mr. Pottinger's latest statement about plans to convene a Federal grand jury particularly pertinent now is that William B. Saxbe, Senator from Ohio and President Nixon's nominee to succeed Mr.

Richardson as Attorney General, is reported to have expressed doubts about re-opening the investigation.

As a former colonel in the Ohio National Guard, it is especially incumbent on Mr. Saxbe not only to give full support to the convening of a Federal grand jury but to pledge that he would in no way interfere with the investigation. Indeed, a full statement by Mr. Saxbe on the matter ought to be considered an important element in the confirmation hearings. Beyond the tragic issue of Kent State itself, the case remains a test of the Justice Department's determination to accommodations, cover-ups and potential make a clean break with a past of politics, conflicts of interest.

THE IMPACT OF STRIKING THE HOLD-HARMLESS ON SSI

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Ms. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to insert this Extension of Remarks today because I am deeply disturbed at the action of the House in voting 246 to 163 in favor of the Griffiths amendment to strike the hold-harmless provision of H.R. 11333.

On many occasions Representative GRIFFITHS and I have been in agreement, as I hope and expect to be in the future, but in this instance I just cannot concur with the gentlewoman from Michigan.

In his speech before the Chamber yesterday, Congressman ULLMAN noted that the cost of living has skyrocketed out of sight in the last few months. While this means a hardship for all of our citizens, for our elderly it is catastrophic. As the rest of us worry if we will be able to have turkey for Thanksgiving because of the shortage of birds, our elderly are being reduced to eating dog food.

In the months of July, August, and September, the seasonally adjusted cost-of-living index for food rose 28.8 percent. That increase affects all our elderly, including those residing in the 10 States which were protected by the hold-harmless. But the effect of the vote this afternoon will be to deny these recipients the extra income they need to get through these hard times.

In spite of protests to the contrary the 10 States affected by this amendment are not so well-to-do that they can come up with the \$40 million and \$70 million it will cost States such as New York and California to cover the loss of Federal funds. The alternative is to deny the anticipated social security increase to residents of those States.

Now I recognize that many in this Chamber will retort that the recipients in New York, California, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Rhode Island do not need the increase as badly as those in the rest of the Nation. Thankfully the elderly in my home State of New York do receive a larger income than those of the same age in Mississippi, but this by no means can be equated

with living in the lap of luxury. Our elderly are still poor, they are hardly less poor than their counterparts in some of our other States.

It should also be noted that although the hold-harmless was designed to protect only 10 States, they happen to be some of our most densely populated. About one-third of the 30 million beneficiaries of the social security system reside in the States which have lost revenues through this amendment.

The move to strike the hold-harmless is disturbing for another reason. I believe that it will have an adverse impact on the willingness of the States to put up their own money to supplement social security benefits in the future. For what we have done this afternoon is to say to the States "do not try to improve social services and social welfare programs in your States. If you do we shall penalize rather than reward you for your efforts." That is the antithesis of what we have alleged to be the policy of both the Congress and the administration, but actions speak louder than words and the message to the States has been very clear this afternoon.

KNOW YOUR TOWN

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters in the towns of Suffield and Torrington have performed a great service to the community through their publication of the "Know Your Town" booklets.

Counterparts exist in other Connecticut communities where there are League of Women Voters chapters. These publications have been compiled by the league to acquaint the residents of their towns with the structure of their government, and the available community services and facilities.

Included in the publication is information about the history of the town, governmental organization, public protection, municipal services and health, educational, and recreational facilities. Also, part of the booklet focuses on the resident as a citizen and voter in the community. In the booklet, there is information on parties, registration, and voting qualification, absentee voting, the "who, when, and where" of elections, and voting machine procedure.

The need for such a publication as a reference for the residents of a community is clear, and the towns of Torrington and Suffield are fortunate in having chapter members of the League of Women Voters who have used their time and talent in composing "Know Your Town" booklets.

The League of Women Voters has traditionally been a strong force in fostering political responsibility and informed participation of citizens in their community. The Torrington and Suffield chapters carry on this excellent tradition by pub-

lishing these booklets. They are truly valuable tools which inform residents of the resources in their community, and help citizens develop political awareness and a sense of responsibility toward the community.

COMPLIANCE WITH EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROVISIONS OF THE NEW VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LAW

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8070, a bill to "authorize grants for vocational rehabilitation services and for other purposes" has passed both Houses and subsequently been approved by conference. Enacted on September 26 as Public Law 93-112, the law was the result of several years of hard work by the Select Committee on Education and its distinguished chairman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMANS).

Included in title V of the new law are several sections relating to the employment of the handicapped and the participation of the handicapped in Federal programs.

Section 501 describes the action to be taken by Federal agencies to ensure non-discriminatory, fair consideration of employment for the handicapped. Section 503 requires an "affirmative action" in the employment of the handicapped by all Government contractors. Section 504 requires that "no otherwise qualified handicapped individual" shall "solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

As a supporter of all these provisions of the bill, I have requested that 35 Federal agencies, from the Social Security Administration to the Interstate Commerce Commission, advise me of their progress in complying with these new provisions of the law. It is important that all Government agencies realize the importance and immediacy of the provisions, and never again permit the Federal Government to make the type of stupid and costly mistake that marred the District of Columbia's subway project. A substantial amount of work was permitted on this \$3 billion federally aided project before the courts ordered installation of the special accesses to the subways for handicapped persons—persons who, after all, are helping to build the subway with their tax dollars.

At this point, I would like to include a copy of the letter which I am sending to the agencies in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1973.

DEAR —: As you know, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 was enacted on September 26th as Public Law 93-112. The new legislation requires, among other things, fair consideration in employment and participation of the handicapped in Federal jobs,

in the employment practices of Federal contractors, and in the conduct of Federal Programs.

Section 501 of P.L. 93-112 describes the action to be taken by Federal agencies to ensure non-discriminatory consideration of employment for the handicapped. Section 503 requires affirmative action in the employment of the handicapped by government contractors. Section 504 requires that "no otherwise qualified handicapped individual shall be excluded from the participation under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

As a supporter of the inclusion of these provisions in the new law, I would appreciate it if your Department could keep me advised on actions you will be taking to ensure fair and improved employment consideration of the handicapped, both by your office and by the contractors funded through your office.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to express to the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee my strong belief that the Food and Drug Administration's regulations on food supplements should not bar millions of Americans across the country from obtaining, without prescription, the vitamin and food supplements they feel are essential for their health.

No one wishes to permit the distribution of unclean or dangerous substances. But it seems to me that the people of this country are sufficiently well educated and informed to choose for themselves from among the supplements commercially available and that the proper role of Government is to assure the purity and proper labeling of these substances, as long as there is no evidence that they are poisonous or otherwise detrimental to the average user.

I include the text of my statement to the Subcommittee at this point:

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to submit to this distinguished Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee my view concerning the FDA restrictions on vitamin and food supplements.

After more than a decade of dispute, the Food and Drug Administration has issued Recommended Daily Allowance for each vitamin and mineral products. The consumer reaction to these regulations is unprecedented; thousands of letters have been received by the FDA protesting the new policy and insisting that this time the FDA has overstepped its authority.

I am very much inclined to agree that the FDA is meddling in areas of control for which it has no legislative mandate. The Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended, prohibits interstate commerce in foods and drugs which are adulterated or misbranded; much of the substance of the vitamin-

mineral product regulation seems to be of a purely economic nature. Basically, these regulations:

Specify which vitamins and minerals may be included in a supplement and in what combinations

Set forth upper and lower limits for dosage levels of each vitamin and mineral allowed in a supplement

Require certain labeling (i.e., % of the Recommended Daily Allowance for each vitamin and mineral, the expiration date, etc.)

Restrict to prescription sale vitamin-mineral preparations containing more than a specified dosage level of the vitamins A & D.

Granted, it is clearly in the interest of the consumer and the responsibility of the FDA to impose limits on dosages of vitamins and minerals where there is a question of toxicity. Such may be the case for limiting the amount of the vitamins A and D available in one dosage unit. I believe it is generally conceded in the scientific community that these vitamins are toxic at high levels; if so, restrictions are justified. However, little or no evidence exists to suggest that any other of the vitamin or minerals subject to the new regulation are hazardous at high levels. Much to the contrary, new discoveries are being made every day regarding the therapeutic advantages of high vitamin intake.

I certainly do not pretend to be a dietary expert and neither am I advocating the use of dietary supplements. However, I do feel the public does have the right to purchase vitamins and minerals in dosage forms which are the most convenient when there is no issue of safety at stake. As long as the products are adequately labeled and unadulterated, the FDA's job is done.

For this reason I have introduced a bill to limit the authority of the FDA regarding the regulation of food supplements. In order to issue any regulation which would limit the potency, number, combination, amount, or variety of any vitamin and/or mineral product, the FDA would have to prove that the supplement is intrinsically injurious to health. Thus, if certain vitamins or minerals are dangerous at the levels above the maximum levels proposed by the FDA, precautions would be taken to limit their use by consumers. Otherwise, consumers will be free to purchase the product in a form which meets their needs.

DAY OF NATIONAL CONCERN DECLARED IN UTAH

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today, November 16, has been declared a "day of national concern" in Utah—a day of concern over the deepening crisis facing our Nation and an occasion to dedicate ourselves to restoring integrity to our Government.

The Committee of National Concern has realized the frustration and confusion of many Utah citizens over recent events that have resulted in a House inquiry into impeachment proceedings against the President. It is the committee's belief, and my own, that confidence in the American system of government can be strengthened by constructive action rather than idle preoccupation with our country's problems. There will be a silent noon vigil held today at the Federal Building Plaza in

Salt Lake City. Public hearings are also scheduled for concerned citizens to discuss current issues and offer possible solutions that may be forwarded to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we here in Washington also take a moment to direct our thoughts, prayers, and reflections toward resolution of the critical problems that face us in our national Government. These problems must be dealt with by an active Congress, moving vigorously, yet judiciously to restore in our system. I want to state clearly the confidence of the American people and my own strong faith in our ability to regain national self confidence.

WATERGATE: THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of complicated legal and constitutional questions surrounding the two highest officers in the land, we must not lose sight of the fact that the various Watergate investigations have thus far revealed only small pieces of the whole story and have yet to put them together in very convincing frameworks. As Timothy Ingram puts it in the article to follow, we do not even have a plausible explanation for the famous burglary.

It is not enough to impeach the President and remove him from office. The diseases that plague our body politic involve many people in the Government, in the business world, and in the political and criminal underworlds. A single coherent plot is doubtful, but there is already on the public record much evidence to suggest myriad and sometimes conflicting plots in pursuit of economic, political, and ideological goals.

Congress and the public should not sit back and placidly wait for a special prosecutor or a Watergate committee to do the whole job. For the job is too big and requires too much intellectual perception, doggedness, and courage for any one group or individual, even the Washington Post. We must all work to push the public dialog onward. In that spirit I urge to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the November 1973 Washington Monthly which suggests only a few of the many unexplored avenues in the evidence already at hand. The article follows:

ITT AND WATERGATE: THE COLSON CONNECTION (By Timothy H. Ingram)

The Colson memorandum was introduced to the Watergate Committee on August 1, 1973, without fanfare, almost as a throwaway. Sam Dash, the Committee's chief counsel, had obtained it the night before from a secretary who worked at the White House, and he wanted to slip it in somehow during the third day of H. R. Haldeman's testimony.

Dash was asking Haldeman whether he always informed the President of potentially embarrassing developments—and he offhandedly cited the Colson memo as an example. It was a truly astonishing document. Dated March 30, 1972, the same day Jeb Magruder

said that final plans for the Watergate break-in were approved, it warned of existence of other internal memoranda that "directly involve" President Nixon in arranging the favorable settlement of the government's antitrust suit against the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation (ITT). The evidence "would lay this case on the President's doorstep," warned White House Special Counsel Charles Colson.

Thanks to Senator Edward Gurney, the Committee's attention was deflected from the Colson memorandum before anyone had a chance to gauge its importance. Overshadowed by the Haldeman testimony, it was soon forgotten by both the Committee and the press.

Failing to pursue the logic of the Colson memo, both the Watergate Committee and the press lost a golden opportunity to try to answer that often-forgotten, but fundamental question: Why, on June 17, 1972, did seven men burglarize and bug the offices of the Democratic National Committee? What was it that was worth the high risk, the \$250,000 cost, and the amount of planning and energy that went into the Watergate operation? What, in God's name were Howard Hunt and his faithful Cubans looking for?

Like so many other elements of the hearings, the Colson memo was introduced without a framework and without any real effort by the Committee to fit it into the larger picture. The task of sorting out the importance of the Colson memo—as with other items introduced and then forgotten during the hearings—was left to the press, already overextended by the sheer bulk of the Watergate hearings.

One reason for the neglect of the Colson memo was that it dealt with ITT and therefore appeared non-germane in the midst of the Watergate hearings. Scandals, like metaphors, do not mix. ITT also raised the complicated jurisdictional question involved in defining congressional turf. The Senate Judiciary Committee had already spent two months looking into the ITT affair, and as a result the Ervin Committee tended to shy away from the issue.

Amid the Committee's preoccupation with "who-knew-what-when" and "is-he-repentant," the hearings lost their focus. At the end of the first phase, television viewers knew about the discrepancies between the Dean and Mitchell testimony, but had little more understanding of the rationale for the break-in than they did a year earlier.

The problem is one that would seem obvious to any fictional detective. Neither the Watergate Committee nor the press has ever developed a coherent theory of the case. At no point during the entire proceedings has any hypothesis been advanced that could be tested against the statements of various witnesses. Instead, most of those involved in the Watergate hearings have proceeded with a detachment worthy of the most pedantic of scholars. "We won't form any opinions until all the facts are in" sounds judicious, but it certainly doesn't equip the Committee to ask relevant questions along the way.

Lacking their own hypotheses, the Committee investigators have been left with the theories generously offered by the burglars themselves. Howard Hunt, for example, gave an explanation which met all the criteria except plausibility. Perfectly contrite, looking prison pale in his wash-and-wear suit, Hunt asserted that his men had hoped to find evidence at the DNC connecting the Democrats to tainted money from Cuba.

Many found it hard to take this explanation seriously. As Senator Daniel Inouye asked incredulously, "Did you expect the photographer to find somewhere in a ledger: 'Received from Fidel Castro, x number of dollars?'" Hunt's explanation also seems to rest on a flimsy factual basis. Michael Rich-

ardson, the one outsider in a position to know what the burglars were photographing, has contradicted Hunt's claims. Richardson works at Rich Photos in Miami and developed the film shot inside the DNC headquarters during the burglars' first successful break-in. Richardson told me that the pictures showed surgical gloves holding memos and letters, some of which bore the DNC letterhead and were signed "Larry." There were no photographs of financial records or account books.

If members of the Committee did not press Hunt and the others harder for an explanation, it may be because they suspected that ultimately there was only a "why not?" motivation for the burglary. In other words, with so much money, so few scruples, and such a finely developed sense of paranoia, the Committee to Re-elect the President (CRP) should almost have been expected to have bugged the Democratic Party headquarters. If the men surrounding the President could tolerate the bumbling of a Donald Segretti, why wouldn't they spend \$250,000 to keep Gordon Liddy and his ubiquitous flow charts out of their hair?

The problem with this hypothesis is that the Watergate burglary seems to have been far more than a simple make-work expedition. Jeb Magruder explained that the White House regarded O'Brien as the Democrat's "most professional political operator" and feared that if O'Brien remained as DNC chairman he could be "very difficult in the coming campaign." O'Brien's importance is underlined by Magruder's testimony that Charles Colson had telephoned him "some time in February" to urge that Magruder "get on the stick and get the budget approved for Liddy's plans; that we need information, particularly on Larry O'Brien."

Why was Larry O'Brien so important? Given the ferocity of the Democratic Party's fratricidal struggles, it is hard to believe that even the "most professional" Democratic political operator could intimidate such a hardnose as Colson. But something else could—and did—scare Colson, who probably was the prime motivating force behind the break-in. That something was ITT.

This hypothesis does not purport to explain every detail in the case, but it does offer a way of fitting a number of unexplained facts together. Admittedly, the Watergate burglars might, through serendipity, find other useful evidence at the DNC. But the burglars' main purpose was to find out whether Larry O'Brien had the missing ITT memoranda. If the documents were as damning as Colson feared, they might provide the issue that could allow even George McGovern to defeat Richard Nixon.

A bit of scene-setting may be useful. In March, 1972, when the final go-aheads were being given for Gordon Liddy's plans, the White House was in near hysteria over the ITT affair. On February 29 Jack Anderson had blown the scandal open by publishing the "Dita Beard memorandum." This document indicated that the Justice Department had let ITT off the hook on a major antitrust charge after the company had pledged \$400,000 for the Republican Convention.

In the months preceding the Watergate burglary, as Attorney General nominee Richard Kleindienst went through a protracted inquisition before the Senate Judiciary Committee, the White House grew increasingly suspicious that Larry O'Brien had inside information on the whole ITT affair. In December, 1971, three months before Jack Anderson's Dita Beard story, O'Brien had sent a letter to John Mitchell asking whether there might be a connection between "ITT's sudden largesse to the Republican Party and the nearly simultaneous out-of-court settlement of one of the biggest merger cases in corporate history."

Even after the confusing ITT story faded

from the headlines, O'Brien and the DNC refused to drop the issue. The statements and publications that came from O'Brien's office during this period were remarkably prescient. In one DNC publication, *Fact*, a box entitled "Watch This Man" itemized the wheelings and dealings of the President's personal attorney, Herbert Kalmbach, a man at that time virtually unknown.

To those close to the President, O'Brien looked like a dangerous man. He had the dope on ITT, and ITT was what frightened the Administration the most.

Another indication of the White House concern over ITT was John Dean's conversation with General Vernon Walters, deputy director of the CIA, in February, 1973. Referring to a burglary of the Chilean embassy in Washington nearly a year earlier—in which the intruders took documents rather than property—Dean told Walters he believed that Frank Sturgis, a Watergate burglar and former CIA employee, was involved. In April of this year Dean told James Schlesinger, then director of the CIA, that several CIA veterans who had been involved in Watergate had taken part in the Chilean embassy incident. The apparent motive for the burglary was to search for documents exposing ITT's plans to subvert the Allende government in Chile.

Meanwhile, a special group made up of Colson, John Ehrlichman, and Fred Fielding of Dean's staff was on plumbing duty at the White House, examining the ITT documents that had not yet hit print. To their horror they realized that copies of some of the most potent evidence were still unaccounted for. This was the fear that led Colson to compose his memorandum of March 30, 1972, outlining the evidence that could implicate the President and Mitchell:

"A memo sent to the Vice President addressed 'Dear Ted' from Ned Gerrity [or ITT] tends to contradict John Mitchell's testimony because it outlines Mitchell's agreement to talk to McLaren [head of the Justice Department's antitrust division, the man who had pushed the case against ITT] following Mitchell's meeting with [ITT President Harold] Geneen."

"It would carry some weight in that the memo was written contemporaneous with the meeting. Both Mitchell and Geneen have testified that they discussed policy only, not this case, and that Mitchell talked to no one else. The memo further states that Ehrlichman assured Geneen that the President had 'instructed' the Justice Department with respect to the bigness policy. (It is, of course, appropriate for the President to instruct the Justice Department on policy, but in the context of these hearings, that revelation would lay this case on the President's doorstep.) . . .

"There is a [Herb] Klein to Haldeman memo, dated June 30, 1971, which of course precedes the date of the ITT settlement, setting forth the \$400,000 arrangement with ITT. Copies were addressed to Magruder, Mitchell, and Timmons. This memo put the A. G. [Mitchell] on constructive notice at least of the ITT commitment at that time and before the settlement, facts which he has denied under oath. We don't know whether we have recovered all the copies. . . . In short, despite a search, this memo could be lying around anywhere at 1701 [Pennsylvania Avenue, CRP headquarters]."

The memo implicating Mitchell was still at large; the even more explosive evidence concerning Nixon was in the files of the Security and Exchange Commission, and thus, far from invulnerable. To Colson the danger was clear: "Kleindienst is not the target, the President is. . . . Make no mistake, the Democrats want to keep this case alive, whatever happens to Kleindienst."

O'Brien had been the most effective adversary on ITT. The consequences of his obtaining the missing memos could be disastrous. Finding out how much he knew—

and, if necessary, preventing him from using what he did have—might easily have justified an operation like the Watergate burglary.

One reason why the ITT-Watergate connection has not been explained is that John Dean, who appeared to expose every other White House intrigue, did not mention ITT in his testimony. Dean's silence may have been based on self-interest, since Dean had been intimately involved in the original ITT settlement.

The limited mind set which saw the Watergate scandal in one category and the ITT scandal as a separate entity has also blocked a thorough investigation of both episodes and their cover-ups. What no one seemed to realize is that events build on themselves and that scandal does not respect jurisdictional boundaries. The special prosecutor, Archibald Cox, now has the wayward memos that Colson panicked about in his letter to Haldeman. Perhaps the memos will help Cox develop the theoretical framework the Watergate Committee has found so elusive.

LIFTING WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS COULD SOLVE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, commonsense tell us that freedom and liberty have been proven as the best way to allocate resources. I enclose the following article by Henry Hazlitt which makes so much commonsense.

I would urge Mr. Hazlitt's solution to the energy crisis as better than any that the Government can come up with.

The article follows:

LIFTING WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS COULD SOLVE ENERGY CRISIS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The President's broadcast proposals for dealing with the energy crisis left out the most important step of all. This would be to remove immediately, at every level, all price controls on gasoline and other petroleum products.

No other measure proposed by the President compares in urgency with this. Look at the effect on demand. A rise in the price of fuel oil and gasoline, as a result of the shortage, will put immediate pressure on practically every consumer to conserve its use and reduce his consumption. This applies to profit-seeking and loss-avoiding corporations as well as to the overwhelming majority of private car drivers. There could be a prodigal here and there who will not change his habits; but this will be of minor quantitative importance. There is no other form of rationing as quick and efficacious as rationing by the market or by the purse.

Now let us look at the effect on supply. It is being generally assumed that in the present oil and gasoline crisis an increase in prices (and so in profit margins) cannot increase the supply. This is quite wrong. It can speed up transportation and deliveries. It can lead to the re-opening and working of marginal wells that did not pay out at lower prices. It can stimulate exploration. It can also stimulate and help to provide the funds for new refining capacity.

Above all, it can enable Americans to compete on at least equal terms with the nationals of other countries in bidding for the available supplies of oil from abroad. The higher the price they can get, the more oil the producing countries will be tempted to explore for, pump and export. This applies even to the Arab countries that are threaten-

ing to shut us off. If they carry out their threats in full, they will be cutting off their own noses. The higher world prices go, moreover, the more the Arab lands will be tempted to double-cross each other.

Let's say countries A, B, C, D and E together produce 40 per cent of the world's annual petroleum supply. They can raise world prices only by reducing their annual output. They can do this by entering into a pact in which each agrees to reduce his production by a uniform percentage. They can get the higher world price, but each country has less oil to sell. Meanwhile, oil producers in countries outside the area of the pact also have the advantage of the higher price rise, but can in addition sell at that price all the oil they are capable of producing.

It occurs to nation A, a member of the pact, that if it secretly fails to cut its production by the amount it agreed to, it can sell more oil at the higher price brought about by the restricted output of countries B, C, D and E. But this idea may occur to any one of the five. In any case, Americans ought to be allowed to bid for foreign oil without restriction, and not merely to pass on the higher cost, but to make whatever profit a free competitive market will allow.

If oil and gas prices continue to be held down by arbitrary controls, however, most of the "voluntary" measures that the President recommends—driving cars less, reducing speeds, forming car pools, lowering temperatures in the homes by six degrees—may meet with negligible compliance. Excellent advice for the other fellow, nearly everyone will agree; I hope he follows it.

Some of the President's advice itself is needlessly confused. "We must ask everyone to lower the thermostats in your home by at least six degrees." Taken literally, this would mean that if you previously kept your home at 78, you should lower it to 72, but if you previously kept it at 68 you should lower it to 62.

Again, the advice to drive less and form car pools may not carry as much weight as otherwise to listeners who have followed Mr. Nixon's flights every few days to one or another of his homes in California, Maryland and Florida.

(The weekend before his oil conservation talk, Mr. Nixon suddenly, according to the New York Times account, "rushed from the White House (with only a minimum support staff of about a dozen Secret Service agents and other personnel) and got on the helicopter which took him to Andrews Air Force Base to board his Boeing 707 jet before the press office could assemble the pool . . . the press plane—a chartered commercial jet—left two and a half hours later." It has been calculated that the President's official plane burns 2,000 gallons of jet fuel each hour of flight.

The President has proposed heating oil rationing and contingency plans for gasoline rationing. Some temporary allocation system may prove unavoidable. But compulsory rationing can tend to have the opposite effect from that intended. It merely shifts competition from the market to the political arena. Every pressure group frames plausible arguments for special treatment. Everybody buys up to his quota for fear he may later be cut off.

What is most disheartening about some of Mr. Nixon's new proposals is that once more they call for the solving of a problem by throwing more money at it—more government spending, more government intervention, the creation of still another army of bureaucrats. Do we really need a new government department or agency to tell us that we ought to increase our refining capacity, use more coal, develop more nuclear power, and all the rest? Would it immediately decrease or increase our energy supplies to force electric utilities to convert from oil to coal?

The best part of Mr. Nixon's proposals are

those that call for less rather than more government intervention—such as relaxing environmental standards, allowing the Alaska pipeline to be built, ending government regulation of natural gas prices, and the like.

Past experience suggests that government intervention can be counted on to do precisely the wrong thing. In 1959, when it was argued that American-produced oil was selling too low because too much oil was being produced internationally, President Eisenhower imposed a restrictive quota on oil imports by sea. That quota remained in effect until a year or two ago.

When we should have been conserving our domestic oil supplies, increasing our shortage capacity and refinery capacity, and importing, refining, storing and burning foreign oil (which we could have gotten much cheaper) we did the exact opposite. Let's be careful that we do not act with equal folly now.

**OUR NATION SALUTES LOCAL 250,
URW, AFL-CIO ON ITS 30TH AN-
NIVERSARY**

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the day-by-day task—most times, regrettably, unheralded—in the constant quest for improving the quality of life for all of our fellow-Americans is carried out laboriously by those men and women who truly do the work of our country and produce all of the goods and services that contribute to and truly make our Nation the promised land for all those who would share in the American dream and good life. The success and happiness of the workmen, workingwomen and their families depend in large measure upon the harmony and effectiveness of management-employee relations in the industry where they earn their living. In my hometown of Wayne, the Mack-Wayne Plastic Co. has achieved outstanding success in the marketplace and is a source of great pride to the residents of our community. In maintaining its economic vitality and viability as a corporate entity we are indeed proud of its workmanship and business enterprise in our Nation's industry.

The employee relations at Mack-Wayne is spearheaded by Local 250, URW, AFL-CIO which has achieved a bond of understanding and communion among the administrative officers and employees that has over the years earned the prestige and respect of our community as a good place to work. This year marks the 30th anniversary of the charter establishing Local 250, URW, AFL-CIO as the employees' collective bargaining unit of Mack-Wayne. In celebrating the commemoration of this 30th anniversary of the employees' union at Mack-Wayne, I wish to bring to your attention and commend to you and our other colleagues here in the House the outstanding accomplishments and good works of all of the members and officers of Local 250 of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, AFL-CIO. The current officers are as follows:

Executive Officers: The Honorable Gordon Beck, President; Herb Jennings, Vice-Presi-

dent; Stephen Kopach, Secretary; John H. Kookan, Treasurer; Andy Millarck, Sentinel. Executive Board: The Honorable Frank Potanka, Fred Hoffman, Charles Robbins, John Mogielnicki, Foster Thompson, Earl Decker and Bob Reitz.

Trustees: Hon. James Vandermeiden, chairman; Hon. Jeff Jacobus; and Hon. Elaine Rydzik.

A 30th anniversary observance honoring the officers and members of Local 250 was recently held in New Jersey. The honored guests were: Hon. Joseph Ugrovitch, international representative; Hon. Peter Bommarito, international president; Hon. John H. Kookan, Local 250 treasurer; Hon. John Baldante, international representative; Hon. Edward Neilly, international representative; and Hon. James McIntosh, president of Mack-Wayne.

Members of the program committee were: Hon. Herb Jennings, cochairman; Hon. Earl Decker, cochairman; Hon. Gordon Beck; Hon. Alice Losey; Hon. Foster Thompson; Hon. Ann Marion; Hon. Bob Reitz; Hon. Ethel Slawson; and Hon. Steve Kopach.

I know you will be most interested in the following historic chronicle of the cooperative efforts of this union's accomplishments, both for the success of management and the success of the employees, as prepared and presented by their membership at this celebration:

HISTORY OF LOCAL 250, URW, AFL-CIO

On September 1, 1943 a charter was granted to Mack Molding employees and our old Plastic Workers, Inc., became Local 250 United Rubber Workers of America.

The following names appear on the charter: Charles Dulanto, Pasquale Ruggiero, Ellen Sisco, M. Tollonitsch, Irene Bankos, Tim O'Keefe, Charles Herman, Jo Brinster, William Bowersox, Myron Boyce, Tony Conti, Ann Harvie, John Pelak, Al Heroski, Ray White, Jo Jackson, Irv Jacobus, John Lynch and Anny Rydzik. Of these nineteen—six are still Mack employees but only one is still a union member.

John Baldante was assigned to help us organize and was our first Field Representative from our International Union. The officers of the old union were unanimously elected as officials of the new Local. Charles Dulanto, President; A. Rydzik, Vice President; T. O'Keefe, Treasurer; Kay Breitenbach, Secretary; Ellen Sisco, Chairman of the Executive Board. It was the custom for years for the Executive Board to elect its own chairman at its first meeting. The International By-Laws a few years ago made the President automatically the chairman. Kay, our secretary, resigned shortly after we organized and Pat Ruggiero took her place.

Our first Negotiating Committee was C. Dulanto, A. Rydzik, P. Ruggiero, T. O'Keefe and E. Sisco with John Baldante guiding and teaching us along the way. On January 24, 1944 our first contract was finally signed. The Company gave us check-off of dues for those members who would sign authorization cards. Many of us did, but a great many preferred to pay their own dues, making the first few Treasurers' job much more difficult than it is today. Our Union recognition was only a maintenance of membership for the life of the agreement (one year) then a fifteen day withdrawal period. Believe us we made sure we didn't arrange a meeting to accept the contract during that period. Most people kept their membership during negotiations so they could hear what went on and so they could vote and by that time the fifteen days were gone and the Union was safe for another year. We had a very few withdrawals but most of the members stuck

with the new Local. Finally in 1950 six years later we won a Union Shop with a very few exceptions, which supposedly had a religious reason. This gave the Union not only financial security but also the security of knowing that if a certain group disagreed about something they could no longer withdraw or try to organize with a rival union. It also put us in a much better bargaining position.

In 1950 we started a building fund. The members were assessed fifty cents per month for this fund. In 1954 we purchased our present headquarters complete with mortgage. The building is now completely ours. Many improvements have been made through the years.

In 1954 we went from a one-year contract to a two-year contract. We also started to have our officers elected to serve a two-year term instead of the one year they had previously served. Year after year since its inception, the Union has been responsible for many changes in the contract that benefited the employees, both with regard to pay increases and the addition of many fringe benefits. The two things we had to fight the hardest and the longest for was for the Union Shop in 1950 and Pension Plan that we finally received in our contract.

In this our Thirtieth Anniversary, we look back on thirty years of service and association, that any Union would be proud to acknowledge.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege and honor to seek national recognition of the good works of Local 250 and respectfully request that you join with me in saluting and extending our best wishes and congratulations to their officers and members in commemoration of the 30th anniversary of their charter and organization as a leading union of employees who truly enrich the quality of life in our community, State, and Nation.

SIMAS KUDIRKA

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on this date, I would like to ask my colleagues to pause for a moment and reflect with me on the unjust imprisonment of a Soviet Lithuanian seaman whose crime was to seek asylum in our country. Simas Kudirka was imprisoned 3 years ago on November 23, in Soviet Russia, after he jumped from his fishing trawler onto the USS *Vigilant*, a U.S. Coast Guard cutter. He was returned to his ship by the American authorities, and has been neither seen nor heard from since. We were informed, however, that his attempts gained him a prison sentence in Russia.

Since that date 3 years ago, regulations have been issued to the effect that should a similar incident arise in the future, the United States will immediately grant asylum. But that does not help Simas Kudirka.

I have written to Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, and to Ambassador Dobrynin. I have met with Kenneth Rush, Marshall Wright, and John Armitage of the State Department. And still I have received no satisfactory response concerning either the welfare or the release of Simas Kudirka.

This week, I applied for a visa to visit Simas Kudirka in the Soviet Union. I have not yet received word as to whether or not my request will be granted, but I plan to pursue the matter until I do get satisfaction.

As I said in my letter to Dobrynin, I hope and pray that the Soviet Union and the United States can bring peace and understanding to our troubled world. Such an achievement is only possible, I believe, if we can alleviate human suffering and misunderstanding. For this reason, I have asked for the Soviet Government's assistance in this noble quest by demonstrating their basic human compassion for Simas Kudirka and his family.

I hope my colleagues will offer whatever assistance they are able to achieve this end.

CALDWELL HIGH: OHIO'S TOP CLASS "A" CROSS-COUNTRY SQUAD

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I take this opportunity to salute Caldwell, Ohio, High School's outstanding cross-country team—Ohio's State champions in class "A" cross-country competition for 1973.

Under the expert leadership of Coach Rod O'Donnell, the Redskin Warriors established themselves as the premier class "A" cross-country team in the State as they bested 10 other schools and outpaced their nearest rival by 11 points in the final standings.

In 3 short years of competing in the cross-country title meet, Caldwell High School has inched steadily upward; 2 years ago, turned in a respectable showing, while last season the Redskins finished second. To the delight of the student body of Caldwell High and all the citizens of Caldwell, the team won it all in 1973. Already, they are talking about an encore.

The class "A" cross-country title Coach O'Donnell's long distance men brought home was the first State championship ever won by a Noble County team, competing in a major sport.

In addition, the victory marked the first time in the history of State cross-country competition that three members of the same team finished in the top 10—a fact all the more impressive when considering that 70 runners started the race.

Dugan Hill, senior cocaptain of the Redskins, finished fourth in a time of 10:23 setting the pace for the Caldwell State champs.

Brian Jonard, a freshman, finished sixth in 10:26 and Chuck Schoepner, senior cocaptain, finished seventh in the same time of 10:26.

Bill Jonard, a sophomore, Don Snodgrass, Jack Cox, and junior Kevin Watson, all contributed to the team victory.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to citing the historic State title run of Caldwell's team, I would also like to comment on the reception these young men received

upon returning home from Columbus. It is obvious from the Journal and Noble County Leader account of their triumphant return that the entire community of Caldwell rallied to welcome the team home. They were greeted by a large crowd, honored by school officials and classmates and given a hero's ride through town.

The tributes paid the team are certainly appropriate. The members of the squad have set a positive example to all who have witnessed their campaign for the State crown.

Congratulations, Dugan, Brian, Chuck, Bill, Don, Jack, Kevin, Coach O'Donnell, and Caldwell High, for a job well done.

FINDINGS OF FACT

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the October 18 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I recounted my experiences in being denied a reserved seat on a flight to Chicago, because American Airlines had oversold the flight. Coincidentally, on the same day, Ralph Nader recovered \$25,010 from Allegheny Airlines for bumping him off a flight on which he, too, had a confirmed reservation, thus causing him to miss a speaking engagement in Connecticut.

Because this reprehensible practice of the airlines deserves to be fully aired, I am including here the text of the decision by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in Nader against Allegheny Airlines:

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

This case came on to be heard before the Court, sitting without a jury, and the Court, having considered the evidence introduced at the trial, the stipulations entered into by the parties, and upon consideration thereof including the arguments of counsel as well as the trial briefs, hereby makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Plaintiff Ralph Nader is a citizen of the United States and resides in the District of Columbia.

2. Plaintiff Connecticut Citizens Action Group (hereinafter CCAG), is a non-profit corporation, organized, and existing under the laws of the District of Columbia and has its principal place of business in Hartford, Connecticut. It is a public interest advocate for environmental and consumer issues arising in the State of Connecticut.

3. Defendant, Allegheny Airlines, Inc., is a corporation having a principal place of business at the Washington National Airport near Alexandria, Virginia. It is an air carrier and holds a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board and is regulated by the laws of the United States relating to such carriers and by the rules, regulations and orders promulgated by the CAB in accordance with the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

4. In the early spring of 1972, CCAG became involved in a controversy over proposed public utility rate increases in Connecticut. CCAG had planned to hold a rate-payers rally on April 28 to raise public support in the Hartford area for CCAG's efforts to oppose

pending electric utility rate increases in particular and for the group's consumer rights activities in general. Mr. Nader, who assisted in the organization of CCAG in April 1971 was scheduled to appear in Storrs, Conn. on April 28, 1972. The director of CCAG ascertained that Mr. Nader would be available and willing to appear as the keynote speaker for the rally, which was then planned to be held over the luncheon hour in downtown Hartford and adequately in advance of Mr. Nader's later appearance that day at Storrs.

5. On Tuesday, April 25, 1972 Plaintiff Nader made a confirmed reservation for Allegheny Flight 864, scheduled to depart Washington National Airport at 10:15 a.m. on April 28, 1972 with arrival at Hartford, Connecticut's Bradley International Airport at 11:15 a.m.

6. In reliance upon Mr. Nader's confirmed reservation on Allegheny's Flight 864 on April 28, 1972, CCAG's representatives began on Wednesday, April 26, 1972 to distribute flyers for the 12:15 p.m. rally on April 28, 1972. CCAG had also planned to use the noontime rally to take advantage of Mr. Nader's great popularity and influence in the State of Connecticut to generate "spill over" contributions in CCAG's 1972 fund drive. Also based on Mr. Nader's commitment the CCAG was able to enlist the appearance of the Mayor of Hartford and President of the City Council at the rally to endorse CCAG's efforts to be allowed to intervene as full parties in the State's utility rate proceedings. As a result of these efforts at least 1,000 people arrived for the rally just before the scheduled stated time.

7. Plaintiff Nader's ticket was picked up from a travel agent in downtown Washington, D.C. on the morning of April 28, 1972. On the same morning he arrived at approximately 10:05 a.m. at the main terminal building of Washington National Airport. He was advised to proceed to Gate 17 on the lower level. There, upon presentation of his confirmed reservation and ticket he was denied boarding on Flight 864 because it had been oversold by the Defendant Allegheny Airlines, Inc.

8. The Plaintiff Nader then inquired of Allegheny Agent at Gate 17, John McDonald, as to whether there were any stand-bys already on board the plane or whether there were any passengers who would volunteer to give him his seat. Mr. McDonald refused to make either inquiry.

9. The Plaintiff Nader informed Mr. McDonald at the departure gate of the likely harm that would occur to him and Plaintiff CCAG if the Defendant refused to honor his confirmed reservation, but all Mr. McDonald did was to offer the Plaintiff Nader another flight to Hartford via Philadelphia on a fifteen-passenger plane which was scheduled to arrive in Hartford at 12:10 p.m., some 55 minutes after the scheduled arrival of Flight 864 in Hartford on April 28, 1972. As a result of Allegheny's conduct, Mr. Nader incurred \$7.00 in long distance telephone expenses and \$3.00 in the additional cost of a ticket to Boston. (From Boston Mr. Nader travelled by car to Storrs.)

10. CCAG's director informed the crowd at the rally that Mr. Nader could not appear as scheduled. The crowd of 1,000 dwindled to about 200 persons who remained to hear the Mayor, the Council President and CCAG's Director, Mr. Moffett, speak. CCAG lost the contributions expected to be generated both at the rally and by canvassing and direct mail solicitations of persons whose names were to be obtained at the rally or as a result thereof. Furthermore, CCAG suffered extreme and very real embarrassment, loss of professional esteem and prestige throughout the State of Connecticut as a result of Mr. Nader's failure to appear as advertised. CCAG also incurred \$50 to send a car to Boston to pick up Mr. Nader and transport him to Storrs.

11. Allegheny Airlines has a practice of sys-

tematically overbooking its flights by accepting more confirmed reservations and selling more tickets for a flight than the number of seats which are actually available on its aircraft.

12. Over-booking by Allegheny is substantial. In April, 1972, according to the record herein the company bumped 945 persons, and during the period from January 1969 through August 1972 some 15,929 persons were not accommodated on Allegheny flights for which they had confirmed reservations. During April, 1972, 18 Allegheny flights between Washington and Hartford were over-sold or overbooked with the result that some 48 confirmed reservation-passengers were left stranded.

13. Allegheny is and was at all times pertinent herein aware of the fact that its over-booking practice inevitably resulted in denials of boarding to some persons on some flights who held confirmed reservations, and it is further aware that this practice does in fact cause severe distress and financial loss to persons who rely upon confirmed reservations.

14. Through advertising and other means Allegheny holds itself out and represents itself to the public that it offers reliable reservation policies which, if available and confirmed, will assure any prospective passenger of a seat on the flight designated in the confirmed reservation.

15. There is nothing in the advertising of the defendant which makes the public aware of the Defendant's practice of intentional over-booking of its flights or the fact that this over-booking practice does in fact create a substantial risk that confirmed reservations will be dishonored. Nor is the public advised in detail of the over-booking practice in the tariffs filed with the CAB or of the fact that all members of the Air Transport Association, of which the Defendant is a member, intentionally sell more tickets than they have seats for their particular flights. In fact, the Court finds that the Defendant and its agents conceal their over-booking practice from the public and furthermore did so in this case, which intentional over-booking resulted in financial harm and damages to each of the Plaintiffs herein.

16. Prior to April 28, 1972 neither Plaintiff was made aware of Allegheny's intentional over-booking policy or of the fact that Flight 864 between Washington and Hartford in particular was intentionally overbooked. The fact that Plaintiff knew from previous experience that other airlines such as American and Eastern over-booked flights, did not make either Plaintiff aware of the fact that the Defendant in the case at bar did this or that it also engaged in such practices.

17. Each Plaintiff relied on the Defendant's confirmation of the Plaintiff Nader's reservation as an assurance that he would be accommodated and allowed to board flight 864 and as a result of such reliance each of the Plaintiffs were injured by virtue of Mr. Nader's inability to arrive in Hartford, Connecticut as scheduled.

18. The Civil Aeronautics Board has not attempted to directly regulate the reservations practices of Allegheny or any other airline, but it does require all airlines to tender certain compensation to passengers who are denied boarding on a flight. Such compensation represents liquidated damages for "bumping" claims against the carrier, if accepted. CAB regulations specifically contemplate full judicial redress as an alternative means for the vindication of the aggrieved party's rights, at his sole option. 14 C.F.R. §250.8. (Tr. 160-61).

19. Forthwith upon denying boarding to Mr. Nader, Allegheny conveyed to him a written instrument containing an offer of settlement, acceptable within 60 days, of his claims arising from the incident, thereby acknowl-

edging its actual notice thereof and waiving any requirement for further action on his part within any shorter period.

20. Allegheny's tariff rule requiring written notice of claims within 45 days, if not waived, was literally complied with, since (a) the company's own employee delivered to its offices on the day of the denial of boarding a writing describing the incident and setting forth the amount to be offered to Mr. Nader as liquidated damages, and (b) the tariff does not specify how or by whom the required writing must be given; and (c) a denied boarding transaction is not completed before the tendered compensation is either accepted or rejected by the recipient, and written notice was given to Allegheny by Mr. Nader's representative contemporaneously with the rejection of its settlement offer. Moreover, by its own terms, the rule is inapplicable to the instant case, which involves a claim for damages arising out of Defendant's discrimination, fraudulent misrepresentation and intentional tortious conduct.

21. The Defendant Allegheny Airlines is a common carrier which is licensed or authorized to do business by the Civil Aeronautics Board, as hereinbefore stated, and is the holder of a certificate of public convenience and necessity. As such it has a public duty and an especially large and high fiduciary obligation to make its policies known to all of its customers with regard to its intentional over-booking. The fact that it conceals such practices in its advertising and otherwise, and, by virtue of its failure and refusal to take reasonable steps to avoid harm to the Plaintiffs herein is tantamount to willful and wanton misconduct which gives rise to and provides a proper basis for each of the Plaintiffs' claims for damages.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter (28 U.S.C. 1331, 1332, 1337), *Fitzgerald v. Pan American World Airways*, 229 F.2d 499, 502 (2nd Cir., 1956); moreover, the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds \$10,000.00. The Court also has pendant jurisdiction over any non-federal claims, *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966).

2. The Plaintiff, Mr. Nader, is entitled to both compensatory and punitive damages under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, Section 404(b), 49 U.S.C. § 1374(b). Mr. Nader has established a *prima facie* case of unreasonable discrimination: He possessed a confirmed reservation and ticket, and the resultant right to a seat. The Defendant, who intentionally over-sold the seats, did not honor that priority. The Defendant has failed to sustain its burden of proof that the discrimination was reasonable by demonstrating company policy and why, in this particular case, its policy did not work an "undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever" to Mr. Nader, where the Defendant permitted passengers with subsequent or no reservations to have priority over a passenger with a confirmed reservation who had not been informed of the risks attendant to the Defendant's concealed policy of over-booking. *Archibald v. Pan American World Airways*, 460 F.2d 14, 16-17 (9th Cir. 1972); *Kaplan v. Lufthansa German Airlines*, 12 CCH Av. Law Rep. 17, 933 (E.D. Pa., Civil No. 68-2611, decided 4/9/73); *Mortimer v. Delta Air Lines*, 302 F. Supp. 276, 278 (N.D. Ill. 1969); *Wills v. Trans World Air Lines, Inc.*, 200 F. Supp. 360 (S.D. Cal., 1961).

3. The Defendant, through its agents, servants and employees, knowingly and intentionally misrepresented a material fact, namely that Mr. Nader had a guaranteed reservation for a seat, upon which each of the Plaintiffs relied. *Accord, Isen v. Calvert Corp.*, 379 F.2d 126 (D.C. Cir. 1967); see *Sankin v. 5410 Connecticut Avenue Corp.*, 281 F. Supp.

524 (D.G.D.C. 1968), *aff'd sub nom Benn v. Sankin*, 133 U.S. App. D.C. 361, 410 F.2d 1060 (1969), *cert. denied*, 396 U.S. 1041 (1970). In light of all the evidence in this case, the Plaintiffs' reliance was reasonable and resulted in the injuries and damages which they incurred. It was foreseeable that the Defendant's intentional misrepresentation would be relayed to other members of the public and they would rely upon the Defendant's representation since the Defendant's legal duty is to provide the public with reliable air transportation under its certificate of public convenience and necessity.

4. CCAG is eligible and entitled to recover herein for damages it has incurred due to the Defendant's intentional misrepresentation even though they were not direct parties to the transaction in issue because (1) the misrepresentation was knowingly and intentionally made; privity of contract is not required here; (2) CCAG was within the class of foreseeable plaintiffs (the class is determined by the Defendant's legal duty to the public at large both under its license and by its better position to prevent injury to the public by full disclosure of its practices affecting the public); (3) CCAG made a reasonable reliance on the misrepresentation and was thereby damaged. See Prosser, "Misrepresentation and Third Persons," 19 Vand. L. Rev. 231, 246, 250 (1966); 37 C.J.S., Fraud § 61; 37 Am. Jur. 2d, Fraud and Deceit § 298; *Cf. Rush Factors, Inc. v. Levin*, 284 F. Supp. 85, 90 (1968).

5. Other than \$50 CCAG has not proven its claim for actual damages with sufficient legal precision to permit a specific award of compensatory damages. Even though CCAG probably was less successful in their fund drive due to the loss of prestige and dampening of the drive's momentum when Mr. Nader failed to appear at the rally, their actual loss in fund solicitation is too speculative to provide a basis for an award of compensatory damage. However, the Defendant's intentional misrepresentation did constitute an invasion of CCAG's legal rights, and, therefore, CCAG is entitled to nominal damages. *Chesapeake & Potomac Tel. Co. v. Clay*, 90 U.S. App. D.C. 206, 194 F.2d 888, 890 (1952). See, *Cook Industries, Inc. v. Carlson*, 334 F. Supp. 809 (D.C. Miss 1971); *Oklahoma Natural Gas Corp. v. Municipal Gas Co. of Muskogee*, 113 F.2d 308 (10th Cir. 1940).

6. Punitive damages are awarded against a tortfeasor to punish him for the good of the community for his outrageous conduct and to deter others from such conduct. *Chesapeake & Potomac Tel. Co. v. Clay*, 90 U.S. App. D.C. 206, 194 F.2d 888, 891 (1952). Since the Defendant herein intentionally engaged in substantial overselling, and intentionally did not inform the public of this practice and the attendant risks, and intentionally sought to conceal such information from all its passengers and particularly from the victims of this practice, it is clear that the Defendants acted not only wantonly but with malice. They are, therefore, liable to both plaintiffs for punitive damages for their misrepresentation.

7. Under the Federal Rule and the rule of this district, compensatory damages need not be shown to establish a basis for the assessment of punitive damages. E.g., *Wardman-Justice Motors, Inc. v. Petrie*, 59 U.S. App. D.C. 262, 39 F.2d 512, 516 (1930). Therefore, although the proven damages of the plaintiffs are a nominal sum, the plaintiffs may recover punitive damages.

8. The forty-five (45) day time within which actions may be maintained against the Defendant as set forth in its tariff on file with the CAB is no bar to maintaining this action because of the following:

(a) Shortly after dishonoring Mr. Nader's reservation on Flight 864, the Defendant sent him a written instrument, giving him sixty (60) days within which to accept in com-

plete settlement of all claims against the Defendant; and

(b) The aforesaid sixty (60) day offer of settlement and tender of liquidated damages was a written acknowledgement of the Defendant's actual notice of Plaintiff's claims and thereby waived any further action on Plaintiff's part within a lesser period of time; and

(c) The rule is inapplicable to claims for damages for personal injuries arising out of the Defendant's discriminatory, deceitful and intentional tortious conduct; and

(d) The CAB consumer's guide states that passengers have at least 90 days to file a claim, coterminous with the three-month period carriers are required to maintain their ticket records.

CONCLUSION

By virtue of the foregoing, an order will be entered of even date herewith awarding the Plaintiff Nader \$10.00 in compensatory damages and \$25,000 as punitive damages of and from the Defendant. The Plaintiff CCAG is awarded \$51.00 in nominal damages and \$25,000 in punitive damages, of and from the Defendant.

CHARLES R. RITCHIE,
U.S. District Judge.

Dated: October 18, 1973.

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENCY

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, many of the citizens of my congressional district have been quite concerned about the flow of events regarding the Watergate situation. And many of them feel that the office of the Presidency—the executive branch of our Government—is being undermined by actions of both the legislative and judicial branches.

I have recently received a letter signed by a number of my constituents on this issue. I commend to my colleagues their comments on the separation of powers: *Members of the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate:*

We a segment of the people dare to state that the issue which now faces this Nation is not Watergate but the destruction of the Presidency, the Executive branch of government.

The Presidency is the only elective office where all the issues are brought before the people—conservative, liberal or moderate—for majority approval.

To lessen the powers of the President in any degree would be a treasonable act of a magnitude that reduces Watergate to insignificance.

The pertinent question is not what the President actually should or should not have done pertaining to the tapes and documents, but the fact is that the Judiciary actually issued a decree to force the office of the Presidency into subjection. This is as unconstitutional as the President subjecting the Legislative or Judicial to the Executive branch.

The President is not subject to the Judiciary processes of the court and to submit to such action is to reduce the power of the Executive office.

For the Presidency to obey a court order that would force the office of the Presidency into a submissive position before the legislative or judicial branches would be a violation of his oath of office to uphold the

Presidency and the separate balance of power of the Executive, Judicial and Legislative branches.

For the members of the House and Senate to allow such usurpation by the Judiciary to go unchallenged would be a violation of your oath of office.

If the President is guilty of high treason or crimes that warrant punishment, then let it be done under the Constitutional provision of impeachment in the House and trial in the Senate on presentation of evidence.

We feel the future of this government under the Constitution rests in your hands and your ability as members of this body to maintain the balance of power between the Judicial, Legislative and Executive regardless of your personal feelings pertaining to the President.

At stake is not Mr. Nixon, but the office of the Presidency and should be clearly so stated.

May God help you in your deliberation.

Stephen Lee Adams, William A. Edwards, Samuel Adams, Obie Cook, Samuel Gary Adams, Lyle Mays, Jo Ann Adams, Bobbie Mays, Sam Acuff, Mrs. W. B. Willingham, Winborn Willingham, Coy Riddle, Phillis Edwards, Rachel Hudson.

PRESIDENT NIXON RECEIVES HIGH PRAISE FOR COURAGEOUS LEADERSHIP FOR PEACE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, to those critics who have punctuated their cries for President Nixon's resignation by claiming that he has already lost the capacity to govern, the administration's assertion of leadership in the Middle East crisis seems to prove otherwise.

Israel's Premier, Golda Meir went out of her way on Tuesday to praise what she described as President Nixon's courageous stand in the face of the "Soviet threat" at the end of October. Mrs. Meir said:

We are convinced that thanks to the alert declared by the President of the United States in the American Armed Forces undesirable developments were averted. The result was that the Soviet Union preferred to cooperate with the United States in order to prevent a deterioration of the situation which would surely have been brought about by the unilateral Soviet measures.

Moreover, the President's initiatives to mobilize the Nation to voluntarily conserve fuel have been well-received by the American people.

The Buffalo Evening News in their November 13 editorial recognized the President's continuing ability to lead:

NO "INCAPACITY" EVIDENCE HERE

To those critics who have punctuated their cries for President Nixon's resignation by claiming that he has already lost the capacity to govern, the administration's assertion of leadership in two crucial areas last week is a telling reply. Neither the world response to Mr. Nixon's Middle Eastern diplomacy nor the domestic response to his initiatives in mobilizing a nationwide effort to voluntarily conserve fuel seems to have suffered any great impairment as a result of his Watergate problem.

On the contrary, presidential initiatives in the Middle East, exercised through his fast-moving secretary of state, Henry Kissinger, have been instrumental in producing a ceasefire, thereby greatly improving prospects for the difficult negotiations that lie ahead.

As for the energy shortage, the President spoke candidly to the nation, and the plans he outlined are winning public acceptance as well as follow-up support from Congress and state and local officials. All of which suggests that this nation is quite well able to compartmentalize a problem like the Watergate scandal and, even while voicing dismay at the administration's handling of that, still rally to support its needed initiatives in other areas.

None of this is to discount Mr. Nixon's protracted difficulties related to Watergate, or to minimize the severe erosion of confidence his administration has suffered there. As to that, though, the President seems in recent days to be calling for a real change of signals. Whether it was the recent wave of resignation demands from formerly strong supporters that stung him, or GOP reactions to last week's adverse election returns, he has evidently been persuaded to treat his Watergate crisis more seriously and deal with it more openly.

Thus, the White House plans to disclose to the public the content of the secret tapes, as well as other presidential papers, after they have gone to the Watergate grand jury, and the President promises to answer all questions about Watergate in small-group meetings with Republican members of the House and Senate. These moves recognize the seriousness of the President's Watergate credibility problem and face in the right direction of more openness than had been visible in many prior responses.

Admittedly, such steps are coming late in the game. The President, as we've said before, has been too grudging, too insulated. His changes of fully recovering public confidence would have been better a few weeks ago, before any of his erstwhile supporters had taken the drastic, one-way jump of advocating his resignation. But there is still a tremendous reservoir of public fair-mindedness, of men and women still withholding judgment, and certainly the President's best hope of winning their support is with a show of all the forthright candor and openness he can muster.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, 55 years ago, the Latvian nation proclaimed its independence. After centuries of foreign domination, the Latvian people took their rightful place among the free and sovereign nations of the world.

After World War II, the Latvian nation lost its freedom to Russian domination. For the Latvian people, an era of freedom and sovereignty was brought to an abrupt and final end.

Yet, 30 years of Russian domination has not dimmed the Latvian peoples' devotion to the cause of freedom. Their desire for freedom cannot be stifled by their Russian captors. The desire for freedom, once created, cannot be destroyed.

On November 18, Latvians throughout the world will celebrate the 55th anniversary of Latvian Independence Day. This day stands as a reminder to free people everywhere, of the freedom the people of Latvia once possessed and the arrogant way in which this freedom was taken from them.

In view of the shameless events surrounding Latvian domination, I share most deeply and sincerely the sentiment that they hold for this day.

RAPE VICTIM BILL REINTRODUCED WITH 37 COSPONSORS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing, along with 37 of my distinguished colleagues, an important proposal to combat one of our fastest growing, least understood and least reported crimes—the crime of rape. This proposal would establish, within the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Center for the Control and Prevention of Rape. This Center would be responsible for financing and conducting research and demonstration programs into the causes, consequences, prevention, treatment and control of rape. The Center would both expand and intensify research into the causes of the crime and the motivations of the offenders. Perhaps most importantly, though, it would work with the Justice Department to study the rape laws themselves as well as the procedures surrounding the enforcement of those laws with the goals of determining the reasons for the low rate of rape convictions and drafting a model rape law.

This legislation will help this Nation move toward a more responsive, more humane system for dealing with rape victims and a more effective law for dealing with the perpetrators of this crime. It should help us move toward adequately protecting women's rights to physical security, to peace of mind, and to move about as freely as men.

I call upon my House colleagues to join us in this effort, and to swiftly enact this important first step in freeing American women from the threat of rape, and allowing them to move about more freely in our society.

So that my colleagues may closely examine this legislation, the text of the Rape Control and Prevention Act follows:

THE RAPE CONTROL AND PREVENTION ACT

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Rape Prevention and Control Act".

NATIONAL CENTER FOR CONTROL AND PREVENTION OF RAPE

SEC. 2. Section 11 of the National Mental Health Act (63 Stat. 421) is amended by inserting the subsection designation "(a)" immediately before the first sentence and by

CXIX—2356—Part 28

adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) (1) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall establish within the National Institute of Mental Health a center to be known as the National Center for the Control and Prevention of Rape (hereinafter referred to as the 'Center').

"(2) The Secretary, acting through the Center, shall conduct a continuing study and investigation of—

"(A) the effectiveness of existing Federal, State, and local laws dealing with rape;

"(B) the relationship, if any, between traditional legal and social attitudes toward sexual roles, the act of rape, and the formulation of laws dealing with rape;

"(C) the treatment of the victims of rape by law enforcement agencies, hospitals, or other medical institutions, prosecutors, and the courts;

"(D) the causes of rape, identifying to the degree possible—

"(i) social conditions which encourage sexual attacks;

"(ii) motivations of offenders, and

"(iii) the impact of the offense on the victim and the families of the victim;

"(E) sexual assaults in correctional institutions;

"(F) the actual incidence of forcible rape as compared to the reported cases and the reasons therefor; and

"(G) the effectiveness of existing private, and local and State government, education and counseling programs designed to prevent and control rape.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Center to—

"(1) compile, analyze and publish and annually submit, through the Secretary, to Congress a summary of the continuing study conducted under subsection (b) and the research and demonstration projects conducted under Sec. 3 with recommendations where appropriate;

"(2) develop and maintain an information clearinghouse with regard to—

"(A) the prevention and control of rape;

"(B) the treatment and counseling of the victims of rape and their families; and

"(C) the rehabilitation of offenders;

"(3) compile and publish training materials for personnel who are engaged or intend to engage in programs designed to prevent and control rape.

"(d) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

"(e) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for research and development for the prevention and control of rape shall be available for transfer with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Center for such use as is consistent for the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Center for the purposes for which the transfer was made."

"(f) For the purpose of this section and section 281 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act 'rape' shall include forcible, statutory and attempted rape, homosexual assaults, and other criminal sexual assaults."

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 3. The Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2681) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"Part G—Rape Prevention

"SEC. 281. (a) The Secretary, through the National Center for the Control and Prevention of Rape, shall make grants to community mental health centers, non-profit private organizations, and public agencies (determined by the Secretary to be qualified),

for the purpose of conducting research and demonstration projects concerning the control and prevention of rape.

"(b) Projects funded under subsection (a) shall include but not be limited to—

"(1) alternative methods of planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating programs used in the prevention and control of rape, the treatment and counseling of victims of rape and their families, and the rehabilitation of offenders;

"(2) application of methods developed under paragraph (1).

"(c) There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of this part such sums as may be necessary.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to advise, consult with and make recommendations to him on matters relating to rape prevention and control.

"(b) The provisions relating to the composition, terms of office, and reappointment of members of the advisory councils under section 432(a) of the Public Service Act shall be applicable to the committee established under this section, except that the Secretary may include on such committee such additional ex officio members as he deems necessary.

A VICE-PRESIDENTIAL RESIDENCE

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for an official residence in the District of Columbia for the Vice President of the United States.

The establishment of an official residence for the Vice President and his family would be, in a very real sense, a national monument which would belong to all of the people of the United States. The need for such a residence has, in my mind as well as in the minds of a number of my colleagues, become a very real one.

This need was apparent at least as far back as 1965-66 when the 89th Congress authorized the construction of just such a residence on the grounds of the Naval Observatory. On October 20, 1965, the Senate Committee on Public Works pointed out in its report number 914 to accompany S. 2394 that:

It is unrealistic to expect a Vice President in today's world to fulfill his many responsibilities without the aid of an official residence. This may not have been the case in the past, when the Vice-Presidential Office was regarded as something in the nature of an honorary office. This no longer holds true. The Vice President of today is deeply involved in the administration of government and as such deserves a residence befitting the new status of his Office. The social functions in which he is expected to serve as host are matters of no small concern to the Government. They also require so much space, so large a staff and so much expense, that it is altogether unreasonable to expect the Vice President to take care of matters of this kind on his own in his own home.

The then Vice President, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, declined the op-

portunity providing for a Vice Presidential home, thus leaving Public Law 89-386 in effect but dormant.

I feel compelled to introduce this legislation as a result of observations and conclusions I reached during the hearings recently completed by my Government Activities Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, concerning Federal expenditures for security purposes at the LBJ Ranch, Hyannisport, San Clemente, and Key Biscayne.

The Senate Public Works Committee Report Number 914 from which I already quoted expressed its concern for the security of the Vice President when it stated:

The committee believes it is fitting and proper that an official residence be provided for the Vice President. In today's atmosphere of turmoil and trouble throughout the world which requires stability and continuity in our two highest public offices and with the need for security so dramatically brought out by President Kennedy's assassination. We impose upon the Secret Service the duty of protecting the Vice President, but permit the occupant of the Office to reside at indefensible locations dictated by personal income or wishes. Protecting the Vice President, would be made much less difficult in an official residence whose location could be chosen partly with security precautions in mind.

We in the Government Activities Subcommittee have had testimony as to the large amounts of money expended to protect the past and present holders of the office of the President and Vice President of the United States. While that committee has not yet completed its report, the conclusion is fairly obvious that increasingly significant expenditures of Federal monies are required for the protection of our Vice President as well as our President.

It will be recalled that the security expenditures for the former Vice President Agnew at the home that he had recently purchased in Chevy Chase, Md., amounted to approximately \$125,000. I believe when we recognize that the office of the Vice-Presidency will continue to be a changing one with respect to its occupant, the Federal Government will in the long run save money if it provides for a permanent residence. If such a permanent residence is provided then the question of the propriety of security expenditures and the recoverability of such expenditures will cease to be a question of major concern for the Congress.

The bill which I am introducing today provides for the purchase of an existing property in the District of Columbia as opposed to the authorization to construct a new house as contained in Public Law 89-386.

I believe this distinction is important because—at the present time—we do not have a Vice President. However, contemplating that we will have a confirmation by the Congress of a new Vice President in the near future, it seems apparent that it would be financially prudent to acquire such a residence now. Such action would obviate the need for the expenditures of large sums of money for security purposes at a private residence of our next Vice President as well as all of our future Vice Presidents.

MINNESOTAN WINS TOP RAILROAD PRIZE

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago here in Washington, a young man living in my congressional district, David Schauer of Arlington, Minn., won the first-place \$1,500 scholarship prize from the Railway Progress Institute for his essay on how to prevent nationalization of the Nation's railways.

David, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred J. Schauer of Arlington, is a Life Scout and active in numerous school and community activities. All of us in Minnesota are proud of his accomplishment. Beyond that, however, David's thoughtful commentary touches on a subject of growing concern here in the Congress, and I wish to call attention to his analysis by inserting his essay in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

WHY AND HOW SHOULD WE AVOID GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF THE RAILROADS?

The purpose of this paper is an attempt to explain the "why" and "how" of avoiding government takeover of the nation's railroads.

One reason for preventing government takeover of the railroads was stated by James J. Hill, the famous businessman who built the Great Northern Railway. He wrote: "The experience of state-owned railroads in Europe, in Mexico, and elsewhere, unable to sustain themselves without rates much higher than ours, although labour is far cheaper, our own experience in the conduct of all large undertakings by the government, proves that the work would cost from 50 per cent more to several times as much as now. This added cost, together with the disadvantages of an inferior service, would fall on the people."¹

Many railroads in Europe suffer great losses as a result of nationalization. According to U.S. News and World Report, the British and Italian railroads lose between 300 and 600 million dollars a year and the French railroads lose around 900 million dollars annually.²

Another reason for preventing government takeover is the effect of constant pork barreling by the members of Congress, the probable controlling body of the nationalized railroads. This constant congressional pork barreling for unnecessary lines would lead to further monetary losses.

To prevent government takeover, the railroads of America must be allowed to do two things. First, Congress must remove several anti-trust and monopoly laws so the railroads can consolidate into several big systems. The reason for this removal of laws was given by James J. Hill. He stated: "A railroad is a natural monopoly. There is room for only so many in a given territory. If there are two lines where one would suffice, the added burden falls on the public. A railroad must either earn money to operate it, or borrow. In either case the people foot the bill."³

¹ James J. Hill, *Highways of Progress* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, May, 1910), p. 134.

² "Future of Passenger Trains," *U.S. News and World Report* (January 3, 1972), p. 46.

³ James J. Hill, *Highways of Progress* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, May, 1910), pp. 126-127.

James J. Hill's response to having railroads consolidate was this: "The final product must be a number of strong systems, each competent to give to the people of the territory served by it the best service; all competing against one another for the better development of the areas served by them respectively and the sale of their products in the common market."⁴

Second, the railroads must become intermodal, or diversified. The railroads must invest in the other forms of transportation, such as trucking firms, airlines, hotels, ships, telecommunications, and pipelines. They may also invest in such material resources as forests or minerals and haul these same resources.

The Canadian Pacific Railroad is an example of what an intermodal transportation corporation can do. This corporation can move any product to its destination without the product ever leaving the possession of the corporation or having to be transferred to another firm's transportation service. The Canadian Pacific Railroad also earned \$96.1 million in 1972 proving that an intermodal corporation is very profitable.

We have seen that government takeover would result in poor service and public debt. The only way government takeover can be prevented is by having the rail lines consolidate and let the lines compete in providing better service to the customers of its area instead of competing against one another in the same area. The railroads may also become intermodal.

BAN THE HANDGUN—IV

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the article printed below tells the tragic story of a young man slain by a friend while inspecting a pistol they had found. The death of 16-year-old Stanley Williams is grievous evidence that handguns should not be extensively available. The establishment of strict gun controls pertaining to both the acquisition and disposal of these weapons is essential if we are to stop the carnage. The article which appeared in the New York Times follows:

A BRONX YOUTH, 16, IS SLAIN BY FRIEND SHOWING OFF A GUN

Stanley Williams, 16 years old, met with some friends yesterday morning on the roof of a Bronx building to inspect a pistol one of them had said he had found.

One of the youths pointed the pistol at him and pressed the trigger twice. It clicked both times. The third time the pistol, a .38-caliber Smith & Wesson, fired, hitting Stanley in the chest. He was pronounced dead on arrival at Fordham Hospital.

That was the account the dead boy's friends gave the police at the Ninth Detective Division offices after having previously told them that an unidentified youth had shot young Williams in the hallway of the building at 2101 Morris Avenue in which they all lived.

Three youths, whose names were not given by the police because they are juveniles, were brought into the 46th Precinct headquarters for questioning by Ronald Degan, an assistant district attorney.

There, one of the youths told the police that he had found the pistol in the back-

⁴ James J. Hill, *Highways of Progress* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, May, 1910), p. 237.

yard of the building on Thursday and did not know that it was loaded. He said it was passed around among the four boys. The weapon was later found by the police in an air shaft. They said it could not be traced to its original owner.

After further questioning, two youths, both 15-year olds, were booked. One was held on a juvenile delinquency-homicide charge. The other, who had found the gun, was charged with juvenile delinquency and possession of a firearm, and released on his parents' recognizance. Both youths will be brought to Juvenile Court on Monday morning.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, my vote on the motion to override the veto to House Joint Resolution 542 has been reached after many long hours of thought and consultation. These efforts have only strengthened my conviction that this resolution is an abdication of congressional responsibility and a cover-up for its failure to use its constitutional power to restrain presidential warmaking.

The Constitution clearly provides in article I that:

The Congress shall have power . . . : To declare War . . . and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water. To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that use shall be for a longer Term than two years. To provide and maintain a Navy. To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

A reading of U.S. history shows that the Framers of the Constitution vested the warmaking power in Congress as a curb against the excesses in authority experienced under the British monarchy. The Founders had rightly observed that the Executive had a "propensity" for warmaking, as James Madison had pointed out. For this reason, the power to initiate war was entrusted to Congress. House Joint Resolution 542 violates that constitutional trust by allowing a President to wage war without congressional approval and without effective legal restraints.

Until recently Congress acted responsibly in keeping this trust intact. Even when Pearl Harbor was bombed without warning, it was Congress that declared war on the Axis Powers and not the Executive. This resolution, however, would sanction more recent abuses of power as witnessed in Vietnam and Cambodia and move us closer toward one-man military rule.

In carrying out its constitutional duties Congress has already created the necessary structure to review U.S. defense policy and determine by legislation our future commitments. For example, the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees have the responsibility to judge what circumstances require troop deployment and military assistance abroad. This existing structure provides much stronger procedures and safe-

guards than have been established under this resolution.

House Joint Resolution 542 is nothing more than a codification of Congress refusal to act decisively in time of war. It grants the President carte blanche authority to commit our troops anywhere in the world for up to 90 days. We have heard many pious statements that the troops would be withdrawn if Congress disapproved within 60 days.

Unfortunately, these statements completely overlook the reality of the situation. Our experience shows that once a President has committed U.S. forces abroad, it becomes virtually impossible to reverse the momentum of that decision even though it may be totally unwise. We would be drawn inevitably into supporting the President or else be accused of abandoning our troops in the field of battle. There is little doubt that under the 60- to 90-day allowance Congress would have readily approved the deployment of troops to Vietnam, and found itself even today deeply involved in the quagmire of that conflict.

Even if initial support for war should wane, the President would still retain the upperhand by manipulating the POW and MIA issue to his benefit. Is there anyone in this body who would vote to leave our POW's and MIA's behind in a withdrawal. I think not. I find it difficult to believe that we have so quickly lost sight of the meaning of Vietnam—that once a President has unilaterally committed troops overseas, it is virtually impossible for Congress to bring them home. The time for decision is before the fait accompli and not afterwards.

House Joint Resolution 542 contains another serious loophole; it appears to direct the President to consult with Congress "in every possible instance." This language is so loose that the Executive would have the exclusive right to decide whether he had time to consult with anyone before engaging in war. I must strongly disagree with those who argue that Congress has already lost much of its war powers and can only regain them through this resolution. What Congress must do is not surrender its constitutional authority, but use its power of the purse to cut off warmaking funds. I recognize that the supporters of this resolution were motivated by the best of intentions. But I fear that in their zeal to act and to reach what they consider an acceptable compromise, they have sown the seeds of a continuing Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

INDIANA SCHOOLS SET NATIONAL ENERGY EXAMPLE

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues and the American public the energy-saving campaign undertaken by Indiana University in Bloomington and Purdue

University in West Lafayette more than a year ago, long before the current energy crisis.

The farsighted leaders of these two excellent Hoosier educational institutions, President John W. Ryan of Indiana and President Arthur G. Hansen of Purdue, initiated a cost savings program which saved the Indiana taxpayers a combined total of more than \$364,000 in electricity and water bills.

At this point, I would like to share with you separate reports on the cost savings program prepared for me by both universities:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

BLOOMINGTON, IND.—Indiana University is flipping—light switches and water faucets, that is. And many little flips are paying off in big savings.

The Bloomington campus spent \$151,688 less for electricity and water in six months of a Conservation Campaign launched by students, faculty, and staff than it spent in the comparable six months in the previous year, Roger L. Grossnickle, superintendent of utilities and electrical engineering, has reported.

Grossnickle gave a large measure of the credit for the savings to the conservation efforts of the campus community. In the spring semester, posters and stickers for light switch plates and water faucets were distributed over the campus urging users to conserve energy and reminding them that "every drip counts."

Grossnickle compared the second six months of fiscal 1972-73 with the same period in 1971-72, which was before the Conservation Campaign began.

"Though there may be other factors involved that have not been considered, this comparison indicated a saving of \$79,500 in electrical energy alone to say nothing of the lamps, ballasts, bearings, labor, etc., that this amount of electrical energy represents," he said. "The comparison of water bills for the same periods shows that we saved 107,744,000 gallons of water amounting to \$72,188 savings."

Grossnickle also pointed out that the "electrical energy which we did not use also represents the following pollutants that the utility companies did not dump into the Air: sulphur dioxide, 362,000 pounds or 181 tons; nitrous oxides, 120,700 pounds or more than 60 tons, and particulate, 6,106 pounds or more than 3 tons."

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

WEST LAFAYETTE, IND.—Purdue's year-long program to economize through utilities savings paid off in 1972-1973, Vice President and Treasurer Lytle J. Freehafer revealed this week in a letter to all university staff members.

"Take a bow! The combined savings in our utilities budget exceeded 5 per cent, actually totaling \$212,689!" Freehafer said in his letter. "What does that mean individually? At a time when the university's operating funds are critically short, it means that many employees who received pay increases would not have gotten them because these funds otherwise would have literally gone up the stack."

University officials had originally calculated that individual economies—turning off that unneeded light, closing doors to humidity-controlled rooms, using minimal air-conditioning, closing down water usage in laboratories when not needed—would save up to \$180,000.

Water saving alone was an economic and ecological victory in the 1972-1973 fiscal year. The drive resulted in the university pumping 207,000,000 gallons less water than in the previous year, a 10 per cent reduction in a

period in which the Physical Plant Department expected a sharp increase, Freehafer said.

Power usage in the year increased by only 20,000 kilowatt hours, "a drop in the bucket" since the university used 129,400,000 KWH and traditionally has experienced a 6 to 7 per cent annual increase in its purchased and Purdue-generated power requirements.

Freehafer also thanked the student body for its cooperation in the year-long drive to cut down on utility usage to save precious university funds.

SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the past 3 weeks the U.S. Congress has received what has been reported as a record response from the American people concerning the scandal that has become known internationally as Watergate. I am certain that it was this unprecedented response from thousands of citizens that is responsible for Mr. Nixon's decision to back down on the tapes issue, and fostering the gesture of leveling with Republican Members of Congress. However, his dismissal of Special Prosecutor Cox and the seizure of his files gives the public no sense of security that the same will not happen if Mr. Jaworski also decides to take his appointment seriously—a decision to uphold justice at all cost.

The distinguished Senator from the State of Indiana (Mr. BAYH) contributed an article to the November 14 issue of the New York Times concerning the restoration of faith and confidence by congressional appointment of a special prosecutor. I commend it to my colleagues for their reading:

THE PROSECUTOR

(By Birch Bayh)

WASHINGTON.—The appointment of Mr. Jaworski as the new special prosecutor is not responsive to the valid, sustained public demand for an independent prosecution of Watergate and other cases that had been under investigation by Archibald Cox. The appointment of Mr. Jaworski within the executive branch to investigate the executive branch—a person who could be dismissed by the President as abruptly as was Mr. Cox—will, with good cause, fuel public concern that justice is not being pursued thoroughly and without constraint.

Also, the informal agreement that the new special prosecutor can be dismissed only with the agreement of Congressional leaders does not have the force of law. There is nothing that can be done legally to prevent the President from changing his mind, as he did in the case of Mr. Cox, and unilaterally dismissing Mr. Jaworski.

After an exhaustive study I am convinced that a statute giving the United States District Court authority to appoint an independent prosecutor would be upheld.

The first issue with which we must deal is whether the Congress has the power to delegate such an appointment. That power is specifically derived from Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution which states:

"The Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments." These clear words, and the judicial interpretation of them, leave no doubt that Congress is empowered to authorize judicial appointment of an independent prosecutor.

Moreover, there is a law on the books, the constitutionality of which has been sustained, that specifically gives U.S. District Courts authority to appoint U.S. Attorneys to fill vacancies.

The second issue is whether the creation of an officer, subject to dismissal only by the court, violates the separation of powers doctrine. On the contrary, court appointment of an independent prosecutor may be the only means of affirming the separation of powers, and is corollary doctrine of checks and balances.

The separation of powers is not a formal rigid doctrine dividing our Government into watertight compartments. Rather, it is a functional doctrine to assure that checks and balances prevent one branch of Government from assuming unreasonable powers. In the situation now confronting us, it would do violence to this concept of checks and balances to leave within the executive branch the authority for an investigation of the executive branch.

The power to prosecute alleged wrongdoing in the executive branch clearly is among those powers vested by the Constitution in the Government. As Chief Justice Marshall wrote in his classic description of constitutional power: "Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional." (McCulloch v. Maryland).

In this context of Congressional power it is both "appropriate" and "plainly adapted" to the end of prosecuting wrongdoing in the executive branch for Congress to create an office of independent prosecutor.

Also, the "necessary and proper" clause has been held to give Congress certain responsibilities lodged in other branches of Government. While prosecutorial powers traditionally reside in the executive branch, the unusual circumstances created by the President's action necessitates that the Congress share in those responsibilities.

Mr. Jaworski's appointment as special prosecutor is totally inadequate, as any Presidential appointment would be. In light of recent events, the word "special" is meaningless. Independent authority, not special authority, is what the American people demand of a new prosecutor. Congress must respond if we are to restore the public faith and confidence from which a democratic government derives its strength and authority. There is no means left to us for the restoration of that faith and confidence other than the creation of a legal and constitutionally proper independent prosecutor to see that justice is administered fairly, fully and promptly.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, 5 days ago Catherine Hammer was killed

by a handgun during an argument with a friend.

On October 31, my esteemed colleague, the Honorable EARL LANDGREBE, said in an insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Guns owned by private citizens are not the same guns used in crimes by criminals.

But Catherine Hammer's death was not premeditated. The person who killed her probably never committed a crime before.

The article on the murder of Catherine Hammer is from the November 11 Washington Post, and is included below:

WOMAN KILLED, MAN CHARGED

A 43-year-old Prince Georges County woman was shot to death Saturday evening during an argument, county police reported yesterday.

Police said Catherine C. Hammer, 5311 29th Ave., Hillcrest Heights, fell into a dispute with James Hubbard, 56, 3201 E St., SE, about 6:15 p.m. During the argument, police said, she was shot three times with a .32 caliber revolver.

She was pronounced dead on arrival at Prince Georges County Hospital. Police said Hubbard later called county detectives and turned himself in. He has been charged with homicide, according to police.

H.R. 9474 CONTINUED

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to continue my remarks with reference to the Senate amendment to H.R. 9474 which we approved yesterday and returned to the other body for final action.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9474 will benefit more than 2.3 million World War I, World War II, Korean, and Vietnam veterans, their widows, and dependent parents by increasing monthly non-service-connected disability and death pension rates and dependency and indemnity payments by a minimum of 10 percent.

Of particular significance is the amendment approved yesterday providing a lump-sum payment to the surviving veteran and the unmarried widows of those veterans who were so wrongfully victimized in the "Brownsville Incident" of 1906. This provision was originally contained in a separate bill (H.R. 4382), considered by the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension, of which I am a member, during June of this year. The objective of the amendment is substantially the same as contained in the separate House bill in that its purpose is to confer a pensionable status on veterans and the survivors of the veterans involved in the Brownsville incident.

To briefly, recount, the Brownsville incident stemmed from a shooting in the border town of Brownsville, Tex., on the night of August 13, 1906. Around midnight on this date, between 5 and 20 people shot up the town, killed one per-

son, injured another, and discharged between 150 and 300 rounds of ammunition in a space of some 10 minutes. The alleged culprits were members of the Army's all black 25th Infantry Regiment who were stationed just outside the town at Fort Brown.

Without according them a hearing President Theodore Roosevelt ordered all 167 men in the regiment "discharged without honor" and also ordered them "forever debarred from reenlisting in the Army or Navy of the United States, as well as from employment in any civil capacity under the Government." In other words, these men were punished for a crime for which they were never formally charged, tried, or convicted.

It is significant to point out that the 25th Regiment had been the first unit called up for service in Cuba during the Spanish-American War. The unit's capture of El Caney in dawn to dusk fighting enabled Theodore Roosevelt to take San Juan Hill the following day.

On April 6, 1910, a military court of inquiry allowed 14 of the men to reenlist, the remainder were forced to live out their lives under the shadow of their "no honor" discharge.

Today, only one man, 87-year-old Dorsey Willis of Minneapolis, Minn., is still alive out of the original 167 men of the 25th Regiment. For the past 56 years he has spent his life shining shoes in a Minneapolis bank building.

On September 22, 1972—66 years after the Brownsville incident—Secretary of the Army Froehle cleared the soldiers' records and termed their discharges "a gross injustice."

Enactment of H.R. 9474 as amended provides much needed increased benefits to more than 2 million veterans, their wives, and dependent parents; it will help to correct an injustice committed years ago; and, finally, it will enable Dorsey Willis and his wife to live out their remaining years in some degree of financial security.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I again urge our colleagues in the Senate to give final approval to H.R. 9474 at the earliest possible date.

TWO CONNECTICUT RESIDENTS WIN ROBERTO CLEMENTE AWARDS

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, we in Connecticut are extremely proud that two of the nine winners of the first Roberto Clemente Humanitarian Awards are Connecticut residents. They are State Commissioner of Community Affairs Ruben Figueroa and Hartford Newspaper Publisher Juan Fuentes.

The awards were presented by the Roberto Clemente Humanitarian Institute, an organization founded by the

family of the late Pittsburgh Pirates baseball star.

Figueroa was recognized for being the first Puerto Rican to serve as head of a State Department and for his "many tireless evenings trying to help the Puerto Rican community in Connecticut," according to Clemente's widow, Mrs. Carmen Rodriguez-Clemente.

Fuentes, publisher of the Hartford Spanish-language newspaper La Prensa Grafica, was cited for his newspaper work.

Mrs. Clemente said:

He has gone through hurricane and storm to get news from the Island and the mainland to the Spanish community in Connecticut that does not read English.

I would also like to take this opportunity to add my hearty personal congratulations to the many already received by these two distinguished Connecticut citizens.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF A BILL TO ALLOW, FOR FEDERAL INCOME TAX PURPOSES, A DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN INTEREST COSTS INCURRED BY CERTAIN INVEST- MENT DEALERS

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which provides that certain interest costs incurred by dealers in connection with the purchase of tax-exempt obligations will not be disallowed as a deduction for Federal income tax purposes. The bill is designed to correct an inequity that has prevailed in our tax laws far too long.

Under present law, section 265(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 disallows a deduction for interest on indebtedness incurred to purchase or carry Government obligations whose interest is tax exempt. It is quite rational to expect that ordinarily a taxpayer who borrows to purchase tax-exempt bonds should not be allowed a deduction for the interest paid on the loan and then also be exempt on the interest earned on the bond. However, rationality further demands that under certain conditions, modifications of this general principle must be provided. I will explain the justification for such a modification, as provided in my bill, in the case of the security dealer.

A significant part of the business of investment dealers is to underwrite municipal bonds, the interest on which is exempt from Federal income taxes. The dealer performs a service that is analogous to the function the retailer performs in marketing the goods of a manufacturer. The security dealer carries bonds—as inventory—the same as the retailer must maintain an inventory of goods. Furthermore, since much of today's business transactions require op-

erating through the credit market, it is not uncommon for businesses to obtain funds from external sources to maintain their inventories. Similarly, the investment dealers must borrow funds in order to purchase and hold their bonds for sale.

If a security dealer pays a greater interest cost on the loan used to carry the tax-exempt bonds than he receives as a return on the bonds, he incurs a net interest cost. Yet this net cost is not recognized as a legitimate business cost for tax purposes. This is clearly inequitable. No one would doubt that an inequity would exist if a retailer were disallowed a deduction for part of an expense representing a legitimate interest cost of carrying his inventory. So why should it be equitable in one case and not in another? There is no sound reason for this. Thus, my bill asks for an allowable deduction for the interest cost on the loan to the extent it exceeds the interest earned on the bonds. It does not ask for any discriminatory favors. It asks only for fair treatment.

In past years, various dealers in the business of buying and selling municipal bonds have challenged the disallowance of a deduction when the interest costs exceeded the interest income from the bonds. One point that was made by the court in the case of Paul P. Prudden and others—2 B.T.A. 14—was that the statute on the disallowances is clear, and the duty of the court to follow the statute is clear. I agree that the courts had no choice except to follow the law. That is the very reason I appeal to the Congress to modify existing tax laws according to the provision of my bill. In recent years, the Congress has been keenly concerned about correcting inequities that have unfairly burdened certain sections of our business-taxpaying community. Although we have come a long way toward removing discriminations, we should not relax now. Therefore, my suggested correction of the inequity that I have described today should be adopted quickly. It would be another significant step in our march against inequitable tax laws.

An exception to the disallowance of an interest deduction provided in section 265(2) is granted banks by Revenue Ruling 61-222—1961, 2 C.B. 58. This ruling states that section 265(2) does not apply to interest paid on indebtedness represented by deposits in banks engaged in general banking business since such indebtedness is not considered to be indebtedness incurred or continued to purchase or carry obligations within the meaning of section 265.

Another somewhat related exception, which was provided in the Revenue Act of 1964, applies to certain nonbanking financial institutions that deal in "face amount certificates" and are subject to State banking laws. The face amount certificates are issued to investors who make periodic payments to the institution for a specified period of time as a means of investing their savings. The holders of the certificates are repaid the payments plus interest as specified in

the certificate. The Revenue Act of 1964 provided that these financial institutions can deduct, under certain conditions, the interest on these certificates even though the payments received from the investors are partially reinvested by the institutions in tax-exempt bonds.

Thus, the tax laws have recognized in recent years that some exceptions to the strict rule of disallowance are justifiable. Now is the time for Congress to provide further recognition to this fact by enacting the long overdue modification provided in my bill. This will remove a serious inequity created by section 265(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and will strengthen our general tax structure by making it a fairer tax structure.

THE ELDERLY: THEY STRUGGLE FOR THEIR DAILY BREAD

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, last year, when Congress enacted automatic cost-of-living adjustments in social security benefits beginning in 1975, the economic picture was brighter than it had been for many months. Consumer prices were rising at an annual rate of less than 3 percent, and it looked like we were having some success in slowing down the inflationary momentum that had plagued us the past few years. It did not appear that catch-up increases in social security would be necessary until January 1975, as provided in the legislation.

Since that time, however, prices have zoomed skyward. Food costs have jumped a phenomenal 20 percent and the cost-of-living generally has soared 8 percent. Inflation is public enemy No. 1, and no group is suffering more than the elderly and others struggling to get by on a fixed monthly check.

The 5.9 boost in benefits we approved earlier this year for mid-1974 will be of some help. But in the months that have gone by, the financial problems of our older citizens have become even more acute. Their income situation has reached a crisis point.

Each day I receive poignant letters from senior citizens in my district vividly illustrating the personal hardships they endure because the small amount of money coming in each month simply does not keep pace with skyrocketing inflation.

Nutrition is affected most severely. Food constitutes about 27 percent of the aged's budget, in contrast with 16 percent for all Americans. Locked into fixed incomes, the elderly have no recourse but to cut back on the quantity and quality of their food consumption, even though they may be jeopardizing their health by doing so.

The social security boost we are considering today would give some sorely needed relief. The bill provides a two-stage boost in benefits next year—7 percent coming in April's checks and another 4 percent in July's checks.

Our elderly, blind and disabled can-

not be asked to wait any longer to catch up with last year's inflation. This measure seems to be the best way to ease their financial burdens in the quickest fashion. While I have some reservations about the possible effects of expanding the payroll tax wage base indefinitely to cover social security benefit increases, I believe this bill is fiscally responsible and I can see no other way to finance a raise at this time.

I am hopeful that the legislation will be approved by Congress and signed by the President at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, an article appeared recently in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer which paints a gloomy but accurate picture of the unmistakable link between inadequate income and the poor nutrition, loss of homes and related problems that can make old age so terribly frustrating. I am inserting this graphic story by P-I reporter Joel Connelly as part of my remarks, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THEY STRUGGLE FOR THEIR DAILY BREAD (By Joel Connelly)

An old man collapsed in a Ballard apartment house last Sunday. He had not eaten enough. And he hadn't been eating the right kinds of food.

Coping with rising food prices—a serious problem for many families—is a life-or-death crisis for many senior citizens.

Other senior citizens from the Ballard area talked with The P-I yesterday about the struggle for their daily bread.

"I'm limited in how much I can eat, and what I can eat. You see—after rent—I have \$130 a month to live on," a neatly dressed elderly gentleman—one of 70,000 residents of Seattle who are over 65—explained.

The man—who asked not to be named—was visiting the Northwest Senior Center in Ballard.

"I spend about 50 cents on my breakfast, eat a sandwich here for lunch, and budget about 90 cents for my dinner," the man said.

"I cannot afford any kinds of meat, of course. Even a small package of salami now costs 69 cents, for six slices. I can't afford that, and there's a lot of fruits and vegetables I can't buy either. I can still get milk, but it's up to 35 cents a quart, and so it's always got to be the cheapest kind."

With hamburger costing more than a dollar a pound—and a half-gallon of milk now priced around 65 cents—the elderly are eating fewer foods.

Why? Fixed incomes and rising prices are a recipe for hunger.

"Even the Social Security increase in January won't help things very much," said Al Strum, interrupting his bridge game at the center.

"You see, when the federal government raises our Social Security payments, the state will cut down on our public assistance. That means our incomes will remain exactly the same."

Senior citizens must also face rising medical and drug costs, compounding the squeeze as food costs eat up more of their budgets, reported Ruth Baker, another outspoken bridge player at the Center.

Many elderly residents said the fact that they live alone also places strains on the food budget.

"It is very difficult to go down to the market and buy food for one person," observed Mrs. Agnes Lau, president of the Northwest Center's board of managers.

"I buy a head of lettuce, but have to throw half of it out two days later. I buy lunch meat, and it spoils if I don't use all of it at once. And you also find—as everyone knows—that if you buy smaller quantities of food you pay more."

Some elderly residents said they are re-

sorting to group meals and other tactics to cope with the high cost of eating.

"Several of us have been getting together to cook meals—both for companionship and for economy," said Mrs. Emma Cowardin, who greets visitors to the Center.

"It's easier to cook for several people, and we've found that we can eat better, and buy things like roasts, if we pool our resources."

The elderly are dining out less frequently.

"Some of us go down to Manning's which is pretty reasonable, but things still add up. We can't afford to pay \$2.50 for a meal, and what can you get for a dollar anymore?" asked Mrs. Lau.

Other elderly residents claimed that the 10 per cent senior citizen discount offered by some eating establishments is illusory.

"A group of us went to a restaurant, and ordered their senior citizen dinner," Mrs. Baker, recalled, "but we were told that it doesn't apply on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday nights."

In addition to eating less, senior citizens say they are eating less well.

"We of course don't eat steaks anymore," reported Mrs. Goldie Chapman, a soft-spoken woman. "We have a lot of casseroles now, and eat a lot more starches. We just don't have the balanced meals that we had before..."

"... And fruits and fresh vegetables have simply gone out of our reach," added Mrs. Baker her bridge partner.

Mrs. Baker said she could afford only two boxes of strawberries this season.

"It's even getting terribly expensive to keep pets," she added. "It now costs 21 to 22 cents for a can of cat food. And you know, when you've got a little pet and you live alone, you hate to give it up."

The rising cost of food has contributed to a loss of homes, senior citizens at the center also reported.

"When you're squeezed by food and taxes, it means that you can no longer afford to keep up your home," said Mrs. Carrie Geary.

The problem of rising food prices has such an adverse effect on the lives of senior citizens that the Northwest Senior Center hopes to begin serving hot noonday meals by mid-December.

"People aren't getting enough to eat, it's as simple as that," answered Leo Desclos, director of the Northwest Center and an assistant director of the citywide Senior Centers program.

"They don't have much money to start with. They don't have means of transportation to shop for what bargains are available. Many of them—7 out of 10 in the area we serve—live alone, where they can't find decent food available for a single person, and are so lonely that they sometimes don't have the motivation to prepare it."

"Everything ties in, and conspires against elderly people on this," Desclos said.

A FRIEND IN NEED IS A FRIEND INDEED

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, with all the recent attention focused on petroleum shortages arising from the Middle East conflict, it is comforting to acknowledge the efforts of our friends in Indonesia for increasing their oil production at a time of national and international crisis.

It was my pleasure and relief to hear General Sutowo, the president of Indonesian State Oil and Gas Mining Enterprises announce in my presence last

week, the continuation of supply of 160,000 barrels of oil to the west coast of the United States.

I take delight in bringing excerpts of this most significant address to your attention as an illuminating shaft of light in an otherwise dark and forbidding energy landscape:

THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN-INDONESIAN
ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Mr. Ambassador, all of our many distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, . . . Under Pertamina's management, Indonesian oil production has nearly tripled since 1966, reaching 1,300,000 barrels daily this year.

We have become the eighth largest oil exporting country in this world.

We supply among others 160,000 barrels of crude oil a day to the West Coast of the United States.

Oil now accounts for not thirty percent of Indonesia's total export earnings, as it did in 1966, but almost 50%; and it is expected to contribute over 50% of this year's government revenues.

We at Pertamina have signed 50 innovative and harmonious production-sharing agreements with foreign contractors covering one quarter of Indonesia. Since 1966, 58 new oil and gas fields have been discovered, offshore and onshore, by these foreign oil companies and Pertamina.

We at Pertamina are also producing liquefied propane and butane gases and carbon black for the domestic and world markets; and, of major significance, we are now developing large natural gas fields in North Sumatra and East Kalimantan into important sources of liquefied natural gas, LNG, for the United States, for Japan and for other markets.

We have recently signed a contract with Pacific Lighting International Inc. to deliver North Sumatran natural gas to the West Coast of the United States in the form of LNG beginning in 1978.

Finally, Pertamina now owns and operates refining facilities with an aggregate capacity of approximately 400,000 barrels per stream day. In addition, a new refinery of 100,000 barrels daily capacity is under construction at Cilacap on the South Coast of Central Java, and is expected to be in operation in early 1976.

I could go on and on, for we are very proud of this record. We are grateful for the part many of you have played in building this record. But tonight the times are too critical to dwell on the past, as I have done on previous occasions. Tonight we must look to the future. It is not enough to tell you what we have done. This is a time for us to talk about what we are going to do together.

For we meet in a time too serious for reminiscing and boasting about what we have accomplished, too serious for the usual words of self-congratulation and comfortable reassurance. We meet in a time of world economic crisis—not one crisis but many—a world energy crisis, a world monetary crisis, a world food and commodity crisis, to name only those most prominently before us. This we must realize above all: no nation on its own, not Indonesia and not even the United States, can hope to either solve or escape these crises. Tonight, this week, this year, therefore, is a time not for words but for action—cooperative, reciprocal actions that benefit all mankind.

It is in that spirit that I address you tonight. It is in that spirit that I have the honor and duty to set forth tonight for you and for all Americans, in Government, in industry, in finance and all other walks of life, the principles which characterize American-Indonesian economic relations.

Let me make our position perfectly clear at the outset. My statement speaks only of Indonesia's own policy and performance, seeking to set the record straight on those

matters where we believe our policy may not have been clearly understood by all.

Our approach can be summarized in six basic principles:

First: In this time of shortage, I want you to know that Indonesia is endeavoring to increase its petroleum production and exports.

Second: Whatever concern or adverse report American investors may have had about Indonesia in years gone by, I want to make it clear that we now welcome American businessmen with genuine respect and friendship.

Third: I do not come tonight to plead Indonesia's poverty. I come to tell you of Indonesia's wealth—a wealth of natural resources, raw materials, and willing workers that await your capital investments.

Fourth: We in Indonesia are not sitting back dependent on foreign investment. Under government incentives for savings, we have already surpassed foreign investment in Indonesia, as extensive as it has been, with our own domestic investment.

Fifth: Our policy in Indonesia today is clearly one of collaboration, not expropriation.

Sixth, and finally: We do not ask foreign investors to come to Indonesia to make a gift. We expect you to come to Indonesia to make a profit.

Ladies and Gentlemen: In your newspapers and other publications, general, governmental and professional, I have read many anxious analyses of the American energy crisis. They speak of political developments in one part of the world, and they speak of the production situation in another part of the world, and they speak of economic conditions in still another. But rarely if ever do they speak of Indonesia.

Indonesia, the eighth largest oil exporting country in the world, one of the oldest oil producing countries in the world, is largely overlooked. Indonesia crude, with the particular low sulphur content that is so urgently sought in our country today for environmental reasons, is largely forgotten. Indonesia's capacity to more than double its production and exports of petroleum in the next several years, and its capacity to send you and other countries LNG, and its capacity to supply your petrochemical producers and consumers with critically short products, are all largely ignored. For reasons I cannot comprehend, almost no one in all these studies, speeches and reports ever thinks of Indonesia.

Tonight I ask you, your government, your press, your business colleagues, to think of Indonesia, in your interest as well as ours, not merely with respect to petroleum but regarding business investments and opportunities of every kind.

Think of Indonesia—not a far away, out-of-the-way little country, but a nation of more than 120 million people, one of the 5 largest in the world, located strategically in the international crossroads of one of the busiest shipping routes in the world; and the coming of the ultra-large crude carriers will make your East Coast and every other place on earth within economical range of our ports.

Think of Indonesia—not merely the land of Bali and lovely tourist attractions, but also a nation of bustling and building industrial development, with highly motivated low-cost labor, and a rapidly expanding infrastructure in communication, transportation, power, housing recreation, medical facilities and other basic needs for foreign investors.

Think of Indonesia—not merely in the traditional terms of oil and rubber and tin, but also in terms of steel pipe, cement, paper and textiles, in terms of the vast mineral, agricultural and timber resources waiting to be tapped, in terms of the abundance of our other raw materials, and the wide range of potential manufacturing and agricultural enterprises so likely to be successful when undertaken.

Think of Indonesia—not an unstable, unpredictable, inhospitable economy, as you may have heard long ago, but a nation which has, under the new leadership of President Suharto, eased the inflation that was raging in 1966, increased the Gross National Product by an average rate of 7 percent a year, achieved a surplus in its balance of payments, increased its ability to absorb foreign capital, established a widely respected Central Bank, and offered to investors from all over the world several investment incentives, joint ventures, flexible foreign investment statutes, political guarantees, a high degree of worker productivity, successful employee training programs, a modern telecommunications system, an efficient sea transportation network, a belief in the free market system, and above all genuine hospitality to foreign businessmen and investors.

So I ask you—think of Indonesia—and then come to Indonesia. We can help you; and we need your help, both private and governmental. We need your capital, your managerial skills and your industrial organization. We offer you in return virtually unprecedented and virtually unlimited business opportunities:

An opportunity to participate through production-sharing contracts in the expanded exploration and production of our known oil and gas potential;

An opportunity to help build the additional refinery capacity that we will need to meet our domestic as well as foreign demand by 1978;

An opportunity to help build a multi-million dollar integrated petrochemical complex that will start producing in 1978 a wide variety of materials needed to meet the shortage of plastics;

An opportunity to participate in the unique \$400 million project for the development of Batam Island into a major industrial, urban and seaport complex that will generate net foreign exchange earnings, according to plan, of some \$90 million a year;

Mining opportunities in the 53 huge blocks of potentially mineral-bearing land which the government has opened up for applications from foreign and domestic investors.

Timber, paper and pulp opportunities in a country that has multiplied its timber exports more than 50 times in six years and still has under concession only about half of the great forest lands suitable for continuous timber production;

Agriculture-related opportunities to achieve our Government's major goal of self-sufficiency in food, giving high priority to projects for foreign investment in agricultural estates, husbandry, fishing, fertilizer plants, rice mills, agricultural equipment, and fishery cold storage and canning factories;

And finally, opportunities in tourism, in transportation, in manufacturing, in a long list of other industries and areas; for I have cited only a few leading examples, and because Indonesia intends more and more to process its raw materials at home by adding value before export, and because we intend also to diversify the productive base of our economy, we are moving toward more new industries and investment opportunities than ever before.

Pertamina plays a leading role in all this because Pertamina is more than an oil company. We are a fully rounded development company, a development company for the entire nation; and we are also, let me stress, undertaking community activities and civic construction and cultural preservation projects throughout our country as well. We invite foreign investors to join us in any or all of these other efforts, for experience has shown that they make possible the kind of human and public relations that can cement a long-term partnership.

So I repeat: come to Indonesia. You will not be turned away; and you will not be disappointed. We can help each other; and

in a world economy beset by crises, that is what friends should do.

I do not pretend that all is easy or rosy, that our country is free from problems or imperfections, or that there will be no struggle, no risk and no effort required in the months and years of collaboration that lie ahead. But Indonesians have been struggling for their political and economic independence and development, and for a decent life for themselves and their children, for hundreds of years.

We are not discouraged. We are not afraid. We will not give up. With your help, and with God's help, we will make our nation a land of opportunity for all, for those of you from abroad who join hands with us, for those of us at home who have struggled so long, and for our children and their children who make this struggle worthwhile.

THE RAPE PREVENTION CONTROL ACT

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article in the *Progressive*, Michelle Wasserman quotes a woman from Philadelphia:

Women live according to a rape schedule, whether they realize it or not. Where they live, how they work out their jobs, their transportation, the way they relate to men on the street—everything a woman does conforms to that schedule.

According to the FBI uniform crime report released last August 1972, U.S. crime in general, declined 3 percent while forcible rape rose by 11 percent. Even more shocking is that reported rapes have increased 70 percent since 1967. This means that in 1972, 43 out of every 100,000 females in America were reported rape victims.

But the horror increases with the realization that most rapes are not reported. Estimates vary, but it is generally believed that only one in every five rapes is reported. In the District there were 714 reported rapes in 1972. Using the above estimate, that means there were over 3,500 rapes last year in the District alone. My own district of Denver has the unfortunate distinction of having the third highest per capita rape rate in the United States.

Denver also has a very low conviction rate. Out of 126 cases which went to trial last year in Denver there were only 42 convictions—a rate of 33 percent compared to a national average of 55 percent. The low conviction rate reflects the fact that rape is the only crime in which the victim is presumed guilty until proven innocent.

As Nancy Gager Clinch and Cathleen Schurr point out in their article on rape in the *June Washingtonian*, the burden is on the victim to prove: The identity of the rapist, corroborative evidence of the crime itself, and that she did not "consent" by word or action. For other major crimes—robbery, assault, fraud, the victim's word is sufficient to take the case to the jury, but in a rape a woman's word is not enough. Corroborative proof, which is very difficult to attain, is legally

required. Ms. Clinch and Ms. Schurr conclude that:

Originally corroborative evidence was included in the law to protect men against women who might bring false charges of rape . . . But the chief reason corroboration is still required is, as New York attorney and legal scholar Morris Ploscove, says, "because ladies lie." Men and rapists, in the eyes of this judicial expert, presumably do not.

The psychic impact of the rape is very difficult for a woman, but it is magnified tremendously as she begins to face the ordeal of convincing a skeptical world that she is telling the truth. First, the rape victim must face the police officer who often has the belief that she somehow "asked for it." He will interrogate her, asking many embarrassing questions, but he will not generally have the courtesy to explain why he needs the information so she could answer more easily.

Next the victim must face the hospital where she is quite likely to receive callous treatment. Doctors dislike making rape examinations because of the time it takes in court later, so the woman is often forced to wait a long time for minimal attention. Many hospitals are careless in giving out information on necessary tests for venereal disease or pregnancy and often will give out the "morning-after" pill without warning of its serious potential harm. Even more outrageous is that many women have to pay for the hospital examination and future tests. Thus women have to pay for their own rape.

The next phase of the ordeal is the courtroom. Although the alleged rapist has the right to an attorney, with whom he can meet regularly and whom he can fire if necessary, the victim's case is assigned to a prosecutor and she has no control over how her case is handled. In most instances the rape victim does not even meet the prosecutor before the preliminary hearing and, therefore, has no idea what to expect or what will be expected of her. For obvious reasons, most of the cases do not make it past the preliminary hearing.

If her case progresses, the victim must continue to prove she did not consent. The police, the courts, the media tell women not to resist because she might get killed. But juries are often convinced that the woman did not resist enough, as happened to the George Washington University women who were raped last year. Moreover, no evidence is permissible as to the rapist's sexual history, even of a previous rape conviction. The woman's sexual history however, will be thoroughly explored with the implication that a "loose" woman cannot be raped.

Women's groups are joining together to fight against the treatment of rape victims. The first rape crisis center was started in Washington, D.C., in June 1972 and many more have since been started. Providing numerous services they: go with the victim to the police and hospital, if she wishes to go; provide information on self-defense; act as a referral service to other services, such as mental health clinics and venereal disease clinics; review police and hospital policies toward victims and suggest changes where necessary; and many make efforts to hire experienced lawyers to counsel

the victim and to encourage prosecutors to be more responsive to the victim's needs. These groups are doing a commendable job and it is important for women to be involved in changing that which affects them so directly. However, the Government is shirking its own duty to rectify the blatant injustice caused by our present system.

It is in response to this desperate need for change that I join with my colleagues Representative ASHLEY, BURKE of California, GRASSO, and HEINZ to cosponsor the Rape Prevention Control Act. It will establish a national center for control and prevention of rape within the National Institute of Mental Health and provide for a comprehensive study to be conducted on all the various aspects of rape and rape laws. Additionally, an information clearinghouse would be established which could provide helpful information as to where most rapes occur, under what conditions, what tactics are most successful in fending off the potential rapist, et cetera. Thus, through this bill, we could join with the many women's groups to work toward the elimination of the grim indignities faced by the rape victim, and eventually of the crime itself.

WHAT STRIKES DO TO THE INNOCENT BYSTANDER

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, last year I had the pleasure of appearing on the television program, "The Advocates," with Mr. Alan Reynolds. During this television show Mr. Reynolds, who is the resident economist of *National Review*, and I discussed some of the problems surrounding strikes and what could be done if Congress brought itself to tackle labor reform.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Reynolds wrote an article based on the television program and I would like to take this opportunity to recommend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

WHAT STRIKES DO TO THE INNOCENT BYSTANDER

(By Alan Reynolds)

When a union closes down all the suppliers of a good or service in a community, costs are imposed on people who are not involved in the labor contract. If this neighborhood effect of strikes only created a consumer "inconvenience" there would be ample reason for government intervention—just as there is in the analogous case of air polluters. Areawide strikes, however, do much more than deprive consumers: Serious financial losses are absorbed by wholesalers, retailers, manufacturers and shippers (and their laid-off employees) who are critically dependent on the struck materials or services for their livelihood. No measure of, say idle man-days due to strikes has any bearing on this vital social cost. In this year's West Coast dock strike, for example, farmers lost a billion dollars in export revenues, and many importers, retailers and freight forwarders lost much or all of their income. Many innocent people were thus forced to pay—in lost revenues and jobs—for someone else's decision to close every port on the

West Coast. Moreover, even when such strike-induced "inconvenience" amounts to thousands of lost dollars, the injured parties are not allowed to sue the union for damages.

Why should a union wish to strike all competing businesses simultaneously? Such a strategy obviously creates less—not more—pressure on each employer, since each firm would surely prefer to have his competitors struck too, rather than lose customers to unstruck rivals. Many business representatives have, in fact, openly advocated the "stabilization" of industrywide bargaining.

If unions nonetheless choose to strike all competing employers in a community, it must be because 1) it creates public pressure for a quick settlement at any cost, and 2) it makes it easier for the employers to pass on exorbitant wage costs in the form of higher prices. The first effect we'll call "blackmail," since the public is held for ransom; the second effect is "cartelization," because hitherto competing firms are transformed into a shared monopoly (with the monopoly rent going to labor) by having the principal element of their costs dictated equally and simultaneously. If each company negotiated separately, it would still have to keep wage-benefit offers competitive, but each firm could not be sure of not having its price undercut by a rival employer who drove a harder bargain.

Though third-party blackmail is sometimes nationwide in its impact—as in the transportation industries—the most pervasive effect is the sum of all the shutdowns in all the metropolitan centers. Here are only a few examples of areawide strikes in Greater New York in the past two years:

Gravediggers struck eight weeks. They left fifteen thousand unburied bodies, and got an 18 per cent pay raise.

Tugboat workers struck for two months, and got wage and benefit increases of 58.5 per cent over three years.

Printers struck the three largest newspapers and got a pay boost of almost 42 per cent over three years. (Previous strikes and slowdowns had caused three New York newspapers to go out of business, thus aggravating the cartel effect.)

Parking attendants struck 650 garages and left a hundred thousand cars stranded behind locked doors.

Gasoline truck drivers struck six oil companies which handle about 85 per cent of New York's gas. Commuters, taxis, school buses, police cars and ambulances ran short of gas.

A teamsters local struck thirteen dairy plants which normally supplied four million quarts a day.

Fuel oil truck drivers in December struck three hundred independent companies, shouting "no heat, no heat!" So, hundreds of thousands of people had no heat in their homes in mid-winter.

WAGE COLLUSION

This sampler purposely lists only small local unions to show that the "nuisance" of multi-firm bargaining is not by any means confined to big unions, nor to public utilities and services, and especially not to manufacturing (of 43 major strikes in New York in the past decade, only five were in manufacturing). Of course the case against industrywide wage collusion is even stronger: This is no different in its effects from colluding to set prices, except that wage collusion raises prices further, because wages are so much larger a component of costs than profits.

The blackmail-cartel strategy encompasses hundreds of unionized fields. The basic story remains the same in all communities—only the actors change.

To be sure, none of the above strikes was a "national emergency," but that's little consolation to a New York dock worker unemployed by the tugboat strike, sitting in a cold house with his car locked up and

out of gas, his dead wife unburied, and his children left without milk. Multiply this picture by all the cities in the country and you get some idea of the scope of the problem.

We may safely assume that the reason strikes are directed against whole communities, rather than against employers, is that this strategy yields the highest wage gains. Why else would unions pursue a strategy that is clearly less injurious to employers than the single company strike? Where large inventories prevent strikes from hurting the public, e.g., the automobile industry, the alternative technique of striking a single employer is usually used—and the wage gains are rarely as large as in third-party strikes. Moreover, many union mergers and pacts, as well as Jimmy Hoffa's pre-jail efforts to get all unions in each area to have their contracts expire on the same date, can only be understood as efforts to increase wage leverage by blackmailing larger segments of the public.

JOBS AND PRICES

The conclusion is obvious: Unions that threaten strikes against the public (and the threat alone often suffices) are able to extract unusually high wage gains by holding innocent bystanders for ransom. The first side-effect of this extortion is to increase unemployment among the union's own members. If the companies can pass on the wage costs in higher prices, fewer units will be sold and less labor will be required. If the wage gains are at the expense of profits (which they clearly can't be year after year), surviving firms must restore profitability by using less labor. If featherbedding succeeds in keeping profits low, many firms will not survive in the economy-wide competition for investment funds, so they will be driven out of business—again creating massive unemployment. The unemployment effect of wage increases that are higher than productivity increases (adjusted for inflation) is inescapable: By pursuing apparently suicidal wage demands, a majority of union members, through seniority protection, are able to vote newcomers out of a job.

The unions themselves have often complained of the decline of jobs in unionized trades. If such employment declines were all caused by "automation," why has automation singled out union trades while employment for the economy as a whole continues to grow? From 1900 to 1960, employment in predominantly non-union sectors increased substantially: Wholesale and retail trades employed 5.3 million more persons; non-domestic services added 4.69 million; salaried employment in manufacturing increased by 3.13 million. In the same sixty years, strongly unionized fields did not generate any new jobs at all: Mining employment fell by 270,000; construction employment remained the same; transportation and utilities used 1,620 fewer people; and non-salaried manufacturing added only 120,000 jobs. The astonishing thing is not that we have about 6 per cent unemployed, but that the non-union fields have been able to absorb so many persons who were displaced or excluded from better opportunities by union activities.

Eventually, those unemployed by reason of union tactics will seek work in non-union jobs—thereby driving non-union wages down by increasing the supply of labor in those job markets. Professor H. Gregg Lewis has calculated that the 10 to 15 per cent relative wage advantage of union members as a whole was the result of a 3 to 4 per cent reduction in non-union wages (relative to what those wages would have otherwise been). The average worker's real take-home pay actually fell from 1965 to 1970—despite a 53 per cent nominal increase in total employee compensation—partly because an ever-larger share of national income was going to employees in the strongest unions (including government unions). The average first-year increases in major collective bargaining agreements were 8.9 per cent from 1965 to 1970,

and the percentage rose steadily, while non-union manufacturing wage increases averaged only 5.2 per cent over the same period, and never exceeded 6 per cent. By increasing the share going to relatively skilled employees (who were the highest paid even before unionization), unions have contributed substantially to income inequality.

Non-union workers (almost 78 per cent of the labor force) and members of relatively non-collusive unions (another 12 to 16 per cent) pay three times for the extortion of elitist unions: first, by paying higher prices for union-made goods; second, by having their wages depressed by the flood of workers who are forcibly excluded from union jobs; and third, by paying higher taxes to provide \$329 million a year in welfare and food stamps for strikers.

THE OPTIONS

Government officials typically react to short-run unemployment as though it were caused by anything but union policies. Construction unemployment, for example, declined every year from the 1961 to 1965 average of 12.8 per cent to a 1969 figure of 6 per cent. In 1970, though, when third-party strikes resulted in an average national increase of 14.7 per cent in construction wages, unemployment rose from 6 to 9.7 per cent. Government leaders operate under the delusion that inflation cures unemployment—which it can for only so long as job applicants can be fooled into mistaking an inflated wage offer for a high real wage. The existence of short-run unemployment in union trades therefore creates pressure on the Federal Reserve to restore the balance between labor costs and prices through monetary inflation.

The high wages achieved by the blackmail-cartel technique attract many more workers while ensuring many fewer jobs. These desirable jobs must then be rationed by lengthy apprenticeship, strict seniority, hiring-hall favoritism, high dues, nepotism and discrimination. The inequitable waste of manpower implied by this posting of "no trespassing" signs in many crucial job markets clearly distorts and reduces the economy's total production, and lowers our capacity to grow. Without single-union monopoly of entire trades, such rationing devices could not be so tyrannical. Though some unions of limited scope might still be able to extract unemployment-producing wages (e.g., through local licensing and building codes), no single union could prevent a man or woman from practicing the trade of his or her choice. Alternatives would exist.

The public is not likely to continue to permit labor disputes to inconvenience consumers, cause losses to innocent parties, and create scarcities of needed jobs. No other organizations can do any one of these things without facing criminal or civil prosecution. Either we must limit strike power in some way, or we must allow Congress to stop more and more strikes, on an ad hoc basis, and impose compulsory arbitration. Strike intervention by Congress have been unfair because they have singled out certain industries, unwise because they involved the dangerous principle of government control of incomes, and unsuccessful because they were extremely imposed.

If we opt for limiting strikes, rather than eliminating them, there are two general options: Either we set up a regulatory agency with broad powers to restrict the scope of labor-management conflict, or Congress establishes a broad rule which achieves the same result without relying too heavily on the good sense and good will of administrators. In view of the notoriously poor performance of existing regulatory and anti-trust agencies, some specific congressional goals are clearly preferable. That is, it is better to set up specific rules and let the courts make exceptions, than to be intimidated by the exceptions into letting the courts grope for specific rules.

SOME ILLUSTRATIONS

In the ideal case, unions should be limited to organizing and/or striking single companies. In this way, a large employer would face a large union, and each employer would be more intimidated by a companywide strike than by today's collusive industrywide agreements. Most important no single union could threaten to close down a whole regional or national industry, which, as we have seen, is a purely antisocial act unrelated to legitimate bargaining.

Objections to such single-firm negotiations include: 1) the blatantly anticonsumer argument that such arrangements would introduce "unstabilizing competitive factors" into the cozy union-manufacturer collusion to keep new entrants out of certain industries; 2) unsupported charges that pension and insurance benefits without industrywide contracts (it seems more likely that a little variety and rivalry in wage-benefit offers would have desirable net effects); and 3) generalization from exceptions where the rule would appear hard to apply.

Construction—with almost a million employers—is an unusual case. Indeed the Nixon Administration has even suggested that the incredible wage gains in the building trades were caused by excessively fragmented bargaining. Where several trades have bargained with an organization of contractors, however (as in the 196-day construction strike in Kansas City in 1970), the gains have been at least as large as in single-employer strikes, and the third-party costs have been greater.

Construction workers are uniquely protected by law against competition through union control of licensing, apprenticeship and building inspection and through building codes that perpetuate time-wasting techniques. The Davis-Bacon Act, which requires contractors on federally aided projects to pay prevailing union wages, has put a federal floor under the highest wages and has caused local gains to spread to surrounding areas. It is true that switching to single-firm organization would not eliminate government power to punish people for practicing a trade without union permission. Cases of this sort require supplemental legislation (or, rather, de-legislation).

The atypical case of very small employers, as in construction, could be easily dealt with by a provision that a single union could represent, say, no more than two hundred workers or all of the employees of a single company.

A related difficulty is illustrated by the case of longshoremen—veteran practitioners of extreme third-party extortion since, at least, the London dock strike in 1889. The problem is that dockworkers now work for many different employers who draw from a hiring hall when their ships are in port. In view of the potential abuses of hiring halls as instruments of favoritism and discrimination we should consider establishing competing halls, or abolishing hiring halls altogether. If shippers could not rely on hiring halls, they would be compelled to offer some contractual guarantee of work to a basic crew, thereby greatly increasing employment security. Then most employees would work for specific employers, and the single-firm principle could be applied. If a group of shippers got together to share employees, the association would be treated by law as a single employer and could be organized as such (the same is true of contractors' associations). Alternatively, a separate limitation on union scope—for example, that no single union would be allowed to organize more than half of any one port's employees—could be established for dockworkers. Even simply restricting unions to single ports would at least prevent Harry Bridges from threatening to close West, East and Gulf Coast

ports simultaneously. Again, such exceptional cases in no way justify the status quo, nor do they necessitate compulsory arbitration, nor do they require abandoning the general rule of single-company organization. Even labor problems can be solved; we are not at the mercy of blind forces.

WHO'S TO BLAME?

Finally, it may be said that big unions are needed to balance the economic power of big corporations. This is simply incorrect. The private sector unions that are most powerful in terms of third-party or cartel effects are in industries which are typically run by small employers: trucking, shipping, garment, construction, coal, printing, entertainment etc. The manufacturing sector, where most "big" corporations are found, accounts for little more than a quarter of total employment, and wage and price increases in manufacturing have generally been below those of any other sector. Now, the six largest unions represent almost 40 per cent of all union membership. If the six largest corporations employed anything approaching 40 per cent of all union members, then we might have some sort of relevant comparison of labor market concentration, though its significance would remain unclear.

A second point: a company's monopoly power over the sale of its product has nothing to do with the monopoly power in the purchase of labor. A firm that dominates a product market and is thereby able to sell its product at somewhat higher prices cannot therefore purchase labor at a lower wage. Indeed, the exact opposite may be closer to the truth, since unions tap any excess profits. A union's monopoly power in the sale of labor could only be said to "balance" an employer's power of exclusive employment—a power that simply does not exist.

Actually, the whole idea of "bargaining power" is misleading at best. Size has very little to do with the ability of firms or unions to affect prices and wages. What matters is the ability to eliminate, or to control the price of, substitutes for labor and/or products. Large firms and unions may have more financial resources which enable them to endure long strikes, but the strike is not thus rendered less painful. Small firms and unions can, moreover, achieve the same result by borrowing or combining contributions to a strike-insurance pool, as is now done among trucking firms, to provide financial aid to struck members.

Employers, no matter how big, have no labor market power remotely comparable to that of unions. They are simply intermediaries between labor costs and the prices charged to consumers. Employers certainly can't pay less than the going rate for comparable labor without losing all their best workers to competing firms. A power in product markets comparable to union power in labor markets could only be said to exist if all of the producers in an industry got together and said: "We are going to stop production as long as necessary until we get a 20 per cent price increase, and we will picket and boycott anyone who tries to hire our laid-off workers."

Most criticism of unions has been misdirected at the alleged inflationary impact of big unions, and at the impact of nationwide strikes. This traditional view neglects the social cost of striking all competing firms in a community, and the resulting effect on employment opportunities and income distribution. Moreover, the crude "solution" of compulsory arbitration is only a patchwork treatment of the most conspicuous symptoms, and is an approach which threatens the freedom of contract. By establishing, instead, a paradigmatic goal of single-company unionization, enforced through the Justice Department, we could preserve the right of employees to strike against their own em-

ployer, while preventing certain unions from using injury to the public as a bargaining device.

ARAB AND AMERICAN EXPORTS—
A GROWING CONFRONTATION?

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I have inserted in the RECORD statistics revealing the extent of the Arab dependence on American agricultural products. The irresponsible actions of the Arab leaders who are participating in the oil boycott reveal a lack of understanding of the extent to which the Western world and the Middle East are dependent upon each other for the basic commodities of life.

It is my belief that all concerned with these matters, including those states embargoing oil should be fully informed about the extent and nature of U.S. exports destined to the Middle East. With that purpose in mind, I include herewith data on U.S. exports of chemicals, manufactured goods (classified by their chief material), and machinery and transport equipment.

The statistics follow:

U.S. EXPORTS OF CHEMICALS, MANUFACTURED GOODS BY CHIEF MATERIAL, AND MACHINERY AND TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT TO THE ARAB STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE OIL EMBARGO AGAINST THE UNITED STATES—CALENDAR YEAR 1972

Item	Value (dollars)	Shipping weight (1,000 lbs.)
1. IRAQ		
Chemical elements and compounds.....	108,100	-----
Dyeing, tanning, and coloring materials.....	6,140	-----
Medicinal and pharmaceutical products.....	1,668,752	-----
Essent oils, perfume mtrls., soaps, etc.....	6,927	-----
Synthetic resins and plastic materials.....	13,013	-----
Chemical products and materials n.e.c.....	209,676	-----
Total chemicals.....	2,012,618	2,006
Rubber mfrs.—semifin. and fin. n.e.c.....	49,918	-----
Wood and cork manufactures, n.e.c.....	121,266	-----
Paper, paperboard, and manufactures.....	74,239	-----
Yarn, fabric, and articles, textile.....	18,331	-----
Nonmetallic mineral manufactures, n.e.c.....	160,906	-----
Iron and steel.....	843,576	-----
Nonferrous metals.....	12,047	-----
Manufactures of metal, n.e.c.....	173,983	-----
Total manufactured goods by chief material.....	1,454,266	3,630
Machinery, nonelectric.....	9,647,858	-----
Electrical machinery, appr. and appl.....	1,385,183	-----
Transport equipment.....	2,596,075	-----
Total machinery and transport equipment.....	13,629,116	7,934
2. KUWAIT		
Chemical elements and compounds.....	228,420	-----
Min tar and oils and crude chems., etc.....	526	-----
Dyeing, tanning, and coloring materials.....	342,617	-----
Medicinal and pharmaceutical products.....	877,457	-----
Essent oils, perfume mtrls., soaps, etc.....	798,185	-----
Fertilizrs—Mfrd. and fertilz mtrls, n.e.c.....	1,400	-----
Explosives and pyrotechnic products.....	13,616	-----
Synthetic resins and plastic materials.....	102,111	-----
Chemical products and materials n.e.c.....	1,891,965	-----
Total, chemicals.....	4,265,337	8,137

Item	Value (dollars)	Shipping weight (1,000 lbs.)
Leather, mfrs, n.e.c., and dressed fur- skins.....	41,480	
Rubber mfrs—semifin and fin, n.e.c.....	738,792	
Wood and cork manufacturers, n.e.c.....	24,746	
Paper, paperboard, and manufactures.....	301,114	
Yarn, fabric, and articles, textile.....	957,368	
Nonmetallic mineral manufactures, n.e.c.....	712,455	
Iron and steel.....	791,633	
Nonferrous metals.....	338,740	
Manufactures of metal, n.e.c.....	1,759,369	
Total, manufactured goods by chief material.....	5,665,697	12,506
Machinery, nonelectric.....	23,611,669	
Electrical machinery, appr, and appl.....	6,612,054	
Transport equipment.....	46,932,586	
Total, machinery and transport equipment.....	77,156,309	52,577

3. SAUDI ARABIA

Chemical elements and compounds.....	1,268,139	
Min tar and oils and crude chems etc.....	3,037	
Dyeing, tanning, and coloring materials.....	1,698,100	
Medicinal and pharmaceutical products.....	2,885,241	
Essent oils, perfume mtrls, soaps etc.....	2,094,409	
Fertilzrs—MFRD and fertilz mtrls, NEC.....	1,673	
Explosives and pyrotechnic products.....	197,780	
Synthetic resins and plastic materials.....	480,140	
Chemical products and materials NEC.....	2,937,243	
Total chemicals.....	11,565,762	30,367
Leather, mfrs, NEC, and dressed fur- skins.....	703	
Rubber mfrs—semifin and fin, NEC.....	2,398,249	
Wood and cork manufactures, NEC.....	343,744	
Paper, paperboard, and manufactures.....	1,371,919	
Yarn, fabric, and articles, textile.....	1,808,308	
Nonmetallic mineral manufactures, NEC.....	1,553,779	
Iron and steel.....	5,282,416	
Nonferrous metals.....	481,453	
Manufactures of metal, NEC.....	7,588,819	
Total manufactured goods by Chief material.....	20,829,390	59,811
Machinery, nonelectric.....	95,751,640	
Electrical machinery, appr, and appl.....	22,447,273	
transport equipment.....	75,469,049	
Total, machinery and transport equipment.....	193,667,962	115,041

4. QATAR

Chemical elements and compounds.....	33,130	
Dyeing, tanning, and coloring materials.....	50,588	
Medicinal and pharmaceutical products.....	118,862	
Essent oils, perfume mtrls, soaps, etc.....	70,516	
Explosives and pyrotechnic products.....	1,134	
Synthetic resins and plastic materials.....	1,600	
Chemical products and materials n.e.c.....	155,667	
Total, chemicals.....	431,497	1,808
Rubber mfrs—semifin and fin, n.e.c.....	149,421	
Wood and cork manufactures, n.e.c.....	3,554	
Paper, paperboard, and manufactures.....	36,811	
Yarn, fabric, and articles, textile.....	47,332	
Nonmetallic mineral manufactures, n.e.c.....	25,894	
Iron and steel.....	391,160	
Nonferrous metals.....	14,224	
Manufactures of metal, n.e.c.....	316,304	
Total, manufactured goods by chief material.....	984,700	2,352
Machinery, nonelectric.....	3,835,190	
Electrical machinery, appr, and appl.....	390,019	
Transport equipment.....	5,741,612	
Total, machinery and transport equipment.....	9,966,821	7,608

5. BAHRAIN

Chemical elements and compounds.....	1,863,217	
Dyeing, tanning, and coloring materials.....	142,851	
Medicinal and pharmaceutical products.....	98,388	
Essent oils, perfume mtrls, soaps etc.....	320,131	
Explosives and pyrotechnic products.....	16,886	
Synthetic resins and plastic materials.....	47,492	
Chemical products and materials nec.....	267,471	
Total chemicals.....	2,756,436	15,612

Item	Value (dollars)	Shipping weight (1,000 lbs.)
Leather, mfrs, nec. and dressed fur- skins.....	2,785	
Rubber mfrs—semifin and fin, nec.....	100,337	
Wood and cork manufactures, nec.....	11,406	
Paper, paperboard, and manufactures.....	236,146	
Yarn, fabric, and articles, textile.....	126,335	
Nonmetallic mineral manufactures, nec.....	113,433	
Iron and steel.....	1,178,708	
Nonferrous metals.....	139,602	
Manufactures of metal, nec.....	939,558	
Total manufactured goods by chief material.....	2,848,310	7,506
Machinery, nonelectric.....	10,664,899	
Electrical machinery, appr, and appl.....	1,325,564	
Transport equipment.....	1,946,863	
Total, machinery and transport equipment.....	13,937,326	21,854

6. ALGERIA

Chemical elements and compounds.....	467,106	
Dyeing, tanning, and coloring materi- als.....	48,906	
Medicinal and pharmaceutical products.....	21,925	
Essent oils, perfume mtrls, soaps, etc.....	108,635	
Fertilzrs—MFRD and fertilz mtrls, n.e.c.....	1,336,295	
Explosives and pyrotechnic products.....	3,992	
Synthetic resins and plastic materials.....	108,563	
Chemical products and materials n.e.c.....	726,169	
Total, chemicals.....	2,821,591	65,362
Leather, MFRS, n.e.c., and dressed fur- skins.....	4,768	
Rubber MFRS—Semifin and fin, n.e.c.....	75,320	
Wood and cork manufactures, n.e.c.....	1,459	
Paper, paperboard, and manufactures.....	256,541	
Yarn, fabric, and articles, textile.....	108,140	
Nonmetallic mineral manufactures, n.e.c.....	70,198	
Iron and steel.....	847,787	
Nonferrous metals.....	9,165	
Manufactures of metal, n.e.c.....	1,146,567	
Total, manufactured goods by chief material.....	2,519,945	8,052
Machinery, nonelectric.....	26,761,740	
Electrical machinery, appr, and appl.....	1,868,849	
Transport equipment.....	21,130,510	
Total, machinery and transport equipment.....	49,761,099	25,996

7. LIBYA

Chemical elements and compounds.....	473,418	
Dyeing, tanning, and coloring materials.....	151,080	
Medicinal and pharmaceutical products.....	1,063,917	
Essent oils, perfume mtrls, soaps etc.....	460,878	
Explosives and pyrotechnic products.....	62,824	
Synthetic resins and plastic materials.....	174,072	
Chemical products and materials n.e.c.....	1,332,082	
Total, chemicals.....	3,718,271	11,409
Leather, mfrs, n.e.c., and dressed fur- skins.....	3,742	
Rubber mfrs—semifin & fin, n.e.c.....	955,793	
Wood and cork manufactures, n.e.c.....	23,106	
Paper, paperboard, and manufactures.....	389,917	
Yarn, fabric, and articles, textile.....	244,375	
Nonmetallic mineral manufactures; n.e.c.....	177,011	
Iron and steel.....	3,271,032	
Nonferrous metals.....	131,944	
Manufactures of metal, n.e.c.....	2,926,542	
Total, manufactured goods by chief material.....	8,123,462	20,089
Machinery, nonelectric.....	41,525,566	
Electrical machinery, appr, and appl.....	8,034,914	
Transport equipment.....	9,860,015	
Total, machinery and transport equipment.....	59,420,495	26,997

8. TOTALS—ALL COUNTRIES

Chemicals.....	27,562,512	134,701
Manufactured goods by chief material.....	42,425,770	113,946
Machinery and transport equipment.....	417,539,128	258,007
Total.....	487,527,410	506,654

Note: Figures concerning agricultural exports to Abu Dhabi a member of the United Arab Emirates and a participant in the oil embargo, are not separately available and thus are not included.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

THE NEW ENGLAND FISHING
INDUSTRY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, fishing was quite literally this Nation's first industry. The early immigrants to New England and Virginia discovered they could not feed themselves with agriculture alone, and turned to the seas for basic and necessary food supplements. Our fishing industry not only prospered, but led the world. We remained the largest or second largest fishing Nation until the Korean war.

Since that time, however, we have failed to keep pace. Our catches have declined dramatically as a proportion of the world catch; we have seen our fish stocks depleted; we import increasing proportions of our domestic fish consumption; our fishing communities are depressed; the size of our fleet is dwindling; and the sons of fishermen are leaving their hometowns and their families for more promising employment.

To a large degree, this situation is the combined fault of official neglect and a lack of foresight. If we are going to correct it, we will have to offer the fishing industry the same support we offer other industries, and which other countries offer their own fishermen with whom ours must compete.

There are no final solutions now available, but we must begin now. An article by Frederick J. Pratson, "Fisheries Anchor All Hope on 200-Mile Limit," appeared in the November issue of the New Englander magazine. Although the policy prescriptions are necessarily incomplete, Mr. Pratson accurately describes the plight of this vital American industry. Because in the end the Congress will be responsible for considering, authorizing, and funding programs to address the critical problems reviewed by Mr. Pratson, I insert that article in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues.

The article follows:

FISHERIES ANCHOR ALL HOPE
ON 200-MILE LIMIT

About 80% of the fish Americans annually consume is imported. Canada, for example, exports about 75% of its fisheries' production to the United States.

If you ride one of the Scandinavian tourist ferries from Yarmouth, Nova Scotia to Portland, Maine, there's a good chance your car will be in the ship's hold with a truck trailer full of Canadian fish for U.S. markets. Even that venerable American sandwich, McDonald's "filet-o-fish," is made from imported fish, processed into tasty cubes by such companies as Gorton of Gloucester. And even more hurting to our national pride is the fact that a good portion of the imported fish is caught off New England.

Thanks to governmental indifference, the New England fisheries have had such a bad time of it that the "Sacred Cod," hanging in the Massachusetts State House, should most likely have "Imported from Poland" printed under its right fin. And that famous fisher-

man statue in Gloucester should no longer be that of a Yankee seafarer but a salesman for a Bulgarian herring conglomerate.

Though much fewer in number, traditional seafarers still exist in New England. But many of the Yankee names have been replaced by those that are Canadian, Italian, Portuguese, Greek, and Scandinavian. The Provincetown fishing fleet, for example, is almost all Portuguese.

The New England seafarers of 1973 love the sea and fishing; they want to serve the food needs of the American consumer, and they want to contribute their talents and energies to strengthening New England economically. But the New England fisheries have been shoved aside, almost as an archaic relic of the past, in the heady pursuit of space exploration, East-West détente, and a multitude of other interests.

TWENTY COUNTRIES OFF NE COAST

It comes as a shock when one realizes that there are close to 20 nations fishing within a few miles of the New England coastline. Several years ago, a movie called "The Russians Are Coming! The Russians Are Coming!", offered a comedy about a Russian submarine grounding itself off a fictitious Massachusetts island. In reality, however, the facts are not so comical; the Russians have not only arrived, but they have been here in droves for quite some time.

Hugh F. O'Rourke, executive secretary of the Boston Fisheries Assn. and an officer of numerous other national and international fishing groups, offers a good reason why the Russians are off the New England coast.

"In the 1950's, the Russian agricultural plan failed, and they had to do something about providing food for their people," explains O'Rourke. "One of their solutions was fish protein. They sent scientists over to Georges Bank to estimate the fish there, and their vessels soon followed. The only way they could make an efficient operation was to use factory ships, which would stay on the fishing grounds from six to nine months at a time."

Besides the Russians, New England's fishing grounds are being harvested by the Poles, Scandinavians, West Germans, Bulgarians, and others. Russia uses most of the fish it catches itself for within the Eastern Bloc countries. However, Poland, which is not known as a seafaring nation, is one of America's largest suppliers of fish. The Polish fleet is a modern factory-type operation, growing rapidly in number of vessels.

O'Rourke, who visited a Polish ship in Massachusetts waters, tells of comfortable, modern quarters and other amenities which help alleviate the tedium of long periods at sea. The U.S. experimented with two factory ships of its own, designed for long voyages. The multi-million-dollar experiment failed because of the difficulty of attracting crews.

COMPETE WITH GOVERNMENTS

Except for the U.S., Great Britain, and Canada, all the nations fishing in northeast North American waters are government owned and controlled. About the only thing the U.S. government has done for the U.S. fisheries is to provide a 50% subsidy to finance the building of a new vessel. In Canada, a fishery can build a vessel and rely on the government to subsidize most of it.

What does all this activity in New England waters have to do with the supply and price of fish? Greater world demand for certain kinds of food, particularly meat and fish proteins, exceeds the ability of nations to supply them. While the U.S. can exist without fish (the average American consumes 167 lb. of meat annually and only 11 lb. of fish), many countries depend on fish as the staple diet.

The average person in Iceland, for example, eats 82 lb. of fish per year. And the Japanese consume 67 lb. per capita. In Europe, one third of the diet is fish. Europeans consume a greater range of species, such as

herring and dogfish, in contrast to Americans who prefer the so-called "high-class" fish, such as lobster, shrimp, salmon, scallops, haddock and halibut.

Differences in taste mean that New England vessels must be selective in what they bring back to home port. For the American fishermen, it only makes sense to land those species which will attract the highest price and greatest profit. On the other hand, the European factory ship can haul-up and use just about everything caught in the net.

KEY DILEMMA: DEPLETION

The result of trying to fill the increasing needs of both national and international markets, through continuous, high-intensity fishing, is a rapid depletion of marine life. This is the main reason for the high price of fish in U.S. markets and the scarcity of certain favorite species, such as haddock. Add to this the continuing pollution of the ocean from oil spills and waste from urban areas, and the problem becomes even more serious.

However, the most immediate need for the New England fisheries is a solution to the problem of foreign competition and the decreasing supply of fish. The high retail price for fish should mean high profits for the individual fisherman and private fishing company. But the fishermen's profits remain low, because they cannot supply enough of the product to make a higher profit.

The future—or lack of it—for the New England fisheries, therefore, hinges on the availability of the product. However, as long as there is no control over the foreign exploitation of New England waters, the only destiny for the region's fisheries is downhill and, quite possibly, into oblivion. Through international conferences, the U.S. fisheries have attempted to form agreements which would give everyone a fair share of the take. But the Americans have been ignored by the European nations.

At a recent ICNAF (International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries) meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark, the American delegation felt so put-off by the indifference of the other nations to their problems in their own waters that they walked out of the meeting. But such a rebuke is mild compared with what has happened at sea.

WEATHERING HARASSMENT

New England vessels, crews and operations have been harassed by the Russians and others. Lines have been cut and equipment has been lost. The foreigners also act like a pack of wolves waiting for the kill. American vessels find the fish, and, as is the custom, the information is passed from one vessel to another by radio. The Russians and others tap the conversations, fixing the location of the Americans and the schools of fish they have found. Before the New England fishermen know what is happening, the foreign ships are down their backs hauling in the fish. And the New Englanders are no match in a confrontation: the large foreign vessels could easily slice through the American boats.

With imports now accounting for 80% of domestic consumption and with problems mounting for American fishermen, how important are New England's fisheries and why salvage them? First, local fisheries help exert control over the price of imported fish. Without this alternative source of supply, foreign suppliers could dictate both amount and price to American markets. Witness the kind of arm-twisting being applied by oil-rich Arab nations in the petroleum market.

Second, the high rate of inflation, dollar devaluation, and the rising demand for fish protein worldwide create more profitable opportunities for foreign suppliers in markets other than the U.S.

PITCH 200-MILE LIMIT

While we ponder the question of survival, the American fisheries, particularly those in

New England, have decided to act. Their solution is to extend the limits of American territorial waters out to 200 miles. Gov. Francis Sargent of Massachusetts was a strong advocate of the 200-mile limit, and the Bay State legislature made it official. Unfortunately, however, this became a symbolic gesture since there is no way that the state can enforce its act. The fishermen must prevail upon the federal government to make the 200-mile limit legal and police it.

Sen. Edward Kennedy has backed the requests of the fishermen in the Senate, and U.S. Representative Gerry Studds (D-Mass.) and U.S. Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D-Washington) have introduced a bill that would create a 200-mile limit and manage the fisheries in a way that would give preference to the U.S. industry.

A 200-mile limit would allow certain depleted species to replenish themselves, and it would give the U.S. fisheries first preference and protection in their catches. New England fishermen do not want to totally exclude foreign fishing in U.S. waters. They advocate a system which would give each nation a quota of certain species. Such a system would increase the productivity and profitability of the New England fisheries.

The fishermen claim that if they can increase their profitability, it, in turn, would attract private capital back to the fisheries. The new capital would finance new vessels, equipment and techniques that would revitalize the entire industry. But reversal of the industry's downward trend is dependent on the passage and enforcement of the 200-mile limit. Some feel that the 200-mile limit is the last chance to make something out of the fisheries.

JEOPARDIZE "RIGHT OF PASSAGE"?

The federal government has not been enthusiastic about imposing such a limit. Among the reasons: a 200-mile limit in U.S. waters could result in denial of the "right of free passage" for American vessels and military ships in foreign waters. In short, by allowing foreign ships the "right of free passage" in U.S. waters, the U.S. feels free to take that "right" in waters throughout the world. American fishermen stress that the 200-mile limit can be flexible, protecting their interests against foreign competition while allowing passage for other types of vessels.

One of the ironies of the entire debate is that while U.S. fleets are sailing around the world in a defensive shield, the Russians and other Eastern Bloc nations are already in position a few miles off American shores. According to one estimate, there are 343 Russian ships, containing about 8,000 people, cruising off the Eastern coast of the U.S.

It appears that the 200-mile limit is inevitable. Both the pressures of the fisheries and growing public opinion are winning an increasing number of advocates in Washington, D.C. and the state capitals.

Thriving fisheries could pump new life into the New England economy and rekindle that spirit of determination and adventure for which the region was once world famous. If the 200-mile limit is the answer to the problems of New England's fisheries, then the talk should turn to action.

FREDERICK J. PRATSON.

BILL STEIGER TALKS ABOUT OSHA

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, in 1970, performing a rare feat for a second-term Member, our colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER), coauthored a landmark law: The Occupational Safety

and Health Act. Not one to rest on his laurels, BILL's concern about on-the-job safety and health did not stop with that accomplishment. Much like a proud father, he played an active role in guiding the infant law.

"OSHA has not reached the stage of adolescence," BILL said, through an able surrogate, in a recent speech delivered to the National Safety Congress; an adolescence, as we all know, is a time for developing maturity, a time for molding future direction.

Because of BILL's deep involvement in OSHA from its conception, I believe his observations and his concerns about its future will be meaningful to our colleagues and others who hope this adolescent will mature into the effective, fair law Congress had in mind. His address to the NSC, therefore, follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER TO NATIONAL SAFETY CONGRESS, CHICAGO, NOVEMBER 1, 1973

I want at the outset to apologize for not being able to be present personally for this National Safety Congress. I am grateful to Howard Pyle and to Assistant Secretary John Stender for their willingness to allow Chuck Hurley to read my speech.

Last year, you may recall, was an election year, and the House of Representatives wasn't in session during the Safety Congress. This year it is—and, regrettably, the Education and Labor Committee is attempting to reach a final agreement today on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments.

Next April OSHA will celebrate its third birthday. Despite all of the controversy, it is my conviction that the great attention paid to occupational safety and health itself has laid a solid foundation for the goal OSHA seeks to achieve, namely, a significant reduction in the number and severity of accidents and deaths in the workplace. The Act and its implementation are working, thanks in large part to the kind of people in this room this morning—Secretary Stender, and his able staff both in Washington and the field, and all of you, the men and women who in the end have the greatest responsibility for enhancing the workplace environment.

The question then is how do we make the Act and its administration even more effective. Obviously, reasonable people can, and should, disagree about complex issues. That is the strength of our democracy as we seek solutions to very difficult problems.

The House of Representatives' Select Subcommittee on Labor chaired by my colleague, Dominick Daniels of New Jersey, will shortly begin extensive oversight hearings on the Occupational Safety and Health Act. These hearings are important for all of us because during the course of them, legislators, business and industrial leaders, labor leaders and safety professionals will, I know, raise some of the important issues and concerns about the policy direction of OSHA.

Together, everyone involved with the Act has come a long way in the last several years. There is much for which each of us can be proud. Moreover, in the midst of periodic crises and growing pains of a law the size, scope and complexity of OSHA, the ever present OSHA cowboy has helped me maintain a perspective and sense of humor. That marvelous creature is framed in my office and you may remember it became known in Wisconsin as "Steiger's Steed."

I have the feeling that the cowboy is about to be superseded by a recently uncovered contraband document from somewhere deep within the bowels of OSHA itself. It is called the "Gospel According to Steiger" and it goes something like this:

In the beginning there were no coathooks

on the toilet stalls and there was ice in the drinking water.

And on the first day Steiger looked down from the 6th District and saw that the workplaces were of danger.

And Steiger said, "Let us make a task force in our own image, after our likeness and let it have dominion over the land of OSHA. Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the bureaucracy."

From the task force came a man called Guenther and Guenther begat Scannell, who begat Seymore, who begat Ronk, who begat O'Neill, who begat Proctor, who begat Lunnie and they were called OSHACRATS.

And Steiger called Scannell up to the Hill of the Capitol and Steiger gave unto Scannell three tablets of granite, each of which carried the weight of two oxen. And Steiger said, "These are the 1910 commandments for Industry in General."

But Scannell replies, "Surely you do not expect the people of OSHA to carry these tablets to their place of business. Their weight presses upon my shoulders like unto my mother-in-law upon my back." But Steiger was unfeeling and said the stones represent the consensus of the wisemen of the country of ANSI and wise men always bring forth heavy proclamations. And Scannell took the stones to the people.

But there came forth from every tavern and construction site, from every auto repair and grocery, the cry that these standards are like unto the Tower of Babel—they are composed of 14 tongues (no reference to carcinogens) and only the wisdom of Solomon and the expertise of Howard Pyle can comprehend them. But Steiger was not moved by the cries of the multitude because it was 5 o'clock on the first day (and we all know what happens in a bureaucracy at 5 o'clock).

On the second day did Steiger create the Office of State Programs. And off in the distance from the left wing of the valley came the sound of the war drums of the tribe of the AFL-CIO.

On the third day, Steiger said unto OSHA, "Whatever you do, stay out of the garden of the pesticides because the Department of Agriculture owns the fruit of the trees there and you will surely enrage the farmers of the garden. But OSHA entered the garden temporarily, on an emergency basis, saying 800 farmworkers died in the garden last year. But this outraged the farmers of the garden who cried, 'Surely thou knowest 800 farmworkers did not die here.' And Steiger said, 'You would not heed my warning about the garden of the pesticides and now I will lay a pestilence upon the land of OSHA and I will cause court injunctions to rain upon the land for 40 fiscal years.'"

On the 4th day there came into the land of OSHA, a tribe from the right wing of the valley. And they were known as the Birchites and their leader was a giant called Stang. And Stang said to Steiger, "We will put the Nix on OSHA and we challenge you!" And Steiger was sorely pressed. "We will debate you in every tavern and women's club, in every convention hall and trade association in the land. We will talk from day unto night and we will inundate the land with press releases, and the rivers shall turn white from memos." And Steiger smote the tongue of the Giant Stang with his dictaphone machine and the Birchites troubled the land of OSHA no longer.

And on the fifth day, Steiger went into the land of OSHA and was distraught with what he saw. And Steiger said, "Let us reorganize." And they did.

And at the end of the fifth day, Steiger looked down upon the land of OSHA and said, "This is a mess, but then so was the land of Social Security when it first started." And then he rested because in the Bureaucracy there is no 6th or 7th day.

Since I have been labeled the "Father to the Lie" by some misguided souls, this gospel

though exceedingly funny, is not entirely accurate or complete.

One year ago the theme of the Labor Department's presentation to this Congress depicted the implementation of the law as a progression from birth to early childhood. It is my best judgment that, in the long range development of the law's implementation, OSHA has now reached the stage of adolescence.

Thus, this morning let me briefly raise with you some of the issues I believe must be considered as you direct your attention to the policy direction OSHA is taking.

First, from the standpoint of legislation, I do not believe Congress will to any extent gut the basic Act. There are two areas in which changes can and, I believe, should be made. One is the area of consultation about which I have spoken in the past. The Act should be amended to authorize on-site consultation for small employers. The reasons are well known and I believe well understood. My hope is that the Nixon Administration will join with the small business associations and the AFL-CIO which in its convention last week endorsed the concept of on-site consultation if separately financed.

The second area concerns coverage for government employees who today are not covered directly by the Act, but are covered to some extent in those States who have adopted state plans. An amendment to the Act to provide for local and state employees is not easily written. But it is essential if we are to allay the concern expressed by those in the private sector who say, "I am required to do certain things. Why doesn't the Government have to do the same?"

There continues to be within Congress, as you would expect, a dichotomy between those who want to repeal or substantially modify the Act's basic provisions as contrasted to those who seek to put even more power in the hands of the Department of Labor. Because a fundamental power balance exists, I foresee the Act being sustained essentially as is.

That raises the second point I would like to make: the administration of the Act. The primary thrust of the Williams-Steiger Act is not toward punishing employers and employees but rather toward securing the broadest possible compliance. Given the relatively small number of compliance officers, virtually everyone agrees that our success in reducing the toll of accidents nationwide, in large measure, will depend on voluntary compliance. The foundation of voluntary compliance is not unlike a three-legged stool.

The first leg is due process, guaranteeing a fundamental respect for the rights of both employers and employees.

The second leg is a clear and precise understanding of the standards and how they apply to employers and employees in the workplace. Each must have a conviction that the standards have a direct and positive impact on workplace safety and health, and each must have complete confidence that compliance with these standards is in their own best interest.

The third leg, of course, is enforcement. Employers and employees must know that if they choose to ignore the standards and the requirements of the Act, OSHA will enforce the law with a fair and firm hand. First instance citations—though highly controversial and a significant departure from previous efforts—are absolutely basic to the progress which has been made up to now.

Too much or too little emphasis on any one of the legs makes the foundation of OSHA unstable. A balanced approach is the only appropriate response to bring OSHA the broad public support and increased appropriations it needs to accomplish its monumental task.

This leads to my third point. I am concerned that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, in part because of

pressure by the courts and in part because of the forces that surround the Act, has become entangled in a web of enforcement and standards setting procedures that could, if not handled well, weaken the very underpinnings of the Act. For example, in FY 73 there were estimated to be an annual number of inspections of 47,000, while for FY 74 OSHA has targeted an annual level of inspections of 80,000—almost a 100% increase.

This rapid increase in the number of inspections and the obvious need to keep the time between inspections and citations as short as possible can present problems for all of us—problems stemming from a lack of precision in citations issued, from the pressure on the compliance officer to forsake quality inspection to increase quantity, and from pressure on the Labor Department as the number of appeals to the Safety and Health Review Commission accelerate rapidly. While inspections are crucial, overall compliance, I believe, must be firmly grounded in the certain knowledge of both employers and employees that each will get a full and fair shake both in due process and in the enforcement procedures.

Another area of concern deals with the recent rulings of the second, third, and fifth Circuit Courts of Appeal, which have overruled parts of the sanitation, carcinogen and pesticides standards. Each of these decisions—which, I understand, will not be appealed—takes issue with the lack of due process and with OSHA's standards setting procedures. I do not have time to go into this in detail, but in each of the cases—two involving emergency temporary standards—the Labor Department failed to establish sufficient justification for its action. This can have a crippling effect on compliance. Employers knowing they will face new OSHA standards in the near future may well ask: "Should we expend the capital and comply with this standard now, when there is a possibility the standard will be overturned next month? Should we wait or perhaps even take the issue to court?" Vacated and/or modified standards written under the pressure of time do not protect employees and are a disincentive for immediate compliance.

My final point: It would be my hope that after congressional hearings on behalf of on-site consultation, the Labor Department will undertake to expand and make more effective its own efforts in the field. Coupled with that is my hope that the Labor Department will make as a priority a complete review of the standards in order to make them more precise and understandable and therefore lead to more complete compliance.

All of this is by way of saying that this balance between enforcement, precise understanding of the standards and due process can strengthen and indeed sustain the ability of the Act to work. My concerns are not directed to any individual or group. The issues are raised this morning to stimulate, from you—the safety professionals, your concern and criticism, as together the legislative and executive branches and all of you seek the best way of insuring and enhancing the workplace environment for the men and women of the United States.

OSHA is a tough law and yes it is fraught with peril. It is complex and yet, in its own way, quite simple. While the standards may be difficult now to understand, the basic concept of employers and employees working together with a fundamental respect for precision and due process can work.

I do not expect unanimity on these or other policy debates, but it is my commitment to you, to my colleagues in Congress, and to those on whose behalf the Act was passed, to be a full partner in our consideration of policy direction and implementation of the law. We need your help, your understanding and your willingness to give of your talents and time.

DEDICATION OF THE NIMITZ LIBRARY, U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent privilege to attend as a member of the Board of Visitors the dedication of the Nimitz Library at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Because I was deeply moved by the ceremony and by this fine educational facility, I felt it would be appropriate to share the highlights of the occasion with my colleagues, and with the American taxpayers who have made possible the construction of this beautiful library:

PROGRAM

Arrival Honors.

Master of Ceremonies: PROFESSOR RICHARD A. EVANS, Librarian, U. S. Naval Academy.
National Anthem.

Invocation: CHAPLAIN JOHN J. O'CONNOR, U. S. Navy.

Remarks and delivery of building: ADMIRAL ISAAC C. KIDD, JR., U. S. Navy, Chief of Naval Material.

Acceptance of building and remarks: VICE ADMIRAL WILLIAM P. MACK, U. S. Navy, Superintendent, U. S. Naval Academy.

Dedication address: REVEREND JAMES J. KORTENDICK, S.S., Ph.D., Professor of Library Science, Catholic University of America.

Remarks: PROFESSOR ELMER B. POTTER, History Department, U. S. Naval Academy.

Unveiling of Bust of Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz: MRS. CHESTER W. NIMITZ, assisted by Rear Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Jr., Midshipman Rodney W. Savage, Brigade Commander, and Midshipman Stephen C. Nimitz, Class of '76.

Benediction: CHAPLAIN MURRAY H. VOTH, U. S. Navy.

PRESENTATION OF THE NIMITZ LIBRARY BY ADM. ISAAC C. KIDD, CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL.

Mrs. Nimitz, Admiral Chester, Katherine, Ms. Nancy and Mary (in absentia), distinguished members of the clergy, Admiral Mack, distinguished guest and young gentlemen of the Brigade of Midshipmen, you for whom this magnificent library was brought into being.

At this time Admiral Mack, I formally tender to you sir, this building and the wealth that it contains. The transfer comes from our Navy's material establishment responsible for construction to the United States Naval Academy for use.

Fortunately, for this great nation of ours, we as a country have been vouchsafed through heritage and tradition a limited number of heroic giants, thus far, adequate in numbers to our nation's needs in times of great stress or national disaster. History has so favored but a few nations, from time to time. Others less fortunate enjoy but a footnote in the Quartermaster's notebook of world history.

Present today are a few such leaders of that stature, Admiral Mack himself, Admiral George Anderson, Admiral Arleigh Burke and, of course, Admiral Nimitz whom we honor with this great building.

The brief bridge watch stood by Fleet Admiral Nimitz in this great Navy of ours was a model for all privileged to serve our country at sea. The lessons he learned, the judgments he made, the inspiration he passed along, the leadership he practiced daily through precept and example, deserve attentive study and scrupulous emulation.

My father knew him well and had unbounded affection for this great man. I too,

knew well this giant among men, as well as a youngster could . . . but well enough to give credit to him and his inspiration for our Navy's unblemished record of smashing successes following the near mortal blow of December 7, 1941.

We have done Admiral Nimitz honor by naming Nimitz, our newest nuclear powered carrier soon to join the fleet. But here today with the transfer of custody of this library we do even more for you Midshipmen of the Brigade; because we thereby insure availability to naval generations yet to come full measure of knowledge as to how best to use to our national advantage the experiences of the past.

"Men who ignore the past are doomed to relive it," said Santayana. Admiral Nimitz never ignored the past. He studied it, learned from it, used it as a basis to build for success in the future. You young gentlemen can afford to do no less, you to whom these remarks are particularly addressed.

Mrs. Nimitz, who honors us so greatly with her presence here today, has a small calling card of the Admiral's tucked away in his wallet. Frequently she carries that with her. I'm sure she has it in her treasured possessions. On the back of this card, gentlemen, Admiral Nimitz had noted for himself those minimum measures which he considered essential to victory at sea, and not necessarily confined to victory at sea in time of war; but also to the proper application of seapower that could lead to assured peaceful pursuits at sea at all times. To me, those one word reminders to himself synthesize those thousands of volumes in this library recording maritime experience. Admiral Nimitz evaluated decisions, he made against these fundamentals. He acknowledged that it was impossible to fulfill them all under every set of conditions. Yet he had little patience with any proposition that could not fulfill most. His points of reference have served me well. I commend them to your study and memory.

On the back of that card are noted the following eighteen words: Objective, Offense, Surprise, Superiority of Force at Point of Contact, Simplicity, Security, Movement, Economy of Force, and finally, Cooperation.

Truly, only a genius could so succinctly summarize the seeds of success.

Gentlemen, its all there . . . on two short inches of paper. I would challenge any to find more wisdom in such a small space. And I would hope, Mrs. Nimitz, that someday you might find it in your heart to permit that bit of paper to be suitably encased in this great library.

ACCEPTANCE BY VICE ADM. WILLIAM P. MACK, SUPERINTENDENT, U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

Admiral Kidd, Mrs. Nimitz, members of the Nimitz family, distinguished platform guests Father Kortendick and those distinguished guests whom Admiral Kidd has already recognized and I would like to add two to this list—Admiral Calvert who returns to us as a former Superintendent and then Captain and now Rear Admiral Max Morris, who is with us this morning as an ex-commandant. These two wonderful officers have contributed so much to the building and foundation and establishment of this library and we are very happy they could be here this morning.

After having accepted the Nimitz Library on behalf of the Naval Academy, I want next to present this key in turn to the one who has done so much to bring this building to life and who will do so much in the future to make it stay that way and to be always the beautiful building, the usable building as you now see it. Professor Evans.

The dedication of this beautiful building which as you can see dominates now the skyline of the Severn River is the culmination of ten years of study, planning and now construction.

When the need for a modern library at Annapolis was analyzed in 1963, a prime consideration was to build a library that would support best the Academy's mission to prepare young men morally, mentally and physically to be professional officers in the Naval Service, and a library that would, in addition, serve the research and general educational needs of both the midshipmen and the faculty.

Another purpose, perhaps more basic, was to construct a library that would be used fully by the students and that would become an integral part of the educational program.

Now I think if you will examine your printed program you will notice the fact that this library contains not just books but the ability to be used by some 1200 midshipmen at any one time in any of several ways and the uses to be made of this building are just fabulous.

I think we have succeeded in these basic purposes very admirably.

In addition to the familiar library functions, the Nimitz Library here includes spaces for a major academic department, the Division of U.S. and International Studies and also a photographic laboratory which is one of the latest in the country. It also houses an educational resources center, again, one of the best and one of the latest, most modern in the country, where we can use and store and issue audio and visual aids used for instruction. A professor who would want to select library materials and a midshipman studying the same materials will be able to find them under one roof and he would find the full instructional resources of this academy—whether these were books, tapes, films, maps, musical tapes, video tape and all the other resources of the Naval Academy. We have a beautiful television control center which distributes closed circuit programs throughout the Academy, some of which we make and do very well.

Significantly, as anything I think that Admiral Nimitz would have anything to do with, this library has been so planned that the resources can be expanded in the future—perhaps twenty years ahead. We know that this is a dynamic educational institution. We propose to keep it that way. And we think the Academy's programs and teaching methods will continue to change in response to the needs of the fleet and new developments which we find in the educational world.

First of all, I would like to thank the Congress which made this remarkable structure a reality. I would also like to extend my thanks and admiration to Mr. John Carl Warnecke and Associates and to the George M. Ewing Co., for the superb architectural design of this building. As you can see it is somewhat similar to Chauvenet and Michelson Halls yet sufficiently distinct and varied to provide its own unique contribution to the Academy landscape. And I think you will find some of the beautiful pictures in the program are indicative of that and I hope you will take these away with you as mementos of this beautiful building.

Rising next to us is, of course, Rickover Hall which will complete the four major new construction buildings and will, I am sure you will agree, form a most beautiful section of this campus.

I thank also the contractor, J. W. Bateson Sons who constructed the building and Eleanor LeMaire Associates who coordinated the interior decor and if you think it is easy to find something which will be masculine for midshipmen and yet beautiful you will, I think, agree they have succeeded when you see the decor of this beautiful building.

Also deserving of special recognition are the Chesapeake Division of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and the Navy's own Public Work Department. Both of these organizations played major roles in the planning and constructing of this magnificent library.

REMARKS BY PROF. E. B. POTTER, DIVISION OF ENGLISH AND HISTORY

It is obvious that the chief reason for Admiral Nimitz's name being commemorated here is his record of leadership in the Second World War. The main reason why the name "Nimitz Library" has met with universal approval was stated by Admiral Kidd. I think another reason is that Fleet Admiral Nimitz was widely known as an eminent intellectual as well as a man of action, a man of books as well as a man of ships and guns. If he had not been a naval officer, this man of many talents might have made a career as an author, which he was; or as an editor, which he was; or even as a professor, which he was.

Author Nimitz at the age of 27 published in the *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings* a widely discussed and much esteemed essay on submarines. This was only the first of a score of articles published by him.

These articles, assembled and bound together, as well they may be some day, would make a valuable and authoritative book.

Editor Nimitz twice served as president of the Naval Institute, in which capacity he read and made recommendations concerning materials submitted for publication. This task he carried out swiftly and effectively because he was a rapid and discriminating reader. Even in the midst of World War II, after a brain cracking day of directing the strategy against Japan, he usually ended his evening reading history, often while listening to recorded classical music.

Editor Nimitz's most extensive effort was with the book *Sea Power*, which is used as a text in naval history here at the Naval Academy. Through his influence, *Sea Power* was kept so fair and so rigidly objective that a Japanese translation became a best seller in Japan, and a German translation is used as a textbook in the West German naval academy.

Professor Nimitz taught as a member of the faculty of the University of California at Berkeley where he was sent in 1926 to establish one of the original NROTC units. Coming in at the comparatively youthful age of 41 as a full professor and Dean, he aroused some resentment among the grey-beard teachers who had earned their Doctorates and struggled up the academic ladder to attain full professorship late in life. But Nimitz soon won the friendship and respect of his colleagues by his unflinching good humor and his wide-ranging knowledge based on years of selective reading. In recognition of his demonstrated ability at judging people, the faculty invited him to join one of the University's committees on promotions and also one of its finding committees for selecting new faculty.

Professor Nimitz, always adaptable, never thought of himself as a naval officer thrust into an unfamiliar, somewhat hostile environment but only as a member of the faculty. He made lifelong friends of colleagues and students, and never lost his interest in education or in the University of California. That is where he sent his eldest daughter, now Mrs. Lay, to earn her degree, and when he went into semi-retirement it was not entirely by coincidence that he made his home near the Berkeley campus. And the University of California never forgot Nimitz. When his services became available, the university lost no time in offering him, through Governor Earl Warren, the post of regent, a position he held eight years.

The many-sided genius of Chester Nimitz has richly earned him a monument on this historic campus, but the overflowing approval of this dedication among those who knew him best, reflects reverence above all for his shining character. Surely no man in public life has been motivated by loftier ideals of service to his country and to all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the dedication ceremonies of the Nimitz

Library, the Naval Academy Class of 1955 presented a bronzed bust of Fleet Admiral Nimitz which has been permanently placed on the terrace to the library. The sculptor of this bust was Mr. Felix DeWeldon and his compelling remarks concluded the ceremonies. A portion of Mr. DeWeldon's remarks follow:

It was very important to know the man well—his inner self—his character—even before one started to work on the clay model. Once I had the honor of having lunch with Admiral Nimitz, Admiral King and Admiral Carney at the Navy Department. The second time I saw him was at the ceremony when Secretary of the Navy Forrestal gave awards to aircraft carrier groups in front of the Iwo Jima monument. And the third time was at a dinner in Washington in honor of Admiral Nimitz and General Eisenhower.

The sculptor's interpretation is limited to the portrayal of the spirit and character of his subject and light and shadow are his principal tools.

When Admiral Nimitz sat for me I keenly felt his brilliance and lucidity of mind as well as his simplicity and charm of manner. He was a man of scrupulous impartiality with a great gift of logic. His deeply penetrating mind and outstanding leadership left his mark on our Navy for all times. Admiral Nimitz was loved and respected by all who knew him and I sincerely hope that these attributes will be apparent to all who see this portrait bust of him.

Our Navy's successful campaign across the Pacific with its great battles fought and won are a tribute to his leadership. I hope that this memorial which honors Admiral Nimitz will also honor and remind us all of the gallantry of the men of the Navy and Marine Corps who have served under him and of whom Admiral Nimitz has said "Uncommon valor was a common virtue."

HOSPITAL CORPSMAN AWARDED NAVY COMMENDATION MEDAL

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Rear Adm. Freeman H. Cary, the attending physician for the U.S. Congress, made an award of the Navy Commendation Medal to Senior Chief Hospital Corpsman Millard J. Gomez.

Senior Chief Gomez was recognized by the U.S. Navy for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of his duties while serving on the staff of the attending physician to the U.S. Congress during the period of August 1966 to August 1973.

I am especially interested in this award, because Chief Gomez is a resident of my congressional district from the city of Nanticoke. I, too, wish to extend my congratulations to Senior Chief Corpsman Gomez upon receiving this award from the U.S. Navy. It is full recognition of a job well done and must be a source of great personal satisfaction to Chief Gomez and his family and friends.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as part of my remarks the citation that was presented on November 8, 1973, by Admiral Cary to Senior Chief Hospital Corpsman Gomez:

CITATION

In ceremonies held at the U.S. Capitol on November 2, 1973, Rear Admiral Freeman H. Cary presented the Navy Commendation Medal to Senior Chief Hospital Corpsman Millard J. Gomez for exceptionally meritorious conduct while serving on the staff of the Attending Physician to the U.S. Congress. Gomez was cited as follows:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service while attached to the staff of the Attending Physician to the U.S. Congress from 1 August 1966 to 31 August 1973. During this period, Senior Chief Gomez consistently demonstrated unusual initiative, industriousness, vigor, enthusiasm and medical expertise. His performance was particularly commendable in light of his daily necessity for working closely and smoothly with Members of Congress and other high ranking government officials. In these contacts, Senior Chief Gomez elicited only laudatory comments from those whom he served. His knowledge and technical skill contributed importantly to the excellent medical coverage for Joint Sessions of Congress, State Funerals and for two Presidential Inaugurations. In all areas, Senior Chief Gomez' performance of duty was in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service."

HMCS Gomez is the son of Mrs. Nettie Gomez, 924 South Market Street, Nanticoke, Pennsylvania. He enlisted in the U.S. Navy August 21, 1957.

AT LAST, A BETTER WAY TO PICK THE VEEP

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, as part of my continuing effort to draw attention to the need to review the current process for nominating vice presidential candidates, I am today providing for the RECORD a very fine article on the subject by James M. Perry of the National Observer:

AT LAST, A BETTER WAY TO PICK THE VEEP
(By James M. Perry)

It was more than 20 years ago that Herbert Brownell and Thomas Dewey agreed that Dwight D. Eisenhower's running mate would be the junior senator from California, Richard M. Nixon.

They passed the word to the general, who said he was "surprised" to learn "that the Presidential candidate could choose the Vice President as a matter of long-standing custom."

Right up to the final moment, Nixon wasn't so sure he should accept, and his wife, Pat, was even less sure. Dick and Pat stayed up until 4 a.m. talking it out, finally waking up Murray Chotiner to ask for advice. You can't lose anything, the wily Chotiner told them.

Eisenhower didn't pick Nixon; in fact, he hardly knew him. Nixon was picked for the ticket by party leaders because (according to Brownell) he was "young, geographically right, had experience both in the House and the Senate with a good voting record, and was an excellent speaker."

Nixon was also supposed to be a "bridge" between the feuding Eisenhower and Taft factions in the party. Kennedy picked Johnson for a similar reason, he would be a bridge to the Old South, Johnson picked Humphrey because Hubert always had been his bridge to the liberals; and, when Nixon's

time finally came, he picked Agnew because... because he was an ethnic, because he was a governor with some thoughts about city problems, because, maybe, he didn't seem to offend (or threaten) anybody.

And McGovern picked Eagleton because... well, why did he pick Eagleton? Because, maybe, there was no one else.

It is a lousy system, and it is no better now than it was when the naive old general was told what to do 21 years ago. Soon, though, the system will be changed—by the Democrats at least. They have something called the Commission on Vice Presidential Selection whose 70 members will vote before the end of the year on a reform package.

AGNEW FALLOUT

Nobody thought the commission would do anything or that anyone would pay attention to its deliberations, because the Democrats didn't want to hold highly publicized meetings to explore why their nominee in 1972 picked a running mate who'd been hospitalized for mental problems on three separate occasions, especially when that running mate was seeking re-election to the Senate from Missouri in 1974.

But the Agnew resignation, with the resulting vacancy in the Vice Presidency, has changed all that. Now, the question of selecting a fit Vice President isn't just a Democratic problem; it's a Republican problem too. And that's why the Democrats are going to institute meaningful reform this year.

I think I know what's going to be in the package—because the commission chairman, Hubert Humphrey, and the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Robert S. Strauss, seemed to be in perfect agreement last week on what the reforms ought to be. It's in the bag.

But it's fun to listen to the witnesses and leaf through the mail from party leaders, labor skates, and political scientists to learn what they think ought to be done. This commission has inspired some interesting proposals. Thus:

State Sen. Burnett C. Bauer, of South Bend, Ind., would amend the Constitution to "replace the office of the President and the Vice President by an elected three-man commission." The job, he thinks, is too big for one man.

Robert M. Curtis, past chairman of the Broward County (Fla.) Democratic Executive Committee, wants "the person receiving the second highest number of delegate votes... be automatically declared the Vice Presidential nominee."

NUTS TO GEORGE

Donald O. Peterson, national committeeman from Wisconsin, thinks there's wisdom "in encouraging candidates to actively campaign for the nomination of Vice President and not permit the decision to be made by one man."

Charles S. Harnetty, chairman of the Perry County (Ohio) Democratic Party, has two thoughts: "(A) First, do away with every damn McGovern guideline; (B) anyone except Senator George McGovern could of picked a great Vice Presidential candidate."

Rep. J. Robin Harris of the Georgia House of Representatives doesn't want any change in the system because if the delegates to the last convention had been allowed to make the selection, "the result would have been more disastrous than it was." Harris says it gets more difficult all the time being a Democrat.

Sen. John Sparkman, Adlai Stevenson's running mate in 1952, thinks it's just about "impossible to arrive at a good solution.... Frankly, I see little escape from the prevailing custom...."

REALLY BIG REFORMS

Finally, though, it's the political scientists who demonstrate the most inspiration. Sim-

ple reforms aren't enough for them; the reforms must be *really* big—and original. Thus:

William J. Crotty, associate professor, Northwestern University, suggests "the office of Vice President should be abolished by Constitutional amendment." In case the President dies, resigns, etc., "the Congress by majority vote should select a person to serve as a caretaker or provisional President until the next election." But if the next election is more than two years away, then "the parties should nominate candidates for a two-year term and the voters select among them in the off-year elections." Crotty also suggests an amendment providing for a vote of confidence on a President. If the Congress voted "no confidence" twice within 30 days, the President would be forced to resign and an election would be held to replace him within 60 days.

David R. Mayhew, associate professor at Yale University, proposes what he calls "a simple, off-beat idea." He would change the Constitution to "1.) delete anything to do with the Vice Presidential duties... and 2.) delete anything barring a Vice President from simultaneously holding any other office."

Notes Professor Mayhew: "The logic of all this is to allow a party to nominate a man for Vice President without his having to abandon (or refrain from assuming) another office even if he wins the Vice Presidency." And why not? "The official and unofficial duties of Vice Presidents can be abolished at small cost; they don't amount to much anyway." Under Mayhew's proposal, Nelson Rockefeller could be Vice President and governor of New York. Or Honest Ted Britt could be Vice President and still sell used cars.

NOT WHAT, BUT WHO

"The only important thing a Vice President does is take over if a President dies," Mayhew points out. "It makes little difference what a Vice President does while he waits. It makes a great deal of difference what kind of man is doing the waiting."

I like Mayhew's idea. That is *original* thinking, and he is well on his way to becoming a truly big-time political scientist.

But the mandate of the Democrats' Commission on Vice Presidential Selection doesn't allow quite that much latitude.

So what the commission will recommend is this:

That the nominee chosen at the national convention recommend a running mate to the Democratic National Committee, which would be called into session after the convention is over. "That," says chairman Humphrey, "is what I find most engaging." Members of the committee, he added, would cast their votes in proportion to the number of votes their states were allotted at the national convention.

A MINI-CONVENTION

"Right," says Chairman Strauss. "The problem has been haste and confusion," and this proposal, he said, would solve it. It would, in fact, be very much like the mini-convention that picked Sargent Shriver as Eagleton's replacement.

Strauss also suggested that "a special committee or commission, appointed by the Democratic National Committee, be involved in the screening of potential candidates for Vice President, so that when our Presidential candidate is selected, the candidate can benefit from the research of such a commission."

So that, too, will probably be a recommendation.

Liz Carpenter, one of the witnesses last week, said that a Presidential nominee picking a running mate is a little like Moses, when he finally saw the promised land. "He leaned on his staff and he died."

It seems the Democrats will approve mean-

ingful reform, including better staff work. Wonderful.

OUR NATION SALUTES THE HONORABLE PAUL CAVALIERE, NEW JERSEY'S CHAMPION SPORTSMAN AND A LEADING CITIZEN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, last month my Eighth Congressional District, State of New Jersey was the setting for a testimonial to a great champ and sportsman, proud family man, good friend and neighbor, the Honorable Paul Cavaliere, who attained excellence and national prominence in the sports world of boxing. A lifetime ever devoted to good works, compassion and fair play, always with dignity and universal respect, has earned him the title of "Champion" in our State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Cavaliere was born in Paterson, N.J. 68 years ago and has achieved in his lifetime the respect and esteem of all who had the good fortune to know him. It is to his modesty in his achievements, his outstanding expertise in his field of endeavor, the warmth of his friendship and his standards of excellence in the American way of life that I seek this national recognition of his service to his community and his fellowman.

A recent news article that appeared in the Paterson News, one of New Jersey's most prestigious newspapers, most eloquently sets forth a brief sketch of the "Champ," Paul Cavalier, intertwined with the style and grace that depicts an era in our country's history filled with nostalgia but, equally as important, a factual historic chronicle of Paul Cavaliere, the man. Paul's story is truly an epic in our American heritage where success is within the promise of men like Paul who have the zest for pursuing what is within one's heart, matched with the determination and sincerity of purpose to always do the best in everything one sets out to do. Mr. Speaker, at this point in our historic journal of Congress I would like to enter this Paterson News story, written by a most distinguished sports writer, Bob Curley, as follows:

BOB CURLEY'S CURLEY CUES: YOU'RE PAUL CAVALIERE—A CHAMP

You're Paul Cavaliere, the world's uncrowned world's heavyweight champion. Sure, you won the light heavyweight and heavyweight championships of New Jersey, but they never did give you a crack at the world's title because you were too clever for some of the top names.

The record books reveal that you had 115 bouts during your career, lost but three and reversed decisions on two of the defeats.

You're the only man to ever spar with five world heavyweight champions (Gene Tunney, Jack Sharkey, Primo Carnera, Max Baer, Joe Louis). You traveled more rounds with Louis (115) than any other human. You were a real challenge to the Brown Bomber, who during his early training days enjoyed knocking down spar mates. Only once did Louis hurt you. That was the first time you stepped into the ring with him at Doc Bier's old camp in Pompton Lakes. Perhaps you didn't believe all

the things newspapermen had been saying about Joe's left hook and when he caught you with one on the head you said: "I thought I was going to go through the floor."

But you never did hit the deck. You used your ring skill and thereafter more than held your own with Louis. Through the years only an Englishman named Charlie Smith dropped you with a punch. That was in old Madison Square Garden when he caught you with a right to the Adam's apple. You got off the floor and boxed him silly.

You're Paul Cavaliere, who was born on June 16, 1905 in Paterson where you were reared and worked. You were born 50 years too soon, for today you'd be No. 1 on the Leather Pushing Parade. The current crop of boxers would be right up your alley as you would stab and box them silly. Although they termed you a "boxer" you could punch, too, for you had a 25 per cent knockout record.

You're Paul Cavaliere, who emerged after more than two decades of boxing, with no scars of cauliflower ears or punchiness. The only real loss was an "e." Newspapermen frequently dropped the last "e" from Cavaliere and you were Cavalier.

A man with the Patent Leather Kid type of look, one of your greatest victories was over Two Ton Tony Galento in Madison Square Garden. This one was for the New Jersey heavyweight title and there was a platinum blonde named Jean Harlow who sat directly behind your corner rooting for you. The movie queen of the 30s loved your looks and you made a great impression on her as you jabbed and belted Galento, who had 13 straight kayoes to his credit, at will for 10 rounds.

That was one of your biggest pay nights, too. You walked out of the Garden with a check for \$8,000. But that was a lot of money in those depression days when taxes were nil. You didn't earn as much money a couple of years prior when you outpointed Jimmy Braddock for the state's lightweight crown at old Arcola Park. However, you did go home with a title and a victory over the Cinderella Man who later beat Max Baer for the world's heavyweight crown.

You're Paul Cavaliere, a proud grandfather and a Wayne country squire, who has put in over 30 years as an attendance officer for the Paterson Board of Education. You've said the toughest man you ever fought was a lad named Harold Maize, out of Bayonne. Meanwhile Gene Tunney once told News' Diamond Gloves fans at the Paterson Armory: "Cavaliere is one of the cleverest heavyweights of all time in boxing."

You were a dancer with the grace of Astaire and Bolger rolled into one with the fastest pair of hands in the business. You never held back a punch . . . unless it was to avoid seriously hurting a gritty but defenseless opponent . . . and you never held back your feelings about Cassius Clay. You thought he did his country a disservice and have expressed that opinion for a long time.

You're Paul Cavaliere, who started in the boxing business as a 173 pounder at the age of 19. Your best fighting weight was 187 and today you're only 13 pounds above that mark.

You're Paul Cavaliere, who in 1941 became the third man in the ring, officiating countless title bouts including those involving Zale-Graziano, Cerdan-Zale, Giardello-Tiger, Fusari-Robinson. During your spare time you conducted boxing classes at high schools such as Pompton Lakes, Butler, Midland Park and Clifton and devoted 20 years to operating a boxing gym in Paterson where Mickey Polo was your No. 1 aide.

You're Paul Cavaliere, who has helped many a kid out of difficulty, taught others how to defend themselves and have been a blessing to mankind.

You're Paul Cavaliere, whose great love is boxing, but who has an even greater love for your wife, Florence, son, Paul Jr. and your grandchildren. Those whom you have

helped and those whom you have loved are going to honor you at a testimonial dinner a week from Friday night at the Wayne Manor.

You're Paul Cavaliere, a six-foot, 200-pound man with a devastating left hook and a heart of gold. You're Paul Cavaliere . . . a champion who is out of this world.

Mr. Speaker. I know that you and our colleagues will join with me in saluting and extending the appreciation of the Congress to Paul Cavaliere for the example he has established for our youth of America in his sportsmanship and sense of fair play that has truly established him as New Jersey's champion sportsman and a leading citizen.

REPRESENTATIVE VANDER JAGT ADDRESSES THE ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation held its third annual meeting of the Advisory Council on Monday, October 29, in Washington. On this occasion, the speaker of honor was Hon. GUY VANDER JAGT, my esteemed colleague and friend from the State of Michigan.

At the luncheon meeting Representative VANDER JAGT, a member of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and a member of the House Task Force on International Economic Policy, spoke on what he saw as the challenge for OPIC.

I trust my colleagues will find his remarks timely, given not only the present public hearings by the appropriate committees in both Houses of Congress on OPIC itself, but also given the growing importance to the Nation of sound international economic policy planning and goals.

The address of Representative VANDER JAGT follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN GUY A. VANDER JAGT BEFORE THE THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

It has been a rather eventful two weeks for OPIC. Ten days ago, after a lengthy and thorough investigation, the Senate issued a report, the gist of which said: OPIC has got to go. Seven days ago, the House issued its long-awaited report, the gist of which was: OPIC has to stay. How do you like that for a clear-cut Congressional mandate? On the one hand, you are told to close up shop, on the other to keep doing business, not necessarily business as usual in every respect, but performing a vital and a necessary function.

But how could two reports reach such widely divergent conclusions? I think one of the reasons that the Senate report reached the conclusion which it did was that it was based on two case histories. ITT and Jamaica. And quite apart from the objectivity of the analysis of those two case histories, I submit that two case histories is not a valid foundation on which to draw generalized conclusions about a program which is as wide as rich in variety as is the OPIC program.

Not taken into account in the Senate re-

port, in my opinion, were the hundreds of cases about OPIC which do not get into the newspapers. Not taken into account was that 80% of the OPIC portfolio deals with investments of \$2 million or less. Not taken into account in the Senate report, in my opinion, were all those instances where OPIC enters the act after the event, and skillfully, and patiently, and quietly, negotiates an acceptable settlement.

The Senate report was very, very concerned about the theoretical possibility of OPIC's dragging the U.S. Government into a direct confrontation with a foreign government. Not taken into account in the Senate report, were scores of instances where OPIC has been a buffer, in actual practice, to prevent the very kind of confrontation about which the Senate report was concerned. But in my opinion, the basic reason for the widely differing conclusions was the different underlying assumption of each committee. And in an oversimplified fashion, I think this was the assumption underlying the Senate report; there are so many problems, there are so many difficulties, there is such a wave of nationalism sweeping the world, that probably it is not desirable to have U.S. private business investment in less developed countries. Certainly not desirable enough for the U.S. Government to do anything about encouraging it.

The House assumption, in my opinion, was that: in spite of the problems, in spite of the difficulties, U.S. private business investment in underdeveloped countries can be desirable. I, myself, will go a step further and say that in most instances private U.S. business investment in a less developed country is the best thing that could possibly happen to that country, and probably best thing that could happen in carrying out the objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

Even though we are operating now under the umbrella of detente, detente itself acknowledges the fact that we have two diametrically opposed economic systems competing with each other, and competing for the allegiance and the loyalty and the support of the people of the world, three quarters of which live in the less developed countries. And with a dramatic paring back in our aid program, it seems to me that one of the crucial tools which we have left in this competition is the potential for achievements and performance by U.S. business in the less developed countries of the world. I really believe that our economic system—what it has been able to achieve—has something to offer the needs and desires of such countries.

You see this reflected in varying ways, in varying sections of the world. In the Far East, in Korea and in Taiwan, where OPIC has encouraged investment, you find in the capital city of South Korea—in Seoul—an example, a witness, I think, not of the words but of the demonstration of what free enterprise can indeed accomplish. This city, just 20 years ago, was flat on its back, war-devastated, totally destroyed. Today, when you walk amidst the brimming, bustling traffic of its busy streets, you realize that an economic miracle did indeed take place; a modern construction, sprouting out everywhere is visible evidence that the dynamic, free enterprise economy of South Korea is the fastest growing economy in the entire world.

Or go a thousand miles south to its tiny neighbor, Taiwan. There, you see a nation—equipped really with nothing but the dynamism of its free enterprise system—which in spite of diplomatic set-back after diplomatic set-back last year, increased its exports an incredible 40 percent to the markets of the world. And you see there a nation, which with the dynamism of its free economy, with the outside investment which has helped it, is generating a per capita income for its people one hundred times greater than the per capita income of the controlled economy of mainland China.

I believe that in this enterprise system of ours, we do have a story to tell the nations. A story that can be told by example, by performance and by achievement. I think that story reaches behind the Iron Curtain.

Last August, I went to Zagreb, to open the U.S. exhibit at the International Trade Fair. Afterward I had to visit each of the six republics in Yugoslavia. I was meeting with the president of Macedonia, and we got into a conversation in which he said that unemployment in Macedonia was 22%. This was in August, when I was heading into an election campaign, and when 6% unemployment was a catastrophe for America. On top of that, I had just voted for the Emergency Unemployment Act, in the Congress, which set up jobs in the public sector for those who couldn't find jobs in the private sector. President Nixon vetoed it. I voted to override his veto.

I said to the communist president of Macedonia: "what are you doing about the 22 percent unemployment?" Well, he said, "we are trying to lure foreign capital, we are trying to get it to invest here. In fact, we are trying to get your U.S. business to come, and we are offering them 50 percent of the action—50-50 in the new business." I said, "well it's great for the long run, but what are you doing immediately to address this problem of 22 percent unemployment. Don't you have anything like our Emergency Unemployment Act program?"

He said, "you don't understand. You don't solve the problems of unemployment by putting people to work at make-work jobs. The only way you really get at the roots of unemployment, is to put a man to work at a job where he is productive, and where there is a profit to be made."

And I thought, "my goodness, either this world has gone crazy or I have. Here's a communist president lecturing a Republican capitalist about the essentiality of the profit motive."

I think you can see the great opportunity we have in the countries of Africa. There is a continent where the countries, in some cases, are so rich in resources, and pools of manpower, and yet so woefully inadequate in terms of economic development. I think these small, ten-year old countries are valiantly trying to develop and pull themselves up by their own boot straps; but the going is very, very hard and very, very difficult. For their development, they need and desire all of the private investment that they can get.

And they do, indeed, very much desire it. I remember a case in Sudan, where I was in February as the personal representative of the President to encourage U.S. private investment in, and trade with Africa. Sudan is the largest country in Africa, and is about one-third the size of the United States.

It is rich in natural resources, rich in fertile agricultural land, but only one-sixth of the tillable land in the Sudan has been cultivated, and the natural resources lie untouched underneath the rich soil. Why? They don't have any transportation, and they don't have the money to build the roads, the railroads, or even to dredge out the river channels. They can't get their products to viable markets.

In fact, about the only paved road in Sudan is that leading out of Khartoum, going 80 miles back into the interior. The Sudanese call this road the "American Way", not just because it was built with U.S. money, but because all along this road and for hundred of yards back are clustered the majority of private businesses and commercial enterprises that you will find anywhere in Sudan. They think of that kind of business as the American way, and the American way looks awfully good to the Sudanese right now.

It wasn't always that way. In 1967 they were enamored with Russian claims of what a controlled economy could do. They were convinced that the capitalists were milking off the rich profits and sending them back

home. They were also upset with our stand in the 1967 Mid-East war, and so they decided that they would kick the U.S. out, invite the Russians in and that they would nationalize all of their businesses, which they proceeded to do. But when the people experienced in the ways of business began to run business down, down, and down—not only were there no huge profits to milk, but there were also larger and larger deficits which had to be made up with bigger and bigger subsidies from out of the general treasury.

By June of 1972, the president of Sudan recognized that he had made a mistake. Not only recognized it, but he went on nationwide radio to announce that he had made a mistake when he turned the U.S. out and invited the Russians in. He announced that he was going to de-nationalize the businesses as rapidly as he could.

When Jamie McClelland, my assistant, and I arrived in Sudan, our ambassador scheduled a Friday morning meeting with, they said, a few Sudanese businessmen, put on by the Sudanese Chamber of Commerce. Our ambassador was astounded when 50 Sudanese businessmen showed up, because Friday is their Sunday, and it is very, very important to a Sudanese to be with his family on Sunday. But there was one thing more important for the Sudanese businessman, and that was to use that opportunity to talk with a representative of the U.S.; to urge him, to (yes) plead with him to do any thing he could possibly do to get U.S. business to invest in the future development of Sudan. They very much desire and need U.S. business investment, and are doing everything they can to encourage it. I think in many ways they are a parable of many of the countries with which I am familiar.

In fact, I think for the Senate subcommittee to decide on its own what is desirable or not desirable for the less developed countries smacks a little bit of the arrogance of power and judgment of which the Senate has previously been so critical. It would seem to me that we should do as OPIC does—let the nations decide for themselves whether they need and desire that kind of U.S. business investment.

And if we let them decide, there is no question in my mind but that they will say their need is overwhelming, their desire is equally overwhelming, and that the opportunity is there. Their arms are open wide, the doors are open wide. It is the role and the task of OPIC to try and help to lead business through that door. The mandate of OPIC is one that in this juncture in history, I think, rings out—and that is, to mobilize and facilitate participation by U.S. private capital in the economic progress in less developed nations. And that is precisely what less developed nations need today, and what they want.

Let me, before I close, touch very quickly upon two other points making private the role of OPIC and the flexibility that is needed by OPIC. In terms of privatization the Senate committee wanted the OPIC insurance portfolio turned over to the private sector immediately. Well, there's a problem there, and that is that the private insurance industry in the U.S. isn't ready now, won't take it now; it can't take it now. The Senate recommendation also does not take into account that under the very able leadership of Marshall Mays, OPIC has been moving in that direction, but moving carefully and thoughtfully, because the whole experience of U.S. insurance has been domestic. It has not been foreign. We don't have a Lloyd's. Certainly therefore, we want to go very carefully.

I personally would not like to see the role of OPIC removed entirely. It seems to me vitally important that the U.S. Government have a handle or a lever or an input into the shaping of the nature of the investment so that it can maximize its acceptability to the

host country, and minimize the risk of expropriation. And so that we can, to the highest degree possible, make the nature of investment consistent with the objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

You know, multinationals are here to stay. We know that we don't know a great deal about multinationals. We know they are new. We know we are on uncharted waters, but we do know that under the pressure of business, internationalization is essential if business is to remain prosperous and able to produce not only goods at competitive prices for the individual American but also revenue, taxes and jobs for the betterment of the U.S. economy at large.

The Senate report would have the Government, through OPIC, just walk away from all of that. The House report believes that it is vital that the Government participate with business in formulating the kind of business policies that will contribute to a wise and sound foreign policy, and in moving toward the goals and objectives of that foreign policy.

Now, on the problem of flexibility. We live in such rapidly changing times—what was sound policy two years ago is not necessarily sound policy today. You have to run fast just to stand still. And you have to adapt to changing times and circumstances and challenges. I commend OPIC for its innovative and imaginative spirit, and its attempts to try to keep pace with changing times, and for the way in which the House report which encouraged innovative and imaginative actions by OPIC was received.

I personally saw the imagination, the innovation of OPIC, in terms of a technical training center which I am interested in developing in Abidjan in Ivory Coast. When I came to the end of that tour for the President, at one last meeting with 40 representatives of top U.S. corporations there, I asked them what can the U.S. Government do to help them invest in and expand their trade with Francophone West Africa. They were unanimous that the most important thing of all would be some mechanism by which we could transfer American know-how and training skills to the Africans so that the manpower skills would be there to realize the market potential which is already there and growing. Without the manpower skills, it couldn't be done. They also believed it essential that U.S. business have an input into the mechanism, so that students would be trained not for theoretical needs, but for actual needs—and in the immediate future.

When I mentioned this concept to the Minister of Planning, Minister Diawara of the Ivory Coast, he agreed thoroughly and said, "if you ever get anything like that going at all, we will provide all of the land and all of the buildings that are needed. We think that it is right on."

I came back to Washington, and knew that such a concept would need the total cooperation of the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, A.I.D., OPIC, and other governmental agencies, and certainly the total cooperation of the private U.S. sector. And it was OPIC alone that was so mandated by its charter to encourage U.S. investment in less developed countries in ways such as this, that are so welcomed by the host nations. It was OPIC alone that had the flexibility and the personnel with skill enough and imagination enough to take that ball and run with it. We have now reached the point, under the tremendous leadership of Sheldon Gitelman of OPIC, of being ready to proceed with the feasibility study in which five top U.S. corporations are participating and which will examine, first of all, the market opportunities for those companies in that area.

Second, and far more important is what manpower skills are needed in order to realize those opportunities. And, three, perhaps most important of all, what should be the mechanism and the nature of it for the mesh-

ing of those economic opportunities of the manpower needs. Sheldon has done a good job, not only in getting business to match OPIC's grant, but also in getting business to commit the top leadership of their companies to serve on our working committee to make sure that this will be something with sound and thoughtful business input.

So, I think this is an example of the kind of innovative and imaginative leadership which OPIC has been providing, and continues to provide in bringing together the cooperation of governmental agencies, U.S. business, and countries that need and desire our help so much. I commend OPIC for its willingness to adapt and change to meet changing times and circumstances, and for remembering the advice which was given to us long ago by James Russell Lowell when he said,

"We cannot make their creed our jailer, they must forever onward sweep and upward who would keep abreast of truth. New occasions teach new duties, and we should not try to open the future's portal with the past's blood-rusted key."

We know that there is, indeed, great opportunity in the underdeveloped nations of the world. We know that that blood-rusted and worn-out key will not open the door to a more prosperous tomorrow. The needs and the desires as well as the opportunities in those nations are evident. In part those needs can be met by the genius that is American free enterprise—both in terms of what it can achieve, and in terms of what its performance has been to date. I think OPIC stands at a unique juncture in history, with a tremendous opportunity. I compliment all of you for your efforts to try to work together to find the key that can unlock that door to a developing tomorrow which will inure to the great benefit of the objectives of the foreign policy of the United States.

RECLAMATION—1973 AND IN THE FUTURE

HON. DAVID TOWELL

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks made by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Gilbert Stamm, at the 27th Annual Nevada Water Conference held in Carson City:

RECLAMATION—1973 AND IN THE FUTURE

It is always a good tonic for any Commissioner of Reclamation to speak here in Nevada, to Nevadans about Water Resource Management.

The State, in addition to being the birthplace of Reclamation, has a way of bringing into extraordinarily sharp focus just what Reclamation is really all about. For more than 130 years, you Nevadans have battled an essentially continuous drought through reclamation of your arid lands for irrigation.

In spite of having the lowest average rainfall of any State in the Nation, Nevada has managed so far to supply water to her growing cities, develop and sustain a large mining and milling industry, develop hydroelectric power and perhaps most important of all, irrigate as much as one million acres. Although Reclamation as an agency is a relative newcomer to Nevada water resource and management—having been here only about 70 years—we are proud of the contributions we have been able to make to the development of the State.

With all the progress that has been made over the years in the development and utilization of Nevada's limited water supplies,

many of the basic problems remain. Nevada still has a scanty average rainfall. You still have vast stretches of land that could be made productive with an assured water supply. Your cities continue to grow, demanding not only greater quantities of scarce water but higher qualities as well. There are the inevitable disputes over available water supply, so common in water-short areas.

As I am sure virtually everyone here is well aware, one such dispute involves the division of the Truckee River waters between Pyramid Lake and the Newlands Reclamation Project. That controversy is widely known and of long standing. I suspect there are few informed people in Nevada who are not aware of the essential elements of the problem.

The latest move in that struggle has been official notice from the Secretary of the Interior to Truckee-Carson Irrigation District that the operating contract between the U.S. and the District will be terminated as of October 31, 1974. The termination grows out of violations by the District of Departmental Operating Criteria and Procedures for the Newlands Projects. I am personally saddened by the turn this dispute has taken.

Under the termination procedure, TCID will continue to operate the project facilities during the coming year, including Derby Diversion Dam. However, should the District divert more than 288,000 acre-feet, the quantity allocated by Judge Gessell and adopted by Secretary Morton's rules and regulations, the overages will be deducted from subsequent year water supplies. The Department will take physical control of the project on October 31, 1974. I personally am hopeful that some solution to the issue, interim or long-term, will be found prior to the takeover date and that actual takeover will not take place.

There is no doubt in my mind that litigation of the various rights of the parties involved in this situation will be initiated during the coming year. There is, after all, a great deal at stake. The litigation undoubtedly will be troublesome, costly, and lengthy. It will not add a single gallon of water to the supply of the Truckee and Carson River Basins. Nevertheless, the issues are such that probably they can be resolved only through the litigation process.

Ambiguities of Orr Ditch decree and the Alpin temporary restraining order must be clarified. Rights to the short water supply must be established. Otherwise the situation can only worsen as this area continues to grow, as it undoubtedly will, and the competition for water intensifies.

There is no getting around the immense water supply problems Nevada faces here and in virtually every other area of the State as well. But they are not insoluble. Nevada has had such problems for a long time and history shows that Nevadans are capable of the dedicated, practical efforts needed for solutions.

The Bureau of Reclamation is continuing to contribute to the efforts you are making toward solutions of these problems.

For example, the Bureau's Project Skywater program here in the Truckee River Basin appears promising. The Desert Research Institute is conducting the weather modification research program, and will begin a fourth season of cloud seeding this winter. The next step in this phase of the program will be a year of data analysis.

If the project is successful, and preliminary analysis of the data is encouraging, it could go a long way toward alleviating the gross water supply deficiencies in the Truckee River Basin.

Although funding has been very short, the Bureau has been able to do some field explorations, mostly in cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey and some oil companies, to learn more about the water supply potential of geothermal resource areas in Nevada. Attention was given especially to

the Stillwater and Soda Lake areas near Fallon.

Reclamation provided leadership for a Nevada Westwide Study Team composed of Federal, State and local agency representatives. The team developed input for the Western U.S. Water Plan study, a principal part of which was in the form of assistance to the State of Nevada on the State Water Plan. During the past year, this effort has been focused primarily on identifying alternatives to meet the present and future needs for water and related land resources in the State, and on preparing reports to explain those alternatives.

The team approach to Nevada's water planning has proved very effective. However, the enabling Westwide program was terminated, except for wrap-up work, last June 30, while the team was still in full stride on State Water Plan work. At the request of your State Engineer, the team will continue as a Nevada study team at least until the regional reports are completed. The reports will continue Nevada data to the Westwide wrap-up, as well as material for the State Water Plan.

The Bureau assisted the California Fish and Game Department in setting up a project for trash fish eradication at Boca Reservoir. With the cooperation of water user agencies that have Truckee River storage interests, the Bureau arranged for nearly complete drawdown of Boca Reservoir to provide a small pool to accommodate game fish removal and trash fish kill.

While Boca Reservoir was being drawn down, Prosser Creek Reservoir was kept practically full through the summer and Stampede Reservoir was kept near the maximum level to which it has been allowed to fill since construction.

At the request of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Reclamation did the field and design engineering work needed to prepare for rehabilitation and betterment of the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation irrigation system. A contract has been awarded, and Reclamation will administer construction. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Reclamation are discussing similar assistance on several other Indian irrigation systems.

The completion of Stampede Dam access road recently marked the windup of current Bureau construction in the California portion of the Truckee River Basin. However, we issued specifications during October for construction of Marble Bluff Dam and Pyramid Lake Fishway on the Lower Truckee.

In southern Nevada, the Clark County Sewage and Wastewater Advisory Committee has recommended development of a plan, emphasizing advanced waste treatment, to handle pollution problems in Las Vegas Wash and the Las Vegas Bay arm of Lake Mead. Maximum beneficial use of the treated wastewater for in-valley irrigation, power, and industrial uses, and future ground-water recharge is considered to be of major importance.

Southern Nevada water share benefits, along with other areas along the Colorado River, in the Colorado River Water Quality Improvement Program now before the U.S. Congress. The Nevada Congressional delegation has introduced bills in the Senate and House which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a program of salinity control for the Colorado River.

The bill, titled the "Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1973," would authorize construction works to control saline flows from LaVerkin Springs in the lower basin, and Paradox and Grand Valleys in the upper basin.

Generally, the program provides for investigation of feasibility of constructing point and diffuse source control projects; initiating nonstructural control measures related to irrigation scheduling and management; conducting basinwide desalting activities; and determining the effect of these activities on the economics, ecology, and esthetics of the

area. A provision is included covering a feasibility study of Las Vegas Wash facilities.

The Southern Nevada Water Project, which diverts Colorado River water from Lake Mead, delivers treated municipal and industrial water to the Las Vegas metropolitan area. Operations of the system began in June of 1971 upon completion of the first stage of the project.

The first stage, which includes the facilities constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the treatment plant built by the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, was completed at a cost of \$50 million and provides the capacity to deliver 132,000 acre-feet per year to the project area.

During the planning of the project, Reclamation studies indicated that this capacity would serve the needs of the area until the year 1990. However, data compiled from the first 27 months of operation show that deliveries to some entities are running ahead of projections, and the timetable for constructing the second stage may have to be moved ahead, possibly as early as 1980. Deliveries through the first 8 months of 1973 are running about 22 percent more than for the same period of 1972. For calendar year 1972, deliveries were 46,400 acre-feet and in 1973, we expect this to increase to 56,600 acre-feet. The peak daily use, reached in August of this year, was 104 million gallons which is 52 percent of the 200 million gallon per day capacity of the treatment plant.

The Amargosa Project in southern Nevada, extending into California, offers a potential water supply. Reclamation's study of this project is limited to an appraisal of land and ground-water resources in the Amargosa Valley. A special report will be issued sometime next year.

A deep well was drilled recently to help determine the hydraulic characteristics and lithographic makeup of the ground-water basin. Data from this well, substantiated by gravity surveys conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey and Reclamation, indicated that the ground-water basin contains a large body of good quality water. We have deferred further feasibility studies until a supplemental water supply for southern Nevada becomes essential.

In October 1972, a small population of the endangered Devil's Hole pupfish consisting of 27 adult fish was transferred from its natural habitat in Ash Meadows, Nevada, to a manmade refugium on the Colorado River just below Hoover Dam. This sanctuary, constructed jointly by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Nevada Department of Fish and Game, was designed to simulate as nearly as possible the original habitat which was threatening the tiny fish with extinction due to ground-water pumping in the Ash Meadows area.

Twenty-four of the 27 transplants survived and in only 10 days, biologists observed the first young in the facility. Spawning has continued, and the last count in April 1973 revealed an estimated 160 fish—nearly twice the count in the January estimate. Breeding has continued and additional young fish have been observed throughout the summer months. Although water temperature and algae growth continue to be threatening variables, the conditions in the refugium appear to be stable at this time.

In March 1973, the Bureau of Reclamation, in conjunction with National Park Service and the Nevada and Arizona fish and game departments, began an intensive investigation of large-mouth bass in Lake Mead. Under the leadership of the Nevada Department of Fish and Game, the participating agencies spent numerous hours studying parameters affecting the breeding and spawning of the bass. Most of the observations were made underwater, using SCUBA diving apparatus. At times during the peak of the spawning activity, up to four days per week were spent making underwater observations.

With the study continuing into the fall

months, the earlier data are being analyzed and later this year, plans will be formulated for next year's study. Identifying the limiting parameters on largemouth bass reproduction in Lake Mead should enable all agencies concerned to manage more effectively that segment of the fishery.

Late last month a "Conference on Population and Development: The Great Basin" was convened in Reno by the Desert Research Institute. Representatives from Idaho, California, Utah, Oregon, Nevada, Arizona, and elements of the Federal Government participated. The purpose of the conference was to assess some of the problems as well as the potentials of the Great Lahontan Basin and begin the difficult task of organizing on a basinwide basis to deal with the problems and realize the area's potential.

I was impressed at the forward thinking tenor of the conference presentations. A number of the subjects discussed were items of continuing interest to the Bureau of Reclamation and certainly they will be of great interest to those of you attending this conference. I was especially pleased to learn the time and emphasis accorded to such items as geothermal resources which could be tapped for minerals, water, and steam to run generator turbines; the possibilities for using remote sensing; the Bureau's Project Skywater studies being done by the Desert Research Institute; recreational resources; and water law and development policies, all of which can have a significant effect on whatever use you decide to make of these great open spaces in the Lahontan Basin.

It is important, I believe, that the conference did not simply stop at a recitation of the area's problems and its potential for growth.

Instead, a call for coordinated planning for the future of the basin was made. And initial steps were taken toward organization of a consortium of government, business, education, and research elements from the several States involved in the conference. An organizational meeting is scheduled for next spring, which I believe shows that the people involved are headed in the right direction and they mean business.

I sincerely hope those of you in the water business here in Nevada, as well as the other states involved, will take a deep interest in the activities of this forming group. There is no doubt in my mind that the future of this great area rests in large measure on the wise use of its limited water supplies. Your knowledge and experience could well make vital contributions to ultimate success.

I assure you Reclamation stands ready to assist where possible.

I mentioned earlier Project Skywater, the Bureau's research program, to develop cloud seeding as a safe and acceptable water management tool. I'm sure you are watching the Desert Research Institute's work for Skywater at Pyramid Lake and are interested in the Colorado River Basin Pilot Project. Both efforts have been encouraging, and we are convinced they have great potential.

The technology coming from DRI and Skywater's other studies can be a source of new water—but if the technology is environmentally sound and acceptable. So far, I can assure you that the detailed ecological studies—by the Bureau and others—have found no surprises. Potential increases in moisture are well within Nature's natural variance, and the tiny amounts of seeding agents appear innocuous.

The Pyramid Lake Pilot Project—now approaching its fourth winter—seeds about half of the suitable storms moving over the Sierra crest into the Truckee River watershed. Professor Joe Warburton and his DRI associates compares the seeded storms with similar, untreated storms. They report they're finding a measurable increase from seeded systems, but it may be several years before there is enough data to confirm their initial findings. There are indications from

another Skywater study that—under optimum conditions—cloud seeding could add up to 129,000 acre-feet of new water to the Truckee annually. This would be a sizable contribution to the water demands of Pyramid Lake and the Reno-Fallon area.

The Colorado River Basin Pilot Project covers 1,300 square miles of the San Juan Mountains in southwestern Colorado. It, too, is entering its fourth winter season, but the geographic and climatic conditions there differ from the Sierras. Another 2 years of data will be needed before we have firm evidence. At the moment, however, it appears that the technology could add up to 1.3 million acre-feet of flow to the Colorado River.

Within these possibilities, and perhaps others yet to be recommended, I am confident that Nevada's future is bright and am convinced, however, that water resource development must play a major and continuing role in Nevada's growth plans. Water resource development is Reclamation's business, so I expect that we will work closely with Nevada interests and thus will share in maximizing the State's potential.

A HEARTWARMING PHONE CALL TO RUSSIA

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the good fortune to be able to assist one of my constituents, Mrs. Yolanda Herskovitz of Oceanside, N.Y., in reaching her sister in the Soviet Union. Mrs. Herskovitz and her sister, both Jews, have been separated for 28 years after surviving the horrors of Nazi concentration camps during World War II. This was a heartwarming experience for me, Mr. Speaker, and one of the small things that make our jobs so rewarding.

The Long Island Press has chronicled that phone call and the circumstances that have kept Mrs. Herskovitz and her sister apart for these many years, and I would like to insert the Press article herein:

HOLY DAY SORROW—CALL TO RUSSIA BRINGS GUARDED REPLY, LITTLE HOPE
(By William Barber)

She never cried.

Even when her sister began sobbing into the telephone, Yolanda Herskovitz fought the impulse, closed her eyes, breathed deeply and continued the conversation.

"Hello. Hello Marguerite," the Oceanside woman sighed, continuing in her native Hungarian. Their talk became animated, but the tension lines on Mrs. Herskovitz' face underscored the urgency of the call.

"Why are they holding you back? Why won't they let you come to America?" Mrs. Herskovitz implored.

From a telephone inside a tiny post office in Uzhgorod, Russia, came the guarded reply, "I don't know. I just don't know."

The reply echoed in the Baldwin office of Rep. Norman Lent, who had placed the call to Mrs. Marguerite Winkler early Friday morning.

With the help of Lent, Mrs. Herskovitz was able to speak with her sister for the first time since they were separated 28 years ago after surviving horrors of Nazi concentration camps.

Lent, an East Rockaway Republican, is now working with Mrs. Herskovitz to break down another barrier—the repeated refusals of the Soviet Union to grant emigration visas to America for Mrs. Winkler and her family.

"Applications for emigration visas have been submitted four times since 1967. All requests for reunions have been denied by the Soviet authorities," Mrs. Herskovitz said following the telephone call.

The woman said her sister's husband, Morris, 59, is a tailor, and that her 58-year-old sister suffers a serious heart condition.

"They have two sons, Tibor, 27 years old, and Michael, age 33, who have both completed their Soviet Army service and are neither university graduates nor security risks. We have guaranteed their employment and travel expenses to the United States," Mrs. Herskovitz said.

She said she asked her sister several times about letters and packages the Herskovitz family sent to Russia.

"Every time, she said 'I don't know.'" But know she did. Their mail has been censored, and a package of clothing we sent has not been received.

"I asked her, too, how many more people there are who want to emigrate but cannot. I know she knows who they are but she would not say over the phone."

Mrs. Herskovitz, who was 17 years old when she and her sister were separated, said she was thrilled to have spoken with her sister again.

"I still just don't believe it. I will never forget this," she added, saying her sister finally ended the conversation to attend services marking the holiest of Jewish religious holidays, Yom Kippur.

"The time zone where she lives is different than in New York and we reached my sister about 4 p.m. She said she would go to services in a home, because the temple has been closed."

Although saddened by repeated failures to secure emigration visas, Mrs. Herskovitz said she was optimistic that the Soviet Union would relent and allow the family to emigrate.

"I have two brothers in America and another in Israel. Marguerite has no other blood relatives overseas. Perhaps next year we will all be together," the woman said.

SPACE IMPORTANCE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Daily News of McKeesport, Pa. in a succinct editorial describes well the significant contributions of Skylab 3 and the importance of the National Space program as a whole to the United States and to the world. As the next and final flight to Skylab is prepared, it is worth considering the words of this editorial:

SPACE IMPORTANCE

Space flights have become so successful and routine for American scientists that many persons are questioning what value there is in further manned missions in view of the high costs incurred.

It has been proven beyond a doubt that this nation can carry out successfully virtually any space exploration it sets as its goal—and such ability in itself is enough to give the people reason for pride.

But beyond the accomplishment of physically carrying out the flights is a wealth of knowledge amassed that in future years may affect the entire manner in which man lives on Earth. The Skylab 2 flight, just concluded could be the most productive for scientists of all manned launches insofar as it affects our daily existence.

No one, of course, can predict all of the benefits. But the thousands of photos and

miles of tape could lead to an endless source of pollution-free energy, a catalog of the world's resources and new metals and materials.

The spacemen, Alan L. Bean, Owen K. Garriott and Jack R. Lousma, proved in their record 59½-day orbit of the Earth that man can adapt to the weightless environment of space. Doctors were elated over the physical condition of the men upon their return. Except for a brief spell of dizziness which was expected as part of the process of readapting to Earth's gravity, the men suffered no apparent ill effects.

NASA Administrator James B. Fletcher, summing up the importance of Skylab 3, said that it makes "the transition of the space program dominated by exploration to a period comminated by exploitation of the space around us as a global resource." He added that "space is a place, a very unique place and a new important resource that can be used for the benefit of people everywhere on earth...."

Scientists will study the photos and sensor data brought back to determine if a space science can be developed for locating hidden oil and mineral reserves; assessing agricultural potential, arable land and diseased and healthy crops; estimating timber volume; mapping snow cover and assessing water runoff; charting air and water pollution and their sources; forecasting weather and determining fishing grounds.

Experts also are hopeful that data gathered from filming solar flare eruptions will help unlock the secret of controlled thermonuclear fusion, which is the source of the sun's energy. This would aid in the search for an unlimited and pollution-free power source on Earth.

All of these benefits may not be reaped from the Skylab flight, certainly not in the immediate future. But the knowledge gained, used in conjunction with that obtained from other space explorations, undoubtedly will someday have a heavy influence on our living habits.

The benefits of science usually are not limited to a particular period of time, but instead are accumulative for the good of people over the years.

That is one of the principal reasons for continued space exploration—that the good may not only help us now, but make the world a better place for future generations in which to live.

CONGRESS CAN HELP INCREASE OUR FUEL SUPPLY

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is now generally recognized that our domestic production of oil and gas is inadequate to meet our needs, that our imports are seriously curtailed, and that every feasible action should be taken which would tend to increase our own domestic production.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including a letter from Mr. Gerald D. James, a highly knowledgeable authority on this subject. His observations and recommendations are sound and should be favorably considered by the Congress. The letter follows:

Kerrville, Tex., November 6, 1973.

Congressman O. C. FISHER,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Why should the price of crude oil produced in the United States be federally controlled at an artificial level sub-

stantially below the price of imported foreign oil? Is it not true that we now need to increase domestic oil production? Is it not true that we now need to effectively encourage conservation of oil? Does an artificially low price for domestic crude promote discovery of additional domestic reserves and encourage conservation of present supplies? Is control of domestic crude oil prices at an artificially low level truly in the national interest, required by the facts and equitable to all concerned; or is this policy dictated by an engrained prejudice on the national level of government against the oil and gas industry? Is this prejudice of such emotional strength as to obscure the facts, the equities and the national interest involved? I propose to present you with some fundamental facts bearing on these questions and offer a few observations relative thereto.

I, along with a group of associates, am involved on a small scale in the independent phase of the oil and gas exploration and producing business. We have worked hard for many years to accumulate a small inventory of producing leases as well as some non-producing leases which require further exploration and development. We must utilize our income from producing leases to maintain these properties and finance additional lease acquisitions, drilling, work-over operations, etc. Contrary to the commonly accepted Washington, D.C., view, an existing oil well does not operate itself and does not automatically relegate its owner or owners to some mystical society of financially secure and super privileged people-eaters. We work hard, pay taxes, raise children, make mortgage payments and frequent trips to the bank for business loans, just like many other people.

Our principal oil production is shallow; about 2500 feet deep. The wells produce anywhere from 5 to 30 barrels of low gravity oil per day. On a field wide basis we produce 97% salt water and 3% oil; that is to say that for every 100 barrels of fluid removed from the earth 97 barrels are salt water and 3 barrels are oil. This oil and water must be artificially lifted to the surface because of insufficient reservoir pressure. This is accomplished by gas jetting which requires a central gas compressor and high pressure gas lines to each well and low pressure gas lines returning from each well. Then all of the salt water must be re-injected under pressure into the producing sand. This requires salt water pipelines, tanks for collection and settlement stations, electric pumps and injection wells. These injection wells must be periodically acidized to clean the formation so it will accept the salt water. The salt water pumps are powered by electricity. All of the oil must be treated with chemicals before it leaves the field. Because of the high volume of salt water produced we must periodically work-over our wells and replace the tubing.

This operation requires a full time field crew, field vehicles, office staff, accounting services, insurance, telephone expense, electrical power, chemicals, field tools and many other items, services and expenses too numerous to mention. Occasionally we will even lose one of these wells and have to drill and completely equip a replacement well with no increase in production. All of these activities and expenses related to "old" oil, the price of which is frozen.

The operation outlined above costs money; more and more money each day for less and less production. Costs of labor and services increase constantly, electricity rates are up, vehicle costs are increasing, costs of replacement pipe are out of sight; we must even pay more for fuel to operate our field vehicles—everywhere you turn, each activity you undertake involves added and ever increasing costs; costs that are not regulated or controlled. Social security goes up, unemployment taxes, ad valorem taxes, excise taxes go up.

The costs and expenses required to com-

ply with an ever increasing maze of federal regulations and completing federal questionnaires and dealing with federal agencies go up and up and up. Yet the price of oil, the commodity which must support all these costs and expenses, is frozen. The obvious result is lower profit, less income tax paid to the federal government, premature abandonment of producing wells, reduced exploratory and development activities, an artificially low price for oil and gas products to the consumer which encourages greater consumption, a reduced supply of domestic crude, more fuel shortages, eventual higher prices to the consumer, greater dependence on foreign governments and greater deficits in our balance of payments. All of this for prejudice and temporary political expediency? All of this because of ignorance and an insatiable lust for bureaucratic power through controls, controls and more controls?

Bear in mind that the greater portion of all oil and gas reserves discovered to date in the United States have been discovered by independent entrepreneurs and operators. They will perform likewise in the future if the federal government does not strangle them all to death.

I submit that if emotionalism, petty politics and the needs of a growing bureaucracy could be set aside, and rational decisions could be made solely on the facts and in the national interest, the following steps would be taken:

Controls would be removed on the price of domestic crude and the well-head price of natural gas. Controls would be removed on the price of steel tubular goods used in the oil industry. (Would you believe that we cannot now find or buy at any price new or used casing that we need for two wells that should be drilled right now?). The price of domestic crude would seek its market level. This would reduce consumption much more effectively than any rationing system or new set of conservation controls devised in Washington. This also would inject more money into the producing end of the business which would be used to (1) pay more federal income taxes and (2) search and drill to find more oil and gas.

The depletion allowance would be restored to its previous level. This would help the independent attract outside investors to his exploration ventures and thereby increase drilling activities and increase discoveries and supplies of oil and gas.

The exemption from income tax on production payments carved out in connection with purchases of producing leases (eliminated in 1969) would be restored. This would encourage small operators and independents to purchase stripper production from major oil companies and squeeze out more oil. (Major oil companies usually abandon producing properties at a much higher production level than most independents because their higher overhead and operating costs cause them to reach an economic limit sooner.)

The steps set forth above will decrease consumption, increase present supplies and future reserves. These steps may not be immediately attractive politically and certainly would not be to the liking of many "staffers" and "heads" who feel like free enterprise is a bunch of junk anyway. But how do you think people, yes—the voters, are going to react to the controls, to the liberal, anti-business bureaucrat-politician establishment, when their homes and schools are cold and there is no gasoline for their car and their job is shut down because of the lack of fuel and power, and the country is at the mercy of the Arabs and the Russians. Do you think it will then be sufficient to say to the American people, "Well, at least we broke the back of those greedy, money hungry, blood sucking oil and gas producers"????

Yours very truly,

GERALD D. JAMES.

UNMASKING CANADA'S ANTI-UNITED STATES POLICIES

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, numbers of people are finding out these days just who is on which side in a number of imbroglios. The Israelis have found out, to practically no one's surprise, that oil means more than morality to Western Europe, and that honor, national pride, and elemental decency apparently no longer count in international trade equations, at least insofar as England and France see matters. We have long known that this is true, but now the evidence is overwhelming.

The United States is also finding out some harsh facts of economic life as a result of her support of democracy in the Middle East. A number of nations, which have sat at America's table in America's house, are taking advantage of our vulnerability in terms of foreign trade to administer sharp blows to our interests. I am not speaking of France, for example, because she has always been our enemy. I address my remarks to one nation in particular, which, when named, will no doubt shock a number of Americans.

Canada has been taking a violently anti-American trade posture—in the process delivering solid blows to our economy, and adding to the Nation's difficulties. Very few Americans have been taking notice of this series of events.

Foremost among her choice of weapons against the United States has been use of tax increases on Canadian crude oil to American cities in the northern tier of States. It is worth noting that these sections of the Nation are notoriously short of oil and gas, and are most dependent on Canada for oil imports.

Not content with one such increase, Canada has imposed a second increase, raking in mammoth profits in foreign exchange from the United States at a time when we are in great need of reliable sources of foreign oil.

Recently, Canadian Energy Minister MacDonald stated that east coast refineries might be required to cut off their exports to the Northeastern United States this winter to maintain Canada's "neutral" status in the Arab States' use of oil as a weapon against the United States.

Trial balloons have been floated indicating that Canada might cut off all of its 1 million barrels daily of oil exports to the United States. MacDonald has been quoted as saying that Arab countries might object to operations in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland which refine oil imported from abroad and then ship refined products to New England.

Exports to the United States from Canada's east coast refining facilities have averaged about 1 million barrels daily, mostly heavy fuel and some jet aircraft fuel. MacDonald said the Arabs have voiced doubts about a pipeline that carries oil from Portland, Maine, to Montreal. Attempts are being made to explain that the oil comes in bond for direct

transfer to Montreal and none is used in the United States, MacDonald stated.

These are the words of the Energy Minister of the so-called most special ally and friend the United States has in the world. Can one believe one's eyes and ears, as this minister publicly and unashamedly crawls to the Arabs, begging them to accept the explanation that Canada is not favoring the United States. I remember a different Canada, proud of its closeness to the United States, allied with us in two world wars and united in a search for justice in the world. Today's Canada and her policies are a far cry and a sad one from that memory.

What it boils down to is the regrettable conclusion that Canada is energetically following an anti-American foreign policy in the economic area, aimed at appeasing the Arab dictatorships. Such policies are being orchestrated by the new left-leaning Premier of Canada.

His dislike of President Nixon is certainly obvious, but I see no reason for him to use his personal dislike for our elected head of State as a lever or a rationale for these policies. However, I refuse to believe that this is in itself the reason. Rather, it is only a contributing factor. Here is, in fact, a new left, proto-Socialist national leader, using Socialist slogans and catering to nationalism to adhere to third world attitudes and policies. A similar policy has characterized Australia in recent months, adding to the list of neutralist poseurs who are neutral on the side of the Russians, the Arabs, and the United Nations.

For example, for years now, under Trudeau, Canada has forbidden any trade or exports to Israel that could even remotely be considered military related. This policy has been adhered to even as the Soviet Union has poured arms into the Arab world. Meanwhile, Canada would not even sell Israel primer cord for commercial dynamite.

Now, because we insist on defense of democratic ideals, which on paper Canada subscribes to also, we, along with Israel, are confronted with an energy boycott which does no credit to those western democracies who go along with it. To see some nations, such as France, England, and Canada, eagerly serving as economic lackey to the Arabs, is as embarrassing to the beholder as it is unbecoming to the participant. When it directly harms the United States, then it ceases to become an exercise in degradation and becomes an offensive weapon against every American citizen this winter.

The time has come for two steps to be taken. First, the American public must be made aware that Canada has become an economic foe of the United States. Second, with regret, the United States must make it clear to Canada's Government, with apologies to Canada's people, that we must retaliate in self-defense. If we allow Canada to take the United States over the hurdles and get away with it, every other nation seeking such a chance will take their cue and act similarly. We cannot allow such economic hostility to be vented against our Nation.

The President, with assent of Congress, can and should retaliate forthwith against Canada, using our leverage in the auto market as a starter. Canada has

access to our automobile market on favorable terms, and needs the economic gains from such favored treatment now more than ever before. Taking away such a benefit would bring home to the people of Canada how we feel over Trudeau's policies.

With friends like Trudeau, America needs no enemies. It hurts me to take such a stand, knowing how the overwhelming majority of Canada's people feel toward our country. Too many Canadians have shed their blood in common cause with America for the hurt not to go deep. It is my fervent hope that they will understand that their Government's unfair and uncalled for policies have brought this situation to pass. Nonetheless, the time has come for revealing the true state of affairs.

NEEDED SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE VOTED BY CONGRESS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to support H.R. 11333, the Social Security Benefit Increase Act, which passed the House so overwhelmingly today. To many of the 20 million elderly, who live totally on their fixed incomes, the 20 percent increase—effective September 1972—barely gave them sufficient funds to manage their lives. Since then, their budgets have been ravaged by a 7 percent increase in the cost of living, with food prices leading the list on the consumer price index, jumping at an annual rate of close to 30 percent. As one of the 113 members of the House who urged consideration of an immediate 7 percent increase, it is disappointing that we are delaying the benefit's increase. However, I am pleased with the rapid consideration we have given to cost of living adjustments for the aged, and I am satisfied that this two-phased, 11 percent increase will provide a strong hedge against the forces of inflation.

It is unfortunate that the increase could not have been scheduled for December. However, testimony from Social Security officials before the Ways and Means Committee suggested that such a change was not feasible since it would take them 6 months to program the percentage increase to the 25 million old age and survivors, disability and health benefits recipients. Because I would like to eliminate bureaucratic delays as the reason for denying the aged cost of living increases, when needed, I have asked the General Accounting Office to audit the procedures of the Social Security Administration to determine what steps would have to be taken to improve the response time of their system.

In a larger sense, today's vote attests to the concern Members of the House of Representatives feel toward the problems of the elderly. However, I believe that during the debate a number of significant statements were made concerning the impact increases have on the actuarial soundness of the fund, as well as the growing regressiveness of the social security payroll tax as it takes a

larger and larger bite out of the pockets of the low- and middle-income wage earners. Although H.R. 11333 enlarges the financial base, perhaps the time has come to take a longer look at the financing of social security and to look for more equitable ways of funding an actuarially sound system.

Should we experience a downturn in the economy, the actuarial soundness of the social security fund could be jeopardized in the future.

Moreover, the prospect of fuel shortages leading to an economic dislocation could seriously jar many of the presumptions on which the fund now operates. In other words, current defense of the soundness of the fund is based on the presumption that our economy will continue to grow and wages will continue to rise bringing ever rising social security contributions from payroll taxes.

I think it is important for us to examine this problem now in order to provide this generation of aged and the future generations with full protection of an adequately funded social security system.

HIGH WATER LEVEL IN LAKE SUPERIOR CREATES PROBLEMS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal last Sunday had a short but perceptive article about the problems being caused by high water levels in Lake Superior.

For many months now the Corps of Engineers have been using Lake Superior as a reservoir, holding back waters which would normally flow into the lower Great Lakes, in order to ease serious erosion damage which has occurred along Lakes Michigan, Huron and Erie.

The predictable effect of the corps action has been serious damage to the red clay shoreline of Lake Superior itself.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to comprehend the problems that high water levels cause in a red clay area until you see what has happened along Northern Wisconsin. A few weeks ago when I was traveling along the Lake Superior shore, that lake was red, and I do not just mean it had a slight red hue. That water was red, a result of the huge volume of new red clay being dumped into the lake daily and the churning up of red clay already there.

Damage to Lake Superior itself is only part of the problem. Homes are being washed away. Grain silos in Duluth-Superior are being flooded. Docks for pleasure boats and ore carriers alike are being uprooted all along the lake.

What must be realized is the very basic difference between the damage along the lower lakes and that along Lake Superior. The first has been caused by natural causes. The damage to the Superior shoreline has been caused by very deliberate action—in this case, to alleviate damages to citizens living along the lower lakes.

Mr. Speaker, while I stand ready to debate the advisability of using Lake

Superior as a reservoir, it has been done. The problem is that no efforts were really made to minimize the damages from doing so. People in the area were not consulted, and neither, in fact, was the Congress. Nor is compensation being paid to those who have suffered property damages from the manipulated high water levels.

The United States-Canadian International Joint Commission, which regulates the lake levels, has recommended that such compensation be made, and I agree. Congressman JOHN BLATNIK—whose district also borders on the Lake Superior shore—has introduced legislation to provide compensation where damages are directly attributable to action taken by the Federal Government. That is a fair and equitable bill, and I am hopeful that the Congress will act favorably on it as soon as possible.

The article from the Milwaukee Journal follows:

ON, WISCONSIN—OPPOSITION TO RAISING SUPERIOR'S LEVEL JUSTIFIED

A potentially useful legal attack is being planned on the federal government's practice of manipulating the water level of Lake Superior to ease shoreline erosion in the other Great Lakes. As severe as the damage is along such shorelines as southeastern Wisconsin's, for example, it is most unfair to seek relief here by making damage somewhere else even worse.

The Northern Environmental Council, supported by some Wisconsin and Minnesota representatives in Congress, is challenging the Army Corps of Engineers, which manages the water level under directives of the US-Canadian International Joint Commission. Pushing Lake Superior to its legal maximum of 602 feet above sea level keeps erosion damage there constant, especially along its red clay shoreline, and makes even more severe damage certain when a northeast storm rolls waves up to 603 or 604 feet.

The environmental council charges that corps of engineers manipulation of gates at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to keep Lake Superior high, is in response to the greater political power around the other lakes. It also charges that the corps has not fully calculated the economic and environmental effects of this on Superior's shoreline. Whether politics has anything to do with it, there does need to be a clearer picture of the effects.

Not the least economic effect might eventually be on the American taxpayers. Public subsidy of repairs or erosion control is not warranted when damage to private property results from purely natural forces. But Lake Superior shoreline erosion results largely from overt action of the government. The consequences of this, in any damage claim against the government, could turn out unexpectedly costly.

THE ENERGY CRISIS DOES NOT AFFECT TRAVELING BUREAUCRATS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the energy crunch continues to dominate the news and conversation. In my State of great oil production, unrealistic and poor planning in oil and gas regulations, we find farmers without diesel fuel to run their tractors, fishermen without diesel fuel to run their boats, and even reports of oil

drillers who are unable to get gas to run their oil drilling rigs.

The bureaucratic panic and overreaction to make certain that northern city dwellers maintain their lifestyle may find them warm this winter but with little food next year unless our food-producing sector of the economy is given top priority over such necessary morale functions as theatrical productions and athletic events.

While the people are being made aware of energy shortages and the Pentagon even announces that for matters of emergency defense it is now dipping into our domestic power supply, there appears little leadership from higher places.

The presidential plane continues its trips to California and Florida. Secretary Kissinger, who has just returned from Moscow and Israel, junketeers to Peking for highballs. Secretary Butz addressed the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization in Rome, Italy, and indicated U.S. participation in an international food reserve. Assistant Secretary Brunthaver, with nine USDA officials and representatives of private industry, is in Moscow working out agricultural cooperation programs with the Soviets. Also this week a U.S. oil and gas expedition in the Soviet Union, costing 189 American oil companies \$11.5 million, is reported to have been attended by 1,700 Americans.

During the Christmas recess many of our colleagues are waiting to jump in their airplanes to tour around the world to "solve the needs and wants of those emerging nations."

And in Washington, D.C., where the nativity scene has now been declared unconstitutional for the Christmas pageant, we are advised that the national Christmas tree will be dimmed by 99.93 percent.

Yet, children continue to be bused for the sole purpose of achieving proper racial proportions according to some judge's theories of equality, but pollution control devices on the 1973 and 1974 model automobiles have not even been authorized to be suspended to conserve fuel.

The prevailing question on the mind of every American Socialist must be, "How long will it take to whip the American people in line by the use of rationing and allocations so they will willingly surrender their freedoms and lifestyles to live and operate within the regimentation of an energy-regulated and controlled environment?" Cliches such as "Arab oil blackmail" may soon wear thin with Americans. We are looking for answers, not scapegoats.

Is the situation so critical that the American people do not even have the energy resources to adequately defend our country from enemy attack?

I include several related newsclippings:

U.S.-U.S.S.R. JOINT COMMITTEE MEETS NOVEMBER 14-16

WASHINGTON, November 9. The first meeting of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Joint Committee on Cooperation in Agriculture will be held in Moscow Nov. 14-16.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Carroll G. Brunthaver will lead a nine-member U.S. delegation, including USDA officials and representatives of private industry. The Soviet

Committee will be made up of comparable officials and institution representatives.

The meeting will be the first under the Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Agriculture, signed in Washington on June 19, 1973. The Joint Committee on Cooperation in Agriculture, authorized under the Agreement, will work toward implementing provisions for cooperation (1) in agricultural economic research and information and (2) agricultural research and technological development. Working parties have been appointed and will meet together with the Joint Committee in Moscow.

Members of the U.S. delegation are Carroll G. Brunthaver, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, Chairman; T. W. Edminster, Administrator of USDA's Agricultural Research Service (ARS); Quentin M. West, Administrator of the Economic Research Service (ERS); Roy L. Lovvorn, Administrator, Cooperative State Research Service (CSRS); Gordon O. Fraser, Assistant Administrator for International Trade, Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS); Billy E. Caldwell, Staff Scientist, ARS; John A. Knebel, General Counsel, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Darwin E. Stolte, Chairman, Cooperator Committee for Agricultural Market Development, U.S. Feed-grains Council; and Emmett Barker, Farm and Industrial Equipment Institute.

Members of the Working Group on Agricultural Economic Research and Information are: Quentin M. West, Acting Chairman; Wayne Sharp, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Commodity Programs, FAS; Gordon Fraser, William Horbaly, Assistant Administrator for Attachés, FAS; Darwin Stolte, Roger Euler, ERS, and Richard Haidacher, ERS.

Members of the Working Group on Agricultural Research and Development are: T. W. Edminster, Acting Chairman; Roy L. Lovvorn, Billy Caldwell, Emmett Barker, Harlow Hodgson, CSRS; Roger Gerrits, ARS, and Harroll Barrows, ARS.

WORLD FOOD SECURITY

One of the items that has come up for considerable discussion at the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) conference in Rome has been the question of world food security. There has been a lot of worry in recent months about the ability to supply food to the developing nations; about the ability of the nations of the world to take care of distress areas as currently occur in Western Europe or in Bangladesh or South Vietnam or places like that.

There are two kinds of world food security that we need to consider. The first is supplies relieve hunger and even starvation in most places of the world where that occurs. The second is some system of food production and distribution that will iron out these periods of great surpluses and seeming shortages of food that we seem to have right now.

I think the basic problem here is some way of food and ability to deliver them that will to get more price stability in foods than now exists. We have talked in the FAO conference about an international food reserve. The United States' position is that we will participate in that kind of reserve so long as it remains under national sovereignty. We need a better system of information collection and dissemination about food needs and food supplies. We need some international items about the level of reserves that should be maintained. And I think we need better coordination of our food relief efforts around the world. Presently there are too many nations involved in unilateral food aid.

We need somehow to coordinate this and to extend this aid on a multinational basis. I think that will come out at the FAO conference in Rome.

[From the Washington Star-News, Nov. 12, 1973]

OIL FIRMS' SHOW IN SOVIET UNION APPEARS SUCCESS

Moscow.—If interest is an indication of success, the first U.S. oil and gas exposition in the Soviet Union has done well.

The exposition, known as Nefta-Gaz '73, attracted more than 30,000 petroleum technicians, engineers and specialists during its nine-day run at Moscow's Sokolniki Park, organizers said.

How much of that interest will be translated into sales remains to be seen, but American exhibitors are optimistic—for good reasons. Some estimates indicate the Soviet Union will drill at least 10,000 oil and gas wells annually during the next five-year plan, and it is expected to go into foreign markets for much of that drilling and engineering equipment.

"It's definitely been worth the effort," said Tommy Wall of Houston as the show closed. Wall represents the oil field division of Houston's C. Jim Stewart & Stevenson, Inc., makers of air compression systems and hydraulic closing units. He said his company has firm indications of new orders from the Soviets.

A year in the making, Nefta-Gaz attracted 189 American companies, which invested \$11.5 million in the exhibit, spokesmen said. On display was \$13 million in U.S.-produced equipment, including a 112-foot, self-propelled oil drilling rig.

"We gave out buttons promoting the 1975 joint Soyuz-Apollo spaceflight and have been overwhelmed by the response," said Jerry Emblem, sales manager of Rockwell International for the Benelux nations and Scandinavia.

Rockwell, which produces valves, meters and regulators for the petroleum industry, is building the docking module for the flight.

Hans W. Lange, of Meriden, Conn., president of AMF-Cuno, manufacturers of oil field service equipment, was impressed with the number of persons from nonpetroleum industries who asked about application of products in their fields.

"They have shown particular interest in one of our filters which can radically improve the quality of their paint," Lange said.

Even businessmen not reporting sales were pleased with the exhibit. A. J. Petersen, manager of export sales for the Armco Steel Corp., Houston, was typical.

"It will take time for the fruits of our efforts to show," he said. "It does, however, look encouraging."

While almost unanimous in their praise of the show, exhibitors were more critical of things outside the exhibit hall. Lodging was a frequent complaint.

"We had to have four or five persons share a room at the start because the Russians didn't have enough hotel rooms," said Ben Kemperman, marketing manager of Rockwell International. "We even had one of our men bed down one night in a sleeping bag in an American office here."

About 700 Americans were expected for the exhibition, but children and wives swelled that number to more than 1,000, according to one participant.

[From the Washington Star-News, Nov. 11, 1972]

YULE TREE LIGHTS PARED (By John Sherwood)

If you really want to see the glorious National Christmas Tree next month, better bring along a flashlight. It's beginning to look not much like Christmas.

As a seasonal example for the rest of the decorations-happy, but energy-poor country, the National Park Service will short-circuit the great Santa symbol by 99.93 percent.

Last year's tree was illuminated by 9,000 lights, but this year there will be just five floodlights doing the work of many little twinkling soldiers.

And, to make the scene even less tradi-

tional, the Nativity setting has been banned by the courts because of separation of church and state.

The decision may lessen the impact of the new "permanent" Colorado blue spruce. The live 38-foot-high tree from Hunlock Creek, Pa., recently was replanted successfully on the Ellipse as a conservation example for the rest of us. In years past, cut trees were used.

The entire "Pageant of Peace" sparkled with a total of 23,270 lights in better times, but that number is being cut to a few thousand for 1973, the year of the Great Dim-Out.

The National Park Service expects the total watts to be reduced by 81.9 percent, from 75,000 to 7,000. There still will be a double-row of evergreens flanking a path to Big Green One, but they might be hard to find.

The traditional lighting ceremony will be held Dec. 14 anyway.

No decision has been reached on Christmas lighting at the White House.

THE PRESIDENT, THE CONGRESS, AND WATERGATE

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a request from a constituent of mine that I place in the RECORD, a statement by him concerning the President, the Congress, and Watergate. That is an unusual request, but because these are unusual times, I do ask unanimous consent to insert his statement in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

CHIPPewa FALLS, Wis.,

October 31, 1973.

Representative DAVID OBEY, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DAVID OBEY: In light of the recent and most extraordinary events connected with the Watergate case, culminating in the "disappearance" of two key tapes, the decimation of the Justice Department's investigating staff, and Richard Kleindienst's ITT revelations, I should like to request something I would not have thought to have done under other circumstances—to have a statement of my own read into the Congressional Record. The statement follows:

The Executive Branch of this nation's government has fallen to its lowest, to its worst point in the history of our nation. Never before have we seen in the White House such contempt for the laws and the people of the United States. And, although presidents have sometimes forgotten that they were the chiefest public servants, not merely the Chief, none has ever before so flagrantly ignored the will of the House, the Senate, the Courts, and the People.

Our Constitution remains the Supreme Law of the Land, and in swearing to uphold it and faithfully discharge his duties of office, Mr. Nixon has perjured himself.

Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the President to wage an exhaustive war without consent of Congress.

Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the waging of a secret war, using undisclosed funds, appropriated for other use. It forbids it.

Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the President to impound funds duly appropriated through legislation. In making the President an executor rather than a legislator, the Constitution forbids it.

Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the President to use public funds to furnish and improve his own estates.

Nowhere does the Constitution permit the President to use Federal Regulatory Agencies to "pressure" news agencies which disagree with him.

Nowhere does the Constitution allow the President to use his office and authority to extort campaign funds, nor to buy those funds with anti-trust settlements.

Nowhere does the Constitution allow the President to use his authority to order illegal entry into private citizens' homes or offices, nor into the offices of political opponents, nor to spy on political opponents. The Bill of Rights forbids those acts.

Nor does the Constitution allow the President to withhold evidence in a criminal case where a felony has been charged, nor may he legally destroy such evidence.

Nor does the Constitution put the President above all law and morality. The presidency is a sacred trust, but not a sacred shrine.

Honor would require that a president who has lost all public trust, and whose continuance in office threatens to erode public belief in the government and respect for law, should resign his office as gracefully as he could. We have recently been given an example of such behavior by the Vice President, under considerably less provocation.

Since the President has rejected the honorable path open to him, he has left only two alternatives. Congress may choose to do nothing, thus assuring the decay of respect for law, of respect for the government, of national morale. Or it may act to impeach the President.

Members of the House, the choice is yours. I, and other citizens who still have a faith in the Constitution and in our laws, pray that you make a wise decision.

I recognize that the language of the foregoing is strong. This is hardly a time to mince words, or to wait cautiously, or to let bygones be bygones. I believe that there is much more at stake here than the honor of one man—or two, or five, or a hundred. We face a test of the very strength of our democracy: Will the Law endure, or will political power and influence be given sovereignty over our nation?

I do not ask you to necessarily present this statement as your own belief, but merely wish it to indicate that a portion of the citizenry feels this crisis to be of the utmost gravity, and that impeachment is now in order, and we are past the point of delay.

If you will consent to place it in the Congressional Record, I would appreciate a copy of that day's Record, or an extract therefrom.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

LAURENCE GOLD.

DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION WEEK

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the week of October 21 through 27, 1973, was Drug Abuse Prevention Week. I was pleased to introduce the resolution commemorating this week, and was even more pleased with the continuing positive response which the promotion of this week has elicited.

As conceived by the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, Drug Abuse Prevention Week 1973 was a totally new approach to an old problem. The Special Action Office and others who work in the drug abuse field have learned from experience that the old messages simply do not work very well. Scare tac-

tics have not proved effective in preventing our young people from abusing drugs. Straight informational programs have all too often led to increased experimentation, as young people have learned more about the variety of drugs available, and have been tempted to try them.

This year, based on some recent evaluations of new types of prevention programs, the Special Action Office has designed a totally new campaign which sees drug abuse for what it is: A form of rebellion, or a symptom of a larger personal problem. The message of this year's Drug Abuse Prevention Week is that the problem is not drugs, the problem is people. The problem is loneliness; peer group pressures; difficulty communicating with parents or friends.

Drug Abuse Prevention Week 1973 talked about "a brand new language"—a language of caring and sharing, of trying to understand one another. It is a message that calls for breaking down the barriers that exist between the races, the generations, the organizations in our society. It is a message that calls for families and communities to work together to eliminate not just drug abuse, as insidious as that problem may be, but to eliminate the problems and situations which tempt young people to abuse drugs.

I believe this is a fine message, and one which must be heeded by all Americans—not just during "Drug Abuse Prevention Week" but throughout every week of the year.

Mr. Speaker, in preparing for this year's program, the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention issued several publications, including "Right Next Door: An Ideabook for Community Leaders." The publication suggests what local leadership might do to accelerate effective drug abuse prevention, and I include excerpts of this important document at this point in the Record:

HOW ABOUT YOUR COMMUNITY?

Drug abuse prevention is a matter of bringing together people, programs and resources. Community leaders interested in working on a new agenda for prevention ought to consider looking at their blocks, towns, counties, as a collection of all three. A good way to begin planning related to Drug Abuse Prevention Week 1973 would be a "positive inventory" of things going on and people with skills and interests. The emphasis of this year's campaign is on people, and how they interrelate, regardless of the kind of pattern of living or family grouping we find. What we're interested in—and what should interest local leadership—is the variety of ways people come together and accomplish things, make things happen.

The search of community resources and activities shouldn't be construed as a search for "trouble." It's not just drug programs, or examples of people involved with drug treatment, we're looking for. Instead the inventory ought to include all kinds of activities and organizations that bring people into working, sharing and supporting relationships with each other. Drug programs and crisis-oriented projects are one kind of interaction, but there are many others. (By the way, does your area have an organized drug abuse prevention agency, coordinating council or its equivalent? If not, a campaign to develop one ought to be high on the list of priorities. Most localities, major city governments, states and counties have officials with the responsibility for dealing with drug abuse: talk to them about coordination and program planning, if they haven't already pooled their resources and approaches.)

Churches, schools, civic associations, fraternal social organizations, law enforcement agencies, unions, business and trade groups—all of these exert leadership, and share in the future of a city or town. Then, too, community leadership also includes those people who through their charisma, clout, or obvious and demonstrated concern, have earned the people's respect and cooperation. ("Accidental" leadership is just as influential as the official kind, in many instances.)

Use this network of leadership to identify programs and activities in your area. And think of these projects as resources to be tapped in fostering improved interpersonal relations:

- Multi-purpose hotlines offering family counseling, tutorial assistance, information or public services and more

- Volunteer projects bringing young people into helpful contact with the elderly

- Foster Parent and Big Brother programs
- Block clubs, neighborhood associations and culturally-oriented social clubs

- Neighborhood youth centers, halfway houses and storefronts

- Community boards working with public services like police and schools

- Social and civil projects based at churches, colleges, service clubs

- Drug prevention and treatment projects housed in community facilities, church basements, storefronts

How, specifically, can communities use these programs—and the hundreds of other examples you'll find—to help people strengthen their relationships with each other? Here are just a few examples:

In several cities, neighborhood groups with different ethnic backgrounds take over a public facility for a week (a pier, a local tourist attraction) and present a "festival" of dances, foods, songs, history and cultural highlights. Community leaders work with representatives of the ethnic community, to showcase that group's ethnicity. And the evidence strongly suggests that festivals and fairs like these help to break down the walls of unfamiliarity and suspicion that so often divide people along ethnic lines. Communications and contacts improve, and people become a little less like strangers and a little more like neighbors.

A lot of cities are finding that the people who work in drug abuse treatment, prevention and rehabilitation programs can be of real help in other community projects—as family counselors, liaison with business and industry to help bridge the gap between the world of work and the "street."

It's not surprising to find young people from a drug program working hand in hand with the police department to set up counseling and referral procedures, or identify potential trouble spots in drug-affected neighborhoods.

The hotline concept has matured from the early days, when it was not much more (in most cases) than an emergency phone line to someone who could talk a drug-taker down from a bad trip. Now, many hotlines are staffed by professionals and trained volunteers, who are able to deal with a variety of personal, family and community problems, and who often find themselves simply being asked to talk—just provide companionship and another human voice—to help someone make it through another lonely day.

These are a few of the many approaches to identifying and utilizing community resources for drug abuse prevention. More help is available from some of the organizations listed in the Appendix of this booklet, or by obtaining copies of:

- "Community Action for Drug Abuse Prevention," Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, Washington, DC 20500.

- "Effective Coordination of Drug Abuse Programs: A Guide to Community Action," National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852

"Common Sense Lives Here," National Coordinating Council for Drug Education, 1211 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036

PLANS AND PROJECTS FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

From short-term events geared specifically to Drug Abuse Prevention Week 1973, through long-range planning, there are a number of things that can be done to tap the strengths built into a city, town or community where people really work with each other, help each other out. All of these ideas have a common goal: creating and sustaining effective, supportive personal relationships and involvement within the community, for the sake of every person there who might be actually or potentially caught up with drugs.

A "YES!" FESTIVAL

Positive and affirmative images can emerge by staging a "Yes!" festival in your neighborhood block, city or village. It would be a time set aside for reminding yourselves of the good and helpful things that people are capable of doing for each other.

Arrange for local theatres to open up some screening time for a locally-produced film festival. Arrange hours and special sessions at recreation centers, parks, playgrounds—and earmark the sessions for people who participate in families or groups. Find a block in the city where residents really want to clean up their alleys and curbs, then match up that block with a youth group and set them to it, with city-supplied materials. Lots of communities have staged "anti-drug" rock concerts—maybe you can incorporate a big musical event as part of a "Yes!" celebration.

In this brief booklet, it's not possible to offer all of the details for conducting this kind of festival. Consult some of the organizations listed in the Appendix for specific suggestions on how to get this kind of activity off the ground, or talk to your local service club or recreation department. Help *does* exist where you are.

OPEN SCHOOLS

In large cities and small towns, schools have been identified as prime resources for all kinds of community events, meetings, off-hours education, recreation, counseling, "raps" between distant groups and more.

One of the pioneer projects involving open schools was the Flint, Michigan, program. The "community schools" movement got a start there when the Mott Foundation made it possible for Flint public schools to offer a wide range of services—far beyond what had been traditionally asked of the school system.

Flint's program depends on successful identification of needs and human resources available within the community and the city. Using that kind of awareness as a base, Flint school programs reach out in areas like juvenile delinquency, adult education, neighborhood improvement, personal enrichment courses, programs for the elderly, retraining for job upgrading, intergroup relations and more.

Perhaps you can work with your schools to develop some of the things done in Flint. There are other ways, too, to open up the school process and use it to strengthen the bonds between people: home-teaching programs, led by local faculty members and conducted in the neighborhood themselves; including parents and children in lesson-planning, so that what is done at school is not a surprise to the family (and so that what happens at home is more closely tied to school work); bring community people into the classroom as resources.

INVOLVEMENT BY LAW ENFORCEMENT

There are many opportunities for law enforcement people to interact with prevention and treatment projects, and many of these opportunities center on the role of families and neighborhoods, groups and peer circles, within the community.

Families, block clubs, even youth gangs can be persuaded to help with the planning of anti-narcotics drives, so that the reasons

for the campaign are understood, along with the methodology. Police-community relations teams have been formed to build bridges between law enforcement professionals and youth leaders, parents, school officials, street leaders. Police officers have become excellent "surrogate big brothers" in a number of school and out-of-school projects. Law enforcement, too, has helped community organizations—like churches, service clubs, social and fraternal organizations, ethnically-oriented groups—develop and sustain effective membership activities and enthusiasm.

In the end, our greatest asset in this struggle will be the energy and spirit of the American people. One of the most important lessons we have learned in the fight against drug abuse is the immense value of the one-to-one relationship—the bond of trust between the drug victim and someone who cares enough to help that individual.

The deep personal involvement of countless individual Americans is the key to success to drug abuse prevention. Government programs can provide a means for encouraging such involvement and for providing other necessary resources, but without the concern and commitment of our people in their communities the problems of drug abuse cannot be alleviated.

There are clear limits to what governments can do about drug abuse and still preserve the essential values of a free society. It is unlikely that the problems associated with non-medical use of drugs will ever be wholly eliminated or that we will reach consensus on the most effective ways to reduce the costs of such behavior. Serious problems remain, but even as we adjust our priorities to meet the new realities, we can take pride in having made contribution to the progress to date.

FAMILY ACTION PLANNING

Communities might want to organize family action centers, which would develop and implement unique family-oriented programs (counseling, parent education, provision for temporary alternate families for troubled youth, a family ombudsman to work directly on critical problems, etc.). Such a center might be financed through a combination of private and public funds, and staffed by professionals in the appropriate disciplines—drug abuse treatment, psychology, family therapists, marriage specialists and others.

Day-care centers, neighborhood service centers, vital information on city services, resident counselors in apartment units and multi-family dwellings, reduced rates for public events and facilities—these and more can also be planned as a part of community support for the family process.

Many organizations listed in the Appendix have experience in helping communities plan for these programs, and they are ready to help you with your specific local initiatives. Use local data and locally-derived priorities as your baseline before making any detailed plans for these programs. The experience and insight of local leadership must be the starting point for community action.

These are just some of the things that can be done to strengthen the environment in your town and make it supportive for the people who live there. There is a proper and productive role for families and groups of people, both in the lives of the members of the family and in the life of the community-at-large. Sometimes, things get out of balance, and people forget how to live effectively as brothers and sisters. Restoring the process, putting things back in perspective, is not an overnight task, nor is it simply a matter of telling people that things ought to be better. Community leaders who want to help people re-discover the value of inter-personal communication and community interaction should expect to make a commitment that will last over time.

The results ought to be worth the effort. Drug abuse is a manifestation of deeper problems that run through the lives of those who suffer it. By turning attention back to the process of living and relating, the family-

oriented feelings and energies that bring people together, it is possible that we will be able to turn the corner in real and long-lasting ways, and begin to put drug abuse behind us.

RESOURCES FOR COMMUNITY LEADERS Materials

Common Sense Lives Here, handbook for initial coordination of total community effort for drug abuse prevention. Information about attitudes, resources and organizational techniques. Available from National Coordinating Council on Drug Education, 1211 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Suite 212, Washington, D.C. 20036. (202) 466-8150

Horatio Alger's Children, by Richard Blum, Ph.D. (Jersey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1972) The first book to focus attention on the family as an important influence on drug taking behavior. A primer for community leaders developing family-oriented drug abuse prevention programs.

"You, Your Child and Drugs," information and advice to concerned parents. The emphasis is on discussion and parent/child dialogue. Available from Child Study Association of America, 9 E. 89th Street, New York, New York 10028

Effective Coordination of Drug Abuse Problems: A Guide to Community Action, culls suggestions from surveys or existing community drug abuse prevention efforts, contains suggestions for initial community efforts at program coordination and advice on improving less-than-successful efforts. Published by the National Institute of Mental Health, 1724-00288. Available from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

"Community as the Doctor," 29 min. sound/color 16mm. film depicts a small California community organizing a comprehensive drug program—community leaders discuss necessary elements in a successful effort. Available from Dick Ham Productions, 352 Waverly Street, Palo Alto, Cal. 94301.

Doing It: Community Action on Drug Concerns guide containing criteria for local action, community models, and bibliography of both print and audiovisual materials. Available from Service Department, Board of Christian Social Concerns, 100 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

"Any Drug Education Program That Talks Only About Drugs Is, At Best—A Waste," 45 min. taped/slide presentation, introduction to drug-related issues. Focus is placed on people problems rather than drug problems. Available from Do-It-Now Foundation, P.O. Box 5115, Phoenix, Arizona 85010.

National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Social Seminar Series, 15 films, guidelines and discussion guides designed originally by teachers explore the institutions, experiences and culture in which drug use takes place. Specific individual films of special merit are: "Brian At Seventeen," "Changing," "Community in Quest," and "The Family." Good discussion leaders are necessary with these films. Available from National Institute of Mental Health, Drug Abuse Film Collection, National Audiovisual Center (GSA), Washington, D.C. 10409.

Organizations

National Coordinating Council on Drug Education, 1211 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 466-8150

In addition to developing *Common Sense Lives Here*, NCCDE offers broad spectrum consulting services on community organization, publishes bi-weekly newsletter, *National Drug Reporter*, for entire drug-concerned community.

Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, 726 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D.C. 20506. (202) 456-6633.

Office of Communications coordinates all federal government media efforts in the drug abuse prevention field; provides information on overall governmental activities, programs and funding priorities.

Council on Family Health 201 East 42nd

Street, New York, New York 10017 (212) 421-1070. Contact: J. Alan Bergman, Staff Director.

Sponsored by the manufacturers of non-prescription advertised medicines, the CFH functions are to promote the safe, effective use of medicines and other family health care. CFH focuses primarily on that segment of the drug abuse problem related to the misuse of proprietary products and directs its message to mothers and housewives.

American Social Health Association 1740 Broadway, New York, New York 10019 (212) 582-3553. Contact: Donald R. Clough, Ph.D., Assoc. Dir. for Programs.

Sponsored by the nation's United Community Campaigns, the Association sponsors an information center on drug abuse, the publication of educational materials, the conduct of research, and offers guidance to communities and organizations.

Boy Scouts of America North Brunswick, New Jersey 08902. Contact: Gerald A. Speedy, Director Program Development.

The Boy Scouts run a special drug abuse prevention plan entitled "Operation Reach," which promulgates the idea of parent/son communication as a key to drug abuse prevention. Programs involve participation of both parents and children in groups process.

Boys Clubs of America 771 First Avenue, New York, New York 10017 (212) 684-4400. Contact: Arthur L. Williams, Jr., Assistant Director, National Program and Training Services.

Local Boys Club programs strive to involve both parents and child in each program. In addition, parent education programs that include parent encounter groups, parent-child programs, and family therapy sessions are encouraged. The total program of the Boys Club strives to meet needs, interests, and excitement necessary to avoid apathy, boredom, and negative social relationships.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611 (312) 787-0977. Contact: Mrs. William C. Balsinger (202) 537-0811.

A first priority of the current national Action Program relates to drug abuse with the philosophy that "drug abuse among the young, with its frequently tragic consequences, demands immediate and informed action. Direct steps include education about drugs for both children and adults, legislation, counseling, and therapy for young abusers . . ."

United States Jaycees Post Office Box 7, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74102 (918) 584-2481. Contact: James A. Nielsen, Programming, Research & Development Director.

The Jaycees are involved in two major programs which relate to the family and building family structures. Operation Threshold is a project which seeks to foster good habits in coping with the alcohol problem. The Jaycees are the first major organization to try to develop patterns to build family structures with long-range plans.

THE CUYAHOGA VALLEY NATIONAL PARK: THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL URBAN AREA PARKS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Congressman SEIBERLING, Congressman REGULA, and myself, as well as the chairman of the House Interior Committee and over 40 other Members of the House joined in cosponsoring legislation to create a National Historical Park and Recreation Area in the Cuyahoga River Valley between Akron and Cleveland.

The development of a park in this area

and the preservation of this beautiful open space in the midst of one of the most populated sections of the Nation would be a major step in the administration's stated goal of bringing "Parks to the People."

The concept of a national park along this scenic and historic river valley has been under discussion for several years and has earned the widespread support of communities throughout Northern Ohio. As an example of the type of continually growing support, I would like to enter in the Record at this point a resolution adopted by the city council of Lakewood, Ohio in support of the expedited passage of legislation creating this park and recreation area.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that as a result of the energy crisis it is increasingly important to create parks in the more populated portions of the country. I would like to enter in the Record at this point an article from the New York Times of August 15, 1973, entitled "Drop in Park Visitors Laid to Fear of 'Gas' Shortage." As the article indicates—

Visits to most of the country's major national parks have declined this summer, in what park officials see as the first strong evidence that many Americans have changed their 1973 vacation plans because of threats of a gasoline shortage.

Since it is likely that the gasoline shortage will be with us for several years and since the cost of fuel is likely to increase dramatically over time, it will become more and more difficult for easterners to travel out to Yellowstone or the Grand Canyon. Yet the need—and time—for recreation continues to increase. It is imperative that our citizens in the densely populated Eastern States have beautiful and interesting park sites close by.

Certainly the Cuyahoga Valley Park proposal is one of the very best candidates for an urban area park. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this park legislation can be considered favorably in the very near future.

RESOLUTION No. 4963

An emergency resolution urging the appropriate elected representatives to the Congress of the United States to support the pending legislation to establish the Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area.

Whereas, a Bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives to establish the Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area, the primary purpose of which is to preserve the Cuyahoga Valley—the only major open space remaining between the highly industrialized cities of Cleveland and Akron, and

Whereas, the State of Ohio has no National parks or recreational areas and there is a pressing and critical shortage of Federal and State recreation facilities in this specific area, and

Whereas, the Cuyahoga Valley is one of the most strategically located resources in reach of urban America, and represents a unique natural resource that can be programmed and preserved as a recreational mecca for the American public, and

Whereas, this Council desires to express to the appropriate elected representatives to the Congress of the United States its deep concern for the preservation of this magnificent Valley and the relief of the critical shortage of open space and outdoor recreational resources for the millions of people in the area, and

Whereas, this resolution constitutes an emergency measure in that it is imperative that this Cuyahoga Valley recreation area be preserved as soon as possible before development destroys the beauty of the Valley.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the City of Lakewood, State of Ohio:

Section 1. That the Council of the City of Lakewood for and on behalf of the citizens of the City of Lakewood strongly urges the representatives to the Congress of the United States to support and expedite the pending legislation to establish the Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area.

Section 2. That the Clerk of Council be and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to United States Senators William B. Saxbe and Robert Taft, Jr., and to United States Representatives James V. Stanton, Louis Stokes, Charles A. Vanik and William E. Minshall.

Section 3. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure for the reasons stated in the preamble hereof and provided it receives the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all members elected to Council, it shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its adoption and approval by the Mayor.

DROP IN PARK VISITORS LAID TO FEAR OF "GAS" SHORTAGE

(By Robert Lindsey)

Visits to most of the country's major national parks have declined this summer, in what park officials see as the first strong evidence that many Americans have changed their 1973 vacation plans because of threats of a gasoline shortage.

At 17 national parks checked by The New York Times, 14 had fewer visitors last month than in July, 1972. National Park Service officials said such a widespread decrease in summer was rare and that historically park use has risen at an average annual rate of more than 5 per cent.

"It's not so much that there's a shortage of gasoline, but that people have heard there is; it's the psychological effect," said Donald Dayton, superintendent of Carlsbad Caverns National Park in New Mexico. The park had 7 per cent fewer tourists this July than last.

Some park administrators also cited other factors in the decline: inflation, public doubts about where the nation's economy is headed and the extensive publicity in recent years that national parks were congested and spilling over with people.

"The bottom fell out July 1," said Jack Anderson, superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, which spans parts of Wyoming, Montana and Idaho.

"July is usually our peak people season," he said in an interview. "Normally, we get 24,000 to 26,000 new visitors a day, but this year it was closer to 20,000." For the month, visits were off 10.2 per cent from July, 1972.

Mr. Anderson said he suspected that the nation's "total economic picture," along with fears of a gasoline shortage, were the major reasons. "Have you checked the price of eggs lately?" he said with amazement, adding that egg prices had increased more than 40 per cent in recent days at stores in the park.

AREAS LEAST AFFECTED

Park officials said that recreation areas in the Northeast and mid-Atlantic states were least affected by the slump, apparently because of the shorter driving distances from urban areas and thus less need for gasoline.

And, they emphasized, despite the lull, many outdoor recreation areas throughout the country are still suffering from severe midsummer overcrowding.

"I think a lot of people are going to parks closer to metropolitan areas and not going as much to places farther away, where they aren't certain about the supply of gas," a park ranger said in an interview at Grand Canyon National Park in Arizona. The park showed a

21 per cent decline in visitors in June and a 26 per cent decline in July, but still has serious road congestion problems much of the time.

The decline at Grand Canyon was from 1,561,000 in July, 1972 to 1,156,200 this July.

The three parks checked by The Times where the number of vacationers continued to increase this year are Everglades Park in Florida, Yosemite in California and Zion in Utah.

Apparently reflecting an unabated boom in tourism to Florida Everglades park use this summer was up 20 per cent, officials reported.

At Yosemite, where summer visits are up 10 per cent, park officials theorized that many Californians who ordinarily might journey to more distant outdoor parks were sticking closer to home because of the threats of a gasoline shortage, which have not materialized as severely as predicted in much of the country.

Essentially the same reason—proximity to populous southern California, a day's drive away—was given by officials at Zion National Park, where visits were up 5 per cent in July.

These gains, however, run counter to the over-all trend.

Officials at several parks said their admissions had increased each month this year until about mid-June, when they began to slump. Several said they thought park admissions might pick up this month as word spread that gasoline shortages were not so bad as forecast.

"Our April, May and June were higher than normal because, I think, a lot of people wanted to miss the gasoline shortage," said a park official at Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky. Admission at the park were off 3.5 per cent in July.

Park Service officials reported other examples of the summer pattern so far, as follows:

Through the first six months of the year, visits at Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming, were up 5.3 per cent from 1972. But by the end of July, there had been a small decrease in the cumulative total for the year. July visits were off 6.4 per cent.

Crater Lake National Park in Oregon admitted 130,000 visitors in July, 21 per cent fewer than in the previous July.

At Big Bend National Park in Texas, park visits increased 22 per cent in the first five months of the year but only 4.8 per cent in June. In July there was a 1 per cent decline.

The other parks checked by The Times where visits declined during July were the following:

Hot Springs National Park in Arkansas, a 14 per cent decline; Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, 8.5 per cent; Glacier National Park in Montana, 6 per cent; Olympic National Park in Washington, 5 per cent; Great Smoky Mountains National Park in Tennessee, 2 per cent; Bryce Canyon National Park in Utah, 1.1 per cent, and Acadia National Park in Maine, 1 per cent.

VISITS "SPREADING OUT"

Gary Everhart, superintendent of Grand Teton National Park, said he thought "all the publicity about over-crowding in the national parks" had been a factor in keeping some people away. One reason for the sharp decline in visits in July, he added, could be that more and more Americans were trying to beat the summer rush.

"Our visits are spreading out," he said. "We find we're getting more people early or late in the season than we used to."

Park Service administrators accustomed to the problems of dealing with ever-growing pressures on their facilities, generally regard the slump as a temporary respite. Merle E. Stitt, the superintendent of Grand Canyon National Park, said in an interview:

"We don't know what's behind the decline—probably many factors, including the gasoline shortage. But as long as it's happening, it has one benefit: it makes it somewhat more pleasant for the people who do come."