

United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 11650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on the amounts paid for communication services shall not apply to the amount of the State and local taxes paid for such services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 11651. A bill to temporarily suspend motor vehicle emission standards and prohibitions against modifying emission control systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NIX, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SETTERLING, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 11652. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants and

provide technical assistance to units of general local government to implement programs which are designed to increase the use of carpools by commuters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 11653. A bill ratifying and confirming an agreement by the Secretary of the Interior providing for the issuance of a lifetime grazing permit to the Gray family now consisting of Jack Gray, Henry Gray, and Robert Louis Gray, relating to the grazing of cattle within the confines of the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 11654. A bill to suspend motor vehicle emission and fuel standards for the duration of the energy crisis in order to conserve fuel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H. Con. Res. 385. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that no pardon, reprieve, or amnesty be given to deserters or draft evaders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 11655. A bill for the relief of North Central Educational Television, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETCHUM:

H.R. 11656. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elmer Andreotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 11657. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Ann Sharar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

366. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislative Council of Maryland, Annapolis, Md., relative to the resignation of the resident clerk of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD NOT RESIGN AND CAN BE REMOVED AFTER IMPEACHMENT

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on November 2, in this Chamber, our distinguished colleague, Senator BARTLETT, expressed to us his deep concern over the suggestions and demands that President Nixon resign his office because of the accusations, insinuations, and innuendos of Watergate. This is, of course, a concern which each and every one of us must share in equal measure, in view of the disastrously adverse constitutional effect the establishment of such a precedent would create.

As Senator BARTLETT pointed out, article II, section 4 of the Constitution provides that the President shall be removed from office only after impeachment for and the conviction of "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

Not once in the almost 200 years of our existence as a Nation has a President resigned. No provision of our Constitution even suggests, much less requires, resignation because of accusations or public clamor. Such demands cannot be justified merely because of a lowering of public support, else several of our great Presidents, including Lincoln, Wilson, and Truman, each of whom suffered a sharp drop in popular support while serving as President, might not have finished their elected terms of office.

Even aside from the massive adverse impact upon our constitutional system resignation would have, such action will prove nothing. It would, however, result in a serious and possibly fatal division among our people and thus seriously endanger the proper solution of the grave problems, domestic, and foreign, with

which we are presently confronted. Such a precedent would establish that a minority could through false accusations and propaganda drive from the Presidency a strong and able President and thus rob the people through false witness and intimidation of their President whom they had duly elected. It could result in the destruction of our form of government by visiting punishment upon an individual, innocent of wrong-doing, rather than to devote attention to the root causes of evil in our political system and their orderly removal. The latter is, of course, our function as Senators.

I associate myself with what our distinguished colleague, Senator GOLDWATER, said concerning the present crisis on November 4:

I'm asking in the name of reason, in the name of sanity, of justice and enlightenment, in the name of the great God above, for a moment of quiet thought and reflection.

If we can have such a moment to quiet the hysteria that grips us, we may be able to proceed to the task ahead; to put in order our house of government; to eliminate the incompetent, punish the guilty, and to make sure that what has happened will not happen again—but all this in an orderly, deliberate fashion.

To the Congress, to the White House, to the Administration, to the press and the news media, to the pulpits and the universities, to each and every one of us, I plead for restraint in this crisis. For us to stay on this road of unreason means stark tragedy.

Finally, in the words of the street, in God's name, "Cool It!" Give us time to think, and look at the road ahead.

I wish to assure my colleagues of my deep conviction that the vast majority of our citizens—those who have not become propagandized into frenzied criers for resignation or impeachment—entertain the same thoughts. I know this to be true of those who have studied the matter, unbiased and without partisanship.

Such a group of citizens who, in 1971, associated themselves as the Committee for Constitutional Integrity, obviously

after study and deliberation, sent a telegram to President Nixon and issued a release on November 7, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY:
PRESIDENT NIXON HAS A CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATION AND A DUTY IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST TO IGNORE HYSTERICAL DEMANDS THAT HE RESIGN

The Committee for Constitutional Integrity has this date addressed to President Nixon the following telegram:
President RICHARD M. NIXON,
THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

As a group of citizens concerned with the preservation of the Constitution, we, the Committee for Constitutional Integrity, urge you to stand firm against the hysterical demands for your resignation. It is the genius of our Constitution that it permits our Presidents to withstand the shifting winds of partisan fury, and to serve out their terms of office unless they are impeached and convicted for treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. This is not the first time that political partisans have first sought to discredit the authority of the President by unscrupulous propaganda and then demanded that the President step down on the ground that he has lost the confidence of the people. President Truman at one point had a Gallup Poll rating substantially lower than that which the polls assign to you. Demands were made, notably by Senator Fulbright, that President Truman resign for the supposed good of the country. President Truman refused to heed these demands and later was triumphantly reelected by the vote of the people. It is now universally agreed that President Truman served the country well, and that he did right to preserve the Constitution by resisting pressure and intimidation.

The firm adherence to the constitutional mandate that a President should serve out his term of office and not yield to the momentary winds of public opinion is what saved this nation during the Civil War. At one point President Lincoln privately des-

paired of reelection during the 1864 campaign. But under the shelter of a fixed term of office, he did not quit but held firm. He achieved reelection and saved the Union.

It is supreme folly to undermine the principle of serving out an elected term of office—a principle which has served us so well—by pressure for your voluntary resignation. If there be those who are genuinely and patriotically concerned over the loss of Presidential authority, it should be their duty to stop the vendetta of members of Congress and the media launched against you and your administration. Recently when you proclaimed your military alert, there were people who snickered and said that this was an artificial move designed to distract the people and divert them from their concern with Watergate. This suicidal cynicism is blamed on you and is cited as a reason why you should step down from the Presidency. But all it demonstrates is that some people have been so misled by hysterical propaganda that they cannot understand the needs of national security. It is a situation that needs to be corrected by awakening the forces of reason to counter hysterical propaganda, and not by punishing a President who has manfully sought to protect the nation.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY,
FRANCIS G. WILSON, *Chairman*.

The Committee for Constitutional Integrity was established in March, 1971. Its purpose is to participate with other organizations and individual citizens, likewise motivated, to urge governmental organizations, government officials, and individual citizens, when deemed appropriate, to maintain integrity in the preservation of our Constitution. Its officers are: Chairman, Francis G. Wilson, PhD, Emeritus professor of Political Science, University of Illinois; Vice Chairman Franz O. Willenbacher, J.D., Captain USN (Ret.), lawyer; Secretary, Benjamin Ginzburg, PhD, former Research Director U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

A NEIGHBOR SPEAKS UP FOR AMERICA

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is not too often that we get a chance to see ourselves as our neighbors see us—and be cheered by the image.

Some time ago, Gordon Sinclair, the Canadian radio and television commentator, broadcast an editorial from Toronto. Mr. Sinclair's commentary makes especially heartening reading for us right now, particularly those who are short on perspective and long on pessimism.

Mr. Sinclair's editorial was reprinted in the November 19, 1973, edition of U.S. News & World Report, but for those who may have missed it, excerpts are presented here:

[From U.S. News & World Report,
Nov. 19, 1973]

"LET'S HEAR IT!" FOR U.S.

This Canadian thinks it is time to speak up for the Americans as the most generous and possibly the least appreciated people on all the earth. . . .

Germany, Japan and, to a lesser extent, Britain and Italy were lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans who poured in billions of dollars and forgave other billions in

debts. None of these countries is today paying even the interest on its remaining debts to the United States.

When the franc was in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the Americans who propped it up, and their reward was to be insulted and swindled on the streets of Paris.

I was there. I saw it. When distant cities are hit by earthquakes, it is the United States that hurries in to help. . . . This spring, 59 American communities [were] flattened by tornadoes. Nobody helped.

The Marshall Plan and the Truman Policy pumped billions upon billions of dollars into discouraged countries. Now newspapers in those countries are writing about the decadent, warmongering Americans.

I'd like to see just one of those countries that is gloating over the erosion of the United States dollar build its own airplanes.

Come on, let's hear it! Does any other country in the world have a plane to equal the Boeing Jumbo Jet, the Lockheed Tristar or the Douglas 10?

If so, why don't they fly them? Why do all the international lines except Russia fly American planes?

Why does no other land on earth even consider putting a man or woman on the moon?

You talk about Japanese technocracy, and you get radios. You talk about German technocracy, and you get automobiles.

You talk about American technocracy, and you find men on the moon—not once but several times—and safely home again.

You talk about scandals, and the Americans put theirs right in the store window for everybody to look at.

Even their draft-dodgers are not pursued and hounded. They are here on our streets, and most of them—unless they are breaking Canadian laws—are getting American dollars from Ma and Pa at home to spend here. . . .

When the railways of France, Germany, and India were breaking down through age, it was the Americans who rebuilt them. When the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central went broke, nobody loaned them an old caboose. Both are still broke.

I can name you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble. Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to the Americans in trouble?

I don't think there was outside help even during the San Francisco earthquake.

Our neighbors have faced it alone, and I'm one Canadian who is damned tired of hearing them kicked around.

They will come out of this thing with their flag high. And when they do, they are entitled to thumb their nose at the lands that are gloating over their present troubles.

I hope Canada is not one of these.

ISRAEL AND OIL

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there was recently brought to my attention an excellent editorial from the Savannah Morning News regarding a study on our Nation's future energy needs that was conducted by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The B'nai B'rith study and this editorial point out the importance of self-sufficiency on the part of the United States, with which I whole-

heartedly concur. I feel very strongly that a long-range policy must be developed to secure alternate sources of energy for two primary reasons: First, we cannot allow ourselves to be put in a position of dependency upon other nations, nor should we ever subject ourselves to blackmail or boycott from foreign countries. Second, even if other nations would sell us all the resources we need, it is predicted that the need will be so great by 1980 that it could cost as much as \$20 billion a year for imports. Of course, that would put an intolerable strain on our economy and our already suffering balance of payments situation.

Mr. President, I bring this editorial to the attention of the Senate and ask that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ISRAEL AND OIL

Some commentators believe the continuing conflict in the Middle East may eventually force American policy makers to choose between the two alternatives: Israel or oil. Several Arab leaders including Faisal of Saudi Arabia have said they will sharply reduce oil exports to the United States if Washington continues its pro Israel stance. Today we import only 4 per cent of our oil from the Middle East, but by 1980, if present trends continue, this figure may rise as much as tenfold.

After conducting a study of our future energy needs, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith has concluded that American support of Israel will have much less influence on Arab oil production than most people believe. The ADL is a staunch advocate of Israel, so its position is hardly impartial. Nevertheless, the arguments offered in its study are cogent and well worth consideration.

The study quotes one writer who asserts that, even if President Nixon "throws Israel to the wolves," the Arabs will feel little inclination to step up production to meet all our needs. The Arab oil men, the study notes, realize their valuable resource is a finite one. Over the years they have traded it for dollars that have depreciated in worth and undergone several devaluations. In addition, the Arab economies are primitive and the number of dollar investments they can absorb is limited for the time being.

Under the circumstances the Arabs have a strong economic incentive to curtail production until the value of the dollar increases and more investment opportunities arise. In the meantime, the temptation will be strong for them to raise the price of oil they do export, especially if we are highly dependent on it.

The study cites quotes from Arab officials to substantiate this claim. One high official in the Saudi government said "We have found the maximum revenue we can usefully absorb. Anything we produce over that harms our own interests by keeping prices down and by disturbing our economic balance. Another told the Christian Science Monitor, "We can absorb just so much money and no more . . . It is better to have reserves in the ground than a lot of depreciating dollars in hand."

The elimination of American support for Israel is a goal the Arabs desire but, according to the study, the Arab oil embargo stems more from economic roots than political ones.

One prevalent misconception about the energy crisis is that in the long run we will have to depend heavily on energy imports because our domestic supplies are near exhaustion. Official government troops show that the United States still possesses huge

reserves of conventional fuels. It is estimated, for example, we still have oil reserves in the ground almost equal to all the oil discovered in the country up to 1971.

Development of these resources has lagged for a number of reasons which include government intrusions upon the market place, industry practices, and excessive environmental regulations. These and other stumbling blocks are being attacked and every effort made to expand production . . . This development coupled with nuclear technology and other energy sources should close the energy gap. Unfortunately, that time will not arrive for at least 10 to 15 years.

During this interval we have two choices. We can undertake public and private efforts to eliminate wasteful energy consumption or we can comply with Arab demands and hope for the best.

In either case, energy costs will rise. Excessive dependence on Arab oil, however, has additional liabilities. If we give in to what amounts to blackmail, we set the stage for similar tactics in the future. The cash export needed to pay for oil imports would weaken our balance of payments. This outflow of dollars would in turn place serious strains on the world monetary structure.

All in all, the ADL study makes a convincing case that the crucial decision we must make in regard to our energy problems is not one of Israel or oil, but of eventual self sufficiency or dependence.

BAN THE HANDGUN—V

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, widespread availability of handguns inevitably leads to tragic results. We are all too familiar with the customer shooting and killing the store owner during the course of a robbery, but as one of the articles below describes, strict gun controls will also protect the customer from the shopkeeper.

The articles reprinted below which appeared in the October 28 edition of the New York Times and the November 13 edition of the Washington Post, respectively, are further evidence of the need for strict gun controls, for the safety of our shopkeepers—and their customers.

The articles follow:

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

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

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

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

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 13, 1973]

OWNER SLAIN IN HOLDUP OF CARRYOUT

The owner of a Chinese carryout restaurant at Kenilworth and Eastern Avenues in Prince Georges County was shot to death last night during an attempted armed holdup, county police reported.

The victim, identified as Ken Lee, 39, the owner of the Continental Carry Out, 1701 Kenilworth Ave., was shot once in the face as he stood behind a counter, police said. He was pronounced dead at the scene shortly after the 9:40 p.m. shooting.

Police said early this morning they have not been able to determine exactly what precipitated the shooting since Lee's wife, Moy Yue Tei Lee, the only witness in the store at the time, speaks little English, and was being treated for shock at Prince Georges General Hospital.

Apparently, police said, one or perhaps two men armed with guns entered the store, demanded money, and in the course of the robbery shot Lee.

The gunmen fled immediately, police said, and Mrs. Lee, who was not wounded by the robbers, ran screaming to a nearby liquor store, where employees telephoned police.

No arrests had been made as of early this morning, police said. Officials, who said they were unsure whether any money was taken in the holdup, were questioning Mrs. Lee early today through an interpreter from the embassy of the Republic of China.

CHROME FROM RHODESIA—SECURITY OR IMAGE?

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, two leading newspapers, the Phoenix, Ariz., Republic and the Boulder, Colo., Camera had excellent editorials dealing with the question of the United Nations embargo against Rhodesia.

These editorials discuss the matter of the importation of chrome into the United States from Rhodesia and the importance of chrome as a strategic material.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Phoenix, Ariz., Republic of October 30, 1973, and the editorial from the Boulder, Colo., Camera of October 29, 1973, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHROME FROM RHODESIA

Committees devoted to foreign affairs in both the House and Senate have approved bills that would prevent the United States from importing chrome from Rhodesia.

This African country long has been the chief target of trade sanctions instituted by the United Nations. The United States went along with these sanctions until 1971 at which time our military procurement people decided it was foolish to us to be almost entirely dependent upon Russia for our chrome supply.

Much to the chagrin of the United Nations, the U.S. Congress voted to exempt Rhodesian chrome and other metals from

the boycott. Attempts to repeal this exemption provision were made in 1972 and failed, thus bringing us to the third round.

Why all this fuss about chrome?

Chrome ore, from which chromium is made, is vital to this country's defense.

Existing U.S. supplies of the ore are slim, just enough to meet essential needs for three or four years at most. If that stockpile is used up, what do we do for security needs in case of a real emergency?

When Rhodesia was sanctioned out of the market place, Russia became our principal supplier of this vital defense material. For a price, that is. High-grade chrome ore rose from a pre-sanction cost of around \$25 a ton to over \$70. After we began buying from Rhodesia the price began to drop and now chrome costs an average of \$57 a ton.

Other nations carry on large-scale trade with Rhodesia without attracting much U.N. concern. In fact, some claim that much of the chrome ore sold us by Russia came from Rhodesia for resale.

But the United States, a victim of U.N. hypocrisy through the years, is singled out for condemnation because of our limited trade with that country in order to obtain a vitally needed defense material.

Maybe we have detente with Russia at the moment. Nevertheless, it is dangerous to depend upon the Soviet Union for security materials.

Our exemption from at least this part of the U.N. trade sanction should continue.

Those who propose to keep Rhodesian chrome out of this country, no matter how good their intentions, should realize that our national security comes first.

SECURITY OR IMAGE?

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently approved a bill to repeal the Byrd amendment that allows the U.S. to import Rhodesian chrome, contrary to United Nations economic sanctions against Rhodesia in objection to that country's white supremacy government. A House subcommittee has approved an identical bill.

It is argued that U.S. prestige in the U.N. is damaged by the current U.S. policy of ignoring the boycott and that plenty of chrome is available from the Soviet Union.

In spite of the current detente with the Soviets, it is hardly prudent policy for the U.S. to remain dependent on them for a militarily strategic metal. Nobody knows when they will turn off the detente and return to bellicosity toward the U.S. Furthermore, the U.S. pays exorbitant prices for low-grade Russian chrome, while the Russians buy high-grade ore from Rhodesia.

Another hypocrisy is reflected in the fact that 95 percent of Rhodesia's other export trade is carried on with countries giving lip service to the U.N. sanctions.

Further hypocrisy is evident in the fact that the U.N. deplores white supremacy in Rhodesia, an admirable ideological stance, while the world organization looks the other way from equally deplorable tyranny practiced by black supremacy in other African countries.

Ideology aside, it is our view that commercial and political relations with other countries should be grounded in our national interests and not on ideology, especially when the choice is between protection of national security and protection of an image.

Existing U.S. stockpiles are sufficient for about three to four years. If they are used up now, how would we be able to meet security needs if a real emergency occurs? Can we afford to remain dependent on the vacillating Soviets? Or is it more judicious to keep access open to Rhodesian chrome reserves?

ENERGY: FUTURE ALTERNATIVES
AND RISKS

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this assembly that on January 29-30, 1974, the National Academy of Sciences will convene in its auditorium the second of a series of public forums intended to illuminate controversial issues of national importance involving the uses of science.

The subject of this Academy forum is one of critical and urgent concern to all of us—"Energy: Future Alternatives and Risks." It constitutes a major effort on the part of the National Academy of Sciences to bring together the widest possible range of expertise to examine the energy problem, which is one of the most complex and far-reaching we have faced as a nation. Each day brings some new realization of the effects of the problem. As the sense of immediacy mounts into what already approaches hysteria, we are inclined to focus on stop-gap measures for the present with little thought for the future—an irrational approach which undoubtedly has brought us to our present dilemma.

I would like to commend this Academy forum to you and to members of your staff. It is a rare opportunity to explore the totality of the energy problem as it affects the physical, economic, and social welfare of the American people. Despite, or perhaps even because of, our diligence in studying specific facets of the problem, our grasp of the whole is fragmented.

The forum will convene for 2 days. The first day will address varied interpretations of energy supply and demand. Inasmuch as there is a significant range of opinion on the implications of available data, it is necessary to examine this divergence before any accurate assessment of the energy problem can be made. This confusion regarding data on production and consumption has prompted me to propose that an energy data and information center be established as soon as possible. As a result, the National Science Foundation has funded a study to determine just what computer capability would be required for an effective energy data and information center. Meanwhile, the forum offers an opportunity for us to explore in depth and in person, at one time and in one place, a diverse range of opinion on reserves and resources, the effects of conservation on supply and demand, and considerations of environmental health and safety.

After defining the dimensions of the energy problem, its magnitude and scope, the second day of the forum will appraise the institutional changes that may be needed to solve it. Attention will be given to both public and private roles as well as regulation, aspects which are of great interest to all of us.

The afternoon of the second day is provocatively titled "Choosing the Future: Energy, Research, and Human Values." There is little doubt that all actions to-

ward solving the energy problem have profound implications for our quality of life. For this reason, the forum will consider the proposition that the greatest crisis in the energy problem—indeed, the real crisis—may come in choosing compatible technologies and lifestyles. It is, in my opinion, an important responsibility for the Members of this House to see that the American people are informed and become aware of the choices that must be made regarding energy. There is no turning back to things as they were. We can as a nation and as a people choose our future. And it will be in open meetings such as this Academy forum, in the finest American tradition of choice based on fact, that we can work together to help develop a responsible, rational systems approach to solving the problems that face this Nation, and to do so while understanding these facts upon which an integrated national energy policy must be based.

In closing, I would like to remind you that the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, which was passed by the U.S. Congress and signed by Abraham Lincoln in 1863, calls upon the Academy to serve as an official adviser to the Federal Government on any question of science or technology. It is my great pleasure to bring its forum on energy to your attention.

LATVIA

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1918, the small Baltic State of Latvia proclaimed her independence. She ceased to be a nation in 1940 by the unilateral aggression of the Soviet Union. Latvian independence has been nonexistent since that time.

The Russian rule of the people of Latvia, which is entering its 33d year, has been marked by terrorism, exploitation, and utter suppression of personal freedoms and rights. The simple but precious rights which we hold so dear in this country are denied the people of Latvia by their unwanted Soviet masters.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet Union's arbitrary action to consume Latvia and the other Baltic States. The Soviet Union, it should be noted, is a signatory of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. That statement guarantees the right to assembly, free elections, freedom of worship, and the like. Also provided is the right of people to cross over borders for emigration and visitation purposes.

I am one of those Members who welcomes President Nixon's continuing efforts to shape a genuine atmosphere of détente between our Nation and the Soviet Union. Certainly his success in this area has the potential to lead to a far more stable world than we have seen over the years.

But we cannot allow this recent success to blind us to the lessons of past history. The people of Latvia live in a repressed atmosphere because the Soviet

Union denies them the individual rights to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, let us on this 55th anniversary of the Latvian proclamation of independence applaud the courage which the people of Latvia have consistently demonstrated over the years. Let us further resolve to urge and help the President to utilize our improved communications facilities with the Soviet Union so that Latvia may be given the right to self-determination.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE
FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 49

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, Boston equaled a record that no one can be proud of. On that day, Melvin Cook became the 117th murder victim in the Boston area. He was shot six times.

There is little more that can be said about this disgraceful record or about this particular tragedy, except that it, like 53 percent of the murders that have taken place this year in Boston, might not have occurred if adequate handgun control laws had been in effect.

I have included below the November 26 article by John Robinson of the Boston Globe:

MAN SHOT DEAD; HUB MURDER TOLL EQUALS
1971 RECORD

(By John Robinson)

Boston recorded its 117th murder of 1973 Saturday, equaling a homicide record set in 1971.

The latest victim was 32-year-old Melvin Cook, a native of Columbia, Miss., one of six children, and father of five.

Cook's body was found in a first floor apartment at 20 Ames st., Dorchester. According to police, he was shot six times. No weapon has been found, and no arrest has been made.

Cook lived at 42 Humbolt av., Roxbury, with his mother, Mrs. Ziller Cook, who moved her family to Boston in 1952 "to find a better life." She is separated from her husband. Cook attended local schools, including Trade School, which he did not complete.

At age 19, his mother sent him to live with her sister in Detroit, "to separate him, you know, from some of the boys he was running with," his mother said.

While in Detroit, he met and married Louise Terry, had three children by her, and moved back to Boston in 1965. The couple had two more children before separating in 1969. His wife moved back to Detroit with the children.

Cook held an assortment of jobs. He worked for a Malden sheet metal manufacturer, for Boston College as a cook and maintenance man, Boston City Hospital as an orderly, and as a painter and wall paper hanger.

His last permanent job was as a gas station attendant, which ended in August when the station went out of business.

His mother says he has been doing day labor through a local manpower agency since August.

Besides his mother and wife, he leaves his father, Norman of Boston; the five children, Deborah, Rosetta, Melvin Jr., Stephanie and Leronda; four sisters, Mrs. Mattie Jones, Mrs. Faith Harding, Mrs. Dabannee Resca, and

Miss Oketha Cook, all of Boston; and a brother, Trennell, of Mississippi.

Funeral services are incomplete.

From 1960 to 1966, the number of homicides in Boston ranged from a low of 24 to a high of 58. In 1967 there was a jump to 72 and the following year a dramatic rise to 102. Since then, there were two years of decrease, 1969 and 1972, with 91 and 104 recorded murders respectively.

So far this year, the months in which the greatest number of homicides have occurred have been June with 17, January and August with 12 each, October with 11, and July with 10.

Handguns were used in 53 percent of the murders as of Oct. 25. Knives were the second most common weapon, used in about 20 percent of the murders as of the same date.

AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORTS PROGRAMS TO COMBAT CHILD ABUSE

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that earlier this week the Committee on Education and Labor, by unanimous voice vote, approved S. 1191, a bill to provide financial assistance for a demonstration program for the prevention, identification, and treatment of child abuse and neglect.

Evidence of the broad support for this measure, Mr. Speaker, is that, without exception, public witnesses testifying before the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, endorsed this measure.

Further support for this legislation, Mr. Speaker, was recently received from the American Legion, which at its 55th National Convention in Honolulu, Hawaii, adopted American Legion Resolution No. 443.

Resolution 443 cites the need for increased assistance to fund programs to combat the national problem of child abuse and it endorses as well the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect authorized by S. 1191.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution to which I refer follows:

RESOLUTION No. 443

Whereas, Child abuse and neglect continues to be a major problem among this nation's young people with estimates running as high as 60,000 cases each year; and

Whereas, There is evidence that many communities do not offer any or only limited child protective services to insure the protection of the child; and

Whereas, It has been established that the level of federal appropriations under Title IV-B of the Social Security Act which provides child welfare services, including child protective services, has remained static at \$46,000,000 for the past several years even though the statutory authorization for such services is much greater; and

Whereas, There is little or no information about the effectiveness of state child abuse prevention programs as to their ability to identify, prevent, and treat victims of child abuse and neglect; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Honolulu, Hawaii, August 21-23, 1973, that it urges the Congress of the United States to enact legis-

lation to establish the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect together with adequate financial appropriations; and, be it further

Resolved, that The American Legion supports the establishment of a Presidential Commission on Child Abuse and Neglect whose purpose would be to study the many legal and policy questions yet to be answered on this subject.

THE DÉTENTE OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE IN THE COLD WAR: FACT OR FICTION?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent Mideast flareup highlighted the confusion and doubts surrounding détente and "peaceful coexistence." On November 6 our Committee on Internal Security heard an extensive presentation given on this and related subjects by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University. Though the entire testimony will be published by the committee, I believe the following excerpts will considerably whet the reader's appetite to examine the forthcoming publication:

THE DÉTENTE OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE IN THE COLD WAR: FACT OR FICTION?

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

One need only read our daily newspapers, especially during this period of the Mideast crisis, to appreciate the confusion, doubts and apprehensions surrounding the terms "détente," "peaceful coexistence," and "cold war"; reactions that, if they persisted, would constitute prime meat for Communist "peaceful coexistence" tacticians.

The détente of peaceful coexistence, is it fact or fiction? In this compressed analysis an attempt will be made to answer this fundamental question as rigorously and precisely as possible, with paramount, continuing focus placed on the conceptual meaning of the basic terms but developed essentially in their contextual ramifications, covering these respective spheres of application: (a) the historical (b) psycho-political (cultural) (c) economic and (d) military. The consequences of this essentialist analysis will form its conclusion. But first several prefatory and perspectival observations bearing on the nature, meaning and significance of my phrase "the détente of peaceful coexistence in the cold war."

CERTAIN SALIENT PERSPECTIVES

For our first perspective, it should be noted that, substantially, and except for differences in degree and nominal injections, such as the relative decline of the U.S. in a generation and the mesmeric nomenclature "détente," there is nothing new in the current situation as concerns ideological and political cleavages and the realities of cold war and peaceful coexistence phenomena. The multipolar presence of nuclear arms only serves to emphasize these realities, even to the possible extent of nuclear blackmail.

Our second perspective stresses the unshakable faith and goal of Russian Communist leaders in the ultimate world victory of Communism. Aside from the Aesopian language involved, V. I. Lenin wrote, "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable." This so-called inevitability has been underscored by Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev, and nowhere on current record can be found any renunciation of this

goal, which in reality would be Soviet Russian world domination. By incisive logic, if the U.S. were to succumb, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be prefixed with "World." . . . The continuity of traditional Russian imperialism, whether white or red, is not sufficiently grasped in the West and, as indicated later, still less is its corollary technique of "peaceful coexistence," which is not of Bolshevik creation.

Vitaly important, therefore, to the coexistence principle of non-interference and well expressed in the Brezhnev doctrine, the rape of Czechoslovakia, genocidal Russification in the USSR, the Hungarian Revolution and a long series of aggressions since 1917, is the third perspective on Soviet Russian imperialism. . . . From Stalin through Brezhnev at the 24th CPSU Congress in 1971 a consistent over-adulation of the prime achievements of the Russian people, most of whom are victimized by this totalitarian-imperialist system, permeates the official statements.

Logically related to the preceding perspective and also of fundamental importance to the coexistence concept is that of the USSR as an empire-state, an imperium in imperio, an empire within an empire. If as so many of our analysts nurture the misconception that the USSR is a nation-state rather than an empire-state composed of many nations, both the first historical applications of "peaceful coexistence" by the Soviet Russians and the current field of full play of the concept are lost to them.

And lastly, two more perspectives vital to our subject, namely Communist morality and the Pavlovian effect. Lenin set the criterion of relativist Communist morality—"At the root of the Communist morality lies the struggle for the strengthening and achievement of Communism"—in other words, the end justifies any means. And in the area of international treaties his foreign minister, Chicherin, set the nature of Soviet Russian diplomacy in these words, "Every treaty is merely an expression of forces operative in the realm of facts." . . . As for the manipulation of words, particularly the Aesopian language of communist ideology and such favorites as "peace," "self-determination," "liberation," "imperialism," "just and unjust wars" and "voluntary union," the influence of the great Russian scientist I. P. Pavlov remains to this day, where such manipulation engenders both conditioned stimuli and reflexes."

THE MOVING CONCEPTS

The given perspectival groundwork is indispensable to a clear understanding of the dominant, moving concepts of cold war, peaceful coexistence, and détente, their fields of application, and their import. The concepts are, of course, related, and yet they are distinguishable. The broadest of these, the cold war concept, may be defined as a twilight condition of neither genuine peace nor hot war, where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics and techniques—are present except for open military combat between the primary states. Given the fixed goal of world communism or, in other words, Soviet Russian dominance, the concept bears a global dimension and accommodates intra-empire domination and suppression and "wars of national liberation," which are not features of the other two concepts. Thus the methodical exploitation of the resources of the captive nations, both within and outside the USSR, proxy wars as in Korea, Southeast Asia, and the Mideast, and all sorts of indirect confrontations between the primary states to advance toward the fixed goal are evidential expressions of the cold war, which, contrary to much wishful thinking of the present, is incessant.

Closely related to the broadest concept is the more restricted one of peaceful coexistence. From Trotsky and Lenin to the very

present, this vital concept has been adroitly employed as an integral part and means of the intrinsic cold war make-up of the Soviet Russian empire. On this score there are no "if's," "and's" or "but's" as to what Moscow means, and the quotes are in abundance. For examples, "The more deeply the principles of peaceful coexistence are implemented, the more confidently the people fighting for a . . . radical change of the sociopolitical conditions in the world can act";¹ "Peaceful coexistence is a specific form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism in the international arena . . ." (It) does not exclude revolutions in the form of armed uprisings and just national liberation wars against imperialist oppression . . . And on and on, the same theme in the same open way that Hitler let everyone know *Mein Kampf*, but too few believed it.

Not to belabor the concept, it should be obvious that in comparison with the cold war concept it is more restricted, more specific, more systemic, and in poignant actuality is directed at the chief "capitalist powers." The degrees of "peaceful coexistence" can vary directly or inversely with those of cold war. "Peaceful coexistence" is a struggle applied by non-military means; the cold war invites military threats and blackmail against the primary enemy, such as the U.S., and entails military action in the captive nation's area as well as proxy wars against the interests of the primary enemy. Reduced to its ultimate meaning, "peaceful coexistence" is a tactical means of broader cold war strategy, designed to achieve in a low-intensity climate multiple ends and objectives of temporary, critical benefit to the permanent aggressor. It must be emphasized that both concepts sternly preclude any intra-empire changes resulting from expanded external contacts and involvements. . .

Before examining how the concept of détente fits into this framework it is worthwhile at this point to observe briefly several current expressions on the general subject. One, there are indications that Moscow is considering the extension of the "peaceful coexistence" strategem to Red China, despite the absence of systemic conflict. Second, Brezhnev, not to mention others, has openly held that "peaceful coexistence" or low-keyed cold war conditions in the West best serve the communist struggle among "the capitalist powers," and only recently he stressed the compatibility of a revolutionary outlook with "peaceful coexistence". . . Third, contrary to the views of Senator Jackson and others, there are no contradictions whatsoever in the typical Russian posture of waging cold war, pursuing "peaceful coexistence," accepting "détente" and striving for overall military superiority.²

Finally, there can be no confusion as to the meaning of Soviet Russian cold war strategy and the tactic of peaceful coexistence, but there is much confusion in the West as to what "détente" means, a condition that Moscow has not been slow to capitalize on. The term's simple, dictionary form of a relaxation of tensions is not very helpful if this psychosomatic phenomenon is not objectively related to determinative facts. In short, relaxed tensions related to what and for what—fear of nuclear war, a self-induced euphoria, a traitorous willingness to surrender in the historic conflict, a selfish and immoral indifference toward the captivity and plight of one-third of mankind, a naïveté as to Soviet Russian background, performance and pretensions, or a blissful misconception of "peaceful coexistence" as a live-

and-let-live policy? All of this and more has been poured into the empty vessel of détente. . .

By its very nature, détente can never be a substitute for any rational policy, unless a suicidal coping-out is construed as a policy. The significant aspects to note here are as follows: (a) détente is logically implicit in "peaceful coexistence" itself, especially in stimulating euphoria, loss of vigilance, and confusion; (b) as such, Moscow has most readily accepted the word and its possibilities as a convenient adjunct to "peaceful coexistence"; (c) however, in line with the matrix of "peaceful coexistence," détente cannot be permitted to take hold as either a belief or in the form of unrestricted contacts in Eastern Europe; and (d) détente could either be a disastrous response to "peaceful coexistence," sponsored by Khrushchev since the mid-50's, or, with an eye to the graded order and meaning of "peaceful coexistence" and fixed Russian cold war strategy, a real challenge to the "peaceful coexistence" tactic. So far, our détente course has not violated basic principles and alliances by which we cannot but live; however, it has produced many unstabilizing effects in Asia, the Mideast, Western Europe, among the captive nations, and in the traditional moral thoughts of our country as concern human rights, national self-determination, the odiousness of imperialist totalitarianism, and the bold visions of world freedom. To put it plainly, we all want peace, but what happened to justice and freedom?

THE CONCEPTS IN APPLICATION

With these defined understandings it is not difficult to witness the rule of these concepts in the various broad fields of application and to arrive at certain, necessary conclusions and guidelines of action:

(a) Historically, it is sufficient here to emphasize that the cold war animus and the technique of peaceful coexistence have enjoyed a long tradition in Russian empire-building, long before Lenin and Stalin appeared. In relation to "peaceful coexistence," Clausewitz is frequently quoted (e.g. "War is the continuation of politics by other means") but few realize that much of what is contained in the *Principles of War*, and which Lenin studied assiduously, was acquired by the Prussian general's studies in the Russian Empire.³ Important to note, too, is that the first application of "peaceful coexistence" by the Soviet Russians was toward the newly independent non-Russian republics in the 1917-1920 period. These are now captive nations within the USSR.⁴

(b) Psycho-politically, the cold war and peaceful coexistence concepts are well reflected in what is essentially the traditional Russian Troika policy. This consists of (1) a steady totalitarian and imperialist consolidation within its domain of power (2) under the banner of "peaceful coexistence," a divide and subvert process directed at the West, notably the dismantling of NATO and (3) a progressive penetration and undermining of the less developed areas of the world. This race of three-abreast policy is, in part, exemplified by widespread Russification in the non-Russian republics in the USSR, forced economic regionalization, mass arrests of Russian, Ukrainian and other dissidents, and through COMECON and beyond a deepened dependency of the economies and states of Central Europe; its diplomacy, united front CP operations and extensive

espionage, particularly through satellite embassies, in Western Europe and in the Americas; and its intense and deep involvements in Southeast Asia, the Mideast, the Indian Ocean, Cuba and elsewhere. The old Kazakh proverb applied to Russian politicians—"When you travel with a Russian, make sure you carry an ax"—is one deserving of our utmost heed;

(c) Economically, in our growing trade relations with the USSR, the applicability of the proverb runs high; this aside from our celebrated grain deal. A detailed elaboration of my pointed observations here is furnished in further background material submitted as parts of this testimony.⁵ In other periods of "peaceful coexistence," such as the 20's and 30's, we contributed heavily to the industrial build-up of our now prime adversary so that trade was really economic aid to a permanently aggressive regime. . . Now, once again, Moscow and its satraps are seeking the best of American technology and know-how to gain time and advance also their global objectives. The same old arguments heard 40 and 50 years ago on trade and amity and peace are being repeated today.

Second, the imperio-totalitarian nature of the USSR state has predetermined its economy as a command and cold war type since the first five year plan in 1928, and structurally no basic change has occurred in this nature to present date, nor by reason of the essential political character of this state is any such change possible. As a structural consequence, trade has been and is an institutional sieve, utilized intermittently to shore up the economy's deficiencies, which in recent years have been immense, to gain cheaply the fruits of Western innovation and research and, in relief of its persistent capital shortages, to sustain the pattern of resource allocation for the state's unremitting military build-up and global cold war operations.

In the light of all this and to sensibly meet the "peaceful coexistence" challenge with realistic détenteism, the poltrade policy advocated by me years ago before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is the only rational alternative.⁷ This policy, recognizing politico-economic values in any trade with totalitarian communist powers, would constantly value economic advantages in relation to political benefits, just as the communists do . . . The claim of interference in "the domestic affairs of the USSR" is specious from a historical viewpoint and on grounds of the international complexion of this state and the international involvements of two of its national republics. Also, the notion that the external policies of any state can be viewed in void of its internal policies in a crass, current myth; and

(d) Militarily, this technocratic economy has been and is heavily biased toward a build-up that already in overall quantitative terms has made the USSR state the largest military power in the world, and its ongoing qualitative development may in short time enable it to enjoy prime superiority. All this achieved by an economy half the size of ours in total gross product. The "steamroller" of millions of troops under the last Czar of the imperial Russian empire is far exceeded by the developing nuclear steamroller under the present Red Czar of a more expanded Soviet Russian empire . . .

FACT OR FICTION?

In concluding, the answer to our original question is, of course, in the factual affirm-

⁵ "50 Years of the USSR Economy," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Spring 1973, pp. 28-42; Chapter 9, "The Russian Trade Trap," *U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth*.

⁷ Testimony on East-West Trade, *East-West Trade*, Hearings, Part II, 1965, p. 94-104.

¹ *Izvestia*, September 10, 1973

² "Soviets Are Sent To Mideast," *The Washington Post*, October 27, 1973, p. A6.

³ "Mideast Warfare Poses Challenge to U.S.-Soviet Detente Aims," *The Washington Post*, October 7, 1973, p. A8.

⁴ For background cases on this, the short Chapter XV "The Viennese Dance of the Cold War" in my work *The Vulnerable Russians*, New York, 1967, is submitted at this point.

⁵ For background on this, the short Chapter 2, "Seeing Russia In Toto" in my work *U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth*, Old Greenwich, Conn., is also submitted here.

ative. Moreover, the conceptions given here on "cold war," "peaceful coexistence" and "détente" realistically embrace all major sectors of the world and their critical relationships to both our external and internal security. . . .

Khrushchev once said, "The best way to eliminate war is the gaining of power by Communists all over the world." This typical play on Western nuclearitis is another way of saying the World Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with its capital in Moscow. The present and subsequent regimes in Moscow will not deviate from this ultimate goal which is being and will be pursued in the acquired spirit of their forebears under Asian domination centuries ago . . . And in view of what a meager minority has wrought and achieved within the few historical seconds of 56 years, one cannot but agree with Karl Marx and his insights into traditional Russian imperialism, "The only ones in this tragedy-comedy who imperturbably pursue their old objectives and who play masterfully are the Russians."

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF PHILADELPHIA

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the families of those men missing in action during active duty in Vietnam are anxiously awaiting the day when they will learn something about their sons' whereabouts.

In the State of Pennsylvania, there are still some 1,326 MIA's not yet accounted for, including 5 men from Philadelphia. In order to help relieve the grief of the families and friends of these men, the City Council of Philadelphia has adopted a resolution asking that the President account for servicemen missing in action in Southeast Asia.

At this time I enter into the RECORD the resolution adopted by the city council on November 15, 1973.

RESOLUTION

Memorializing the President of the United States to utilize his good offices to seek an accounting of the servicemen "missing in action" in Viet Nam and other Southeast Asian countries.

Whereas, Less than six hundred servicemen of the more than 1,900 men who were lost while on active duty in Southeast Asia have been identified by the enemy as alive and captive; but some 1,326 men are still missing; thirty-one are Pennsylvanians, five from Philadelphia; and

Whereas, On November 15, 1973, the Eastern Pennsylvania Chapter of the National League of Families will participate in a "Walk for Freedom" from Independence Hall to John F. Kennedy Plaza to focus national concern on the plight of our missing men; and

Whereas, Until these missing men are accounted for, their families continue to suffer the anxiety, grief and frustration experienced by the relatives of those who disappear without a trace; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the President of the United States to utilize his good offices to seek an accounting of the servicemen "missing in action" in Viet Nam and other Southeast Asian countries, to help alleviate the grief and uncertainty of their families and loved ones.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the

United States, the Secretary of State, President Pro-Tempore of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators from Pennsylvania, and the Congressmen representing Philadelphia, as evidence of the sincere sentiments of this legislative body.

LEE CARLE: HE GOES FOR NEWS WHILE OTHERS SNOOZE

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on Mr. Lee Carle, considered by many to be the No. 1 newsman in the Virgin Islands.

Lee and I have been close personal friends ever since he walked into my recording studio at Radio Station WSTA 18 years ago. We were associates then, during the infancy of radio news in the Virgin Islands, and I remain, today, one of his many fans.

Lee has since witnessed and influenced the development of radio broadcasting in our islands. As news director of WWTI Radio, he continues to impress Virgin Islanders with his incisive news coverage and enthusiasm for his profession. Lee's professional contributions to the general news awareness of the populace is surpassed only by his personal promotion of island culture and aid to individual Virgin Islanders.

I commend to your attention, the newspaper profile of Lee Carle from the November 8, 1973 issue of the St. Thomas Journal:

LEE CARLE AT THE SCENE—HE GOES FOR NEWS WHILE OTHERS SNOOZE
(by Joan Riehm)

It was September, 1955. A young man in his early 20s, dressed in a black woolen suit that matched his black hair, got off a plane in St. Thomas. He was driven by a calypso-speaking native to the studios of Radio Station WSTA in Frenchtown.

The New Yorker was wide-eyed at the chickens and dogs that roamed around the WSTA building, and the French women sitting on their porches weaving hats and baskets.

Inside, he was introduced to Ron deLugo, who was doing a show at the time. Ron had his shirt off and was drinking a can of beer to cool off. His bare feet were propped up on the turntable as he tracked a long-playing record.

Ron greeted the new disc jockey, and Italian from upper-state New York whose name was Leo Anthony Carlo. "You're doing the 6 o'clock news tonight," Ron told him.

"Oh? Where's the Associated Press machine?" the newcomer asked.

"What AP machine?" Ron said, amused. "We have a copy of The New York Times though."

"But it's two weeks old!" the newcomer exclaimed.

"It doesn't matter," Ron answered.

And that's the way that Lee Carle, the voice of news to thousands of WWTI radio listeners, was introduced to the Virgin Islands.

Like the islands themselves, news coverage has changed a lot since those lazy-hazy days. Now, as news director of WWTI Radio, Lee carries his microphone and tape recorder to

virtually any event of public interest on St. Thomas, and often to St. Croix and St. John.

He's often been asked, he says, how he manages to sniff out news and be on the scene so quickly. "I know a lot of people on the island," he explains, "and they make sure I keep up with what's going on."

As for those fires, which Lee covers almost as thoroughly as the firemen, he has a proven formula. His efficiency apartment on Blackbeard's Hill is within earshot of the fire station. When he hears the fire siren start up, he calls the station immediately for details. "If you wait till the siren is finished to call, the line will be busy," he says knowingly.

While Lee's nose for news carries him to all points of the island, his reporting is not without its unimagined moments. One morning recently, for example, Lee bored listeners for several minutes as he faithfully recited St. Thomas' entire November cruise ship schedule during his early morning report.

Listeners eager for news on the Mideast war and the dispute over the Watergate tapes had to patiently wait for Lee to recite the litany of ship names and dates.

Still devotion to his job and first love, radio broadcasting, has made Lee Carle a popular news figure in the Virgin Islands. It also has allowed him a first-hand look at the way islanders live, work and play that still makes him optimistic about the future of the Virgin Islands.

"I still believe in the Virgin Islands family unit," he explains, "and that's what is going to keep the islands together. When a young dude who thinks he's so bad and so heavy goes to visit grandma, with her pot of kailaloo cooking on the stove, he's going to get it from her if he pulls any of that rough stuff. She won't stand for it. The matriarchal society is still very strong."

Lee thinks that the "tough" attitude displayed by so many young islanders today is "a game they play, because they think it's the only way they can belong to the group. When I see them dressing and acting like they came from 145th Street in New York, I say 'Hey man, how come you yankin' (acting like a Yankee)?' I'd like to see the kids have pride in being Virgin Islanders, not in imitating somebody else."

Promoting island culture and islanders is a big thing with Lee. When he first came, he organized a "teenage disc jockey contest" among youths on St. Thomas and St. Croix. One 15-year-old was so good that he later became manager of WSTA—that was Addie Otley, now Lieutenant Governor.

Lee also remembers organizing the island's first local talent show, in an effort to spark some enthusiasm among island youngsters he found were "listless and uninterested." One of those who performed was Billy Harrigan, now recording artist Jon Lucien.

Lee says he found out early what islanders like on radio, with the success of an afternoon show he emceed call "Young Sound to Soul Side." "The show combined soul music, having people hear their names on the air, and gossip—the three things Virgin Islanders really like," he says.

"Music is a way to reach kids in all walks of life," he believes firmly. "All of the kids want to be entertainers."

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, in the November 21 issue of the

Garfield Heights Leader, a weekly newspaper in my district, William Kleinschmidt, its editor, published a letter he had written to the President.

I was very much moved by his letter, for it states the heartfelt concern that a citizen feels over the course our Nation, which expects the presidency to embody the best in American life, has taken since the revelations of the Watergate scandal.

I commend Mr. Kleinschmidt's letter to the attention of my colleagues:

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: It is extremely difficult to find loyalty these days to the Administration running our government. A person should really stand behind his leader whatever the situation, but you have given us a situation which is hard to swallow . . . that being the Watergate scandal.

First it was members of your own staff who were found to be underhanded in terms of spying at the opposition's headquarters. Then we heard of plans to make certain that your opponent will be the one whom you want to oppose you in your quest for the presidency. Yes, you even exposed the Democratic Vice President nominee as one having mental problems. Maybe this was for the good, but then what you and former Vice President Agnew did wasn't too good either.

Now we come to the tapes which you said you made of talks you had with those members involved in Watergate investigation. You wish to put down our throats the facts that you were not aware of what was going on and that you wanted nothing but the sentencing of those involved. . . . you wish to be exonerated of all wrong doing, like Pontius Pilate did when he washed his hands at the trial of Christ.

We hear that those tapes were lost, were never made, and are hard to listen to due to too much noise in the background. Just how much do you wish us to swallow? Especially when all suspicion leads to you knowing about Watergate. Why did it take you so long to release these tapes, if that is what you are intending to do? Did you wish for the "Bombing of Watergate" to go away?

Yes, Watergate and the Republican administration is on the lips of nearly everyone. The people who had elected you, President Nixon, are finding disappointment when they look for someone to lead them as a Nation. No matter what you do from now on in, the scandal of Watergate will be long remembered; you have stains on your garment, the type of which can not wash out.

If there is a chance of you, President Nixon, being innocent of all that was said, and I hold this as only a very minute chance, you will still have a far way to go to untarnish your image, the image we the people wish to look to, but find it extremely difficult to do.

May God help us through the next three years as a nation, for I fear if we had to rally together due to some catastrophe, we would find it hard to rally around a leader who has proven to us to be scandalous.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM E. KLEINSCHMIDT.

**THE PRISON REFORM TASK OF THE
NEW YORK SOCIETY FOR ETHICAL
CULTURE**

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this past week the Prison Reform Task of the New York Society for Ethical Culture has

been holding its Second Annual Art Exhibit and Sale of various works created by men and women currently incarcerated in various New York State correctional facilities as well as by other inmates incarcerated in penal institutions throughout the country and exoffenders who wish to participate. This exhibit, entitled "Art From Inside," has proven itself to be a visual means of demonstrating to the community at large the theme of the project which is, "Given truly rehabilitative programs and community support, these men and women are capable of contributing artistic and material progress to our community upon their release."

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Society for Ethical Culture on the outstanding work being done by its organization in providing an outlet for the creative talents of men and women presently incarcerated in institutions both in New York State and throughout the country. Through their efforts, these men and women are being provided with an opportunity to develop new artistic skills as well as to improve those they already have. But more importantly, they are being given the recognition of their talents and the encouragement to continue their productive work upon their return to our communities.

**PENAL REFORM AND THE LEGAL
PROFESSION**

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most emotional and complex problems that we as a society have had to deal with recently is the issue of prison reform. Presently, people in many different professions are wrestling with profound questions concerning the way we deal with those who break our laws. Economists, educators, legislators, and lawyers—just to name a few—have begun to focus on the tragic environment of our prisons.

Recently, Morris Pashman, associate justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, delivered an address at the annual dinner of the Federal Bar Association. In his remarks he focused on the urgent need for improving conditions in our correctional institutions. Virtually everyone present agreed that Justice Pashman's remarks were extremely informative and relevant and he was asked to prepare an article, based on his remarks, for the Reporter, a publication of the Passaic County Bar Association.

The article, entitled "Penal Reform and the Legal Profession," offers penetrating insight into the problems plaguing our prison system.

"Man has attempted countless times to alter the conditions of society's 'undesirables,'" writes Justice Pashman, "but with each effort he constructs an artificial edifice—a castle in the sand."

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share Justice Pashman's article with my

colleagues. Highly interesting, it is typical of the compassionate wisdom which has characterized Morris Pashman's dedication to the people of New Jersey. The article follows:

PENAL REFORM AND THE LEGAL PROFESSION

(By Morris Pashman, Associate Justice,
Supreme Court of New Jersey)

One of the most critical and troublesome areas in our social and legal structures is that of the prison—more recently called the correctional institutions—its temporary and permanent occupants, prison conditions, and most importantly, prison reform.

A few short years ago, the issue of prison reform had all the popular appeal of the bubonic plague. Today it seems to be a bit more respectable. But the mood is not noble or generous. It is rather parochial and grudging.

There are no sure-fire remedies. There are no easy answers. I leave the panaceas to those who claim special competence in the areas of criminology, sociology, psychology and the many other penal sciences of which I do not even know the names. My inquiry will be just that—a questioning on a non-technical level which, hopefully, any reflective person will recognize as not ridicule or condemnation of our prisons but an honest appraisal of the effectiveness of our current system.

What has piqued my curiosity and amazement is the persistence of such problems throughout recorded history. Society's challenge is to satisfactorily answer the question—What shall we do with our undesirables? They are no less human than we; yet prisons do not treat them accordingly. Man has attempted countless times to alter the conditions of society's undesirables, but with each effort he constructs an artificial edifice—a castle in the sand. And in this way we have distorted the times and lives of many humans.

The world has distorted time. With machines we have learned to expect instantaneous results. Man has emphasized the result and not the means of attainment. There has been our instant politics of assassination and creedless resolution. Our youth is demanding instant ecstasy through drugs. The present administration has looked to bombing as the complete answer to communist insurgency in Southeast Asia. Our business community seeks instant abundance. And people look to imprisonment as the instant cure for all those who haunt our society. Science and technology have replaced those human institutions that once made life meaningful. We can create and we can destroy.

Time is a very important possession as well as a concept because we have just so much of it. Time is the matrix for all human existence. It is therefore imperative to order our lives in a manner faithful to our own temporal nature. Do not make a child a man, or anything into what it is not; and, in like manner, do not make a criminal an animal only living in the present with an obliterated past and a hopeless future. The world of the criminal is fact, not fancy; law-breakers are a thorn in society's side, but they are there nevertheless.

Our country recognizes all sorts of groups of people in trouble and does much to help. Our foreign aid and relief programs are testament to that. Even if some groups in the end turn against us, we still do not cut off our foreign aid to many other countries. Yet when it comes to another group in trouble, a group much closer to us than some obscure nation, America most vividly demonstrates its split personality. No one wishes to spend any sizable amount of money in this country for prison reform and rehabilitation programs. How can America in one instance recognize the needs of so many groups around the world while it ignores one very

large group staring it in the face? It is as much a conscious choice as it is an unconscious inadvertence.

America cannot afford to ignore this problem, even if it is an unintentional ignorance. We must force ourselves to think about it. Until the time mind can truly overcome matter, will society's mind have to contend with the body of its people even of the lowest sort.

The human being has shown time and time again its ability to acclimate itself to almost any type of physical situation. As the body is strong and resilient, so, conversely, the mind and spirit of man are frail. Prisons make little effort to restore a man's dignity and confidence in himself. What prison actually does is destroy the human fiber which makes man a part of the human race. Prisons, if only meant for detention, serve this primitive principle well; yet what else should a prison do? The criminal is told he must pay his debt to society, but what or who or where is society?

At sentence time the judge talks a little about rehabilitation and deterrence. The judge hopes for the best, yet he has only the vaguest idea of what happens to the offender after sentence day. If prisons are meant for rehabilitation, making license plates is not the answer. It is cruel and wrong to sentence one for rehabilitation to an institution where rehabilitation facilities are completely lacking.

I am not saying empty the prisons and break down the walls. No one can defend one hundred per cent decarceration. Prisons cannot be totally abolished. We are not advocating that philosophy. The millennium has not arrived. Nor do I want to surface as a Utopian. There is a need for prisons, but not the type that generally exist in this country. Allow the criminal to play some meaningful and fulfilling role in society. Do not completely extricate him from society and think you can plug him back in when the time comes.

It is the part of every citizen to help the criminal as he would assist virtually any other group needing a helping hand. Reform is desperately needed, and through the benevolence of every individual and the collective community of individuals, we can strengthen our nation and look forward to the perhaps unattainable day when barred cubicles colored in resignation, bitterness and disgrace will no longer need to exist.

Hardly a day passes without some newspaper report of prison riots, prisoner suicides, actions by prisoners against wardens, and general barbarous conditions. We read about Attica with its bloody results. The subject has enlisted the attention of men and women of many interests and professions. Among them I must mention former Governor of New Jersey, Richard J. Hughes, who has accepted the chairmanship of the American Bar Association Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services. He has been conscientious and devoted in his efforts to inspire the members of the bar and to enlist their efforts in the elimination of this tragic condition.

I am satisfied that the quality and the status of our institutions is a blight on the functioning of our laws governing the treatment of condemned criminals.

As an example of a more recent prison condition, I would cite a case which was lately submitted to the attention of the United States Supreme Court on an application for a writ of certiorari. The issue involved was the constitutional propriety of the treatment of a prisoner under a program of solitary confinement in a typical Texas correctional institution. The writ was denied in October 1972. Sellers et al., petitioners v. George Beto, Director, Texas Department of Correction, 34 L. Ed. 2d 233. Mr. Justice Douglas wrote a minority opinion against the denial of the writ. Justices Brennan and Marshall concurred. In

the course of his statement, Justice Douglas reviewed the factual basis of the petition—the conditions under which solitary confinement was imposed. I commend his words to you.

"In fact, the terrible price we are paying in crime is because we have tended—once the drama of the trial is over—to regard all criminals as human rubbish . . . we lawyers and judges sometimes tend to fall in love with procedures and techniques and formalism. But as war is too important to be left to generals, justice is far too important to be left exclusively to the techniques of the law. The imbalance in our system of criminal justice must be corrected so that we give at least as much attention to the defendant after he is found guilty as before. We must examine into the causes and consequences of the protracted warfare our system of justice fosters. Whether we find it palatable or not, we must proceed, even in the face of bitter contrary experiences, in the belief that every human being has a spirit somewhere hidden in him that will make it possible for redemption and rehabilitation. If we accept the idea that each human, however bad, is a child of God, we must look for that spark."—Chief Justice Warren E. Burger.

While not so distant in space and time yet worlds apart from the Texas correctional viewpoint, our goal and commitment should be to undertake one of the finest forest reclamation projects, so to speak, taking precedence over many others, because you are not reclaiming trees, but human timber. What finer goal is there than to increase the greatest natural resource of the United States which is the reservoir of its useful citizens. Then and only then shall we be able to insure the right of the individual to live free from attack and not be required to endure the pain inevitably felt by tomorrow's victims.

There is no political capital in prison reform. You will be called a bleeding heart or a liberal do-gooder. But you are not running for office. Neither the "soft on crime" nor the "hard line" has worked. Someone must reassess these approaches. The Bar is the kind of group which recognizes the only hope for the prisoner.

In a society that has learned to tolerate dissent, there must be room for espousing unpopular causes that are as just and meaningful as human rights and civil liberties.

The State and Federal Bars and Judiciary should join in prison reform. Only a sense of justice can enlist consensus. I invite all members of the Bar to join in a pledge of interest and cooperation. For myself, I hope to be identified with those who are dedicated to eliminating the blight of our present prison system. It has serious pertinence not only to the bench and bar, but it is directly pertinent to the general welfare and well being of our country on every level.

It is said that not even a bird falls to earth unheeded. Let us not fail to recognize the acutely delicate situation inside our present day prisons. Leonard Bernstein in his Mass admonishes his audience when one of his singers bewilderedly muses, "How easily things get broken." How easily man's spirit is broken! Let us evolve out of primitive penal cruelty to the mind, body and, more importantly, to the spirit of man. We cannot allow the present situation to persist if we expect inmates to relinquish their former selves while we reawaken and instill in them a sense of moral and social value.

A Russian ex-convict named Fyodor Dostoevski wrote:

"The degree of civilization in a society can be judged by entering its prisons." Why must we wait for a serious crisis to develop before we stand up to be counted and heard?

I know that as lawyers we can add very substantial "clout" in the minds of the general community.

A lawyer's obligation to society is per-

petual. He needs no motivation beyond his sense of duty and his pride. And the fact that a moral obligation may end in failure does not make it any less compelling.

BLACK-ON-BLACK CRIME

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the November 1973, *Ebony* carries a photo-editorial on crime in the black community. It is most distressing that at a time when, for survival, all black people must work together to build our communities, some blacks try to rip-off others. They play the oppressor's game. And as *Ebony* says, the time has come for all black citizens to use "their ballots and marching feet" to counterattack the enemy within.

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus I can say that the caucus would be glad to participate in any convention dealing with the problem of black-on-black crime. Since we are not expert on the full social and economic impact of the phenomenon, our role should be supportive of the effort to draw up a master plan.

The article follows:

BLACK-ON-BLACK CRIME

On the South Side of Chicago, a middle-class black man parked his car about half a block from a busy intersection, walked to a mailbox on the corner and was halfway back to his car when he was assaulted by two young men who knocked him down, took his wallet, kicked him and tried to stab him with a knife. Out about the arm, the man defended himself as best he could. The thugs were so engrossed in their attack that they did not notice a squad car pull up and two policemen leap out. Caught red-handed the men were arrested on the spot. This happened in the early evening of a fall day. And it happened just a block from a police station.

In a tenement stairway in Harlem, a teenager died of an overdose of drugs. He had bought them from a neighborhood pusher with money he himself had raised by stealing and selling a television set.

On an afternoon in Washington, D.C., assassins burst into the peaceful headquarters of a religious sect and brutally killed men, women and children—in the middle of an afternoon.

In a residential area of Detroit's West Side, police discovered seven bodies. Their hands had been tied behind their backs and each had been shot in the back of the head in gangland execution style. They were victims in a drug war brought on when young blacks battled for control of the distribution of marijuana, cocaine, pep pills and heroin. The drug war spread from coast-to-coast and additional young men and women died in the underworld battle.

In Chicago, a van drove up to an apartment house. The "movers" went into the building, removed the door from an apartment and carted off every piece of furniture of any value.

CRIMES OF BLACKS AGAINST BLACKS

The unifying theme of the crimes mentioned here (and they are just a sampling of the thousands committed every year) is that they are crimes by blacks against blacks, crimes committed in the ghetto by people who also live there.

They are among the crimes ranging from petty purse snatching to cold-blooded, premeditated murder which make the ghetto a dangerous, more expensive and inconvenient place to live. In most major cities cab drivers refuse to carry fares into many areas after dark. Black businessmen, especially those operating small service businesses such as grocery stores, drug stores, real estate offices, taverns, laundromats, etc., find it difficult to secure proper insurance, and their losses from petty thievery to armed robbery often drive them out of business. A sign on a real estate office in a middle-class neighborhood in Chicago tells its customers, "We do not accept cash for any transactions." Signs on delivery trucks declare: "Driver has no cash." Busses and street cars accept only exact change with the money falling through the change box into a safe which even the driver cannot open. Some "public" stores have a buzzer lock on their doors and will admit only those customers the owner wishes to let in.

MISUSE OF BLACK BROTHERHOOD

During the past decade there has been a great growth of black pride among blacks in all walks of life. More and more, blacks are realizing that they must work together against a common oppressor if they are ever to gain freedom in the white-dominated United States. Unfortunately, some blacks have misused black brotherhood. The two men who attempted to rob and stab the middle-class Chicagoan later pleaded with him through their lawyers that, as a "black brother," he should drop the case. Black merchants sometimes use the "black brother" appeal in unloading shoddy merchandise on their black brothers and a few charlatans in the civil rights movement have used their groups to rip off both whites and blacks.

THE CAUSES OF CRIME AMONG BLACKS

Crime has always been greater in areas of poverty, and the causes are legion. The poor man struggling to keep his family fed and clothed will sometimes, in desperation, rob a store. But the bulk of crimes are committed by those who are, psychologically, outside of society. Blacks today, even though they have made great strides forward in certain areas and now have "legal" equality, are still an oppressed people and, as psychiatrist Alvin F. Poussaint has said in *Why Blacks Kill Blacks*, "Violence can be a potent drug for the oppressed person. Reacting to the futility of his life, the individual derives an ultimate sense of power when he holds the fate of another human being in his hands... frustrated men may beat their wives and children in order to feel 'manly.' Expectedly, these impulses are exaggerated in men who are hungry and without work. Violent acts and crime often become an outlet for a desperate man struggling against a feeling of inferiority."

That feeling of inferiority and the desperate desire "to be somebody" cannot be satisfied with slogans. "I'm black and I'm proud" is all right as a beginner but the young black must be given more if he is to be converted to true black brotherhood. The teen-ager joining a ghetto gang is at least given a sense of belonging and a purpose in life—even if that purpose be a wrong one.

Many middle-class blacks who decry the crime statistics built up by their poorer brethren are often themselves a part of the cause of the crimes. More than one "respectable" South Side Chicago matron will tell you, "I know a man who can get you anything you want from Marshall Field's store. Just give him the size and color."

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

The problem of ridding the ghetto of crime is a difficult one and the solving of that problem must start within the ghetto itself. With-

in every black ghetto, the good law-abiding and hardworking people greatly outnumber those who live outside the law. The law-abiding people must, therefore, demand the right to live in peace and in safety, and that demand must be made, and enforced, by whatever means are necessary. The black criminal must be told in no uncertain terms that his assaults and his thievery and his dope-pushing and his murders will no longer be suffered in silence. He must be made to know that decent black people are going to use their ballots and their marching feet to demand that the politicians they have elected now provide them with adequate, truly effective police protection as well as amelioration of all the horrid social conditions in which criminality breeds. He must be made aware that decent black people are on the lookout for him and that he is subject to such measures as those taken by black mothers in Harlem who smashed dope-pushers' cars with baseball bats and Operation PUSH's "Black Men Moving" who confronted Chicago's vicious teen-age street gangs and announced "We've had enough of your killing and your intimidation, and from now on real black men are going to be the ones you'll have to take on." While we do not urge the vigilante approach, we certainly can understand the desperate situation which suggests that decent, law-abiding black people are fed up and will take no more.

WASHINGTON STATE HOUSE CALLS FOR USE OF DDT AGAINST TUS-SOCK MOTH

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, support has been coming in from all over the country for the legislation I have introduced (H.R. 10796) directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to accept and approve all registration applications presented to him by the Secretary of Agriculture for use on forest and agricultural lands to control insect infestations.

Thirteen of our colleagues have joined in cosponsoring this legislation, which was just recently reported out by the House Committee on Agriculture on November 12. I am particularly happy that one of the cosponsors is chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests, Congressman JOHN RARICK, who has been responsible for the expeditious treatment this bill was accorded by the committee. Our cosponsors represent both political parties, all sections of the country, and include other key members of the House Agriculture Committee.

The bill, which was considered too controversial by some, is overwhelmingly important. It is urgent that the Congress face up to the damage that has been done by insect infestations in various parts of the country, and take the necessary steps to correct it for the future.

Devastation in the West by the tussock moth this year is equal to that done by a number of major forest fires. If this much damage had been done by fire, it would have been considered a major disaster.

We now know that the loss of many millions of dollars worth of timber cannot be prevented by any other means except the discriminate use of DDT—which was banned by the EPA in 1972.

This country and this Congress can no longer afford the luxury of simply bemoaning our fate at the hands of a bureaucratic "Frankenstein's Monster" which we ourselves have created. We are in this situation because of our overreaction to a perfectly valid concern for the indiscriminate use of pesticides; but in our eagerness to solve a problem, we have created a situation in which responsible Federal agencies, such as the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture, have been prevented, in spite of their obvious expertise in the subject, from directing the responsible use of appropriate insecticides, even in the instances where the only option was catastrophic destruction of public and private property.

It is now the responsibility of this Congress to impose rational restraints on the extreme and authoritarian manner with which well-intentioned laws have been administered, and to do so in the interests of the welfare of the people of this country, our environment and our economy. The time has come when we can no longer base our decisions upon emotionalism which allows no room for responsible consideration of the facts relative to such urgent problems.

H.R. 10796 was designed to put the authority for the management and protection of forest and agricultural lands against insect infestations back in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, to insure that future wholesale and unnecessary destruction, such as we in the Northwest have seen due to the tussock moth, will not happen again. Because of the lack of expertise and motivation in EPA, and their neglect of these critical insect infestations in the Nation, a major outpouring of taxpayers' money must now be committed for necessary accelerated reforestation.

We have turned to these legislation means to insure that this technical competence within USDA is brought to bear in all future determinations, and that administrative processes are based on thorough technical and professional findings and fact, not emotionalism and dogma.

This legislation is not designed or intended to respond to a singular event, or a unique situation. It is intended as general legislation to serve the entire country in the future. We want to make certain that the unnecessary waste of our forests—an important facet of our environment, our recreation, and our economy—and the health hazard now faced by farmers who must use dangerous pesticide substitutes for DDT, will not be sanctioned in the future.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, there being no objection, I would like to insert the text of a Washington State House of Representatives floor resolution, sponsored by State Representatives Johnson, Savage, Kilbury, Conner, and Hayner. It is a bi-

partisan resolution, expressing the sense of the people of Washington State who are concerned about our environment, our recreation potentials, and our economy.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Douglas fir tussock moth is defoliating Douglas and white fir trees and other vegetation on an estimated 650,000 acres in the States of Washington and Oregon, which area aggregates about 1,000 square miles, of which some 230,000 acres, or 360 square miles, are in Washington State, and in addition there are major infestations in Idaho; and

Whereas, This area of damage is fifty percent larger than the area predicted for 1973; and

Whereas, This damage is threatening the forest based economy of the area, is destroying the entire ecological balance of the area including degradation of watershed values necessary to the agricultural economy, and is ruining recreational values; and

Whereas, High soil temperatures and other problems in the denuded area make reforestation extremely difficult, and, together with inadequate nursery capacity to grow planting stock, will delay regeneration of the area for many years; and

Whereas, Application of DDT is the only known control measure for the Douglas fir tussock moth; and

Whereas, In 1963, 26,600 acres of hemlock looper infestation were sprayed with DDT in the State of Washington, and in 1965, 65,945 acres of Douglas fir tussock moth infestation were sprayed with DDT, and the report published by the concerned agencies which monitored both these projects reveals that no significant damage to the environment was detected; and

Whereas, Acting on recommendations of forest entomologists, the U.S. Forest Service, the States of Washington and Oregon, as well as the town of Walla Walla, in 1973 requested the Environmental Protection Agency to grant permission for emergency use of DDT to control the Tussock Moth disaster; and

Whereas, The Environmental Protection Agency denied these requests; and

Whereas, There is now no evidence that expansion of this damage will be contained by natural causes or approved pesticides before additional damage is created in 1974.

Now therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Executive and Legislative branches of the federal government be requested to take all actions necessary to assure that the appropriate agencies have the authority and means, including the authority to use DDT if necessary, to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent additional damage from the Douglas fir tussock moth in 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the problems associated with insect infestations confronted many sections of the country in 1972, and still confront us in 1973. The time of action is essential. The protection of our forests against mortality and fire, of our streams against sediment pollution from runoff, of our watersheds for lack of restraining foliage, our wildlife from lack of cover, and our recreation sites must be the first order of environmental business. I believe H.R. 10796 is the responsible action necessary at this time to insure this Nation against further bureaucratic bungling in the future.

TECHNOLOGY AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the face of the energy crisis which has demanded so much of the Nation's attention in the past few weeks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of Dr. Earle B. Barnes, the president of Dow Chemical, U.S.A., on industry's response.

Dr. Barnes, in his reasoned and enlightening remarks, points out that all energy consumers can take action to reduce consumption and thus contribute to the alleviation of our difficulties. Further, he notes the responsibility of industry to the long-term solution of the energy crunch.

Americans have traditionally responded over the years to our national needs, so industry, which has the tools to meet this new challenge, will respond today.

I commend Dr. Barnes' remarks to my colleagues:

TACKLING THE ENERGY CRISIS WITH TECHNOLOGY

(The following article is based upon a talk of October 17, 1973 before the Instrument Society of America. The author is Dr. Earle B. Barnes, President, Dow Chemical U.S.A.)

Last spring, Johnny Cash was just starting to sing about the gasoline shortage and people were deciding to stay home over Memorial Day. About then, I succumbed to the semantics of our time by using the phrase "energy crisis". We have heard so much of this term that some people are probably getting a little tired of it. While a few parts of the USA have experienced a shortage of gasoline or a shortage of heating oil in the past year, most of the American public has not yet felt the effects of any real crisis. . . but they soon may.

Why call it an energy crisis? A crisis can be defined as a "turning point for better or worse", and we certainly are at a turning point. People with vision have seen this situation coming for a decade or two, so then perhaps the so-called energy crisis is a good thing.

For years, both individual consumers and industry used cheap energy inefficiently to save capital expenditures. If we now recognize that we are at a turning point, perhaps a more rational approach can evolve from the existing supply and demand marketplace. Increased energy cost will encourage the homeowner to insulate his house, will prompt industry to redesign processes, and will suggest to the auto owner that perhaps he doesn't need a heavy 300-hp automobile. We must now invest capital wisely to save energy.

As wage rates soared after World War II, cheap energy in part enabled the U.S. to compete in world markets. Now the U.S. manufacturer who expects to see his export market grow must respond quickly to rising energy cost—stop burning up fossil fuels at rapidly escalating rates. Analytical capability, ability to harness computers and instruments, and knowledge of process dynamics will enable the manufacturer to conserve energy. And that's what I really

want to cover; various responses already have been made, but more imaginative responses can be made in the future as we come to our great turning point in man's use of energy.

Human beings make all kinds of responses to a crisis—usually emotional ones. We've already had too much of this, along with insufficient technical response. The response of man's technology to the energy crisis can take two forms:

Conserving energy with existing hardware; Looking into the future and utilizing energy to accomplish man's tasks on a more efficient basis through emerging technology. First, let's look at how energy is consumed in our country today.

USING AND SAVING ENERGY

Industry uses about 40 per cent of our energy and conservation programs are well underway here; 35 per cent heats, cools and operates home equipment; transportation of people and of goods consumes the remaining 25 per cent.

As instrument engineers well know, precise measurements are now mandatory for the industrialist who desires maximum yield, product quality, pollution control and a sound energy conservation program. Today, industry counts the Btu's required to make a pound of product just like overweight humans count calories. In chemical plants, it has been a standard practice to keep material balance records, but a recently introduced extension of this idea is that the energy used in each process is totaled, just as are the raw materials used. Furthermore, the energy needed for pollution control or anything else in the manufacturing process must also be accounted for. A small increase in yield sometimes does not justify the energy consumed to generate the improved yield. Some big process plants run heat and material balances every 20 minutes around the clock and tune up accordingly for optimum plant operation.

Energy can't be saved until you know where you are wasting it. So the energy problem offers a field day for those involved with instrumentation—both users and manufacturers. Industry will always need instruments that offer better measurements and greater reliability, and new instruments to measure new variables continuously.

For highly instrumented plants, we no longer need ask the computer to do something and assume that it has been done. We now ask the computer, "Have you done what you were told to do?", and receive verification.

To conserve energy, neither the consumer nor manufacturer can wait to correct a malfunction until after an energy loss. In the past, we postponed cleaning a heat exchanger when it quit working. Now a computer can calculate heat exchanger efficiency continuously; cleaning is undertaken at an optimum time rather than under emergency conditions.

What does this approach to energy conservation mean to industry, and what have instrumentation people contributed? Dow started an energy-conservation crash program about five years ago. Most of the first four years were devoted to creating sophisticated monitoring systems to find what we were using or losing, where and when. Last year, Dow reduced energy consumption by 10 per cent—while increasing yield—with another 10 per cent reduction being realized this year. Certainly, Dow will reach a point of diminishing return for its efforts, but intends to set tough goals each succeeding year.

Most companies and private consumers can reduce energy requirements by at least 30 per cent, but even a conservative assumption of 15 per cent is the equivalent of 2.8 million barrels of oil per day.

APPLYING TECHNOLOGY TO THE ENERGY PROBLEM

The key to conserving energy—in a kitchen or in an industrial plant—lies in consuming only the exact amount of energy required to do the job. When a housewife makes tea, she usually heats more water than required and often lets the teakettle boil—wasting energy—while she does another task. But instrumentation can help industry save that 2.8 million barrels of oil per day (or its energy equivalent), keeping industry's kettle from boiling too long, by maintaining a precise energy level.

Both consumers and industry must invest capital to save energy by insulating, designing new processes, and measuring accurately the energy used as well as conserving energy by the obvious methods of turning off unneeded equipment (lights we don't need). Instrument manufacturers and users have a great opportunity to develop sensors to measure what we're wasting so we know what to save.

This line of attack is the best technological short-term approach, because we're already using resources faster than we can afford to. But this isn't a way to conserve our way out of present equipment and technology applications. We must keep innovating to improve living conditions and give man even greater leverage in his work with more efficient use of energy.

Many technological advances illustrate this point; for example, low energy, solid-state devices such as transistors and integrated circuits during the past 25 years have saved countless kilowatts.

A TV set built with solid-state circuits requires about half as much electricity as one containing vacuum tubes. If the electronics engineers succeed in their quest for a solid-state substitute for the big picture tube, the energy savings will multiply five-fold.

RCA recently announced the development of a pocket-size television camera with an image-sensing component that contains more than 120,000 electronic elements on a silicon chip the size of a nickel. Fairchild Camera has demonstrated a six-ounce TV camera not much larger than a cigarette package.

One big computer, completed more than 15 years ago, employed 15,000 twin-triodes and required 60,000 watts to operate. In addition, it needed a large air conditioning system to carry off the heat generated by the tubes. This 60,000-watt computer could do little more work than one of today's sophisticated pocket calculators that contains ICs and batteries. Speaking of batteries, companies recently announced the use of molten-salt electrolytes to pack as much as 10 times the energy of a standard lead-acid battery into the same size package.

Light as a form of energy is just beginning to be harnessed and is now at just about the stage of usefulness that electricity was when Edison began his inventing. Lasers, for example, can accomplish many things with only a fraction of the energy input that other devices use.

Only a generation ago, scientists first learned how to "pipe" light. Already the commercial significance of this discovery is great, making hundreds of industrial and consumer devices more efficient and less costly.

These examples illustrate how new technology can make exciting contributions to both industry and home. Our civilization has seen man grow from a one horsepower—or ox power or camel power—to being a 500-hp man (adding up all the devices which work for him). Technology should provide him with even more service for less energy.

THE WILD BLUE YONDER

I have been a science fiction fan for 40 years and the most unbelievable thing is how much of what was fiction 40 years ago is science today. Remember: the time gap from the invention of the wheel to putting man on the moon's surface is less than a single heartbeat in the history of human life. Man's recently accelerated time table of achievement will not be maintained without drawing upon imagination as we exercise inventive minds and creative hands.

Look realistically, but with rekindled imagination, at untapped energy sources, and let us always remember that man cannot create energy. The good Lord gave us energy that is fantastically abundant from the ancestral sun. It is predicted that this source will be available to us for about four billion years.

This gives us a little time.

The sun provides 1 kW/m² per day. If you don't think that is a lot of energy, get out your slide rule. Think for a moment about what solar energy already does. It grows all of our plants, forests and food supply, and provides rainfall. All the fossil fuels in existence could not outproduce the sun for a single day.

Solar energy is here for the taking—waiting for efficient conversion methods that can be accomplished with available capital and efficient transmission methods that depend upon the development of solid-state conductivity or superconductors. Breakthroughs will come in our lifetime. Solar energy is absolutely clean, and no one can steal it; everyone on this globe has an equal chance to acquire it; and there is no need to fight wars to possess it. At the Solar Energy Institute of the University of Delaware, available technology makes it feasible to discuss the cost of solar energy as compared to a conventional steam turbine plant.

Since the 1930s, a man in Florida has provided hot water for his home at least eight months of the year—with a box on his roof filled with coiled copper pipes and covered with a black surface. This man—not a trained scientist—is several decades ahead of most of the world's scientists in doing something about solar energy.

If the impossible just takes a little longer, there is a second way to harness solar energy. The sun does it daily through a magnificent scientific achievement called photosynthesis. The sun takes CO₂ out of the atmosphere and makes cellulose and oxygen, producing untold billions of tons of plants daily. If man can duplicate this process of nature, once again we have a limitless source of energy. The cycle could be perpetual, making cellulose which could be burned to provide energy; the burning process would regenerate CO₂ for this photosynthesis energy converter.

Far out? Most of today's technology would have seemed much farther out to our founding fathers just 200 years ago. Fantastic technological developments occur everyday. In an era when people are more interested in watching a football game than watching astronauts walk on the moon, we are bound to have trouble getting people to understand how the energy crisis will be solved by technology.

TIME FOR APPLICATION OF TECHNOLOGY

Maybe an emergency instead of a crisis is what was needed. Things may be tough for a while, but it would certainly shorten development time. We waste too much time and human effort building ships and hauling oil around the world—doing primitive things like hauling wood instead of working on an electrical generator.

Certainly on a short-range basis, we are forced to do primitive things such as harnessing geothermal energy wherever we can, tapping new oil reserves, speeding up the

Alaskan pipeline and building nuclear plants fast. The point is that we are adequately forewarned that our response and technology to develop new sources must be greatly accelerated.

One response of technology to a real emergency is familiar to everyone. In December 1941, the Japanese cut off our natural rubber supply from the Far East. This product was needed if Western civilization was to defend itself, and the technological response by American industry was fantastic. Dire necessity brought forth the development of synthetic rubber.

Today, we look hungrily at the vast oil reserves of the Middle East and play political and economic chess to maintain its flow to our shores.

Today we are adequately forewarned, and our technological reservoir is far advanced and often unused (this was not so in 1941). At the same time, we are acutely aware of the need to reverse two trends, the waste of energy and the pollution of our planet through misuse of energy and raw material.

The technological response has begun on both counts. Let's speed it up, and approach our more serious problems as we did the conquest of space, always remembering that imagination is the first prerequisite and that the impossible is only a state of mind. Let's work to leave future generations with such an abundance of energy that all men can share it without exercising might and militancy in its pursuit.

THANKSGIVING 1973

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the Members have just returned from the Thanksgiving recess, it is only appropriate that I insert into the RECORD an article on this great American holiday that places it into its proper perspective.

Rather than delve into this subject any longer, I direct to the attention of the Members an editorial in the *Suburban Life—Illinois*—which appeared in their Thursday, November 22 issue. The article follows:

THANKSGIVING 1973

Despite current and projected shortages in everything from fuel and newsprint to food products and some clothing materials, there is still much for which we Americans should be thankful today in observing the 352nd anniversary of the first Pilgrim feast in Massachusetts.

We remain the most prosperous, free-thinking nation on this earth. We waste more food and natural resources than most countries on this globe consume each year. And this wasteful mess is beginning to catch up with us in our current energy crisis.

President Nixon and other governmental officials have asked for a voluntary cutback in the use of fuel oils, gasoline and electrical power. Voluntary acceptance of this necessary conservation is the only way to avoid stringent federal controls.

We are proud of the efforts being made in our communities to reduce consumption of energy, but more public support is needed to make any sizeable dent in our power outlay.

We can make it if we all work together. If a single unused light were turned off in every home in this community, it would be

surprising how much energy could be saved. If each motorist in our area would save a gallon or two of gasoline each week, either by driving under 50 miles per hour or walking to the corner store, it would be a big help.

Our people and the entire nation can either conserve our energy supply voluntarily or we will be compelled to do so by federal law, a step no one wants to see happen.

Let's all get with it and do our share. Our efforts may not only help our nation through a difficult energy crisis but also should result in real savings in our own pocketbooks.

As we sit down to our tables of plenty, enjoying today's Thanksgiving feasts, let us all remember that we will keep our blessings a lot longer if we demonstrate more prudence with our resources.

ELOQUENT BETRAYAL

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, no doubt all of us have been receiving numerous telegrams, telephone calls, and letters concerning constituent reactions to the events of the past few weeks, reactions which have varied according to the sentiment expressed.

But aside from the direct reaction to Watergate, impeachment, and related matters of immediate concern, I have noticed that people are giving deep and very personal thought to these very serious questions and issues that are plaguing our Nation.

A young housewife in my district, Mrs. Judith B. Grossman of Lafayette, La., has shared with me her feelings and beliefs on these matters and most eloquently portrayed the concerns which I believe most Americans now hold. If any lasting benefit can come from the present situation, I believe it will come in the form of an awakening realization throughout the Nation that complacency is dangerous and that active participation in our governmental and political system by everyone is vital if our system is to survive.

Permit me to share with my colleagues Mrs. Grossman's thoughts on this subject:

ELOQUENT BETRAYAL

I am a housewife in her thirties. I have never written my congressman before, I am sorry to say, but I have rarely missed voting in any election since registering in Louisiana in 1962.

Contrary to rumors about the apathy of the American people, I believe that most other citizens, as I, have silently agonized over the tragedy that Watergate has come to mean to the world. I have spent as much time searching my soul over my political thinking as over any of my other beliefs. Yet I have never had enough confidence in myself to express my political beliefs. I also felt that well-known helplessness to do anything about it anyway.

Because of the thinking begun by Watergate early on, I saw through the fallacy of the "silent majority," that a silent majority is no majority at all, but an abnegation of responsibility (however small) as citizens. Not only was my laziness irresponsible, but it was used to indicate support for thinking sometimes contrary to my own. My silence was working against me. I saw that the only

way to affect change is to act, to enter into the democratic process in some way, however small. I then became a participant in a Lafayette citizens' committee.

To do that I had to gain enough confidence in myself to act. Many women my age and in my circumstances—middle class, house in the suburbs, husband in business or a profession, kids, inflation, pollution—are going through a personal crisis similar to the nation's. It is very easy to submit, without thinking, to the traditional roles. Not to act is perhaps the greatest temptation for us who have lost a personal sense of worth but can take refuge in material comfort and in fulfilling the traditional roles. The incipient promise of America that was ours as children in school sometimes emerges as we stand over the kitchen sink. We feel then the tremendous waste of our energies and intellect. It is like a pesky fly buzzing into our safe and routine consciousness. We can either obliterate him and go on as before, or we can listen to our own conscience and do something before the promise of the American dream is withdrawn forever, unrealized.

I have ended my silence. I am learning to act. If I can speak for other women, other Americans like me, I shall add, we have the strength to be all, not only to fulfill our traditional roles, but to speak up for ourselves and to act for our not-so-small bit of humanity.

Only we can realize the American dream.

THE ELIMINATION OF A TAX ON A TAX

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which if enacted will remove the grossly unfair Federal excise tax on amounts paid for State and local taxes on communication services such as telephone bills. The problem is such that the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the Federal excise tax must include amounts paid for State and local taxes on telephone bills. This amounts to double taxation and inequity in our tax laws.

My State of South Dakota was one of the first States the IRS ruled against. Today this double taxation effects Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Tennessee. It has been projected that within the next year about 45 States will have to compute the 9 percent excise tax by including any State or local taxes for services rendered. Although we will only have an 8 percent excise tax next year in 1974 and decreasing 1 percent each year thereafter, we must act to correct this double taxation.

When this problem first came to my attention in August, I thought that it was due to the particulars of the way our tax laws were written in South Dakota, but it is now apparent that all but New York and Georgia may be affected and thus the need for our action. My colleagues might better be able to see the possible affects to their State by knowing that in South Dakota alone, this double taxation will amount to a total of about \$300,000 to \$400,000 in 1974.

For every dollar spent on State and local taxes on communication services, an individual will have to pay 8 cents in 1974 for excise taxes. This may not appear to be very much, but pennies count up and in these days of rising costs and inflation every cent counts.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join in this effort to eliminate this double taxation.

PRESERVING THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, my friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) addressed the convention of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges in Denver, Colo.

Mr. O'HARA, serves this body as chairman of the special subcommittee on education, which has jurisdiction over higher education legislation. He has, on several occasions recently spoken out in opposition to proposals to raise tuition at public colleges and universities. His remarks in Denver, which I include at this point in the RECORD, sum up his views on this controversial subject:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

Let me say at the outset that I address this group in a state of substantial insecurity. I am a new boy on campus in the field of higher education. My distinguished predecessor, Representative Edith Green of Oregon, presided over the Special Subcommittee for well over a dozen years before moving on to the Appropriations Committee.

She left behind an impressive record of achievement and constructive legislation, and I have been busying myself during most of the ten months that I have had that chair in beginning to learn my way around and through the secret passages, hidden trapdoors and other gothic trappings in the Higher Education Act and its auxiliary statutes. Only time will tell whether there is any way to get anywhere from where I now am. But I am trying.

So this fall I have been speaking in front of a succession of the nation's most distinguished educators. A couple of weeks ago, I chaired a panel at the meeting of the American Council on Education. Shortly after that, I spoke to a luncheon group of the College Entrance Examination Board. Last week, I addressed a dinner meeting of the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools. And today, I am addressing you.

A reasonable question might be "O'Hara, who are you to be telling these experts what is going to happen to education? Shouldn't you content yourself with getting their advice and acting on it?"

On the whole, I have been and will continue to content myself with getting the advice of spokesmen for every sector of American education—including college and university presidents, student financial aid officers, the people at One Dupont Circle in Washington, among the most helpful of whom will always be my old friend Ralph Hultt and my new friend Jerry Roschwalb. I shall continue to solicit and give very careful and respectful attention to the ideas of economists and political scientists and students of postsecondary education itself. The

men and women who man the controls and make the machine go will be among the first I shall always consult if my Subcommittee is to function in an informed and useful manner.

But in the last analysis, in the field of higher education as in every other field, it is precisely the inept value judgments of the public which will prevail and if we are to accept the basic idea of free government, should prevail.

The interests that education legislation must serve first are the interests of the students who use the system and the interests of the parents and the other taxpayers who provide the system with all of its lifeblood.

So I comfort myself as I look at a room filled with men whose educational credentials I cannot hope to meet. I comfort myself with the thought that, as a taxpayer, as a father of seven children, the two oldest of whom are just beginning postsecondary education, and as an imperfect reflection of the ideas and prejudices and hopes and aspirations of the people of my Congressional District, I am not wholly disqualified to have judgments on how this nation should and will direct its attention. My judgments are fallible.

And to some extent, they reflect the concerns of a constituency of middle-income Americans who pay the bills and shoulder so many of the burdens of these troublesome times.

Let me put it another way. I have one son at a great State University and another at an equally great State Land-Grant Institution, and I will use every opportunity I get to talk to you about what the future ought to hold for these two sons—and their brothers and sisters.

And it is from that point of view that I think we are going to have to address the great educational policy questions that are now being so hotly debated.

On one of those issues, as I think most of you have heard, I have recently spoken out.

I have denounced, and I will continue to denounce the proposals which have been made, and which will continue to be made, to demand that the alleged "tuition gap" between those institutions supported by tax-based appropriations, and those institutions supported by tax-privileged endowments be narrowed by raising the floor, in the apparent hope of making the ceiling look lower.

I have said about those proposals that it is time to blow the whistle on the efforts of the rich to aid the poor with the resources of the middle-class.

And I will continue to say it as long as those proposals continue to be made.

I may have missed some aspect of economic analysis, but I am finding it very confusing to be told that people who are already finding it difficult to go to the public university are going to be helped to go to the private ones by raising the tuition at the places they can barely afford to attend right now.

Call it naïveté, call it a poor background in undergraduate economics, call it what you will.

I don't think playing musical chairs with financial barriers to education helps anyone.

As I understand the reasoning which brings us to these conclusions it begins with the proposition that tuition does not, for the most part, cover the total cost of instruction.

One set of figures in the recent Carnegie Commission Report suggested that families in the below \$6,000 income bracket contributed in tuition about 40 percent of the total cost of their children's education, while families in the over \$18,000 bracket contributed in tuition 55 percent of that cost.

But at a recent Washington meeting, a respected scholar drew from this the conclusion that "A system with real social equity would have resulted in a range from only

15 to 20 percent for the lowest group, up to perhaps 70 or 75 percent for the highest."

That a family with an income of under \$6,000 ought not to be burdened with 40 percent of the cost of educating its children in college is obvious.

We do not burden such a family with that kind of cost when those children are in elementary and secondary school, and I see no reason why we should continue to do so at the postsecondary level.

But I fail to follow the chain of logic that leads from the proposition that the burden must be lifted from the very low-income consumers to the conclusion that it must then be added to the burden already borne by the consumer in the \$10-20 thousand dollar income range.

And to assert that doing so would lower the financial barriers between postsecondary education and the consumer is simple nonsense.

Let me tell you from the point of view of the Detroit area auto worker who is making over \$12,000 a year now and is working overtime to do it—from the point of view of the school teacher or the policeman or the accountant or the salesman who has to moonlight to make ends meet, it doesn't make sense blithely to suggest that he ought to be forced to pay more of the money he doesn't have to send his kids to college—in the name of removing financial barriers.

Dr. John Raines, assistant professor of religion at Temple University recently wrote, for *Christian Century*, an article called "Middle America: Up Against the Wall and Going Nowhere." I think some of Dr. Raines' observations make a great deal of sense here.

In 1949, he points out, one per cent of the American people owned 21 per cent of the total personal wealth in the nation. During the past twenty-five years while we have been comforting ourselves with the idea that more and more Americans are becoming affluent, that one per cent has raised its share of total personal wealth to 40% or more!

Says Dr. Raines, "There has been upward mobility in America—not at the middle but at the top, which in 20 years has doubled its distance from the rest of us."

He further cites income statistics—already six years old—so we can safely assume that inflation has made them substantially worse—which show that in 1967, 56% of the American families in the 7-10 thousand income bracket; 67% of those in the 10-12 thousand bracket; and 75% of those in the 12-15 thousand dollar bracket got there by having two or more wages in the family. In other words, according to Dr. Raines "Not massive middle-class affluence but massive middle-class moonlighting—that is what the figures show."

I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that middle-class Americans in families where both parents have to work—sometimes at more than one job—just to stay where they are—are not going to understand the reasoning that suggests they are among the wealthy and that they are not paying their fair share of the cost of postsecondary education.

Let's remember, while we are looking at this affluent auto worker whose wife has an office job, who probably has a small equity in a house, owns an automobile he helped build three or four years ago, and who owns a large bunch of bills he and his wife are barely able to pay at the end of each month—that he is probably also paying a higher effective rate of tax—state and federal on his income-based wealth than the higher income professional man, or businessman, whose true wealth may well rest more on property income than on wage income.

Let's look at those figures, too, if you think we are creating a straw man here.

In 1967, the same year as that from which John Raines drew the statistics quoted above, the percentage relationships between wages

and property as a source of income were as follows:

Income of \$5,000 to \$15,000—85% from wages, 12% from property.

Income of 15,000 to 25,000—78% from wages, 21% from property.

Income of 25,000 to 50,000—47% from wages, 51% from property.

Income of over 100,000—17% from wages, 82% from property.

Remember that the tax rate on property income averages 65% of the tax rate on wage income.

Remember, too, that enormous amounts of that property tax derives from tax-free municipal bonds, and other tax shelters—and try to understand that the man whose income derives mostly from his own one or two jobs, and his wife's job, is not going to be impressed when we tell him that he is being "subsidized" because he is not charged most of what it costs to educate his kids at a university his taxes paid for.

Let me stay with Dr. Raines' article briefly because he presents us with some very disquieting evidence about the lifestyle of these supposedly affluent, supposedly upwardly mobile middle Americans.

Let's look as he does, at the 1971 Bureau of Labor Statistics "Intermediate Level of Living" budget, and see how an urban family of four with an \$11,000 income really lives.

First—almost two thousand dollars of that income went to taxes.

\$50 dollars a week went to food. When these figures were compiled that meant meat three times a week—mostly hamburger. I suspect that is a dimly remembered dream for many of these families today.

\$219 a month went to housing expenses, including utilities, mortgage payments, furniture, repairs, etc.

\$612 a year went to medical costs.

Almost a thousand dollars a year went to transportation—which is mostly the cost of getting back and forth to work and the grocery store.

A little over a thousand dollars a year went to clothing for this family of four.

\$563 a year went to insurance, union dues, Christmas presents, and charitable contributions.

\$684 a year went to amusements, including the payment of the TV, to books and records and newspapers, a vacation, and school supplies and toys!

That is the lifestyle of an American family which, the academic economists tell me is "above the median." That is the lifestyle that some bankers, attorneys, and industrialists think can be made a little more austere so that these "upwardly mobile" Americans can avail themselves of the privilege of an education for their kids.

That is how the people live who are accused by the academic economy of not contributing enough toward their own kids' education—and the education of other people's kids, too.

Part, of course, of the rationale for seeking higher tuition payments is the acceptance, perhaps out of pure pessimism, of the idea, fervently preached by the present Administration, that we have reached the highest level we can hope to achieve in the public support of postsecondary education, and that the only alternative is the rearrangement of those resources in more beneficial ways.

I am not suggesting any bad faith or evil motives on the part of those who accept, as graven on stone, the view of public priorities which has the blessing of Richard Nixon, and Roy Ash.

But we do not have to assume that we have no more resources to put into education.

It is possible to lower financial barriers at the bottom of the scale, without raising them further up on that scale.

And there is untapped wealth at the untaxed top end of the income scale which can be used to help pay the costs of public education.

But, above all, I am suggesting that the economists' assumption that education only benefits the student is wholly unproven!

I admit the validity of the argument that a college education substantially increases a student's likely income.

The figure I have seen most emphatically offered is that a college degree holder will likely earn, over the course of his lifetime, something over \$400,000 more than the average high school graduate.

I am not sure that figure takes into account the effects of inflation either in terms of money or in terms of job credential requirements—nor am I sure to what degree that figure may be attributable to the personal drive and ambition that caused the degree holder to go to college in the first place.

But let's assume for the sake of argument that the degree itself produces that 400,000 dollars.

My answer is "so what?"

The highway and the subway are both financed, in large part, by non-users.

In 1971, the United States Government subsidized 13 regional airlines to the tune of 63 million dollars, and we are subsidizing shipbuilders, airports, and the sale of wheat to Russian consumers!

The tax system is filled with provisions which subsidize the home buyer, the borrower of money, the motorist, the user of installment credit, the contributor to churches and nonprofit organizations.

And not least among the beneficiaries of this latter kind of public subsidy is the benefactor of the private educational institution.

I am not singling out tax subsidies or cash subsidies for criticism or defense.

Whatever the merits of any one of them, we can all agree, at the very least, that the individuals who claim each of these tax or cash subsidies personally benefit from the activities subsidized.

And some of those who do not benefit directly and individually from such subsidies are among those whose tax payments are needed to fund the cash subsidies and replace the tax subsidies.

But a subsidy is justified—or not—in terms of the benefit to the public as a whole.

And until we are ready to abolish altogether any form of subsidy to any activity which benefits any individual personally, then I think we have a long way to go before we can begin to justify singling out the student and his family for this exercise in moral regeneration.

I submit that we do not spend money on education—we invest it, and I submit that we have done so since the origins of this Republic, and we have done so knowingly and wisely.

The Northwest Ordinance, the Morrill Act, the long list of Federal and State and local decisions to put public money to the most fundamental of public purposes—the education of children—all these bear witness to the validity of a concept that we are now being asked to discard, so that we can trim our educational aspirations to the Procrustean dimensions set by the Budget.

I think John Dale Russell made the point best in 1960, when he said:

The reason for the support of education out of the public treasury is that an important public benefit is produced . . . In these times there should be no question whatever that education beyond the high school for a great many young people is as essential to the public welfare and security as education of elementary or secondary school level. To impose barriers to continued

attendance in the form of tuition fees at the time of high school graduation, is as unsound as it would be to impose such barriers at the end of the elementary school or at the end of the fourth grade."

There, I suggest, you have the argument in a nutshell.

Either the education system benefits the society as a whole, and access should be truly universal—or it only benefits the student, and he should pay the entire shot.

If education only benefits the individual then we are begging ourselves as taxpayers to provide an expensive system of education, from the Kindergarten through the 16th year, or beyond, which ought to be made available only to those who want to, and can pay for it.

If that premise is correct, then there is, indeed, no justification for the public educational institution, and none whatever for the money-losing private educational institution.

If that premise is right, indeed, education should be wholly a profit-making enterprise, and Harvard and Macomb County Community Colleges should both start making money, or go into the drink.

But if that premise is incorrect—if as we have always believed, and as Whitehead so eloquently said, "The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed," then the society itself derives a benefit from its educational system far in excess of any investment that can be put into it in advance by its immediate clientele.

And if this is the case, I suggest that our job is not to try to accustom ourselves to today's small visions, but to raise our eyes to the goal of a truly universally available educational system without cost barriers.

I think we ought—indeed, I think we must try to create the opportunity for every American—whatever his background, whatever his economic class—whatever his age or the point he has reached in his career—to have access to a full range of postsecondary educational opportunities—to the full extent he can benefit from them.

The kid just coming out of high school; the mature person who wants to change a career, or who finds that his career has been threatened by technology; the person approaching retirement who wants to live a richer life—to each of these the doors of postsecondary education must be opened, and kept open.

And an indispensable element of this, an element without which we cannot remain where we are, must less move forward, is a well-financed, nation-wide system of low-tuition or no-tuition state universities, and colleges and community and junior colleges.

That element is no less valuable than the indispensable system of independent institutions which must be strengthened and preserved to provide a wide variety of choice for those seeking an education.

I accept the proposition that private education should not be priced out of the educational market place.

We need our entire educational system.

There is more need for education, for competent teaching, for research, for the sparking of intellectual curiosity, and for training in job and professional skills, than we can hope to provide with the educational system we now have.

The wide-spread acceptance of the idea that the demand—indeed, the need—for our educational system is shrinking is a counsel of despair on which we cannot build our educational policies.

The American people will support, as they are already supporting, a broadly based, open educational system.

And they will support it more readily if its costs are spread across the society it serves, and not concentrated wholly on those

who happen at the moment—as undergraduates or graduate students—to be "using" the system.

The American taxpayer has earned his reputation as one of the most patient and law-abiding people in the world.

He pays his taxes, even when he isn't altogether sure that he approves of what they are being used for.

He knows he is paying more taxes than his President, and suspects, rightly or wrongly, that he is paying more than his banker, his doctor, his lawyer and perhaps even more than the academic economist who is pontificating on how well subsidized that taxpayer is!

Tell that taxpayer that he has to help a little more to open up the doors to college for his own kids and everyone else's, and he will grumble, but he will help.

But you tell him that the sacrifices he is already making, and the new ones you want him to make are not to help his kids—that he and his children are too "affluent" to need help—and we may have a very vivid bicentennial observation of the Boston Tea Party!

But I think we can avoid that kind of confrontation between those who want to save the values of a mixed educational system, and those who will, in one form or another, have to continue to carry the load.

I think we can, without doing violence to our institutions, or stretching our legislative ingenuity out of shape, come up with educational finance systems which will enable us to reach the goal Thomas Wolfe painted for us:

"So then to every man his chance—to every man regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this, seeker, is the promise of America."

HUD LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would establish a HUD loan insurance program for loans to nursing homes and intermediate care facilities to enable them to install fire safety equipment. Under this proposal loans would be limited to the Secretary's estimate of the reasonable cost of the equipment fully installed, and the loans would contain other terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary.

A provision to provide the necessary loans to nursing homes had been included by the Housing Subcommittee in the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972, but as you know this bill never reached the House floor for a vote. As a result many nursing homes will begin to close their doors at the end of December because they have not been able to obtain loans to install the fire equipment stipulated in regulations prescribed in the 1967 Life Safety Code.

The Social Security Amendments of 1973 imposed the requirement that all nursing homes and intermediate care facilities meet the provisions of the Life Safety Code of the National Fire Protection Association in order for patients in such facilities to retain their eligibility

under the medicare and medicaid programs.

I am sure that we all recognize the beneficial effect of such a requirement in increasing the security of patients against fire. However, without the loans proposed in this bill many nursing homes and intermediate care facilities—a rough estimate is 1,500 to 2,500 facilities—will have to close their doors because they cannot obtain the financing for the purchase and installation of the required safety equipment. Patients from these nursing homes will have to be absorbed by the State hospitals, and we all know that a majority of the State hospitals are terribly overcrowded without these additional patients.

I believe that you will recognize the importance of this legislation, and I sincerely hope that you will support my efforts when this bill reaches the floor for consideration.

IS THERE A POPULATION EXPLOSION?

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary justifications for destroying unborn children by abortion is the so-called population explosion, despite the fact that the United States is experiencing the lowest birth rate in the history of our Nation. Even if there were a population explosion, no one could justify denying the natural God-given right to life of a single person any more than one could justify throwing persons overboard in an overcrowded ship. If we accept the idea that some human lives are expendable, why start with the youngest? Why not those over 60? Why not eliminate the cripples and the lame? As horrible as these thoughts are they are logical extensions of our current antilife attitude.

We do, in fact, have a population problem—the problem being the continued decline in the number of young persons. Each year the number of students in our schools is rapidly declining. Thousands of teachers have lost their jobs because of a lack of children. The number of children in America under 5 years of age has declined by a whopping 15.5 percent from 1960 to 1970. In other words, there are 15.5 percent fewer children under 5 years of age in the United States in 1970 than there were in 1960. This dramatic decline occurred prior to the general spread of abortion. The outlook for our country is grim indeed with the impact of abortion coupled with the already plummeting birth rate.

The following is a segment of the chapter, "Is There a Population Explosion?" and examines population growth as an excuse for scraping live babies out of their mothers' wombs:

IS THERE A POPULATION EXPLOSION?

Although it is impossible to do justice here to what is called the population explosion, we must nevertheless consider several sa-

lient points about it. "Overpopulation" is increasingly cited as one of the principal reasons why unrestricted abortion has now become "necessary." We may note in passing that the same alleged need for Lebensraum, or living space, was brought forward to justify the extermination programs of the Nazis in Germany. Just as many people acquiesced in the programs of the Nazis because of the supposed overriding needs of the German Fatherland, so today many people, frightened by the horror stories told by the population Cassandra in our midst, seem to have been persuaded that abortion is necessary as a population control measure. . . . Japan, for example, has dramatically reduced its population growth rate by allowing abortions virtually on demand.

It is quite true that killing does reduce the population, if that is indeed the only consideration. In point of fact, however, we do not have to take at face value all the hysteria about the so-called population explosion.

(1) The catastrophic predictions of many scientists and demographers are based on a number of "if's" which are far from inevitable.

The first of these "if's" concerns the actual present population of the world. We are told that it is around 3.5 billion, having increased by 2.5 billion in a little more than a century; it is calculated that it will double in about 35 years. But—one of the experts candidly admits—"the statistics are not exact, of course. There is no way of registering the daily births and deaths for much of Asia, Africa, and South America. But the experts are in close agreement about the figures." This must inevitably remind us of the "one million illegal abortions per year in the United States," for which, however, there are no reliable statistics. . . .

Whatever the accuracy of the figures, it is perfectly true and demonstrable that world population has grown phenomenally. We do have the figures for North America, Europe, and some other parts of the world, and we know that population growth in the past century has been unprecedented. If—and this is the second big "if"—departing from our present large population base, we project indefinitely the same rate of growth we have witnessed in the past hundred years, we will be able to calculate a given date when the sheer weight of human bodies will equal the weight of the earth itself; or a date when there will be more than one person for every square foot of the earth's surface. In fact, such projections are regularly being made by some of the more frantic scientists. (One of the interesting things about the population alarmists is that the most extreme among them almost invariably turn out to be biologists; real demographers tend to be a good deal more cautious in their projections.)

These apocalyptic projections, however, are the purest science fiction. They depend on an indefinite or a very long-term extension of the present growth and doubling rates of the world's admittedly large present population. But the present growth and doubling rates of the population cannot continue indefinitely, and not merely because we will all die of starvation or disease or nuclear war long before the earth's available living space is all used up. The current growth and doubling rates cannot continue for quite another reason; the rapid rise in population growth we have seen in modern times is due, as one economist puts it, "not to rising birth rates, but to a recession of the death rate. . . . And every sensible person should realize that death rates cannot go on receding indefinitely."

Since, eventually, everybody is going to die, death rates simply cannot keep going down indefinitely; they have to come into equilibrium with birth rates, as they were

before modern medicine brought about dramatically increased life expectancies the world over, thereby triggering the modern "population explosion." Not only must the recession of the death rate eventually cease, there are indications that it has ceased. In October, 1970, the World Health Organization announced that the steady decline in death rates observed over the past 150 years (coinciding precisely with the "population explosion") appears now to be coming to a halt; mortality rates are fast approaching, or have reached, an irreducible minimum.

"The findings have important implications for the problem of the population explosion," a news story disclosing WHO's conclusions stated. "One of the causes of net population increase . . . has been medical advances reducing infant mortality and combating once-fatal diseases in later life. If those advances have about reached their limit—and if sooner or later the same phenomenon will be duplicated in presently underdeveloped countries whose standards are rising—then at least one of the factors in the population increase will become stabilized."

As for continuing high birth rates, the economist we have just quoted above makes a further point: "All demographers know that birth rates, even in the overpopulated countries, are not up. They have been stabilized for years, and in the prosperous countries are actually down in some cases sharply. *The United States at present has the lowest birth rate in its history.*" (Italics added) The U.S. birth rate, in fact, has declined every year from a high of 25.3 per 1000 in 1957 to a low of 17.4 in 1971; a report by the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies indicates that there were 15.5 per cent fewer children under 5 years of age in 1970 than in 1960—this decrease of children coincides with the greatest increase in the number of people of child-bearing age. This decrease of births has been accelerating over an entire decade; it would seem that the increased availability of abortions occurred too late in the decade to have substantially affected the figures.

As if to underline the hazards of trying to predict merely by projecting existing trends, the U.S. Census Bureau announced, in August, 1970, "a major downward revision in population projections for the next 30 years. . . . It is possible, the Bureau said, that there will be nearly 100 million fewer Americans in the year 2000 than had been forecast in one maximum projection made just three years ago."

Subsequent studies have continued to confirm this new trend. In its issue of November 5, 1971, for example, the *New York Times* reported on three different new studies—the 1970 National Fertility Study, a survey by the U.S. Census Bureau, and a compilation by the National Center for Health Statistics. All of these studies not only confirmed marked reductions in actual births; they confirmed a sharp and rapid drop in the number of children women intended to have. Birth expectations are generally regarded as highly accurate overall indicators of future births, and these three reports all confirmed a "half-a-child" drop in such expectations. Informed demographers are now talking about a "birth dearth" or "baby bust" more than they are talking about a "population explosion."

Of course, the new forecasts may be just as faulty as the old. Nevertheless, an "expert" population projection which is three years later found to be off by 100 million, for example, can hardly be considered exact science. We may be pardoned for demurring when, to counter an alleged overpopulation which cannot be demonstrated, we are asked to accept policies such as abortion-on-demand which overturn the most basic legal and moral principles by which American society has al-

ways governed itself. The evidence for this future overpopulation clearly remains of the most speculative sort.

The other big "if" of the prophets of population disaster concerns the capacity of the world to feed itself—not only its present large population, but the much larger population it will certainly have when birth and death rates reach a new equilibrium. "This problem has been dealt with most capably by British economist Colin Clark who enjoys international reputation as an expert in the area of economic development and demography," Professor Rupert Ederer writes. "Using accepted statistical techniques and reliable data on world land resources, Clark has calculated that presently available land on this earth suitable for agriculture . . . could feed—using the best agriculture techniques presently available—47 billion people at maximum, i.e., at American standards of diet. Accepting that Americans eat more than they need to, Clark further estimates that for people living at Japanese standards of food consumption and timber requirements, the world's potential agricultural and forest land could supply the needs of 157 billion people."

Dr. Jean Mayer, Professor of Nutrition at Harvard and another renowned authority on the subject, has reached conclusions similar to Colin Clark's. "Considering the world as a whole," he writes, "there is no evidence that the food situation is worsening and there is at least a likelihood that food may at some time (20 or 30 years from now) be removed altogether as a limiting factor to population." Noting that since 1850 the increase in food production has been still more rapid than the phenomenal increase in population, and that since the early 1950's especially, the average rate of increase for world food production has been 3 per cent per year while the population has increased on the average only 1.7 per cent, Professor Mayer underlines the further spectacular increases in food production which can result from the application of what is already known about scientific agriculture, especially from the economical harnessing of photosynthesis in plants, and adds, "all this is no longer science fiction. It is as much a reality as the Federal Income Tax."

Nor does all this represent an argument, unresolvable by laymen, among experts—some experts holding that the world can support any foreseeable population, while other experts cry "overpopulation" as the contemporary version of the "yellow peril." We can attest that, whatever our future perils may be, food and other basic resources seem reasonably in balance both now and for the future.

(2) The problems of pollution, congestion and undernourishment in the world today are not necessarily, or even principally, the result of overpopulation.

By the standards of its available technology, a sparse band of Indians in a South American rain forest is surely suffering from the effects of "overpopulation." "Before the invention of agriculture," Lester R. Brown has noted, "the plants and animals supported by photosynthesis on the total land area [of the earth] could support a human population of only about 10 million." The reason for this was that the resources of the earth had not been organized for the production of food. With every development of agricultural technology, however, the number of people who can be supported increases phenomenally. Today, the most densely populated country in the world, the Netherlands, with 375 persons per square kilometer, given today's available agricultural technology, is one of the most prosperous countries in the world.

"The Dutch [agricultural] productivity figures are the most remarkable in the world," Colin Clark writes. "Only about 70% of the country is farmed. The rest consists of urban and industrial sites, or of dunes

and heaths which could only be fertilized at great expense, and which are preserved for forestry and recreation. Dutch agriculture produced 1,070 tons of grain equivalent per square kilometer of farm land . . . the requirements (at Dutch standards of consumption) for 365 persons." In other words, although it is the most densely populated country in the world, the Netherlands can produce on its own land adequate food to feed its own population at a high standard of living.

Scientists Paul Ehrlich and John P. Holdren have disputed the relevance of population density figures in general and the Dutch example in particular to the determination of what constitutes overpopulation. They speak of a "Netherlands fallacy," and point out that "the Netherlands actually requires large chunks of the earth's resources and vast areas of land not within its borders to maintain itself. For example, it is the second largest per capita importer of protein in the world . . ." What the argument fails to take into account, of course, is what the Netherlands exports, and from which other countries trading with the Netherlands benefit.

Both prosperity and the high Dutch rate of production result not from a small population but from its possession of advanced technology. The same applies to other countries. Hong Kong, for example, which houses 3.1 million people on 398 square miles (12,700 per square mile) has been able to double its output of goods and services in ten years.

FEDERAL BUDGET

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week, it is expected that the Rules Committee will submit a legislative package to the Members on the subject of the Congress budget proceedings.

Appropriately, station WMAQ-TV—NBC, Chicago—broadcast an editorial on November 3, on this subject. While the editorial also is directed to the local budgetary problems, it very properly discusses appropriations to be considered by Members of Congress. The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL BY STATION WMAQ-TV

The federal budget—charts, graphs and almost incomprehensible statistics—is a little less exciting to read than the telephone book. Maybe that's why Congress allows the Executive Branch to make up the budget.

It might be dull, but the federal budget essentially determines how our government is going to spend \$270 billion of our money. But we cannot expect the average American citizen to analyze the budget and send along appropriate suggestions to Washington. Theoretically at least, that should be a job for the 535 people we elect to represent us in Congress.

But Congress allows the budget to be the private property of the President and the non-elected people he picks to run the Office of Management and Budget. So the Office of Management and Budget operates as sort of an "invisible government" making the crucial decisions about national priorities.

Congressmen can complain that we're spending too much for this and not enough for that. But Congress has no alternative budget of its own. It has no office to pro-

vide in-depth analysis of the President's budget. So when Congress votes to spend more for a program than the President wants, the President vetoes the appropriation and criticizes Congress for overspending.

That makes Congress a less-than-equal branch of government. And it won't be equal until it establishes its own budgetary office so members of Congress can have enough information of their own to enable them to play a role in setting spending priorities.

This inequality also exists at the local level. In Chicago, Mayor Daley makes up the budget every year, not the 50 aldermen. The mayor gives each of them one copy of his budget book and then, just three weeks later, they have to vote whether to adopt it or not. At least Congress has time to evaluate appropriations requests over a period of months instead of Chicago's quick take-it-or-leave-it way of adopting a budget.

We're not criticizing President Nixon or Mayor Daley. By law, they have the duty to present their budgets. The problem is that Congress and the City Council have failed to assert themselves in this process. Unless the people we elect as legislators grab a share of their authority to set priorities at the beginning of the year, they're not in a very good position to complain the rest of the year about how the money is being spent.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS REVIEW ORGANIZATIONS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to repeal title XI of the Social Security Act; this title is better known as the professional standards review organizations provision. I believe that it is essential that we maintain in this country a system of personalized, efficient, progressive health care.

Last year the Congress, in its desire to approve the social security amendments presented to it, enacted as a part of those amendments a little-noticed section which will, if permitted to stand, greatly jeopardize the quality of health care received by those many medicare and medicaid patients who have been led to believe they would receive, through those programs, the highest quality of care the medical profession has to offer.

Unfortunately, while the purpose of the PSRO seems innocent enough in concept, the specific provisions of the law, when applied to the medical profession's activities, will impose on the professional and its patients a system of care standardized at the level of the lowest common denominator. The law will, in addition, practically remove those guarantees of privacy which have been so important a part of the close relationship which enables doctors to provide their patients with highly personal and highly efficient care.

These are only a few of the provisions of the PSRO legislation which impose on us a necessity to reconsider our action of last year and repeal PSRO's altogether.

DEATH PENALTY SUPPORTED IN
PUBLIC SURVEY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether capital punishment actually acts as a deterrent to murder and other major crimes is one of the most perplexing ones facing our Nation today.

There are strong arguments on both sides and the debate flares anew each time the media reports a killing so violent it shocks the entire Nation. The decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Furman* against Georgia which cast a cloud on the constitutionality of all Federal and State laws imposing the death penalty and served to further confuse the issue.

I realize there is no easy answer to this highly emotional question of whether to impose or dispose of the death penalty. In an effort to learn how the residents of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania felt about the question, I sent a questionnaire throughout the District, asking the people if they felt:

(1) The death penalty is justifiable in cases of first degree murder and other major crimes; (2) the death penalty should be imposed on second-time murderers; (3) the death penalty should be abolished in favor of life imprisonment; and (4) any other opinion the people cared to express.

The response was impressive. I received nearly 26,000 replies, many of them accompanied by letters further explaining the writer's opinion on capital punishment.

The results of the survey showed 94 percent of the people responding favored the death penalty. Of that total, 72 percent advocated it for first degree murder or other major crimes.

Similarly, of the 22 percent favoring the death penalty for "second-time" murderers many indicated this should be the last resort, imposed only after all attempts at rehabilitation had failed.

Six percent of the responses felt capital punishment should be completely abolished. However, here too, there were differences of opinion. Some felt life imprisonment was punishment enough for any crime, providing the convicted party served the full sentence. That is life, no parole, ever. Others felt our entire penal system drastically needs revision with greater emphasis on education and rehabilitation. If this is accomplished, they were willing to parole the "rehabilitated" party.

I would like to include in my remarks some excerpts taken from responses to the questionnaire. They illustrate the wide range of feeling on this issue:

An eye for an eye, etc. . . . Only first degree murder should be punishable by death but not ALL cases of first degree murder. . . . The death penalty should be used only with great discretion and in extraordinary cases.

Death is justified on repeat or multiple first degree murder convictions; life imprisonment on first time conviction with minimum of 10 years and parole; life imprisonment with NO parole for repeat convictions.

Why should there be second-time murderers? Keep the death penalty. . . . Abolish the death penalty for life imprisonment with no possible parole. . . . Death versus death is a meaningless question as long as prisons are in such need of change. Prison reform first!

The death penalty has its merits but I could never vote to impose it. . . . Put the question to a vote in the next national election.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps this last example best sums up the dilemma in seeking an answer to the death penalty question: "Pray for the wisdom of Solomon . . ."

CRIME CONTROL NO. 14

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, on November 26 the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, placed in the RECORD the full report of four community health officials from Cuyahoga County, Ohio. I must say that I have not yet had the opportunity to examine this report in detail, but I have made a cursory examination and wish to point out several things about the report which the distinguished Senator did not emphasize.

First, accidental deaths cannot be used as an argument against private gun ownership unless those who so argue wish to ban private ownership of all things that cause accidental deaths. Might I suggest that in the interest of consistency the gun control lobbyists urge confiscation of private motor vehicles and private homes before confiscation of private guns. If they are genuinely concerned about accidental deaths, they must advocate abolition of private homes and vehicles because these two items cause far more deaths than firearms.

The report itself points out that vehicular deaths per 100,000 people were 10.3 during the period 1958-62, 12.3 in 1963-67, and 15.7 in 1968-72. During the same three periods accidental deaths attributable to all firearms were 0.3, 0.3, and 0.9. This means that the number of vehicular deaths was as much as 41 times as great as the number of firearm deaths. It is also significant that while firearm deaths per 100,000 people amounted to only 0.3 in the 10 years preceding enactment of the 1968 gun control law, firearm deaths have tripled in the 5 years since that landmark legislation was passed.

However, vehicular deaths, even though at one point—1963-67—41 times as frequent as accidental firearm fatalities, are surpassed in number by fatal domestic accidents, which during the same period were 54 times as frequent as firearm deaths. Deaths attributed by the report to "other" causes are also many times greater than accidental deaths attributable to firearms.

In the latest period available—1968-72—the report itself points out that deaths due to vehicular accidents were

17 times as frequent as deaths due to firearms; deaths due to home accidents are 21 times as frequent; deaths due to "other" causes are 15 times as frequent; and industrial deaths were twice as frequent. I can only conclude that the furor about the number of accidental firearm deaths is a grasping at straws by those who have exhausted their meager stock of arguments favoring a Government monopoly on guns.

Second, the report purports to provide evidence for the hypothesis of its authors that "the number of firearm incidents—nonfatal as well as fatal—is a function of the number of guns in civilian hands." Unfortunately I cannot discover within the report any data at all on the number of guns privately owned by the citizens of Cuyahoga County, and must assume that the hypothesis remains unproved since the evidence for it is not presented.

I should, however, point out that could the hypothesis be "proved," it would entail nothing about privately owned guns and crime, for "function" is a mathematical concept, and, as every good statistician knows, does not mean "cause." The two concepts are not only logically distinct, but they have absolutely nothing to do with each other.

As I pointed out some time ago, one may establish a very high correlation between any two phenomena and still not make any statement about causality. I have heard that attendance at theaters has a very high correlation with the phases of the Moon—are we therefore to conclude that moviegoers "cause" the phases of the Moon or that the phases of the Moon "cause" persons to go to movies?

Third, I would like to provide two quotations from the report itself. First:

The city rate [of accidental firearm deaths] in the last five year interval [1968-1972] is four times greater than it was in the period 1958-1962.

Second:

The annual number of accidental firearm deaths in Cuyahoga County tripled in 1968 as compared with the average for the previous ten years, and the increased level was sustained for four consecutive years.

In point of fact, since 1968, the year in which the landmark legislation controlling guns was enacted and went into effect, the number of accidental firearm deaths in Cuyahoga County has reached 77, while the total for the 10 years preceding enactment of the 1968 gun control law was 51. While the number of accidental deaths cannot be used as an argument against private ownership of guns, it can be used as an argument against gun control laws whose express purpose is to decrease the number of firearm deaths. Anyone who doubts the difference in the number of deaths between the years preceding 1968 and the years following 1968 may simply glance at the report on S21038.

Undoubtedly we will now be told that the 1968 law has failed because it was not tough enough. Undoubtedly we will be told this by those who urged Congress to pass the 1968 law in the first place. But why should we believe the gun control

lobbyists now? Their predictions for the 1968 bill have not come true. And if they should reply that the report from Cuyahoga County is atypical and that the 1968 law has actually worked to some extent, then why has the Cuyahoga County report been inserted in the RECORD? The gun control lobbyists contradict themselves no matter which way they turn.

THE NEED FOR LEADERSHIP

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Henry Steele Commager, the eminent historian, wrote "America's No. 1 Shortage: Leadership," which appeared in the November 11 Boston Globe. His profound comments on the present situation deserve the attention of every Member of Congress. We have been elected to provide leadership for a troubled Nation, but as a body are failing in that responsibility. We might all profit by a better understanding of Mr. Commager's analysis.

The text of Mr. Commager's article follows:

AMERICA'S NO. 1 SHORTAGE: LEADERSHIP

(By Henry Steele Commager)

Two centuries ago when the emerging United States had a population smaller than that of metropolitan Detroit today, the political landscape was thronged with the most distinguished group of statesmen any modern nation has ever produced in one generation.

Today, with a population of more than 200 million, the most conspicuous feature on the political landscape is its desolation.

A meager people, scattered over a vast area, without great cities, without a capitol, without familiar institutions of church and state and university and the learned professions, in one long generation produced Benjamin Franklin and George Washington, John Adams and Samuel Adams, Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and James Wilson, John Marshall and Thomas Paine, and a score of others scarcely less eminent.

Today, with every advantage of wealth and power, of science and learning, we have Mr. Nixon in the White House and Mr. Agnew in disgrace, the government in disorder, the opposition in disarray, the Congress in confusion and the courts in retreat, and not a statesman in sight who can be compared with the founding fathers without embarrassment.

PRINCIPLES—AND LIMITS

Nor is this contrast between the 18th and the 20th centuries merely a matter of individuals or personalities. If we look away from the great figures who dominate the vaunted stage of history to the principles they formulated and the institutions they established, the contrast between the revolutionary generation and our own is even more sobering.

The generation of the founding fathers created a nation (they were the first to do so) and invented the constitutional convention, which is the way in which democracy works. They also imposed limits on government—limits that were really effective, such as a written constitution, bills of rights, separation of powers, judicial review and a federal

system—substituted the equality of territories and states for the old world-type of colonialism, and built the political party.

What has our own generation—or the past three or four generations—contributed in the realm of political institutions, or even of political practices? Secrecy, perhaps?

How do we explain this precipitous decline in statesmanship and in political resourcefulness? Why is it that a nation statistically the best-educated in the modern world and certainly the best-experienced in self-government, fertile and talented in so many fields—science, technology, medicine, literature and the arts—is unproductive in the quintessential realm of politics?

The first explanation is a practical one. Eighteenth Century America was a simple agrarian society which provided few opportunities for the cultivation of talent and few openings for such talent as appeared.

What Henry James wrote about the America of Nathaniel Hawthorne's day was even more valid for the America of Washington's: "No state, in the European sense of the word, and indeed scarcely a national name. No sovereign, no court, no personal loyalty, no aristocracy, no church, no clergy, no army, no diplomatic service, no country houses, nor parsonages, nor thatched cottages, no great universities nor public schools . . . no literature, no novels, no museums, no pictures, no political society, no sporting class."

A LIFE OF SERVICE

Certainly the spectacle that greeted a Franklin, a Jefferson or an Adams was even more negative than that which greeted Hawthorne when he turned to the profession of literature. Added to James's list could have been no cities, no manufacturers, no newspapers or journals of importance, no libraries, no professions except those of the law and the church, no music, no opera.

In the old world, a young man of talent had a wide choice of careers open to him; he might be a bishop or an admiral, a scientist or an artist, a man of letters, an academician, a soldier of fortune, an adventurer, a social hanger-on, a great lover. In America, he was pretty much limited to farming or fishing, land speculation, the church, the law, and politics.

Nor—except in land speculation—was there any quick road to wealth to distract ambitious young men from public service. Nothing was more revealing than the simplicity of life of even the famous and the powerful; Washington borrowing \$500 to go to his inauguration, Hamilton casting about for \$20 to tide him over some crisis or other, John Adams pitching hay on his Braintree farm, Thomas Jefferson walking from his inaugural to his boarding house and waiting his turn at the dinner table, Tom Paine living in poverty in his little cottage on the outskirts of New York and buried in a pauper's grave.

Such talent as there was had no effective outlet except in public service of one kind or another and, what is more, that area of service was not only inviting, but compelling.

What a challenge confronted the handful of leaders of that nation-making year, and what prodigies they performed. They had to win independence, create a nation, set up state governments and then a national government, write constitutions and laws, win the west and provide it with government, develop a network of commercial relations and negotiate treaties with nations of the old world, protect far-flung frontiers against the Indian and against the aggressions of foreign nations, lay the foundations for a national culture—we could go on and on.

CONCERN FOR POSTERITY

Wherever we look, we are forced to the conclusion that there is nothing like war for bringing out fortitude, nothing like emergency for bringing out ingenuity, nothing like challenge for bringing out character.

That is just what Washington meant when he wrote, in the moving circular to the states of June, 1783:

"This is the time of their political probation, this is the moment when the eyes of the world are turned upon them, this is the moment to establish or ruin their national character forever . . . for according to the system of policy which the states shall adopt at this moment, they will stand or fall, and by their confirmation or lapse, it is yet to be decided whether the Revolution must ultimately be considered as a blessing or a curse; a blessing or a curse not to the present age alone, for with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be involved."

The founding fathers knew, with Milton, that "fame is the spur"; they were animated, most of them, by a passion for fame and, all of them, by a sense of obligation to posterity. Nowhere is the changing sense of values more ostentatious than in the attitudes toward posterity of the revolutionary generation, and our own; nowhere is it more dramatic than in the decline of the fiduciary sense which animated that earlier generation but, in Jefferson's wonderful phrase, for "our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation."

How this attitude shines forth, over and over, in a Washington, a Jefferson, an Adams, even a Tom Paine who had no posterity and barely even a country of his own. Remember his plea for independence—"tis not the concern of a day, a year or an age. Posterity is involved in the contest and will be affected to the end of time."

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

For a century and a half we were a posterity-minded people, but now who thinks or speaks of posterity? We no longer seem conscious of our fiduciary obligation to later generations. We waste the soil through strip mining, we pollute the lakes and streams until all life in them is dead and some of our rivers actually catch fire, we poison the air with our noxious gases, we kill off birds and animals with our pesticides, we have destroyed more of the land and the waters, of flora and fauna, than has Europe in a thousand years.

In almost everything we seem ready to place the interests of the present above the interests of the future, and there are, alas, no national leaders to call a halt to what is systematic betrayal of the most sacred of fiduciary obligations.

What the American people admire and what the young are expected to emulate are the achievements of private enterprise. Corporation executives, not educators, sit on the boards of colleges and universities; businessmen, not artists and musicians, run museums and orchestras; captains of industry and finance dominate the hospitals, not doctors or scientists.

It is the entrepreneurs, too, who win public recognition and reap public rewards. Occasionally a Kennedy will honor a Robert Frost or a Pablo Casals, or will invite to the White House a bevy of Nobel prize winners. But these are gestures that few take seriously.

What can be done to revive the passion for public service and public enterprise that animated the generation of the founding fathers? Nothing perhaps but changes in the general climate of opinion in the country. Some changes are already under way. The misconduct of the Nixon-Agnew Administration—a misconduct grosser and more dangerous than anything in our history—has shocked the country into a realization of the truth of John Stuart Mill's aphorism that "With small men no great thing can ever be accomplished."

WHAT CAN BE DONE

There are already signs not only of an awakened conscience but of an awakened

realization that conscience is not enough. We can see for ourselves that Gresham's Law, long familiar in the old world, operates in politics as well as in the economy: Base men will drive out honorable men, decency is at a disadvantage when confronted with squalor, it is easy for self-service to usurp the place of service to the commonwealth.

One method of encouraging public rather than private careers is to move resolutely towards equalizing the rewards, even the material rewards, of the two careers. This cannot be done by paying public servants the kind of salaries and endowing them with the prerequisites which businessmen now enjoy (imagine giving a senator, a doctor or a teacher a bonus twice the size of his salary for doing his job well!).

It can be done by providing for higher taxes on high incomes and by closing those loopholes which make our tax laws look like nothing so much as Swiss cheese. A brief consideration of the flourishing state of private enterprise in Sweden, Holland, West Germany, where taxes on high incomes are almost confiscatory, should dissipate the notion that our economy would be injured somehow by a reformation in our tax laws designed to achieve a more equitable system of rewards to the private and the public sector.

A second practical measure to revive interest in public enterprise is equally obvious: To take private money out of politics, to make it impossible for a candidate for any office, from that of mayor to that of President, to buy his election.

This could be achieved by the simple device of prohibiting any private or corporate contributions to elections and placing responsibility for the modest financing of elections on the government itself. That would not be a sure guarantee that all candidates would hereafter be elected on their merits, but it would at least give merit a better chance.

As for changing the climate of opinion, that is, needless to say, more difficult. It could at least be encouraged by a return to the teaching of those great wellsprings of literature—many of them in the Aegean and the Mediterranean Seas—which nourished the minds and spirits of the generation of the founding fathers.

But that, perhaps is too much to hope for.

NEED FOR COPYRIGHT REVISION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried an article which described the recent U.S. Court of Claims' ruling concerning copyrighted materials. Briefly stated, the court ruled photocopying magazines and books by libraries and scientists does not violate the copyright laws.

The fact that the court was split on this matter and that this ruling will undoubtedly be appealed, I think points out that we need better definitions of exactly what constitutes "fair use" of an author's work.

Fortunately, revision of the 1967 copyright law is now under consideration in the Congress at the present time, and I am hopeful that we can move as expeditiously as possible on this important issue.

CONTINUED REPRESSION OF SOVIET JEWS WHO SEEK TO EMIGRATE TO ISRAEL

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring attention today to the ongoing and escalating repression of Soviet Jews who seek to emigrate to Israel.

As an illustration I would use the case of Mr. Leonid Yakovlevich Zabilzhensky, a distinguished engineer and former teacher who is scheduled to go on trial in Sverdlovsk in the near future for the alleged crime of "parasitism." In fact, it is clear that Mr. Zabilzhensky's only offense has been his stated desire to live in Israel.

In November of 1971, Mr. Zabilzhensky was a member of the faculty of the Eural Polytechnical Institute, and had been recently commended by his superiors as a "hard working and creative" teacher.

But, his filing of an application to emigrate to Israel on November 11, 1972, has brought upon Mr. Zabilzhensky and his family a 2-year period of harassment which has denied him the right to work and support his family, and has now culminated with his jailing in the Central Prison in Sverdlovsk on trumped-up charges.

After filing his emigration application, Mr. Zabilzhensky was quickly fired from his job on November 25, 1971, on the grounds of being "unsuitable for the position of an educator of students"—in direct contradiction to his earlier commendations.

Since that time he worked as a loader in a store, a milkman, and a porter, all the while being denied re-entry into his profession. Meanwhile, his reapplications at 6-month intervals for emigration have continued to be turned down without comment.

Finally, in May of this year, Mr. Zabilzhensky was fired from a factory job under false pretenses, and was charged with "parasitism" because he had violated Soviet law which requires its citizens to hold employment. In American parlance, this is obviously a "Catch-22" situation, because Soviet authorities have denied him the opportunity to work.

In short, Mr. Zabilzhensky now faces a number of years at hard labor for nothing more than wanting to live in Israel. By itself, the case cries out for justice. But what is equally disturbing is the fact that this case is but part of an emerging and concerted effort by the Soviet Union to repress emigration to Israel by jailing, on false charges, prominent and activist Soviet Jews who seek to emigrate.

For example, last Friday in Kiev in a secret trial in a factory, Alexander Feldman was given 3½ years at hard labor—his real crime was seeking to join his wife and six children in Israel. Two weeks ago in Derbent, Pitya Pinkhasov was sentenced to 5 years at hard labor on

similar trumped-up charges; and in Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia, Isai and Gregory Goldstein are rumored headed for trial. Again, these individuals have done nothing except seek to emigrate to Israel.

It is all too apparent, then, Mr. Speaker, of what is exactly going on today in the Soviet Union, and it is something that the Congress cannot ignore. We must do whatever we can to stop this wave of political repression and the wave of emerging political trials.

I have, therefore, today, Mr. Speaker, sent the following telegram of protest to Anatoly F. Dobrynin, the Soviet Ambassador to the United States. I would also urge my colleagues to take action on this most important matter.

The text of the telegram follows:

ANATOLY F. DOBRYNIN,
Ambassador, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,
Office of the Embassy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: It has come to my attention that Mr. Leonid Yakovlevich Zabilzhensky is about to go on trial in Sverdlovsk for the alleged crime of "parasitism." In fact, investigation into this case has led me to the irrevocable conclusion that he is on trial for the sole reason that he is a prominent Soviet Jew who wishes to emigrate to Israel, and the Soviet Government is attempting to hold him up as an example. Indeed, Mr. Zabilzhensky's case is but one of many in recent weeks which indicate a concerted effort by your Government to use political trials as a means of repressing the right of emigration of Soviet citizens. In the interest of better relations between our two countries, I strongly urge that your Government drop charges against Mr. Zabilzhensky and allow him to emigrate to Israel.

JEROME R. WALDIE,
U.S. Congressman.

FUEL CONSERVATION: THE ELECTRIC CAR

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received some information very applicable to our present energy crisis from one of my constituents.

Bill Jacob, of Orinda, Calif., has constructed an electrically powered car which he uses daily to commute in the Berkeley-Oakland metropolitan area. The car is powered by batteries, thereby eliminating the need for gasoline, and emits virtually no pollutants into the atmosphere.

This type of vehicle appears ideal as a possible solution to our energy and pollution problems. It would be necessary for the car to be small, for a larger vehicle would require more batteries. The use of the car would have to be restricted to metropolitan use because its top speed is 40 mph. But a small nonpollutant vehicle would be ideal in our now congested and polluted urban areas. Along with its practicality, the electric car is rather inexpensive to operate. Mr. Jacob

reports that his car costs him approximately three-fourths of a cent a mile and that the total construction of the car cost only \$1,000.

In the past I have introduced legislation that would authorize a program of research and development for nonpolluting motor vehicles. The electric car appears to be nonpolluting as well as a means to conserve our dwindling oil supplies. I urge Congress to consider authorization of a program to study nonpolluting, energy saving vehicles such as the electric car.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PROMOTES UNFAIR JOB DISCRIMINATION

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret the necessity of reporting to the House the inescapable fact that the Defense Department is encouraging private employers to practice massive employment discrimination against veterans with other-than-honorable discharges. This conclusion is based on responses to a questionnaire I sent to the Nation's 100 largest corporations.

Of the 74 corporations responding, over 40 percent admitted discriminating against veterans with general discharges—a type the Pentagon considers to be "under honorable conditions."

Veterans with less favorable discharges face even more job discrimination. This investigation proves the utter falsity of the Pentagon's characterization of general and undesirable discharges as nonpunitive.

The problem is far more serious than has previously been suspected. The military discharge classification system invites society to punish hundreds of thousands of former servicemen who have not been convicted or even charged with any crime and even though the armed services have not seen fit to punish them.

It is particularly unfair to base a person's fitness for civilian employment on his military record. Most of these men and women with unfavorable discharges have committed no offense by civilian standards. Every Member of Congress who has served in the Armed Forces knows that military service is very different from civilian life. Yet veterans with unfavorable types of discharges are often, for no other reason, considered unfit for civilian employment.

DISCRIMINATION BY EMPLOYERS

The specific quantifiable results of this investigation are that among the responding corporations—

Forty-one percent conceded discrimination against veterans with general discharges;

Sixty-one percent admitted discrimination against veterans with undesirable discharges;

Sixty-two percent admitted discrim-

ination against veterans with bad conduct discharges; and

Seventy-three percent conceded discrimination against veterans with dishonorable discharges.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that these figures represent the lowest possible percentages of the large corporations which discriminate. Some 27 percent of the corporations responding to the questionnaire indicated that they had no policy regarding hiring veterans with unfavorable discharges or that they had a decentralized hiring practice which made them unaware of any such policy. Therefore, the figures I cite represent only the admitted discrimination. The percentage of corporations which actually discriminate may be substantially higher.

At the same time, I want to emphasize that not all the corporations admitting this employment discrimination totally prohibit hiring veterans with unfavorable discharges. It is inescapable, however, that the standards for hiring veterans with unfavorable discharges are different than those for hiring other job applicants. One may safely conclude that the veteran with a less-than-honorable discharge probably will not be hired unless he has qualifications going beyond those normally expected from applicants for jobs.

UNFAVORABLE DISCHARGE PERCENTAGE HIGHEST EVER

For those who may think the problem is minor or inconsequential, consider the following fact: According to Pentagon figures, in the past 4 years there have been 286,000 less-than-honorable discharges. This total includes 148,000 general discharges; 121,000 undesirable discharges; 15,500 bad conduct discharges; and 1,500 dishonorable discharges.

Only 6 percent of the veterans with unfavorable discharges were court-martialed out of the Armed Forces. The other 94 percent with unfavorable discharges have administrative nonpunitive discharges, but society is treating them in the same way it reacts to convicted felons.

The Congress and the American public have been propagandized to believe that the Armed Forces are helping veterans readjust to civilian life following the national convulsions over the Indochina War. No doubt they are, in many instances.

Analysis of the Defense Department discharge figures, however, suggests that the Pentagon may be creating more readjustment problems than it is solving.

Unfavorable discharges are now being given to the highest percentage of servicemen ever, according to Defense Department statistics. One out of every ten servicemen released receives an other-than-honorable discharge. The percentage of servicemen receiving general and undesirable discharges during the first 4 fiscal years of the Nixon administration was twice the percentage of the previous 4 years. The percentage of bad conduct and dishonorable discharges remained fairly constant.

CORPORATIONS DECODE SPN'S

Another alarming finding of the investigation is that 20 percent of the re-

sponding corporations admitted that they know how to determine the specific reasons behind a serviceman's discharge by decoding numbers on his discharge certificate. These corporations are apparently not deterred or disabled by the fact that the Defense Department officially prohibits distribution to the public of lists explaining these separation program numbers—SPN's.

By having these numbers on the discharge certificate, the Defense Department makes it possible for employers to decode them. It thereby participates in an invasion of the privacy of thousands of veterans, including many who have honorable discharges but unfavorable SPN's.

We do not permit other Government departments and agencies to operate elaborate discharge systems in which every person is classified upon being released. Why should the Defense Department be allowed to act as a screening agency for private employers?

This investigation makes clear the need for remedial legislation, such as that introduced by Mr. KOCH, to abolish the use of SPN's. Serious consideration of remedial legislation by the distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee and the Secretary of Defense would help make employable many thousands of veterans who have been unfairly denied access to jobs because of the unwise discharge policies of the Defense Department.

WE NEED A NEW MINIMUM WAGE BILL

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, when JOHN DENT's "Ode to ERLBORN" came across my desk last week, a thought occurred to me. Maybe my pleas in poem and song for action on the minimum wage bill have been misdirected.

After all, our subcommittee chairman is an experienced legislator. He knows the importance of compromise in the legislative process. He knows that, as troubled as the American people are about matters which come under the heading of Watergate, most are still concerned about their pocketbooks.

He knows, too, that men and women at the low end of the wage scales deserve the time it would take for Congress to pass a good minimum wage bill. And he knows that, as a subcommittee, we have had nothing at all on our agenda for the past 2 months.

In light of this, I am confident that our chairman would provide for early action on this bill if he were free to do so. But we all know the great influence exercised by the leaders of Organized Labor on the majority of the Education and Labor Committee. So again, resorting to simple rhyme, let me suggest:

John, John, he's our man—
If he can't do it, Georgie can!
(And, if he won't, he's a real meany!)

WEST TECH HIGH SCHOOL WINS OHIO STATE SOCCER CROWN

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on November 8 West Tech High School, which is in my congressional district, won the State soccer championship in a closely fought match with Cincinnati Anderson.

A victory like this is the product not only of skill, but also great dedication and hard work. It speaks very highly of the players on the team, their coach, Nick Maric, and the school they represent.

To them I extend my warmest congratulations, and in tribute to their achievement I would like to insert the following article into the RECORD:

WEST TECH WINS STATE SOCCER CROWN

(By Don Fogleson)

West Tech's Cinderella soccer team finally found its glass slipper and made it a sweetheart of a finish last Thursday at Baldwin-Wallace stadium, beating Cincinnati Anderson 1-0 to win the state scholastic championship.

There was no doubt among the 2,000 fans in Berea that the two top soccer teams in Ohio were meeting for the state championship. The two clubs battled to a scoreless tie for 89 minutes of play before Tech sophomore Wolfgang Urban brought down the house with a left-footed boot from 18 yards out that split the Cincinnati net.

Urban was mobbed by teammates and fans and had to be rescued from the throng of worshippers by coach Nick Maric.

After playing scoreless ball through regulation time, the two finalists played two five-minute overtimes and two five-minute sudden death periods. It was in that final sudden death period in which Urban blasted home the championship shot.

West Tech gained a berth in the state playoffs by tying for the Western Division crown of the Ohio Scholastic Soccer League. Eight Ohio teams made it to the playoffs: four division champions, two wild card teams and two top independent schools.

In the first round of play, Hudson beat Hawken School 1-0; Brecksville whipped Rocky River 3-0; Cincinnati Anderson stopped University School 2-1 in overtime; and West Tech defeated Dayton Centerville 2-1.

The warriors drew Hudson in the semifinals and that, too, was a nail-biter all the way. Tied 2-2, sophomore sensation Mike Hubach drove for the Hudson goal and appeared to have a clear shot. A Hudson defender desperately grabbed Hubach, who instinctively passed the ball to an open teammate who made a fine boot to the net. Seeing that it would be a goal, the Hudson goalie lunged at the ball, grabbing it with his hands.

Because grabbing the ball is a soccer violation, Tech was awarded a free kick with just 18 seconds showing on the clock. Hubach lined up for the shot and put the ball squarely into the Hudson goal for a 3-2 victory and a berth in the championship game.

It set the stage for the climatic windup against Anderson, which upended Brecksville 1-0 in the semifinals.

"I'm afraid I'll wake up and find out that it was all a dream," Maric said after the championship triumph. "These are a great bunch of kids. They deserved it."

The Warriors finished the 1973 campaign with a 12-1-1 record and Maric attributes much of that success to a superstition of buying oranges from Little Tony's Open-Air Market before each game. Maric explained that everytime he bought oranges from Little Tony's, located at W. 73rd and Clark, his soccer team won.

"It became a routine thing for me to do," Maric said. "And, yes, I visited Tony's before the championship game."

A FUTURE PRESIDENT

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the Judiciary will soon vote its recommendation on the nomination of GERALD R. FORD as the next Vice President of the United States. It is very possible that the committee will indeed be voting to approve the confirmation of the next President of the United States.

The editorial of the New York Times of Monday, November 26, 1973, makes an urgent appeal to the sense of judgment of the Members of Congress and their responsibility to the American people in this crucial matter. I urge my colleagues to give this editorial which follows the highest and most serious consideration:

A FUTURE PRESIDENT

After announcing that the Senate Rules Committee had unanimously approved the nomination of Rep. Gerald R. Ford as Vice President, Senator Cannon, the committee chairman, was asked by reporters whether he still thought the group was recommending the next President. "I think that's a very strong likelihood," he replied.

Judged by that demanding standard, and it is the only proper standard to apply, it is not clear that the Rules Committee has fully discharged its responsibility under the Constitution. When Congress approved the 25th Amendment in 1965, the legislative history makes clear that Congress was expected to go beyond the routine tests of character and personal fitness customarily invoked in the confirmation of a Cabinet officer or a judge. It was, in addition, acting as a surrogate for the American people.

Senator Ervin of North Carolina had initially introduced an amendment providing that Congress alone fill a vacancy in the Vice Presidency. Presidential nomination and confirmation by both Houses was a compromise between that procedure and the leaving of the appointment entirely to a President's discretion.

Essential prerequisites for the Vice Presidential nomination are: (1) that the nominee be of good character; and (2) that there be no break in political continuity should he succeed the President. Mr. Ford, as a Republican and minority leader, provides the continuity; the lengthy F.B.I. investigation apparently confirms that he is a man of good character. But the Democratic majorities of the House and Senate also have to ask themselves whether Representative Ford meets the test of competence and whether, as representatives of the people, they are justified in assenting to the selection of a candidate with what can fairly be called his unrepresentative views on such major questions as civil and human rights.

With regard to competence, Mr. Ford has no administrative experience, little experience in foreign affairs, and no record of constructive legislative draftsmanship. No important bills or proposals bear his name. He has been almost totally uncreative during his 25 years in the House of Representatives. In 1970, he displayed remarkably poor judgment and inadequate understanding of the constitutional separation of powers when he personally initiated the futile attempt to impeach Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

Representative Ford's relentless efforts to undercut the open housing law, the right to vote law, and virtually every other civil rights statute of the past decade afford no comfort to the nation's Negro citizens and are clearly out of step with majority sentiment in this country with regard to racial equality. His legislative record is remarkably lacking in compassion.

In voting on this nomination, members of Congress are not obliged to rubber-stamp Mr. Nixon's choice. On the contrary, as surrogates for the people, they have a responsibility to weigh this nominee's competence, judgment, independence and philosophical outlook in terms of whether he is the man they can conscientiously endorse as potential President of the United States.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Felician Sisters are a worldwide order of nuns who have dedicated themselves to teaching, care of orphans, nursing, mission work, and social service. Last week, the Felician Sisters began a year-long celebration marking their 100th anniversary of dedication to the people of America. The centennial celebration, which began with a mass of thanksgiving in each of the group's nine North American provinces, is scheduled to continue through November of next year.

The story behind this group is rather remarkable. The community, which now numbers nearly 5,000 members, was established by five sisters who came to this country in 1874. Today, the Felician Sisters work in 31 out of 50 States, in addition to Canada, Brazil, and Europe.

The Felician Sisters have long been active in New Jersey. The Immaculate Conception province in Lodi, for example, was the fourth American province to be established.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take this opportunity to salute the Felician Sisters and to thank them on behalf of the many people they have helped. An interesting article focusing on the Felician Sisters appeared November 22 in the Garfield, N.J., Messenger. In view of the fact that the article offers additional information about the Felician Sisters, I would like to take this opportunity to share their story with my colleagues. The article follows:

FELICIAN SISTERS TO CELEBRATE 100 YEARS OF SERVICE IN UNITED STATES

The Felician Sisters, a worldwide order of nuns dedicated to teaching, nursing, care of

orphans, social service and mission work, will begin a year-long observance of their 100th anniversary in America this week with a Mass of thanksgiving in each of their nine North American provinces. The Centennial celebration will continue through November, 1974.

From five Sisters who came to the United States in November of 1874, the community has grown to 5,000 members who work in 31 of the Union's 50 states as well as in Canada, Brazil, Europe and general headquarters in Rome.

His Excellency Thomas A. Boland, archbishop of Newark, will open the centenary activities for the Felician Sisters of Immaculate Conception province, Lodi, with a Solemn High Mass on Nov. 21, 11 a.m. at Lourdes Motherhouse chapel. Concelebrating Mass with the archbishop will be Msgr. Theodore Bonelli, assistant chancellor; Rev. Richard Groncki of Belleville, Rev. Edward Hajduk and the Franciscan chaplains Rev. Humphrey Tobias, Rev. Camillus Janas, Rev. Amandus Plontek and Rev. Bertrand Bluma.

The community, officially known as the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Felix, was founded in Poland by Sophia Truszkowska in 1855. At the request of Rev. Joseph Dabrowski, five Sisters opened their first foundation in this country in 1874 teaching grammar school in Polonia, Wisconsin, to children of early Midwestern settlers and Indian youngsters.

The Immaculate Conception province, Lodi, was the fourth American province to be established. In 1897, the Felician Sisters staffed St. Anthony's School in Jersey City marking their entrance into New Jersey.

By 1906 there were seven more schools in New Jersey staffed by the Felician Sisters: St. Stanislaus, Newark (1897); St. Joseph, Camden (1901); St. Joseph, Passaic (1902); Holy Cross, Trenton (1902). Also Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Bayonne (1902); Sacred Heart, South Amboy (1902); and St. Stephen, Perth Amboy (1906).

Presently, the 574 Felician Sisters of the Lodi province serve in 11 dioceses, staffing 3 hospitals, 2 orphanages, 8 high schools, 47 elementary schools, 26 kindergartens, Felician College and a School for Exceptional Children.

The Sisters are also engaged in summer camp programs, catechetical instruction, retreat centers, prayer groups, free lunches for the poor, homes for the aged or retired, reading clinics, and diocesan projects. Their sphere of activity extends through New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia and Oklahoma.

Mother Mary Amadeus, provincial superior of the Lodi Felicians, has announced a program of spiritual renewal as well as a series of cultural and social events which will commemorate the Sisters' century of service in America. Since the Immaculate Conception province was founded in April of 1909, special activities will be scheduled at the Lodi motherhouse during that month.

Planned projects include days of prayer, symposium, exhibits, memorial services and Centenary concerts by elementary, high school, and college choirs conducted by the Felician Sisters. Climaxing the celebration will be a Pontifical Mass on April 27 at Sacred Heart Cathedral, Newark.

The Congregation of the Felician Sisters published a Centennial Calendar and a commemorative book, "Response", which depicts the history of the Felicians in America. Both publications are being distributed to the public.

A major project of the centenary year for the Lodi province is the renovation of the Immaculate Conception Chapel located on the motherhouse grounds.

THE WASHINGTON POST LOOKS AT MAJOR OIL

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a lengthy, but thorough, article published in the Washington Post gives a good insight into the role of the larger oil companies in the present energy situation.

I thought it most informative reading and would like to print it in the RECORD at this time:

OIL MAJORS SQUEEZED FROM BOTH ENDS (By Ronald Koven and David B. Ottaway)

The profits of the major oil companies have never been so high; yet the pressures and uncertainties they face, both in their home countries and in the oil-producing regions, have never been so great. Each passing day brings news of fresh demands, controls or expropriations against the majors' holdings—not only in the Middle East, but even in politically "safe" areas like Europe and Canada.

Top oil experts say they are confused as to whether the future of the world's most important multinational corporations is grim or rosy.

For, even though the majors have been losing their share of the world oil pie, the pie's size is not fixed—it has, in fact, been growing in circumference at a phenomenal rate. So the majors' reduced share will probably be larger in absolute terms than it ever was, leaving plenty for the smaller oil producers, the so-called independents as the world's energy needs continue to grow.

Still, it is clear that the days when the so-called Seven Sisters—Standard Oil of New Jersey (Exxon), Royal Dutch Shell, British Petroleum, Texaco, Mobil, Standard Oil of California (Chevron) and Gulf Oil—ruled the world of petroleum as absolute monarchs are over, and that momentous changes are taking place within the industry. These changes may leave them as little more than service contractors, transporters and distributors for the oil-producing states.

A once heretical thesis, by MIT oil economist M. A. Adelman, is that the oil companies have been nothing but "tax-collecting agents" for the Arab oil producers for several years now. Soon there will be little ground for dispute of his view.

The implications of the companies' decline goes far beyond their own commercial positions: Since five of the Seven Sisters are giant American corporations, their loss of power also marks a major reduction in America's economic power in the world.

Abroad, the five U.S. Sisters are the symbols of American "economic imperialism," choice targets for all sorts of economic nationalists. To radicals, they uphold the hated status quo; to nationalistic conservatives, they threaten national independence.

In 1950, the seven oil giants—each of which is an integrated international company—controlled 99 percent of the crude oil production in the world trade. By 1971, the seven, known as the majors, had seen their control drop to 81 per cent in the 11 principal oil-exporting countries (not counting the Soviet bloc and Canada). Japan, which must import all its oil, buys about 70 per cent of it from the majors. The Common Market, which must also import the bulk of its oil, buys half of it from the majors.

The latest Middle East war has only precipitated trends that were long undermining the majors' dominant position. They already faced gradual takeover by producing coun-

tries, increased competition both from private independent companies and from emerging state oil authorities and strict regulation in the consuming countries.

But in less than two months, they have lost any say over crude oil prices or production levels and are grappling with loss of control over the world's most important oil fields.

Only last week, Saudi Arabia said it wanted immediate 51 per cent control over the Arabian-American Oil Co., instead of waiting for the scheduled date of 1982. Owned by four of the five American oil giants (75 per cent) and Saudi Arabia (25 per cent), Aramco is the world's largest petroleum production company.

It is a great paradox that profits should be soaring almost out of sight just as the comfortable world the majors created for themselves is falling apart. Royal Dutch Shell, the world's largest non-American company, has just posted a spectacular 274 per cent third quarter jump in profits over last year. Its big sister Exxon, the world's second largest company (after GM), showed a handsome 80 per cent rise and Gulf Oil 91 per cent.

These figures would not be quite so spectacular if 1972 had not been an exceedingly lean year for the companies. But even compared to 1971, a very good year, the jumps are solid in most cases. The great profits were earned outside the United States.

Many of smaller independent companies which have only relatively minor foreign concessions, had little to complain about, either. Cities Service posted a 61 per cent gain, Getty 71 per cent and Continental Oil 38 per cent.

Such extraordinary yields were possible only before Oct. 16, when Persian Gulf oil ministers more than halved the production profits of the companies—from a high of more than 75 cents a barrel (multiplied by millions of barrels a day) to about 35 cents, according to the calculations of the respected Petroleum Intelligence Weekly.

The oil ministers decreed a new pricing mechanism assuring that 88 per cent of any new price increase the companies declared would go into Arab and Iranian state coffers.

Before Oct. 16, the companies were profiting from a steady rise in oil output, ever-widening production profit margins (from 22 cents a barrel in 1970 to 44 cents in early 1973 and, finally, as high as 75 cents) and relatively compliant consumer governments that allowed much of the steady price increases to be passed on to the consumer.

The Oct. 16 decree was the result of intensive economic intelligence work by Middle East producers on the structure of company profits in Europe. Although detailed information is jealously guarded, it is generally agreed that the companies had traditionally been making more than 80 per cent of their overall profits from production. The formulas the Arabs worked out show, one top U.S. oilman says, that they have decided that overall company profits should be restricted to 10 or 15 per cent, at best.

"In the first flush of despair, at least," said Petroleum Intelligence Weekly, "some tend to feel it would be better to be nationalized than bled white through this form of price and profit-margin dictation since it won't be worth investing the necessary capital for expansion of production."

"The phenomenal earnings we have just seen are definitely an Indian summer, those last beautiful blooms before the frost," commented a leading U.S. domestic oilman. "The Seven Sisters are finishing their golden age."

An oil analyst for a respected Wall Street firm complained, "The bosses want me to make 1974 oil company earnings estimates. I'll make them. But they won't be worth the paper they're written on."

Another factor in the companies' recent high profits was that during the period of wild price rises, the giants were selling off

stocks of oil bought before petroleum prices started doubling and redoubling in what was described as "embargo-induced hysteria," some North African oil that had gone for about \$3.50 a barrel in mid-1971 brought \$12.64 in bidding in Tunisia recently.

The Arab oil ministers also made it clear on Oct. 16 that they are prepared to ration production so as to make the most money from the least amount of oil. The production cutbacks prompted by the use of oil as a political weapon against the backers of Israel also established that the governments, not the companies, will control the level of the oil flow.

"The Arabs were volume-oriented for years," said a U.S. oilman. "Those days are over." The Arabs have decided to manipulate prices and production to maximize the incomes of national treasuries at the expense of company profits, he said.

Meanwhile, consumer governments have been moving to increase their control over the companies at the other end—a move accelerated by current Arab oil embargoes and production cutbacks.

American oil executives fear piecemeal, country-by-country nationalizations, not only at the production end, but also in the consuming countries. "Everywhere the majors go, they run into the same pressures. The word is out. It's not just the Arabs," said an oilman.

West Germany was the only important European government allowing a free market in petroleum, until the Arab cutbacks forced it to join its neighbors in regulating the companies. Several European countries now seem tempted to squeeze the majors out altogether. France is threatening to revoke their refining and marketing privileges if they do not maintain French supplies to the last barrel.

ENI, the Italian state oil combine, was saying only a few months ago that Italy "would be in serious trouble if the multinational companies should suddenly withdraw." Nevertheless, the Italian government was squeezing the companies' profits by not letting them pass on their increased costs, a situation intensified by the latest round of price increases during the Middle East war.

Even before the war, Shell, British Petroleum, Exxon and Gulf had all been acting to reduce or liquidate their Italian interests; now there is serious talk of ENI taking over crude oil imports from the majors in direct deals with the producing countries—wiping out the majors' role in Italy.

There is not much more comfort for the American majors at home. Once used to getting their way with both government and consumer, they have been living for more than a year under the constraints of the Cost of Living Council, which has let them pass on increased raw materials costs but not the costs of new investments. Now, since the Arab embargo, the companies also face government allocation and rationing programs.

"The problem," said an executive of one of the majors, to the agreeing nods of a group of colleagues, "is that government decisions respond to political and social pressures and don't take into account our business needs."

Another of the industry's major uncertainties is where to find the tremendous amounts of investment capital it needs for expansion. Italy's anxiety coincides with increased domestic political pressure to limit oil profits by turning the companies into public utilities.

The Chase Manhattan Bank had estimated even before the Arab oil cutbacks that between now and 1985 the industry would need \$1 trillion for investment and current operating expenses to meet the world's rising energy needs. It considered \$600 billion necessary for new investment and \$400 billion needed to maintain ongoing operation. By comparison, in 1971 the industry's total investment over the years in fixed assets was calculated at \$223 billion.

Chase officials calculated that to meet its investment needs the industry would need to double the rate of its profit margin, since 1955 to 16 per cent. "The expansion of net earnings over the past four years was not even one-fourth as large as the indicated need," said a Chase study. In any case, said a bank official, "We're doubtful that governments would allow such high profits."

Nevertheless, the search "will have to be conducted deeper in the earth, in more remote regions and in offshore areas. In each case, the investment required will be much greater than the amount needed for the smaller-scale efforts of the past."

It is calculated, for example, that a 9,400-foot onshore oil well costs \$140,000. But drilling costs rise geometrically. A 25,000-foot exploratory hole costs about \$5 million and, like as not it is dry. Atlantic Richfield (Arco) chairman Robert O. Anderson agreed that the best a petroleum geologist can generally promise, no matter how ecstatic he gets about the prospect of finding oil, is an 8-to-1 chance of actually finding it. "An 8-to-1 shot is pretty good in our business," said Anderson. Other costs are phenomenal, too. Losing an occasional \$100 million drilling platform in a North Sea gale has to be counted as part of the game.

The industry has traditionally had to generate 80 per cent of its own new investment capital because of the large element of gamble in so many of its operations. But even before the present Middle East crisis, Chase estimated that the industry would have had to borrow 40 per cent of the \$1 trillion from outside sources—eight times as much money as it borrowed from 1955 to 1970.

As it was, the industry's self-financing capacity was declining, and it had doubled its expenses for interest payments in four years. Now, with a severe profit squeeze expected in a year or less, the companies may have to go even more heavily into debt than expected. Yet, investors are unlikely to be attracted to an industry faced with declining profits as a result of price controls, heavy indebtedness and a substantially reduced access to its raw material.

"Nobody is going to invest that kind of big money if they think the industry is going to turn into a public utility," said a veteran stock analyst.

Even before the latest Middle East war, the main question around Wall Street—after the outcome of Watergate—was, "Whither the oil companies?" (Oil and oil-related stocks represent 20 per cent of the issues on the New York Stock Exchange, according to an analyst at the respected Wall Street firm of Schroder Naess & Thomas.)

Despite all the problems, the investment analysts point out that the turmoil the majors have endured in the recent past only goes to show that they are best at dealing with the very thing they fear most—constantly changing circumstances.

"It's hard to imagine an industry which has changed so radically in a year's time, and still they have done very well," said an executive at a leading oil-investment bank. "It shows their resiliency and ability to cope. It's the result of their having to deal with a wide variety of experiences in different countries. They are well-trained to adapt to changing circumstances. It's a high-risk business. They expect the worst. That way they're prepared. Any other industry would have been wiped out."

In addition to their flexibility and expertise, the majors have an impressive array of other strengths and assets:

The world's largest tanker fleet. The majors own, or control under long-term charter, about 1,400 of the 3,500 oil tankers in the non-Communist world—40 per cent of the bottoms and 47 per cent of the tonnage. (About 60 per cent of all merchant shipping is petroleum nowadays.)

With tanker rates having tripled and even

quintupled before the Arab oil embargo, the Seven Sisters had an average cost advantage over those paying "spot" tanker rates of at least 50 cents a barrel and sometimes as much as \$3.

The present replacement value of the majors' tanker fleet is about triple what it cost to build the same ships only two years ago. Everyone is scrambling to build tankers—at a cost of \$50 million for a 250,000-tonner. The majors' still-substantial capital holdings give them a built-in advantage over the international independents and the newcomers to oil shipping.

Most estimates, however, are that tanker building will catch up to the needs in two years or less, bringing rates down and wiping out the majors' advantage. The reopening of the Suez Canal could create a glut within a year.

Refining. In 1971, the majors owned around half of the entire non-Communist world's refining capacity of 47 million barrels a day (including 48 per cent in the United States). The cost of entering the refining sector is almost prohibitive, except for the majors, state oil companies and the handful of primarily domestic American "mini-majors" like Standard of Indiana (Amoco). It costs \$2,000 per barrel of capacity, or \$400 million for a 200,000-barrel refinery.

Marketing and Distributing. Because of their worldwide outlets and transportation capacity in ships and pipelines, the majors will continue for years to have a clear edge. Even the state oil companies will need the majors to help get the right amount of oil to the right place at the right time—a function known as "balancing the barrel." The majors own more than half of the world's marketing network; Exxon alone claims about 10 per cent of all sales.

Goodwill. The intangible asset of an established worldwide reputation assures the majors of a continuing advantage with producers as well as motorists, and—just as importantly—with investors and wholesalers. Even in Arab Socialist states (not to mention conservative, non-Arab Iran), where the majors have been nationalized the new state oil companies have often turned to them for service contracts, to help them find and extract crude, build new facilities and get the oil to Western markets.

Access to Oil. Even though the oil states are gradually taking control of Western-owned fields and production, the majors still retain access to considerable amounts of oil. If Saudi Arabia takes a 51 per cent share of Aramco, it would leave the four American majors with about 4.5 million barrels daily, at the planned prewar production level of 9 million for this month. Even as service contractors in Iran, the majors are getting the bulk of that country's current 6 million barrels daily production.

There are still enough politically "safe" deposits to assure some of the majors of large fields of their own. In the North Sea, which is apparently far richer than had been imagined, British Petroleum and Shell have holdings that may eventually meet most of their future needs. BP is also well-entrenched in Alaska's North Slope oil.

These combined assets of the majors have led Robert Mertz, who has made a study of them for the Brookings Institution, to conclude that the "frequent predictions of the imminent demise of the majors are vastly exaggerated."

"Their global marketing structure," he said, "is their greatest asset for the future competitive position and share of the market and will be the most important factor in joining their interests with those of the producing countries. Besides, three quarters of the major's capital investment are downstream in transportation, refining and marketing. Shell Oil, to take one example, has about 77 per cent of its assets downstream beyond the reach of expropriators."

But the majors' very size, strengths and success make them peculiarly vulnerable to economic nationalists.

As the current crisis in the Atlantic Alliance has shown, even our European allies suspect that American companies will be forced into an America-first policy. Arco's Robert Anderson pointed out that while a company operating in 100 different countries had no problems so long as there was more than enough oil to go around, in a tight supply situation it must prove to each of those 100 governments that it is dealing equitably.

The crisis has forced the companies into the uncomfortable position of allocating the reduced quantities of available oil among competing countries. They are being accused of breaking supply contracts and expect to face an inextricable tangle of lawsuits.

At home, the majors are viewed by much of the public as the direct descendants of the turn-of-the-century "robber barons." Thus, even the relatively minor gasoline shortage last summer was immediately attributed to a "conspiracy" by Big Oil to force up prices. There were immediate demands in Congress for strict new controls and even nationalization, and the companies found little willingness to debate the merits of their case. "Our credibility is zero," said the president of one of the majors.

One of the charges against the majors was that they were trying to force the independents out of business. But some of those independents—medium-sized international operators like Occidental or Continental Oil—have been making gains at the expense of the majors in their former preserves and have suddenly found themselves the favored partners of the Middle East state oil companies.

Both radical and conservative in the Middle East have used the independents' willingness to pay fancy oil prices as wedges for general price increases. John H. Lichtblau, a top independent oil analyst, said, "National oil companies may prefer to sell to independents to keep more buyers bidding. The more buyers there are, the better off the national oil companies are..."

The turmoil of the past several years has demonstrated that there is plenty of room for an aggressive independent, with no stake in preserving the status quo, to make inroads on the traditional turfs of the majors. Armand Hammer of Occidental immediately accepted a Libyan demand this summer for 51 per cent control of his concession. He has been getting more Libyan oil than ever before, while the majors have been restricted to 49 per cent of their previous amounts.

The majors accuse Hammer of having started the whole unraveling process in the Middle East by eagerly accepting every successive Libyan demand since 1970 so as to expand his mini-empire. While the majors are fighting a rearguard action against being reduced to service contractors, Hammer says, "It's a natural tendency for countries to want to control their own resources. There's no sense fighting it. Our company has been a pioneer in service-type contracts, versus the old ownership contracts where private companies think they own the minerals in the ground."

Crude-short Ashland Oil of Kentucky struck a deal with the Iranian National Oil Co. for an assured supply of 60,000 barrels a day—growing to 100,000 by 1975—in exchange for a half of its interests in New York State, including a petrochemical plant and 180 service stations. This dovetails neatly with Ashland's plans to expand its 60,000-barrel a day refinery in Buffalo, N.Y. to 100,000.

Orin E. Atkins, president of Ashland, called the deal "the logical approach to securing long-term supplies."

A group of largely unknown independents signed a memorandum of intent this month

with Iran to build a \$1 billion jointly owned export refinery with a 500,000-barrel-a-day capacity.

Such independents are already veterans from whom the majors know what to expect. Now, however, they are being crowded by a whole flock of new buyers like Coastal States of Texas, the refiner who paid the record \$12.64 a barrel in Tunisia and bought "hot oil" from Libya that the majors with U.S. government backing, claimed in court was illegally sold from their expropriated Libyan fields.

In addition to such unorthodox operators, U.S. public utilities are going straight to the producing countries for their oil. Shortly before the war, southern California and New York power companies were dickering directly for oil at then-record prices.

The prospect is somewhat different for each of the American majors, Exxon, the giant of giants, is generally agreed to be in good shape. Its worldwide interests mean that whenever there is trouble somewhere, there is news that Exxon has been hurt, but it also means that it is widely scattered enough to weather almost any storm.

Mobil is also said to be well off, because it was the least committed of all the majors to Middle East production.

Gulf is considered to be in the most trouble. More than half of its Eastern Hemisphere oil sources are in one spot—Kuwait, the first of the conservative Arab states to demand 51 per cent control. There are demands in Kuwait for a total takeover.

Gulf's Kuwait oil once represented more than 100 per cent of its profits, according to officials at one of Wall Street's top oil banks, since the company was losing money on all the rest of its operations. Gulf's 91 per cent third-quarter profit flattens out to what Petroleum Intelligence Weekly called "a barely healthy 10.8 per cent, when averaged out with the last three years' results."

The situations of Texaco and Standard of California are considered to be between the two extremes—neither good nor bad for the moment.

Some of the majors, at least, seem philosophical about being turned into closely regulated public utilities. "Other industries have managed as utilities. We would, too, if it came to that," said the president of one of the healthier companies.

If the majors are to avoid the fate of having the independents and the state oil companies feed off their carcasses—as the majors themselves fed off the petroleum from the fossilized remains of the swamp dinosaurs pictured in the old Sinclair Oil ads—they must find new strategies for survival.

Their main problem is that the center of profits in production, is driving up. A new locus of profits must be found to provide the enormous amounts of investment capital needed in the coming decade.

The companies are moving in two directions—downstream, in their traditionally low-yield petroleum shipping, refining and marketing operations; and out of conventional oil operations, both back into old-fashioned alternatives like coal and into exotic new ones like extracting oil from shale rock and coal liquefaction and gasification.

For the immediate future, however, most analysts agree, the big money must come from getting most of the profits from downstream oil operations. For the first time in a long time, marketing and refining will have to stand on their own feet," said a Wall Street analyst. "The days when they just served to realize the profits made on production are gone."

With a glut coming in the shipping business, refining and marketing are the only major sectors left for generating profits, and there are major uncertainties in both fields.

But the majors have a relative advantage

in refining because, as worldwide operators, they can more easily plan on the assumption that they will somehow get the oil to keep new refineries busy. Even a medium-sized independent cannot afford to build new refinery capacity at current prices unless it is assured of long-term supplies, and most of the independents are too small to have their eggs in very many baskets.

"We are all faced," said Atkins of Ashland, "with the inability to get a long-term commitment. We're not planning to build a new refinery till we can see the crude oil supply picture. A company needs at least a 10-year contract to go ahead with a refinery. Last year, Saudi Arabia was selling its oil on three-year contracts. This year, it will be only for two years."

Even the majors are holding back on refinery expansion because of the murky supply prospects. Historically, refining has provided profits of only 2 to 3 per cent, according to a leading Wall Street oil investment broker.

As for marketing, the majors are reorganizing, reversing the accepted strategy of the 1950s and 1960s. Then, the prime consideration was not how much money a major's gas stations were making, but what share of the market they represented. As Standard & Poor's investment analysis service puts it, "The majors are tightening up on their downstream operations in the U.S., weeding out unprofitable service stations, and even selling off whole geographical chunks which were not carrying their weight."

Exxon has been selling off its stations in most of the North Central states. Gulf has been getting out of the West Coast.

"We are in a semi-liquidation position," one marketing official for a major oil company said. "We are losing market share, but making more money. If governments only allow price increases for raw materials to be charged to the consumer, then we do better if we don't make new investments, which are at vastly inflationary rates."

The majors are diversifying. Besides seeking new sources of oil—in places as nearby as the Long Island and New Jersey coastlines and as far away as Timbuktu, inland hundreds of miles into the wastes of the Sahara Desert—they have been betting on an eventual comeback of coal.

Many of the oil companies began buying up coal fields back in the mid-1960s; Exxon has estimated coal reserves of 7 billion tons, largely in Wyoming and Montana; Gulf has 2.6 billion tons. The American "mini-majors" are also hedging on coal—Continental Oil has an estimated 8 billion tons.

"Besides oil," says Standard & Poor's, "the major U.S. oil companies now are estimated to provide 20 per cent of our coal and to hold over half our known deposits of uranium." The five U.S. majors all have a stake in shale oil extraction in the Rocky Mountain states, and are branching into nuclear energy.

With crude prices up so dramatically, some of the exotic processes that were considered uneconomical until recently have suddenly become very attractive, although some still look like nonstarters when it comes to providing significant quantities of oil any time soon. Exxon calculates that synthetic crude oil from coal can now be made at a once-prohibitive \$7 a barrel.

Exxon is also participating in a \$1 billion project to extract 150,000 barrels of oil daily from the Athabasca tar sands in Alberta—an investment of almost \$7,000 per barrel of daily production capacity. The company is also heavily committed to pilot projects in the liquefaction and gasification of coal.

"The majors will have to become full-energy companies, able to produce coal, gas, nuclear energy or what-ever," said an executive in the petroleum division of a leading Wall Street investment bank. "They know what energy is all about. They're attuned to the problems, but this is likely to get them

entangled with the antitrust laws, the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Trade Commission and so forth."

Noting that a company dealing in a product in short supply is likely to do well, oil analyst Lichtblau said, "Who would you expect to make money when a commodity is scarce but the people who sell it?"

"It's not as if their product is going out of style. It's not like cigarettes, you know. The majors aren't going out of existence. Exxon will be around as long as we are. They'll make money, but maybe not like in 1973."

The majors themselves talk just as confidently. "Things are tight," said the head of one of the Seven Sisters, "and when things were tight in the past, we always managed to make money."

FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference legislation to create a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. The primary task of this Corporation is to explore for, develop, and produce the large deposits of oil and natural gas on lands owned by the Federal Government.

Our growth has exceeded our capacity to be self-sufficient in oil. In addition to this there is the Arab oil embargo proving we dare not become dependent upon other nations. Some other foreign countries are taking further advantage of our needs to hike their prices. Our response must take the form of energy conservation and energy self-sufficiency.

One matter is not at issue, there remains in the United States adequate domestic resources of oil and natural gas to meet our intermediate term needs, and that the United States owns most of this oil and natural gas.

The U.S. Geological Survey estimated there are almost 500 billion barrels of oil in proved, indicated additional and undiscovered reserves, and almost 2,400 trillion cubic feet of proven and undiscovered natural gas reserves yet to be found both onshore and offshore in the United States. It must be remembered that we presently consume about 6.5 billion barrels of oil and 22 trillion cubic feet of natural gas per year. Estimates of how much of these resources are under Federal lands range from 50 to 75 percent. The bulk of our vast domestic oil and gas resources are public resources and should be developed for the people.

Yet only about 2 percent of Federal lands under which oil and gas may be found have been leased for exploratory and developmental purposes to private oil and gas companies. Recent testimony before a Senate subcommittee indicates that wells on over 10 percent of leased acreage have been classified by the U.S. Geological Survey as "producing shut-in." These are wells capable of commercial production but temporarily "shut-in" and held back from production.

The Federal Oil and Gas Corporation would assure that the public which owns these resources benefits as soon as possible.

There are four essential purposes to be achieved by the establishment of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation:

First. It would develop publicly owned resources on Federal lands to satisfy national energy needs rather than to maximize private sector profits.

Second. Corporation would stimulate competition in the petroleum business.

Third. Corporation would provide the public with knowledge of actual cost of producing oil and gas so public policy can be geared to the Nation's interest. It would give the Nation a "yardstick" against which to judge performance of private oil companies.

Fourth. Corporation would contribute additional fuel supplies which the Federal Government could effectively allocate to essential public needs.

The Corporation would have access to publicly owned gas and oil rights on Federal lands, as well as power to acquire similar rights on private lands. It could enter into the full range of activities necessary for exploration, development, refining, transportation, and marketing of petroleum and gas products. It would be able to enter into activities outside exploration, development, and production only if unable to sell crude oil and natural gas to companies which would promote competition in the industry.

The Corporation would have authority to issue bonds to cover indebtedness, and Federal appropriations in the amount of \$50 million per year would be authorized for the first 10 years.

The Corporation would be required to make public disclosure of its proprietary information to assure data on actual production costs in the petroleum industry. It would make available to the public patents and inventions, and corporate profits would inure to the Federal Treasury for benefit of all citizens.

Development of public resources by a public corporation is not new. The record of the Tennessee Valley Authority speaks for itself. Countries with national oil companies today are more nearly the rule than the exception. In 1914, the British Government, at urging of Winston Churchill, bought controlling interest in British Petroleum—BP. Churchill argued that the British Navy needed a secure source of oil under British control, that if the navy had its own supply of oil it would no longer have to rely on a world market dominated by gigantic corporations, and that long-term energy requirements in war and in peace would be assured at reasonable prices. Churchill's arguments might well be made in another time and place—today in the United States.

The British Gas Council, a governmental agency, has authority to develop gas on offshore public lands, primarily in the North Sea. Its existence has increased natural gas production and reduced natural gas prices.

There are numerous other examples—the Compagnie Francaise des Petroles—CFP in France, the Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi—ENI—in Italy; Pemex in Mex-

ico; Petrobras in Brazil, and YPF in Argentina; Oil India; in each the idea—development of vital resources in the public interest—is the same.

One recent entry into the national energy company field is the Norwegian State Oil Co. A recent study of national oil companies by the Canadian Government notes that—

With the discovery of oil in the Norwegian sector of the North Sea the Norwegian Government took aggressive action to ensure that oil developments would be under terms and conditions which maximized the benefits to the nation.

The purpose of the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation I propose would be to take aggressive action to insure that oil and natural gas deposits—primarily under public lands—are developed and on terms and conditions which maximize the benefits to the Nation.

It is not the purpose of this legislation to provide a forerunner for nationalizing the American petroleum industry. The purpose is to develop public resources—and preserve the free enterprise system in the petroleum industry. But private oil companies need a spur, a yardstick, an incentive, and competition. This Corporation would provide that yardstick.

THE CASE FOR THE SAFE SCHOOLS ACT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year I introduced the Safe Schools Act, H.R. 2650, a bill that would amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assist school districts to carry out locally approved school security plans. The aim of the legislation is to aid school districts in their efforts to reduce crime against students, employees and facilities. Congressman PERKINS, the distinguished chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee and of the General Education Subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 2650 to develop the merits of my proposal. At that time, I listed numerous examples of serious criminal activity in various schools throughout the country.

Incidents of serious crime in public schools against students, staff and facilities have steadily increased. There is no nationally uniform system for computing the statistics on school crime, however, my most recent research, for example revealed that:

On December 21, 1972, a pipe bomb exploded in a corridor at the Glendale High School in Glendale, Calif., destroying 1 locker and damaging 10 others.

In January 1973, two different New York City teachers were raped on the same day in two different elementary schools.

In San Francisco, a 17-year-old boy was stabbed to death after he teased a classmate about losing a game of dominoes to a girl.

In 1 week in April, there were no hot meals for the students of New York City's PS 65. The entire week's supply of food for the South Bronx school, including 154 pounds of ham and 90 pounds of cheese, had been stolen the night before, only hours after delivery.

Other startling statistics involving crime in the Nation's public schools include the following:

Schools have become the third most popular target for bombers in the Nation; Sixty percent of all school fires now originate as arson or during an act of vandalism;

School fires cost \$50 million in 1973;

Even rural schools are finding it "almost impossible" to purchase insurance because of vandalism, according to the National Association of Secondary School Principals;

Cleveland Public School Security Director William Strawbridge has stated that "crime is accelerating at an alarming pace."

In the Seattle public schools:

One million forty-two thousand nine hundred and eighty-two dollars of property was destroyed in 8,662 cases of vandalism in 1972;

One thousand eight hundred and eighty-six crimes against persons were reported in 1972, including homicide, sex offenses, robbery, assault, narcotics or other drugs, and weapons possession;

Assault with intent to inflict serious injury increased more than 70 percent between the 1971 and 1973 school years;

Incidents of robbery doubled over the same period.

In the Los Angeles public schools:

Three million dollars of the school budget was spent on security;

The number of assaults on students and teachers doubled from September to December 1972 as compared to the same period in 1971;

Assaults increased from 423 in 1971 to 1,052 in 1972;

Three and seven-tenths million dollars was lost in vandalized property in 1971 as compared to \$2.9 million in 1970;

In the 1971-72 school year alone, there were 885,000 reports of burglary, 201,000 reports of burglary related crimes, 650,000 of glass breakage, 580,000 of arson, 65,000 of mischievous destruction, and 280 assaults, 17 with guns.

Across the Nation during the 1972-73 school year:

A Fort Lauderdale teacher died after receiving gunshot wounds inflicted by a former student;

An 18-year-old St. Louis student was shot and killed while trying to stop a theft from his school locker;

Cleveland, Ohio, city schools reported 50 incidents of sexual molestation;

One hundred and fifty-five Chicago teachers were assaulted in 1 month in 1972;

Maintenance cost of the Houston, Tex., school security force has increased from \$20,000 in 1972 to \$389,000 in 1973;

The city of Dallas expects to spend as much as \$1.5 million in their security programs;

Washington, D.C., public schools spent \$535,692 on vandalized property;

Kansas City spent \$231,801 on security guards and other security measures.

Surely these statistics warrant congressional action to assist schools to combat the incredible increase of crime, property destruction and personal injury to faculty, students, and staff. Millions of dollars are being drained from the already overtaxed school budget on security systems, and on equipment and manpower replacement. These moneys should be spent for the proper education and training of our youth. Due to lack of funds for the educational curriculum itself, and in response to the increase in crime, some school systems, such as Chicago and Washington, D.C., have introduced armed guards and policemen in an attempt to maintain order. These schools are inadvertently becoming armed camps.

Our public schools need help. The Safe Schools Act would earmark Federal funds for the purpose of studying the school crime problem, developing and testing techniques for dealing with it, and assisting the most vulnerable school districts in formulating and implementing organized programs to achieve a secure learning environment for students and a secure working environment for staff. It is supported by educators, the 75,000-member union of the United Federation of Teachers, police officials, and administrators across the country.

I cannot stress too strongly the urgent and profound need to come to the aid of our schools and enact safe school legislation.

PEAR RELISH AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. W. A. Collins, Jr., of Arlington, wrote a letter this fall pointing out the long term of big government. The letter is amusing, but unfortunately factual, and I would like to share this with my colleagues:

PEAR RELISH AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

ARLINGTON, TEX., September 21, 1973.
Congressman DALE MILFORD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On Thursday, Septem

DEAR SIR: On Thursday, September 13, 1973, my wife and I were making pear relish, something we have done for many years. (It's wonderful on black-eyed peas.) She got carried away with quartering the pears and sliced the end of her left little finger—five stitches worth. She was well taken care of at the emergency room of the Arlington Memorial Hospital.

I am sure you are wondering why I'm taking the time and trouble to inform you of the foregoing. Read on—

On Wednesday, September 19, 1973, my wife received a long distance telephone call from what she thinks was the National Electronics Surveillance System of the Federal Drug Administration asking if a product was involved. The person seemed to have considerable more interest in the product than in the state of my wife's health. My wife in-

formed the person calling of the item involved, namely a kitchen knife. She also informed the person that she could lay no blame on the product; the operator was solely to blame.

I admire the efficiency of a system that can get word to Washington and back in less than one week about our pear relish operation. Further, quite honestly, this is much more government than I am interested in, care to have or want to pay for and recommend that this is one place you can start balancing the federal budget by cutting down on employees and their accompanying expenses.

Yours very truly,

W. A. COLLINS, Jr.

WAR POWERS LEGISLATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my Washington Report, entitled "War Powers," at this point:

WAR POWERS

When historians take a look at the record of the Congress in 1973, my guess is that they will judge the War Powers law as the most important piece of legislation enacted because it marks a turning point in the continuing struggle within the American constitutional system to restore the Congress as a co-equal branch of government.

The War Powers law, a product of 3 years of Congressional work, aims at limiting the Presidential power to commit armed forces to hostilities abroad without Congressional approval. It contains the following provisions:

1. The President is required to consult with Congress before introducing U.S. forces into any foreign hostilities;
2. The President is required to make a full report to Congress within 48 hours after committing armed forces abroad;
3. The President must withdraw all troops within 60 days if Congress has not declared war or specifically authorized the commitment. The President can extend the period for 30 days by certifying to Congress that the additional period is necessary for the safe withdrawal of U.S. forces;
4. And it requires the President to withdraw all troops immediately if Congress at any time adopts a veto-proof concurrent resolution to end an action.

The War Powers law seeks to assure that the most important decision made by government—whether or not to go to war—is shared responsibility between the President and the Congress, as the U.S. Constitution intends and the standards of democracy require. The merit of the bill is that it compels the President to consult with Congress when committing American forces overseas and to obtain Congressional consent for any prolonged military action. The consultative process will require him to justify his actions to Congress, and it will bring the decision-making process on whether to go to war into the open. In my view, this is the law's chief virtue. A primary lesson of the Vietnam War is the peril of secrecy in the conduct of foreign policy and the necessity of open leadership. Basic foreign policy decisions must rest upon informed public support.

The War Powers law also signals a resurgence of Congressional independence after a long period of acquiescence to the President's war-making power. Beyond the vital Congressional check it contains, the law's significance is that the Congress is reclaiming some

of its Constitutional power after a long period of allowing it to be eroded. The President's weakened political position because of Watergate may have been a factor, but I do not view the bill as a vote of no-confidence in President Nixon. Rather, it reflects the new attitude among Congressmen that the Congress must play an important role in the question of whether we go to war. The law is directed at all recent Presidents, and says, in effect, that future Presidents should not make war without Congressional approval. House Majority Leader Thomas O'Neill (Mass.) said, "If the President can deal with the Arabs, Israelis and the Soviet Union, he ought to be willing to deal with the Congress of the U.S."

The War Powers law had a rocky road to enactment. When it first came up for consideration, few legislators expected it to become law, and most were surprised when events converged to enable the Congress to override the President's veto. Some conservatives claimed it was unconstitutional and deprived the power of the President to act decisively in a crisis. However, the law specifically states it is not intended to alter the Constitutional authority of the President, but only to establish a procedure for its legitimate exercise. The measure does not preclude bold and effective Presidential action in a crisis, but only requires him to gain Congressional support. For example, the law would not have hindered the President in following his chosen course in the recent Mideast war, or, for that matter, in any of the recent international crises.

Some liberals objected to the law because they claim it gave to the President authority he does not now have to wage war for 60 days. This argument ignores the fact that the President already acts in this manner.

No miracles should be expected from this legislation. It does not insure the nation against future wars or make the decisions about going to war any easier. The War Powers law probably will not have any immediate practical effect since American soldiers are not in combat today anywhere in the world, or expected to be in combat anywhere. Even with this legislation, the President, on his own, can still commit the armed forces to foreign combat. And once the military power of the U.S. is committed, and with it the honor and prestige of the country, it is unlikely that any Congress will reverse the President and force an end to the fighting. But, this law will make future Presidents more cautious and deliberative in committing American forces, and more inclined to consult with Congress on their decision and to think about its impact on the American people.

THE ISSUE IS OUR FUTURE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the House Judiciary Committee begins to investigate the possibility of impeaching the President, we, as the representatives of the people, must not forget what is at stake if this constitutional crisis comes. Does the Constitution still exist or has the President become a self-appointed dictator?

An article by Ira Glasser, in a recent edition of the New York Westsider examines the possibility of President Nixon's impeachment. I place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a reminder to

my colleagues of what is facing the Congress and the Nation if we do not act on this matter.

The article follows:

THE ISSUE IS OUR FUTURE

(By Ira Glasser)

Nixon is not the only issue. He should be impeached, but impeachment is a grave procedure, not to be entered into lightly, and never to be entered into for partisan political reasons. We should not support impeachment because we have opposed Richard Nixon politically for 20 years, and we should not shrink from impeachment because we have supported him in the past.

We should impeach Richard Nixon because he has tried to make himself an elected king. He has taken unto himself powers that no person—and no government—should ever be allowed to have. He has taken the power to wiretap people who are not criminals, and without even a warrant. He has bombed a foreign nation and kept it a secret from Congress. He has set up a private secret police—the plumbers—to burglarize, spy, and intercept the mail of his political opponents. He has stolen the files of a man's psychiatrist. He has sought to use the Internal Revenue Service to harass his political opponents. He has withheld evidence in a criminal case. He has defied a court order. He has authorized a close aide to offer a federal judge the directorship of the FBI while that judge was presiding over the trial of Daniel Ellsberg. He has authorized illegal dragnet arrests of thousands of peaceful demonstrators. He has systematically harassed the press and used his federal regulatory agencies to intimidate investigative reporting. He has transformed grand juries into instruments of political inquisition. He has impounded funds appropriated by Congress and, in effect, refused to execute the laws.

He has violated a hundred times over his oath to uphold the Constitution. He has systematically taken the kingly position that the legal limits which restrain every citizen and every public official do not restrain him. He has left us no doubt: he means to function above the law. And if we let him do it, we will all be accomplices to the establishment of a monarchy in America.

Individual rights are a limit upon government power. To say that an individual has the right to distribute a leaflet is to say that the government is without power to stop him. If we have the right to vote, that means no government official has the power to stop us. If we have the right to be secure in our homes, that means the government has no power to enter, except under very limited circumstances and even then only with a warrant issued by a judge.

Every individual right can be seen as a limitation upon government power. The Bill of Rights is nothing less than a list of limitations. Our rights are guaranteed only because the Bill of Rights limits government power.

After the American Revolution, the men who wrote the Constitution decided to include a Bill of Rights because they believed strongly that unless the power of the government was explicitly and specifically limited by law, our rights would not exist. The Founding Fathers especially feared the presidency. They feared that unless the awesome powers of the president were limited, he could become an elected king. Unless we limit the president's power, wrote one early American, "we shall find that we have given [him] enough [power] to enable him to take all."

So in order to prevent a presidency of unlimited power, the Bill of Rights was made part of our Constitution. It placed limits upon the power of all government officials, but especially upon the president. For if the president's power was not limited, what would stop him from entering our homes, invading our privacy, punishing us for our beliefs and spying on our activities?

For nearly 200 years, the Bill of Rights has withstood the attempts of many presidents to overrule its limits. Some have succeeded occasionally, and almost all presidents have violated one or another individual right. But until now, no president has so systematically and thoroughly taken the position that his power is unlimited by law. Richard Nixon has taken that position, and he must be stopped.

We are at a crossroads today that we have not been at since the beginning of this nation. Richard Nixon is not the issue. The next three years is not the issue. The issue is our future.

For if we do not impeach Richard Nixon now, then we invite every future president to claim the same unlimited powers. If we do not restore those limits now, we abolish our rights. Individual rights are synonymous with legal limits upon power. If Richard Nixon is not impeached, then the lesson will be clear to all future presidents: they'll all do it, and the Bill of Rights will become a meaningless document.

Any United States Representative who is not for impeachment is an accomplice to the destruction of the Bill of Rights. Any citizen who does not write his or her Representative is covering up the destruction of liberty. Impeachment is not a process merely to remove Richard Nixon; it is instead a referendum on liberty.

Nixon must be brought to trial. This nation needs a public inquiry into his conduct and he deserves a fair trial on the charges against him. The only way to have that trial is to impeach him. Anything less is complicity.

REPORTED MISTREATMENT OF ISRAELI PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, just as I spoke out against inhuman treatment of political prisoners under the Thieu regime in Vietnam, I cannot be silent at the reported atrocities against Israeli prisoners in the recent war in the Middle East.

The Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, specifically mandates standards of morality for the protection of defenseless persons, including prisoners of war, to safeguard their basic human rights. This Convention has been agreed to by most of the countries in the world including Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, and Israel. As of October 26, only Lebanon and Israel had presented apparently complete lists of prisoners of war in accordance with article 122 of the Convention prescribing a full account of all prisoners.

Recently a rally was held in Boston on behalf of the Israeli prisoners of war and to protest reported charges of cruel and abusive treatment. I am including the statements of leading members of the Massachusetts clergy as well as that of Harvard Law Prof. Philip B. Heyman as they relate to these charges of mistreatment of prisoners of war.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,

Cambridge, Mass., November 7, 1973.

The Jewish people have often been sold for a prize by other nations and by Christians. We now witness the great threat of it happening again. This time for the comforts of private cars and well-heated homes—for

oil. We must shout aloud: Let it not happen again.

As a Christian who loves Israel for Jesus' sake, I say: Let not the "energy crises" become a cover up for injustice to Israel—and now especially to the Israeli prisoners of war.

KRISTER STENDAHL,
Dean, Harvard Divinity School.

PRAYER BY REV. DAVID KILLIAN, C.S.P. AT
GOVERNMENT CENTER

Lord, we come together first of all to say that we do not glory in war; we reject the concept of a "holy war"—a concept that suggests that you would countenance brother killing brother for some sacred cause; we admit that war is evil and to be avoided.

But we also affirm that even in war some principles and standards remain namely, safeguarding the rights and lives of innocent non-combatants; refraining from mass slaughter and torture; fair and humane treatment of prisoners of war.

Now that the hostilities have died down in the Middle East we implore all countries to return prisoners of war, to treat prisoners humanely, to give an accounting of those living and dead.

We deplore the news of the mis-treatment, torture and murder of Israeli prisoners of war and we urge all to recognize the Geneva Convention regarding prisoners of war.

And Lord, we pray, bring us your promised Shalom.
Amen.

STATEMENT OF REV. RONALD G. WHITNEY,
ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE
GREATER SPRINGFIELD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

The cold blooded murder of Israeli military prisoners by the Syrians is an unspeakably brutal and barbaric act. This shocking and senseless slaying of helpless Israeli prisoners, bound hand and foot, is a deplorable and despicable atrocity which affronts the moral conscience of mankind. Speaking as a Christian, I call upon the Syrian government, along with all other parties to the sad and senseless conflict in the Middle East, to take all necessary measures to insure safe and humane treatment for prisoners of war as provided for by the Geneva Convention. There is simply no excuse for the murder or mistreatment of prisoners of war by anybody, anytime, anywhere.

STATEMENT OF PHILIP B. HEYMAN, PROFESSOR
OF LAW, HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

I was asked to speak to you today as a law professor, but I accepted because of another role I played for some time a few years ago. From 1965 until 1967, I had a substantial responsibility with regard to American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. My position in the State Department put me directly under Governor Harriman in that area during the latter part of the period.

There isn't a great need for a law professor on an occasion when it looks like prisoners of war are in danger of being mistreated and when the Geneva Conventions are not being complied with. Law professors tell you what the law says when the law is unclear. Nothing could be clearer than the legal situation in this case. An international convention, having the force of a treaty, and agreed to by Israel, Egypt, Lebanon, and Syria speaks in words that cannot be confused:

It defines POW's in a way that plainly covers soldiers and airmen captured by any party in this war. Once a soldier has been taken under the control of his enemy, once he has surrendered, he is entitled to a whole set of protections that most of the civilized world has agreed to since 1949 and indeed in some form for decades before that.

The convention demands humane treatment of all POW's and emphasizes the point in a way that I think is very rare in international law, by making torture or killing an internationally punishable crime.

The Geneva Convention requires prompt notification in two different ways of all names of prisoners of war.

It requires, unconditionally, the prompt repatriation of all seriously wounded and sick prisoners.

It guarantees these rights by providing that the ICRC can visit and interview all prisoners of war.

Finally, the Convention states that healthy POW's shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities.

I cannot personally vouch for the conditions of compliance and non-compliance that I am about to describe. What I am describing is, however, not simply a matter of Israeli reports. It includes information coming from the International Red Cross and the public press; I have checked much of it with our own State Department. What is the situation with regard to prisoners of war in the Middle East? The Israeli Ambassador to the U.N. has reported that bodies of executed Israeli prisoners have been found in areas once held by Syrian forces. Syria's past record with regard to Israeli prisoners is hardly encouraging. Torture is well established. In this context, it may well be significant and it is surely frightening that Syria is making no effort to comply with the provisions of the Geneva Convention that are designed to assure protection for prisoners of war. Syria is not providing lists or any notification of whom it holds, although Israel estimates 150 Israeli military personnel may be held there. Without lists, no one may ever know what happens to Israeli prisoners of war.

Syria is not permitting visits to prisoners by representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross. And this is the most important protection against mistreatment. There has been no indication of a willingness to exchange sick and wounded or other prisoners both of which are required by the Geneva Conventions.

The record of Egypt, while less disturbing, is at best one of partial compliance with the Conventions. Egypt has so far furnished only a partial list of names—perhaps 100. Israel estimates that there are 300 prisoners of war in the UAR. Egypt has so far permitted inspection by the International Committee of the Red Cross of only some of those prisoners it holds. It is making an exchange of prisoners of war conditional on other political moves—the debate about the location of the cease fire line—although the obligation to exchange prisoners at the termination of active hostilities is absolute and binding by treaty.

I am told that Israel has allowed the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit Arab prisoners wherever they are held and as soon as they arrive at detention camps, that Israel has furnished complete lists numbering nearly 8,000 names to the Arab governments, and that Israel is ready to engage in full compliance with the Geneva Conventions on a reciprocal basis with either Egypt or Syria. I know of no complaints of mistreatment of Arab prisoners of war.

My position here is not, however, that of an apologist for Israel or a critic of the Arab states. I am here to speak for the Geneva Conventions and the rights of prisoners of war. I am here to speak for some consistency with American traditions on this subject. If it turns out that Israel is violating the Geneva Conventions, I would speak out as sharply against that country.

A story in the New York Times two days ago paraphrased the State Department

spokesman's reaction to the question of prisoner exchanges. He said this question of prisoners must be linked with future negotiations on a final peace settlement. Other State Department officials say that our government's position is that prisoner questions must receive priority on a negotiating agenda. In either event, the question is treated as a political one. I think that position is profoundly wrong, misconceived, and short-sighted. The Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war was agreed to by most of the nations of the world for the express purpose of removing this subject from international politics. Until now, this has been the clear and forceful position of the United States government. When the question was the handling of the U.S. POW's in North Vietnam during the late 1960s, it was the North Vietnamese who demanded that this be dealt with only as part of a general peace settlement. A general peace settlement was years off and we insisted that international law was clear, that the rights of POW's were established by treaty and were not part of any political negotiation.

I will return to this but let me begin, more systematically, by explaining why I think the position of the United States should be firmly in favor of prompt and rigorous enforcement of international law on this issue. There are four reasons; each is strong enough to require a different policy than that suggested by the State Department spokesman. Together I believe the case is overwhelming.

First, the United States stands for humaneness and the international rules dealing with prisoners of war are fundamental requirements of common decency and humanity. Over the last 100 years the idea has steadily emerged that war is horrible enough without needless mistreatment of non-combatants. The casualty figures on both sides in this war are a recent reminder. POW's fall at the heart of the protection of non-combatants. Both sides in any war can mistreat POW's, but such mistreatment is recognized as an act of cowardice, smallness, and cruelty that gains neither side in the long run. Prohibiting mistreatment—indeed making mistreatment an international crime—and requiring protective measures such as Red Cross visits, lists, and prompt exchanges says something about an internationally shared obligation of humane treatment even on occasions when it is hardest for nations to remember this obligation. America is still a country that speaks out for rules of humanity. Power politics, like anything else, has its limits and the Geneva Conventions represent such limits.

Second, in this case at least what is required by international politics conforms to what is required by common humanity. The United States was prepared to prolong a war for months or years until the safe release of less than 1,000 POW's was assured. This is the one point on which a very wide spectrum of Americans agreed. Had clear knowledge of mistreatment come out before the war was over, peace would have been far harder to reach. The 450 or so Israeli POW's would correspond to over 30,000 Americans in enemy hands. 150 in Syrian hands would correspond to over 10,000 Americans. Surely it is clear that any mistreatment of these POW's could only lead to increased hatred and exacerbate a conflict already tragically difficult to resolve. The Israeli speak movingly of their conception of a peace that could include real friendship with the Arab states. Only this kind of peace is in the long-term interests of the U.S. too. Using POW's as pawns, threatening their indefinite detention and perhaps mistreatment, doesn't further the prospect of a long-term peace.

Third, the Geneva Conventions are a matter of international law. Perhaps above all

else the United States stands for a rule of law in the international area. It is that conception on which the treaties negotiated between the United States and the Soviet Union dealing with strategic weapons rests. That is the foundation of our efforts with regard to nuclear proliferation and atomic testing. The Geneva Conventions are no less international law than any of these other treaties. Like any rules of law, they do not depend for their force on the bargaining position of the parties at any particular time. They are intended to remove certain matters from the bargaining realm and have them decided once and for all by prior agreement.

If we stand with those who would treat the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war as nothing more than an expression of widely held opinion, perhaps like a resolution of the U.N. General Assembly, then we Americans are under-cutting the force of law in international relations. The United States government could not have been clearer on this issue when what was involved were American POW's. The question is the same when prisoners of war in the Middle East are involved. The question is whether international law has any force.

There is a final point that is important to make; it involves national integrity. The United States has, as I have said, stood firmly on the proposition that the handling of prisoners of war is not a matter for political negotiation at least when it involves parties who have agreed to the Geneva Convention. During the late 1960's, we went to nations that were unsympathetic to our policy in Southeast Asia and said to them:

"Whatever you may believe about the war in Vietnam, you have an obligation to support the rule of law as it is applied to prisoners of war."

The International Committee of the Red Cross is a small group of men wholeheartedly dedicated to the application of international rules protecting non-combatants. But it is a group without political influence, a group that is even reluctant to speak out clearly and forcefully on violations because of its fear that such statements may only result in weakening its hand as it tries to aid prisoners of war. The power of the rule of law in this area of common humanity depends upon nations which are not involved in a particular conflict taking a firm and outspoken position behind the Geneva Conventions. When it was our citizens that were involved, we felt it was right to remind other nations of these facts. What credibility will we have in the future if we do not now take the position that we urged on uninvolved nations during the Vietnam war?

It is crucial that we show that we are not a country that asserts its rights under international law but is indifferent to the application of law when the rights of other people are in issue. I deeply believe that we are a country of humanity and that we are a country devoted to law and principle. If we are, our course of action in the present situation is perfectly clear. We must say to the Arab government—and, if it ever proves necessary, to Israel too—that prisoners of war are not a political pawn and that rules of law made for times of conflict do not disappear on the very occasion of conflict to which they are supposed to apply. We must speak out for the exchange of sick and wounded, for the exchange of all prisoners of war, and in the meantime for the protections against mistreatment that are represented by full lists of prisoners and complete rights of access to prisoners by the International Committee of the Red Cross. Our position on mistreatment of prisoners cannot be equivocal. What is at stake is our humanity, our principles, and our basic integrity as much as the lives and welfare of Israeli prisoners of war.

ALLENDE AND CHILE

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a gentleman in Chile concerning the events that have been transpiring in Chile during the last few months.

I found his letter most interesting and informative and want to take this time to share it with my colleagues. It follows:

CENTRO DE DIFUSION CRISTIANA,
Santiago, Chile.

Honorable BEN B. BLACKBURN:

As a long time resident of Chile, I would like to share some insights into the events that have been transpiring in Chile during the last few months. I feel this need because of the move by Mr. Edward Kennedy and other U.S. Senators to have economic aid cut off to Chile "until the civil rights of Chileans have been restored." I believe this move is due to a false understanding of what the supposed Chilean democracy has been like during the last three years, and also to what I consider to be very distorted reporting on the part of the American press.

I ask you to take into consideration some of the things that took place during the three years of the Allende government.

1. Mr. Allende was elected by a minority, about one third of the popular vote. He never ruled as President of Chile, but rather as President of his political party.

2. Unlike traditional political parties in a democracy, Mr. Allende sought to gain total power over the Chilean Republic in the following ways:

a. Bank credits from nationalized banks determined which businesses and industries would survive or die according to their utility to the Allende regime.

b. The land reform program, instead of giving the peasant land, made him an employee of the State.

c. In the government-controlled industries party membership was a pre-requisite to employment, and learning of Marxist doctrine was important in keeping one's job. Thousands of professional people and technicians, who could not fit into the system, joined the ranks of the unemployed and thousands more were forced to leave their homeland to make a life somewhere else. Meanwhile, the government continued to create artificial conflicts in private industries, sending in government mediators which eventually recommended their becoming part of the national domain, steadily decreasing a citizen's right to be employed where he was not fitted into a Marxist mold.

3. Mr. Allende ruled a democracy of which the Executive Branch formed only one part. However, he ignored the Congress and attacked the Justice Department as a tool of the bourgeois system.

4. The so-called educational reform system that the government sought to impose on all levels of the educational system was designed to indoctrinate the student only according to Marxist philosophy.

5. No Chilean escaped suffering the government control of consumer goods. Since things such as television sets and refrigerators were no longer sold on the open market, they had to be gotten through factory organizations who charged not only in currency but in ideological faithfulness. Those who did not have access to these items through government sources were forced to buy them through the government-created black market, which sold for as much as 400% more which meant that the majority of the people were unable to buy.

The government solution to the 6, 24, and 48 hour lines for basic food products such as bread, milk, meat, and sugar was rationing. The rationing cards were given out, a card for each item, by Marxist-controlled organizations. To get these cards the person had to submit himself to the scrutiny of the organizational representative, who surveyed the number of members in the family, the number of rooms in the house, and the political beliefs of its members.

6. The chaos in the Chilean economy was not due to the boycott on the part of the Chilean businessmen or even to the incredible inefficiency of the Allende government. It was due to the communist doctrine that you must completely destroy the nation's bourgeois economy to put it back together again according to Marxist norms.

7. Mr. Allende was an intimate friend of Fidel Castro. In a plan to take over the government totally for the Marxist, Allende's party elaborated the intricate "Plan Z," which was to be carried out according to the Cuban model, assassinating those elements within the Armed Forces not favorable to the government. The amount of arms from Russia and other socialist countries would have been completely adequate to outfit any number of regiments. This plan was backed by hundreds of citizens from Marxist countries who taught the use of arms and revolutionary tactics.

The history of the Chilean Armed Forces has been loyalty to the elected government. It was no different during the Allende regime. The Armed Forces had given the government a more complete backing than any other government before, repeatedly serving in the ministries and many other government posts. They were obedient to the civil authorities even when Allende repeatedly humiliated high officers by asking for their resignations from their posts and then requiring them to resign from the military.

Finally when Chile had become completely broken economically, socially and morally with no hope for recovery, the military felt obligated to intervene. From the vantage point of another country the new government undoubtedly must seem highly restrictive. One must take into account, however, that every bone in the institutional body was broken. Someone had to put on the cast.

Mr. Allende's government was part of the international communist propaganda machine whose aim is to deface the image of the U.S. around the world. For three years on Chilean radio, press, and TV, the Allende government portrayed the U.S. as the imperialist monster who was responsible for the ills of Chile and for those of all underdeveloped nations around the world. My country has made grave errors in its foreign policy and in the way that it has allowed its businessmen to behave themselves in other countries, but I believe that the Marxist portrayal of us is untrue. The new Chilean government is a friend of the U.S. and a salvation to Chile. It deserves much more consideration than it has received.

Respectfully yours,

JEFF MYERS.

THE TUSOCK MOTH EPIDEMIC

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier today of my legislation, H.R. 10796, to transfer authority over pesticides used on agricultural and forest lands against insect infestations from

the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to the Secretary of Agriculture. In speaking of this legislation, I briefly discussed one of the most dramatic facets of the problem which has prompted this general legislation—the devastating infestation of the tussock moth in the Pacific Northwest States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

To better acquaint the Members with the severity of the problem in the Northwest regarding this insect infestation, which can only be brought under control through the use of DDT, I would like to insert in the record the written text of an informational brochure, "The Tussock Moth Epidemic." This information was collected and published by the National Forest Products Association in an effort to show the disastrous effect that a localized insect infestation has on the economic and environmental well-being of all Americans.

There being no objection, the text is as follows:

THE TUSOCK MOTH EPIDEMIC—WHY CHEMICALS ARE NEEDED TO CONTROL FOREST PESTS

Insects are everywhere in the forest. They are part of the natural forest environment, like the rain and the sun. As the forest grows, dies, decays and regenerates, insects play out their roles in the whole, grand, natural order of the miracle of things that live.

But when, by some quirk, the numbers of insects suddenly multiply to enormous proportions, what was once normal becomes very bad. Destruction can be awesome when insect populations surge to epidemic heights.

That is what is happening now, in forests on both coasts of the United States, the inter-mountain region and the South. Insect epidemics have struck, and at a time when pressure against man's management of nature has created public policies restricting the use of insecticides that are the only hope of checking the outbreaks. Well-intentioned caution against the use of chemicals to control forest pests, aimed at improving the quality of our life, is achieving the directly opposite effect.

Millions of trees are being destroyed by the western spruce budworm in the Northern Rockies, the mountain pine beetle in Yellowstone Park, the southern pine beetle in the South, the gypsy moth in the Northeast, and the tussock moth in the Pacific Northwest.

Interim control measures have consistently failed because no effective alternatives to DDT and other proven insecticides have been found. Most new chemical and biological control alternatives are only experimental. Consequently, premature moratoriums on the use of proven chemicals have left pest control vacuums soon filled by insect epidemics.

The tussock moth alone is destroying forests throughout a 1,400 square mile area in Oregon, Washington and Idaho. The governors involved, as well as other leaders, warn that action is urgently needed this fall to make DDT available on a standby basis in case it is needed next spring to fight this record-setting tussock moth epidemic.

The tussock moth story illustrates both the gravity and the impact of not having control methods available.

EPIDEMIC EXPLODES

The current tussock moth infestation was at a virtually undetectable level in 1971. But it exploded during 1972 to defoliate 196,000 acres in the evergreen forests of eastern Oregon and Washington. Seeing the infestation spread wildly, the governments of Oregon and Washington joined the Forest Service in asking the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for permission to use DDT on an "if needed" basis. DDT is at present the only effective anti-tussock moth chemical

suitable for large-scale aerial application to forestland.

William Ruckelshaus, then EPA administrator, denied the requests in April 1973, saying "the benefits do not outweigh the risks." He based his refusal largely on the EPA decision that the infestation would not do significant additional damage and would collapse in 1973 due to a natural virus that attacks and eventually destroys most tussock moth flare-ups.

But the epidemic did not collapse. Instead, the area of infestation trebled during the summer and spread into Idaho. Visible defoliation now covers more than 650,000 acres in the three states—an area nearly the size of Rhode Island. Already it is the largest tussock moth epidemic ever recorded, and no end is in sight.

To most residents of the infested area, the benefit-risk balance scales tipped far over in favor of emergency use of DDT long ago. Close to a billion board feet of mature trees have been killed since the epidemic began. And this does not include the massive loss of young trees under 40 years old for which no figures are available. The forests in the area have been set back half a century, and the economy dealt a staggering blow.

VORACIOUS DEFOLIATOR

The life cycle of the tussock moth (so called because of the larva's tufts or tussocks) begins in mid-May or early June when tiny caterpillars only 1/8-inch long emerge from egg clusters deposited the previous fall. These lightweight larvae are covered with long hairs, enabling the wind to carry them long distances. The larvae begin eating immediately, and continue eating through five to seven moltings until late July or early August when they reach their full size of about 1 1/4 inches and enter their pupal or "resting" stage. The larvae wrap themselves in cocoons from which they emerge 10 to 18 days later as moths. The wingless female moths immediately mate with the winged males, then lay clusters of about 250 eggs, attaching them to the cocoons from which they emerged. The adult moths do not eat. They die shortly after mating.

Since the major dispersal of tussock moth populations is by windborne larvae, chemical control measures must be taken as soon after hatching as possible to contain an infestation.

The larvae prefer to live and eat in Douglas-fir, grand fir and white fir trees. But they will feed on many other trees and shrubs after consuming these, particularly ponderosa pine, sub-alpine fir and spruce. The new larvae begin by eating the buds and tender new needles in tree crowns and branch-tips. The older needles, lower down, are consumed either as the larvae grow, or during subsequent years of an infestation. However, during a tussock moth epidemic entire trees are often defoliated in one summer.

FOREST DEVASTATION

A single defoliation is usually all that is needed to kill an evergreen tree. A partial defoliation stunts growth and weakens the tree so that it is susceptible to killing by subsequent attacks of other insects and disease. Reduction of future regeneration is an even more insidious consequence of the epidemic. The buds from which the seed cones develop grow in the crowns or on the tips of branches where the insects attack first. Thus, cone development is severely retarded or terminated in the early stages of a tussock moth epidemic. Young trees, with new, tender needles, are also early victims. Such damage to forest regeneration may not be evident immediately, but will become all too real within a few years as new growth lags and future productivity falls far behind.

The Forest Service estimates that nearly 700 million board feet of mature timber was killed during the past summer. This is al-

most four times the timber loss EPA said it expected when it denied emergency use of DDT last spring. Timber loss during the past two summers now totals about 800 million board feet. And these totals do not include the vast numbers of young trees below the age of 40 killed by the larvae, since the figures were developed in planning salvage operations of the mature timber.

Salvage operations are underway as lumber companies hurry to move the moth-killed timber into sawmills before it rots. White fir, which makes up the majority of the present kill, must be salvaged within a year and a half after dying.

Mills in the area are working at full capacity to handle the salvage operations. But there is so much dead timber, with about a third of it inaccessible, that most of it may not be salvaged in time. Further, the future capacity of the damaged forests to support mills in the area has already been dealt a stunning blow.

Experts estimate that the insect epidemic has set back forest management in the region some 30 to 60 years. They say that damage thus far will require expenditures for reforestation alone of an estimated \$25 million by public and private landowners over a 20-year period. The Forest Service says that \$17 million will be needed just during the next six years for reforestation and fire hazard reduction.

But commercial timber losses are only part of the values threatened while the infestation expands unchecked. An insect-infested forest is an eyesore. The dead and dying trees turn reddish-brown and finally gray as they are completely defoliated. Ultimately, they give the forest a sepulchral appearance. Wildlife habitats are seriously damaged as natural cover falls victim to the insects and wildlife needing dense forest cover either declines or moves elsewhere. Recreational values are disrupted for decades.

The risks are further inflated by a dramatic increase in the danger of forest fires. The Forest Service has stationed extra fire-fighting personnel and equipment throughout the infested area. So far, they have been involved in two large wildfires that burned out of control. The Forest Service reports that "there is no question (the tussock moth) was a very significant factor" in contributing to "the size of these fires and control difficulties." As more trees die and the explosively inflammable debris builds up, the threat of uncontrolled wildfires will increase.

PUBLIC HEALTH HAZARD

The infestation also poses a public health hazard. Allergic reactions in humans to the body hairs of the larvae cause painful welts, itching rashes and breathing difficulties. The hairs, which characterize the tussock moth and provide it with protection against predators, cover its cocoons and egg masses. The hairs set loose in the five to seven moltings are often carried great distances by the wind.

The allergy problem is particularly acute for loggers when these hairs fly all about them as infested trees are felled. Logging companies have reported that 75 to 90 percent of the logging crews, road crews, truck drivers, foresters and scalers needed for salvage operations are susceptible to varying degrees of irritation. Employees have quit rather than work in infested areas, and logging contractors have had difficulty assembling crews for salvage operations.

CONTROL ALTERNATIVES

A virus disease (nuclear polyhedrosis virus) that attacks the larvae and pupae has proven to be the most effective naturally occurring control of tussock moth epidemics. It normally appears during the third year of an infestation and causes a dramatic collapse of the insect population. However, the virus does not always follow this pattern, as illustrated by its failure to fulfill predictions of such a collapse during the past summer.

The Forest Service says that once the rate of virus incidence achieves 30 percent, the insect infestation of such a virus-infected area is on the verge of immediate collapse. The virus was on the rise this summer in many sectors, combining with starvation and natural parasites to kill large numbers of the larvae in defoliated areas where the outbreak is several years old. The epidemic may well have run its course in these areas. But hundreds of thousands of acres that were infested for the first time in 1973 have little, if any, indication of virus. Therefore, even if the infestation collapses from virus in some sectors, the epidemic could still keep spreading in other areas. The extent to which the virus has developed will not be known conclusively until next spring when the egg masses can be analyzed for virus.

Following the recommendations of EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus to "formulate an action plan based in the use of available chemical methods, other than DDT, that could be put into operation on an immediate emergency basis," the Forest Service has been testing four insecticides—Zectran, Dylox, Sevin 4-Oil and Bioethanomethrin—and two biological agents—the natural virus and a bacteria called Dipel (*bacillus thuringiensis*).

The Inter-Agency Tussock Moth Steering Committee, made up of representatives from the Forest Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Oregon State University and the forestry departments of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, reports that both the biological controls have been highly successful in killing the larvae in test plots. But neither can be made available in sufficient quantity next year to be effective. There are also difficulties with application techniques that must be solved before large-scale use.

Of the insecticides, Zectran received the most extensive testing. It has only a 48-hour effective life. It had previously proved effective against the spruce budworm, and showed some promise against the tussock moth. About 70,000 infested acres were treated with a double application of Zectran that killed large numbers of the moth—but not enough to halt the epidemic. The more limited tests of the other insecticides showed similar results. The Inter-Agency Committee recently reported: "Results of the tests in Oregon and Washington show that all the chemicals killed considerable numbers of tussock moth larvae, but none reduced the population sufficiently to prevent severe defoliation and tree mortality."

The heavier the infestation, the higher the insect kill must be in order to reduce the insect density to a safe level of approximately two larvae per square foot of foliage. In the hardhit areas, this may mean a kill of as much as 99 percent is needed. Although all the chemicals showed enough promise to warrant continued testing in 1974, none are ready for operational use next year.

DDT MAY BE NEEDED

Therefore, if the natural virus does not increase enough by next spring to halt the epidemic, the only way to control the outbreak will be with DDT.

Several tussock moth epidemics already have been successfully controlled by DDT. A chapter on the tussock moth in the Forest Service book *Insect Enemies of Western Forests* tells how a 1946-47 outbreak covering about 500,000 acres in Oregon, Washington and Idaho "might have destroyed nearly two billion board feet of timber had it not been brought under control with aerial spraying on a vast scale." In this case, the Forest Service used "airplane spraying with one pound of DDT in one gallon oil carrier per acre, applied to 413,469 acres.

In a 1965 outbreak, near Rattlesnake Creek in eastern Oregon, helicopters were used to

spray 66,000 acres of forest with .75 pound of DDT mixed in one gallon hydrocarbon solvent and No. 2 fuel oil at an application rate of only 12 oz. per acre. The successful results were closely monitored to determine residue levels.

The Forest Service reported in the June, 1972 issue of *Pesticides Monitoring Journal*: "Surveillance operations by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife indicated that the DDT spraying had little effect on the waters and organisms of Malheur Lake, toward which Rattlesnake Creek flows. Levels of total DDT accumulation in the food chain of Rattlesnake Creek were very low in all components of the sampled community." More specifically, the article said, "DDT residues in the forest floor decreased steadily with time, and at the end of 3 years, more than half the DDT originally added had disappeared." It further noted that "DDT did not leach from the forest floor to underlying mineral soil," and that in the streamwater samples "the maximum total DDT concentration found over a period of 3½ years after spraying was 0.277 parts per billion," with most samples containing "concentrations of DDT near the lower limit of detection." This concentration is far below the conservative limit of five parts per million (or 5000 ppb) established by the Food and Drug Administration as a totally safe tolerance level.

With this sort of concrete evidence, the cities of Walla Walla, Washington, and Milton-Freewater, Oregon, petitioned EPA in May for the limited use of DDT to protect their watersheds from denuding by insect damage and probable wildfire. The cities judged that EPA's concern over watershed contamination, cited as a risk in EPA's refusal to permit the emergency use of DDT, was a minor consideration compared with the harsh realities of watershed damage. Supporting the cities' judgment were the findings of federal examiner Edmund Sweeney, whose conclusions in April, 1972, after seven months of hearings and 8,900 pages of testimony on DDT, included: "DDT is extremely low in acute toxicity to man. DDT is not a carcinogenic hazard (cancer) to man. DDT is not a mutagenic or teratogenic hazard (mutation) to man. DDT is not a safety hazard to man when used as directed."

ACTION NEEDED NOW

DDT may not be needed next spring to control the tussock moth. But what if the natural virus does not increase enough to stop the epidemic?

A survey of egg masses to determine the size and severity of next year's tussock moth population is now underway and should be completed by December. However, there is no way to know conclusively until next spring whether or not this population will be controlled by the virus and further damage minimized.

To make DDT ready in case it is needed, the wheels must start rolling soon. Months of extensive preparation are required to have a safe and effective spraying program. The DDT orders must be placed and the chemical produced. Then it must be delivered to the sites and prepared for mixing. The spraying logistics must be carefully developed, and equipment collected and made ready. All this must take place before the eggs hatch so that the spraying operation can move quickly during the critical application period of late May and early June of 1974.

No carte blanche permission is being sought for indiscriminate spraying. Better equipment and increasingly sophisticated techniques make the application of pesticides more effective and less hazardous than ever before. But time is a crucial factor. Permission is needed soon to start getting the DDT ready, or it will be too late again.

Requests to EPA for authorization to use DDT next spring on an "if needed" basis may soon be renewed. But there are many who fear EPA may not reverse its position, regardless of the evidence.

There is certainly precedent for EPA approval of the use of DDT. Shortly after petitions for its use against the tussock moth were denied, EPA approved a request to use DDT against the pea leaf weevil on 125,000 acres in eastern Washington and Idaho. This is the only limited use registration of DDT to be granted by EPA since it cancelled nearly all DDT uses in December, 1972. EPA permitted the spraying of 0.9 pound of DDT per acre—a heavier application than is recommended to control the tussock moth.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY

There are many who feel that the timber loss due to the tussock moth epidemic was and is far more disastrous than any possible damage caused by use of DDT. Both Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz and Secretary of Interior Rogers C. B. Morton, following recent visits to the devastated forests, have pledged their support of efforts to get DDT released for use in case it is needed.

And there is growing sentiment that Congress may have to step in to stop the senseless, needless destruction. Legislation has been introduced in both the House and Senate to make DDT and other chemicals available if they are needed for pest control. House hearings were quickly scheduled.

Senators Mark O. Hatfield (R-Ore.) and James A. McClure (R-Idaho) voiced deep concern when they wrote Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, asking for hearings on the tussock moth. They charged that the infestation "has not been dealt with in an adequate manner by the federal agencies," and said: "Because of the serious and damaging impact of the EPA decision on our public and private lands, and the probability of similar future decisions, we feel that oversight hearings by our Committee would be highly appropriate."

The tussock moth epidemic is a classic example of how well-intentioned environmental concern can go awry, resulting in far more environmental, economic and social damage than would have occurred otherwise. All forest chemicals—pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers—are affected by this growing problem of premature moratoriums on chemical use.

Already millions of dead trees litter thousands of square miles throughout the United States as mute reminders of well-intentioned neglect. Until adequate alternative methods and materials are developed to combat forest epidemics of insects and disease, unwarranted restrictions against the use of chemical tools will continue to foster the same kind of needless disasters.

QUOTATIONS

"But when you balance what you know the tussock moth can do against the probable effects of DDT, you can't do anything but come out for DDT." Robert H. Torheim, deputy regional forester, U.S. Forest Service, at a press conference on the tussock moth held August 28, 1973 in Portland, Ore.

"Without control, this thing can go on indefinitely. That's what scares me."—Kessler Cannon, assistant for natural resources to Oregon Governor Tom McCall.

"The gambling with this magnificent resource must be stopped."—Tom McCall, Governor of Oregon.

"You have to see it to believe it."—Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz.

"People around here were against stuff like DDT until the moth got their land. Now they don't care what it takes. They want this thing stopped."—John McGhehey, state forester for the La Grande, Oregon region.

TRIBUTE TO LUCIOUS SELMON,
ALL-AMERICAN

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the Second District of Oklahoma is a town named Eufaula. The town is named for an old Creek Indian town located on the Chattahoochee River in Alabama named Yufala, which means, we are told, in the Creek language, "They split up here and went to other places." Apparently the Creeks did not mess around with unnecessary verbiage saying in six letters what it takes the white man nine words to convey.

Eufaula, in Oklahoma, was one of the earlier establishments in Indian Territory with a post office opening February 6, 1874. In the intervening 99 plus years, many people and products have come from Eufaula, but none have brought such fame, such honor, and such glory as three brothers, one-third of the children of Mr. and Mrs. Lucious Selmon, who farmed 160 acres of land near Eufaula, until his retirement about 7 years ago.

Mr. Selmon is 5-foot-4. His wife, Jessie, is 5-foot-5. The Selmon family is highly respected in the McIntosh county seat town because of their application to hard work, their diligence in raising their nine children, and their instilling into the children the desire to achieve.

December 15 will be a big day in Eufaula for it is that day when Lucious Selmon the younger will be honored. The Governor of the State of Oklahoma will be there, we are told, along with Senator BARTLETT, Lt. Gov. George Nigh, and myself if Congress has adjourned, among others.

Lucious Selmon has been described by the University of Oklahoma football Coach Barry Switzer as the finest down lineman he has ever coached. Coach Switzer says that the 5-foot-11, 240-pound Lucious should not only be a strong candidate for the Outland Trophy, but for the Heisman Trophy as well, if the Heisman is ever awarded to a lineman.

It was Lucious, the All-American, flanked to the left and right by his "little" brothers, tackles LeRoy, 6-foot-2, 250 pounds, and Dewey, 6-foot-1, 245 pounds, who spent about as much time in the backfield of OU's foe last Friday, November 23, as did the opponent's quarterback. Out of compassion to our friends and colleagues from the great State of Nebraska, I will decline to mention the fact that the final score, 27-0 was the first time that foe had been zipped since 1968, if we are to believe the news media. Incidentally, the win gave OU the Big Eight title and moved the Sooners into second place in the national standings.

For those of you who are knowledgeable about football statistics, let me cite a few about Lucious without boring you: he has broken up five passes, dumped the quarterback for losses eight times, caused

two fumbles and recovered two fumbles; he has made 56 unassisted tackles and a total of 92 tackles and in addition to his other honors, he has been named All Big Eight twice. Lucious Selmon is much of a man and much of an athlete.

On December 15 in Eufaula, there will be a street named for Lucious Selmon. It will be Selmon Drive. There will be a parade, laughing and joy unbridled, feasting, and festivities, bringing honor to the brothers Selmon and their parents.

All three of the brothers were All State running backs. They are agile and fast according to Coach Switzer and as those of you who were fortunate enough to see them on television Friday can attest; the last time OU will be seen on TV for 2 years.

Lucious, a modest man, says the brothers gained much of their strength by pushing a plow behind a mule on their farm.

Recalls Lucious:

We always had bad fences that helped—agility and speed—because the hogs and cows were always getting loose. You get pretty quick chasing those hogs and cows. If we had had good fences, we probably would not be as quick as we are now.

Mary Rule, editor of the Indian Journal, has this to say:

Lucious Selmon Day should be great in our little town (population 2,355) on December 15th. Along with the three Selmons, Lucious, Dewey and LeRoy, many dignitaries are expected and invited to take part in the great celebration. If you have not been fortunate enough to meet and visit with Mr. Selmon, their mother, you've missed something. She's a great lady."

Of the Selmon family, Eufaula citizens say the black family had the respect of the predominantly white community before the trio's football heroics.

Says Associate District Judge Marshall Warren, a long time friend of the family:

It's just a fine family. They have integrity, honesty, and intelligence. He characterized Lucious, the player, as a tremendous individual. He just doesn't talk about football. He talks about world problems. He has a lot of compassion for others. He's majoring in special education and he likes to work with kids.

Overall, I think this town is as proud of those three boys as any one could be. Mention the name Selmon is like mentioning Eufaula now. Or maybe it's the other way around.

Lucious Selmon takes the accolades in stride. He recalls that farm life was not easy, but has nothing but kind words for Eufaula and its citizenry. Lucious said as Ron Jenkins, AP sports writer, records—

It wasn't an easy life. Being a farm boy, there was a lot of hard work. But as far as being black, I think we were treated pretty equally by the people of Eufaula. That's really true.

Mr. Speaker, I think it only fitting that a street be named Selmon Drive because the brothers Selmon have opened up enough holes in their opponents lines, to drive several diesel rigs through, naturally at 50 miles per hour.

And, to paraphrase the Creek tongue, the Selmon's have "split them up and made them go to other places." I understand that if Lucious gets the Chevrolet scholarship one more time, they are going to make him General Motors chairman of the board.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this tribute, not only to these great and honored athletes, but to their parents, their brothers, and sisters, their teachers, their coaches, and their friends and neighbors in Eufaula. Each one that touched their lives have had a small part in making them the men they are today.

Mr. Speaker, I share that pride.

VON BRAUN LOOKS TO BRING
POOREST OF POOR EDUCATION
BY SATELLITE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the October 4, 1973, Sentinel Star of Orlando, Fla., carried an article about Wernher von Braun and pointed out some of the benefits we derive from our space program.

The article carries comments that von Braun made at the keynote address to the American Society of Photogrammetry's convention last month. I recommend the article to fellow Members and to the general public.

The article follows:

VON BRAUN LOOKS TO BRING POOREST OF POOR EDUCATION BY SATELLITE
(By Bill Osinski)

Wernher von Braun, the man who led America in its reach for the stars, said Wednesday he was "gratified" by his new challenge of bringing education by satellite to the "poorest of the poor."

As the former director of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., Von Braun helped develop the Saturn 5 moon rocket, but now he is trying to bring literacy to the most isolated spots on earth.

Von Braun said a global satellite network that can beam basic education to areas unserved even by roads is the "only solution" for developing nations with high illiteracy rates.

"It's no good to give a man a bag of fertilizer, only to have him eat it because he can't read the label," Von Braun said.

In what he described as the "ultimate" in communications satellite technology, places like rural India, Eskimo villages and American Indian reservations could receive satellite programs with devices much like standard television antennas.

He depicted open-air classrooms fed by the satellite with children's and adult programming that could penetrate regions where formal training is impossible.

"We were often attacked in manned space flight for doing costly things only for the rich few," Von Braun said, "but now the space program is providing solutions for the poorest of the poor—and it is their only solution."

Von Braun's remarks were part of an overall report on space technology he gave as the keynote address to the American Society of Photogrammetry convention being held at

the Walt Disney World Contemporary Resort Hotel.

Speaking at times as if he were still part of the NASA team he left in 1972 for private industry, Von Braun was optimistic on the future of an American space program currently beset by funding and manpower cutbacks.

He said he regarded the success of the first two Skylab missions as a milestone in the history of manned space flight that has already exceeded NASA's expectations.

"Maybe we've all been too conservative," he said, commenting on the apparently excellent condition of the Skylab crew recently returned from 59 days in space.

Von Braun also listed several "major" innovations of America's Space Shuttle program, designed to utilize reusable, airplane-like vehicles in orbit by 1978. These included:

Cost savings—For nonrecoverable space vehicles, the pricetag is \$1,000 per pound of payload, but the Space Shuttle costs are estimated at about \$160 per pound, he said.

Last-Minute rejects—For prior satellites, the ability to function was not known until after it was launched, he said. Sometimes, a failure resulted in a "\$10 million piece of orbiting junk," he said. However, he said, the Space Shuttle can take a satellite up and, if it malfunctions, the Shuttle pilots can then take it back and tell the contractor the thing doesn't work. Von Braun called this pricing policy of paying only for successes "F.O.B. Orbit."

Passenger capability—Extra room in the Shuttle plane will enable several non-astronauts to go along, he said. Such passengers might be "anybody who could fly on an airliner," he said. In the past, Von Braun said, such a policy was impossible, "because we couldn't have any half-astronauts."

The only drawback to the Shuttle, from the pilots' viewpoint, is the fact that the returnable plane does not have the capability to make a second pass at its landing strip, he said.

However, he said, special computer controls and a 15,000-foot runway should solve any potential problems.

Von Braun also discussed current benefits being derived from NASA's unmanned Earth Resources Technology Satellites (ERTS). Existing data is being analyzed to survey crops, locate fish concentrations and search for deposits of minerals and oil.

Pinpointing the extent of a nation's natural resources has caused some developing countries to become "uneasy about others knowing how rich they are." Since the nation that controls the satellite is the one with the knowledge, there is a question about which countries to give the data to, he said.

"At the moment, our policy is to tell nobody," Von Braun said. "But that brings up the question why did we do it in the first place?"

He said the United Nations has formed special committees for such problems.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, during our Thanksgiving recess, Americans of Latvian origin and Latvians all over the world observed the 55th anniversary of the declaration of Latvian independence in 1918. In that

year, the Latvian people, after several centuries of foreign domination, finally had a chance to take their rightful place among the free nations of the world. A period of economic and cultural growth followed and the Latvians were able to enjoy the happiest period of their history as masters of their own state and carvers of their own destiny. In the first two decades the nation proved its ability to govern and became a responsible member of the community of nations.

However, this period of independence was brief. It was the invasion of Poland, resulting from the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact in August of 1939 that provided the springboard from which the Russian Communists launched their attack against the sovereignty of Latvia and the other Baltic States.

On June 17, 1940, the Russians presented Latvia with an ultimatum. This was followed by invasion, breaking the existing peace treaty of 1920 and the mutual assistance pact of 1939. Since that time the Russian domination and exploitation of the Baltic countries has represented the most flagrant case of Russian imperialism and colonialism in an age in which the principles of self-determination of nations prevails throughout the free world. Expropriation, exploitation, russification, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms and terrorism are the marks of Soviet occupation in Latvia.

Shortly after the annexation of Latvia, the Soviets perpetrated one of history's great frauds and held "elections" under the guns of the Red army. An incorporation of Latvia into the Soviet Union followed. To change a nation's constitution, while under occupation is a severe crime under international law. A year later, thousands of Latvians were deported to various parts of the Soviet Union, mainly Siberia. Supplementing the deportations, the Soviets pursued a policy of colonization of Latvia with Russians. This served as a method of changing the ethnic composition of the country.

Despite the captivity in which the Latvians now live, the Latvian people remain dedicated to the cause of the restoration of their freedom. There is still evidence that the desire for freedom along the Baltic persists even now, more than three decades after Stalin's shameless and brutal conquest.

The Government of the United States has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by the Russians. This principle must be carried through in the European Security Conference. In this conference the Russian aim is to get a broad generalized declaration that would ratify the postwar division in Europe. The Americans and the other free nations shall never agree to such a declaration.

On the 55th anniversary of Latvian Independence Day, Latvians fervently appealed to the United States and the other governments and peoples of the free world for help in restoring freedom and independence to Latvia.

A MODEST PROPOSAL CONCERNING GASOLINE RATIONING

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Robert J. Long of Southeast Missouri State University in my district has brought to my attention some thought provoking concepts relating to our fuel shortage and resultant rationing that may ensue. Below are his comments which I wish to share with my colleagues:

A MODEST PROPOSAL CONCERNING GASOLINE RATIONING

(By Robert J. Long, Ph. D.)

There are, at the present time, various proposals for gasoline rationing in the United States in the face of an apparent gasoline shortage and, that some action be taken pursuant to this problem, appears to be almost a certainty. It is therefore appropriate to mention some ideas on such rationing.

A great majority of non-socialist economists believe, consistent with their belief in the supremacy of the price system, that the price system is the best rationing device that exists. We maintain that uncontrolled prices will limit the amount of gasoline demanded by virtue of the income restraint of the buyers. Rationing becomes essential only when maximum prices are imposed upon a commodity and, further, that such price controls should be only a temporary measure. It is incidentally noted that, in general, a "black market" will tend to develop for such price controlled and rationed commodities.

The one thing generally noted about price controls and rationing of a positive nature is that such a system will prevent the limited amounts supplied from being bought almost exclusively by high income individuals. To a great extent, therefore, a ration system is aimed at "social justice" rather than the immediate need to reduce the consumption of the rationed commodity.

The fact that certain persons by reason of geographic location, occupation, and other factors affecting the amount of gasoline essential to the individual is not ignored. The World War II rationing system with its A, B, C, etc., stickers and associated ration books was designed to compensate for these factors.

The World War II system of gasoline rationing did not work completely without abuse and no system can be expected to work perfectly. Things have naturally changed in the many years since World War II and, with respect to some of these changes, any new rationing system should and can to some extent be reckoned with.

The first outstanding characteristic differing of modern times is the large number of better highways in existence. It is generally believed that the price we pay for public highways, like many public services, is not high enough. It would be rational for the government to substantially raise the gasoline excise tax. Allowing some normal market type rise in prices, this increased tax would prevent the oil companies from becoming the exclusive benefactors of such rising prices.

A second major change since World War II is the rise in the number of automobiles and the changed character of automobile engines. Some automobiles simply require more gasoline per mile to operate than do others.

It seems that a rationing system of a more modern nature, rather than a simple return to the World War II system, is in order. On

the basis of sound automotive engineers' advice, all automobiles could be classified according to technological characteristics which affect their fuel consumption per mile. Assuming that the engineers could classify automobiles into three such classes, each automobile could then be assigned accordingly with a corresponding designation such as A, B, and C. This would to some extent correspond to the quality of gasoline required for the proper performance of such autos' engines. It could then be required that automobile owners purchase the class gasoline established for them or a higher grade.

Pursuant to the above and as a temporary measure, the price control board could set price ceilings and floors on the different grades of gasoline. However, the price ceilings could be set at a very high price with a significant differential in price between the grades of gasoline (for example \$0.75 for the lowest grade, \$1.25 for the middle grade and \$2.00 for the highest grade).^{*} Such a system would have little if no effect on the free-enterprise system of pricing and the economy could operate within the normal market framework.

Unfortunately some cases may have to be given special consideration such as increased allocations for those who must travel extensively in their work or decreased allocations for multi-car families where only one person is gainfully employed. In general, however, such a system would provide the necessary rationing within a framework more similar to the free market rather than one of a retreat to the outdated system of World War II.

EVIDENCE OF SOVIET MISSILE SUPERIORITY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Alsop, one of the Nation's most highly respected and consistently accurate commentators on defense strategies, has published an analysis, carried today as an editorial through the Los Angeles Times News syndicate, showing convincing evidence that the Soviet Union possesses an unmistakable superiority in offensive nuclear missiles.

There are several things distressing about what this article brings to the attention of this House and the Nation:

First, the United States, in a decade-long shift—from missile superiority, then to parity, then to sufficiency, then to inferiority—has sacrificed the most vital ingredient of preserving peace, that ingredient being adequate military preparedness through first strike capability. The deterrents to the Soviet Union launching a nuclear attack shrink in light of their superiority.

Second, while the United States followed the spirit and the letter of the SALT agreements, the Soviet Union violated both its spirit and letter by deploying five new types of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Third, while we are continuing to negotiate an even more stringent arms limitation treaty, in good faith not violating

^{*}Such figures are arbitrary and real differentials would have to be on a percentage basis.

the spirit or letter of even the first, the Soviet Union continues on a "business as usual" buildup of arms.

Fourth, the American people really have no idea of how bad our military posture is.

Mr. Speaker, I call this to the attention of my colleagues and the people of this Nation who understand well the lessons of history—that arms inferiority is not the road to peace.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 28, 1973]

THE UNITED STATES-SOVIET MISSILE GAP

(By Joseph Alsop)

Readers who dare to give themselves a fairly ugly reality test are hereby invited to do so. You are not living in the real world of 1973, if you are either shocked or surprised by any of the following propositions.

First, the talk of Soviet strategic "parity" with this country is plain garbage. In nuclear strategic weapons, the Soviets are currently acquiring an enormous lead over the United States. If drastic measures are not taken soon, they will, in fact, enjoy potentially decisive nuclear-strategic superiority by the fairly early 1980s.

Second, the Soviet strategic lead mainly results from no less than five brand new intercontinental nuclear missiles, of far greater power and better design than those they had before. Two additional, still better new missiles are further predicted for testing in only two more years.

Third, for the above reasons, there was no foundation for the major American assumptions that made the first SALT agreement seem acceptable and safe.

If you are one of those who hold that the United States can prudently allow decisive nuclear-strategic superiority to pass to the Soviets, this is rather obviously a report to skip. For those who hold the contrary view, however, the foregoing propositions are easy enough to prove from facts no longer disputed, even within the more error-prone sectors of the U.S. intelligence community.

After the SALT agreement was safely signed and sealed, to begin with, the Soviets briskly began a long series of missile tests, which then revealed the new missiles they had been keeping up their sleeves. Each new land-based missile was thoughtfully designed to fit into the existing silos of one or another type of their existing missiles—thus circumventing the SALT rule against digging additional silos.

The SSX-16 will therefore replace the solid fueled SS-13. Either the SSX-17 or the SSX-19 will replace the Soviet Minuteman-type missile, the SSX-11. The SSX-18 will replace the Soviet monster-missile, the SS-9. Finally, there is the SSN-8, built for the new Soviet D-class nuclear submarine.

It is thought by many who think of such matters at all that the new missiles merely embody minor improvements on the missiles that they will replace. This again is garbage, but it is garbage with a highly significant origin. The error arises from the existence of permanent, ongoing design teams, who were responsible for the older missiles and have now produced the replacements.

The cost to the United States of maintaining so many competing design groups, all encouraged to produce prototypes of new missiles as often as they can make major advances, would be in the neighborhood of \$7 billion per annum. Even in research and development in the strategic field, in sum, the Soviets are investing at a rate that shows the grimmest seriousness of purpose.

As for the new missiles themselves, the land-based ones are uniformly much more powerful than their predecessors, and all four are provided with MIRVed warheads. In all but one case—one of the two competing replacements for the SS-11—the great gain

in power results from use of a "pop-up" launching system.

This permits the main rocket to ignite outside the silo, after the pop-up, which provides an immense gain in thrust for various technical reasons. With additional power thrust behind them, the new Soviet MIRVs are also radically different from our own MIRVed warheads. Ours have power that can be counted in kilotons, whereas the Soviet MIRVed warheads are all in the megaton range. Thus they are effective counter-force weapons—which ours are not.

Overall, deployment of the new missiles with their MIRVed warheads will increase the number of individually targetable Soviet warheads by somewhere between five and six times. As for the new sea-based SSN-8, finally, its novelty is its 4,000 mile range. This will allow nuclear submarines carrying this missile to lie in protected areas like the Bering Sea, there to lob their missiles at almost any major U.S. target with happy impunity.

The SALT assumptions were: a) that the Soviets would not get a sea-based missile with anything remotely resembling this range; b) that we had succeeded with MIRVing all our missiles, whereas the Soviets had failed; and c) that greater accuracy was another huge American advantage. The first and second assumptions have now proved dead wrong. And the third assumption about our accuracy is now meaningless, since it is canceled out by the vastly greater power of the Soviet warheads.

So there you have the facts. In a more rational America, these appalling facts would spur great national efforts. Instead, several members of the Senate Armed Forces Committee were downright angry when they were told the facts. They preferred no contact with the real world.

WHY ISN'T THERE MORE BLACK TELEVISION ON PUBLIC TELEVISION?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the only two programs on public television that are directed at a black audience have had their budgets slashed. "Soul," a quality black cultural program which has for 4 years enjoyed a national audience of over 7 million, has been canceled in favor of a pilot program dealing with various national races and cultures. "Black Journal," a program presenting black news and public affairs, has had its budget cut by one-half.

In essence, then, three-fourths of the total black programming of public television has been eliminated. Of \$215,000,000 authorized for public television and radio "Black Journal," now reduced to six shows a year, received approximately \$350,000.

Since blacks represent 20 percent of the total American population, I think public television has a responsibility to provide programming of interest to the black communities of this Nation.

Regarding this issue, Pamela Douglas has written an article for "The Black Scholar" analyzing the obstacles placed in the way of increased black programming on public television.

The article now follows:

[From the Black Scholar, September 1973]

BLACK TELEVISION: AVENUES OF POWER

(By Pamela Douglas)

(NOTE.—Pamela Douglas has written on media for Muhammad Speaks, the Sengstacke newspaper chain (Chicago Defender, Pittsburgh Courier, etc.), the Black Communicator, TV Guide, and other publications. Recently she has become Program Director at KVST-TV, an experiment in viewer-sponsored television in Los Angeles, due to begin broadcasting in September. She is also at work on a book on Black Television.)

Lately articles on minority access to television have begun appearing in some white periodicals. The impression given is that black efforts in television center on pestering powerful white institutions until they give up a little piece of the crust of the pie. Methods are said to range from begging to threatening and are intended to yield nothing more than a few jobs for a few minority-group people. This is not what the struggle is about now, and it has never been what the struggle is about.

In this article, we will try to set the record straight on a few of the prominent issues in black television. We will examine: public television, commercial television, black ownership of stations, cable television, and some projections for the future. Clearly, none of these subjects will be able to be dealt with in depth in this space, but the overview should at least provide a background for further discussion. In addition to the topics listed, at least four others which are vital will not be touched because justice could not be done to them in an article of this length. The omitted areas are: evaluation of specific programs both in terms of aesthetics and contents, including reviews of shows now on the air; issues for black children in children's television; regional and geographic problems and movements; and black communications organizations.

PUBLIC TELEVISION

The more than 30 million black people in the United States have already paid for public television and have long been owed a measure of control. It is owed to blacks because the public owns the airwaves; yet the air has been abused by stations that send signals over the black community aimed at whites on the periphery, rather than serving the black public. The second reason for the debt is that blacks have bought public television with their taxes. But despite the disproportionately high share of the taxes borne by black (and other poor) people, not one of the 230 public television stations has top black management, and of the 6,750 employees, only 14 "minority group" people (blacks, Spanish-surnamed or Orientals) are categorized as "officials and managers." In fact, the total minority employment had actually decreased from 12.1% in 1970 to 9.2% in 1972. In terms of programming, public television nationally carried one hour and a half per week of black shows (Soul and Black Journal) out of all its broadcast hours.

The full racist implications of this "crumbs" approach to black people were ignored by the administrators of public television as well as by the legislators who hold the power of the purse over public broadcasting. So in the summer of 1973 while the white liberals fought their "noble" battle to re-fund public broadcasting against the Nixon administration forces, very little was said about public broadcasting's debt to minorities and poor people. As a result, one day before the Senate committee approved the appropriation of funds, the members of the Black Congressional Caucus issued a resounding denouncement. Speaking for the Black Caucus, Rep. William Clay (D-Mo.) urged the defeat of the bill unless amendments were added to make public television stations more reflective of minority group interests in both programming and staffing.

To bring public television into a meaningful relationship to the black public, supporters of Black Journal presented "The Black Plan" at the National Association of Educational Broadcasters Convention in Las Vegas on Oct. 21, 1972. The group wants 22% of all funds to go to programming produced by blacks (11% for local programs and 11% for national programs). They also propose that 80% of the 22% of the budget allocated go to black affairs programming other than entertainment or "culture."

But the implications are broader than a request for a percent of the money. Ultimately the move could lead to mass popular control with never a purchase, opting for a pure assertion of rights. Tony Brown, Executive Producer of Black Journal, said, "I really see public television as an alternative. I do not see commercial television as a sufficient alternative for blacks because we'll never gain complete access (in view of the methods of financing commercial tv) . . . Yet, because of the traditional lack of information about public TV, blacks are losing out. Blacks could control public television stations."

What is needed is mass popular education to awaken blacks to take possession of their property. Preventing the movement are a few hard realities: In some geographic locations, public television can not be seen without an elaborate antenna. Second is a general disgust with public TV fare because of all the programming that is boring and irrelevant to blacks (like chess matches and symphony concerts). Rather than taking action to support the black shows that are on and trying to change or remove the others, the whole network is greeted with resignation. And this touches the third point, which is the apathy borne of ignorance and despair that has stood in the way of many potential revolutions before this one.

Nevertheless, a movement of larger proportions than is ever recognized by the white media has taken root. To understand this, it must be understood that Black Journal is not a TV show. It is an organizational focus for a black ideology, the visible tip of the iceberg. Without question it is watched and enjoyed as a weekly show, but below the surface are the support groups ("Friends of Black Journal") organized not only to help keep the program on the air but importantly to spread a philosophy and to become viable in their own right on communications issues and local programming.

Evolving from the riots of the late sixties and the mandates of the Kerner Commission, Black Journal became the one and only national black affairs show on either public or commercial TV in 1968. In 1973 it is still the one and only national black affairs show. The only difference is that in 1973 the danger of its being taken off the air is worse than it's ever been, though the danger was always present.

Tony Brown amplified the historical context: "With the rebellion phase, black programming was born as a response. Whites became guilty-terrified, or terrified-guilty, so they came up with the concept of black programming as a pacification instrument. Now we are at a phase of real conservatism called 'benign neglect.' Now, black programming is not viable because we aren't supposed to talk about being oppressed. I'm becoming more and more convinced that we are going to be further behind than we were when we started with rebellions."

The specific threat takes two forms: local stations not carrying the show sent to them from the Public Broadcasting Service, and the national elimination of the show by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), which funds a large percent of public television. In a number of cases, white station management would preview a Black Journal show and decide not to put it on because it

did not agree with their own white philosophies. In some areas, stations have blacked out the show altogether, and a challenge to the licenses of public TV stations in Alabama is currently pending on this basis. Commissioner Hooks warned station managers, "You can no longer because of your own racism, decide on your own that you're not going to have Black Journal because you don't like it."

The attempted national elimination of the show was more complex because it involved the projected total reorganization of public broadcasting, as mandated by the Nixon administration. In the early fall of 1972, PBS (the Public Broadcasting Service) complied its preliminary recommendations for what shows should be funded by CPB in the 1973-4 season. A confidential list divided all programs into four groups. Group I was what were called "programs with a proven record" for immediate funding. This included the children's shows like Sesame Street, Electric Circus, Mister Rogers, and so forth. Group II and Group III were considered shows with good ideas for which money should not be committed, but which should be held in reserve. Group IV were distant hopefuls. Soul was listed in Group IV—meaning that if this plan had gone through, the show would have been taken off the air. Black Journal didn't even make Group IV. Instead it was heaped into a "no designation" category with other so-called "public affairs" programs.

The reality is simply that the Nixon administration does not want public funds to support shows which criticize it, or which dispute America's apple-pie image. So all "public affairs" shows are potentially dangerous because they might produce critical thought. Enhancing the argument against funding these shows is the pinching off of money to public broadcasting in general—also accomplished by the Nixon administration in its veto of the public broadcasting bill earlier in the year. So by November, 1972, it seemed that serious black programming was doomed, with Black Journal worse off than Soul!

But instead of yielding, a massive campaign on the part of black people in every area of the country was launched, and the real story is not the story of one television show, but the story of how massive public organization and pressure can bring results. Into the campaign went the national Black Congressional Caucus, the Urban League, and several other national organizations, but most of all individual people who sent letters, stood on picket lines, made long distance calls to Washington, and all in all presented a united front to keep their national program on the air.

In St. Louis, a group called ACTION picketed the law offices of the Chairman of the Board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. In New York, a coalition of 300 grassroots organizations, called Black Citizens for Fair Media, issued a statement, "If Black Journal is in danger, all our other black programs are in danger. It's like the kingpin in bowling. When the kingpin is knocked down, the other pins will fall . . ." And this sentiment echoed in letters from blacks who had never participated in an effort like this before.

The result came in early January. The Board of the Corporation was meeting in Washington, with no intention to re-fund the show that day, and pickets appeared, chanting, outside the office. That very day, before any other renewals were announced, the Corporation refunded Black Journal. The New York Times reported "According to the CPB, Black Journal was renewed by the board on the basis of the show's popularity, mail from the viewers, and the recognition of the need for minority programming." No question remained that the power of the people was the only force that got the show renewed. (Despite this initial victory, Black

Journal's budget was subsequently reduced by more than one-half, so that its programming will be severely curtailed this Fall.)

No sooner was the Black Journal battle won, than it was discovered that Soul! was cancelled. Perhaps in faith that the high artistic quality of the show would speak for itself, the administration of the show didn't wage the massive political battle that won Black Journal its life. And thus the hard lesson was learned again: the forces in power respond only to power. Tremendous white power responded to tremendous black power in the case of Black Journal. The white power structure again showed itself unconcerned for the development of a black aesthetic or for giving black people diversity in programming.

At this writing, two token "Soul Specials" are planned for the 1973-74 season. But perhaps even by the date this is published the response of masses of black people could still help the show.

The power in public television, especially for blacks, resides truly in the pressure that masses of black people can apply. Black Journal is on the air in 1973 because of this. The question is not money. At stake is control over our public institutions. And the odds for public television in the next few years could well be all or nothing.

HON. GERALD R. FORD'S FINE SPEECH ON ISRAEL

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor both to arrange for his attendance and to introduce our distinguished minority leader and Vice-President-designate at the United Jewish Appeal "Dinner for Life" at the Colonie Hill Restaurant in my district this past Monday.

The reception given GERRY FORD was one of the most cordial ever, and his words were received with warmth and enthusiasm.

I am pleased to submit for the RECORD his fine address:

ADDRESS ON ISRAEL

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a special pleasure to address you at a time when the world seems finally ready, after so many tragic years of bloodshed and senseless procrastination, to acknowledge an unavoidable reality.

That reality is the reality of Israel's existence. The United States has worked long and hard—and often alone—to uphold Israel's security. In the peace negotiations that are at long last about to begin between Israel and the Arabs, we will continue to support Israel's existence and her right to live in security.

The relationship between the United States and Israel has always been a unique one, and as I worked on these remarks I tried to come to some conclusions about why this should be so. I think I've come up with at least a partial answer, an answer involving the Bible, a poet, a statue, and the work the UJA is doing to assist Russian emigrants. The plight of Soviet Jewry, incidentally, is one that has long concerned me, and I'm sure some of you here tonight remember that I addressed this subject at a rally for Soviet Jewry in Madison Square Garden in 1971.

The passage in the Bible to which I referred

CXIX—2427—Part 29

comes from Isaiah. I'd like to read a few brief excerpts. According to the prophet, the mission of Israel was, and I quote, "... to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free ... to deal thy bread to the hungry and ... bring the poor that are cast out to thy house ... Then shall this light break forth as the morning ..."

As you are well aware, the historical parallels between our age and the age of Isaiah are striking. Then, as now, for example, the Jewish people were returning to Zion to rebuild their nation.

But there is another contemporary historic parallel that I find even more striking. Listen to the following lines, ladies and gentlemen. I am sure you know them by heart.

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed to me:

I lift up my lamp beside the golden door.

Those are, of course, the famous lines engraved on the pedestal of the greatest symbol of human freedom in the world—the Statue of Liberty. They are also the closing lines of a poem that celebrates America as the haven for the world's oppressed. The poem is entitled "The New Colossus." The author was Emma Lazarus, a Jewish woman who organized relief for Jewish refugees who had fled the oppression of 19th century Russia.

The ring of Isaiah is in those lines. I think those words on the Statue of Liberty capture the essential spirit of both America and Israel—almost uniquely among the nations of the world—havens for the persecuted, the homeless, the oppressed.

And it is because of this unique common tradition, I believe, that the bonds between America and Israel are so very close. There is no contradiction whatsoever between the support you offer to Israel and the loyalty you feel toward America.

There are many of you in this audience tonight whose parents came to these shores fleeing oppression. Some of you came under those conditions yourselves. And as you all know, the accomplishments of the UJA in assisting such immigrants have been nothing short of phenomenal. And what you and your parents found here was something you could not find in the nations you left—the promise that you could rise just as high and travel just as far as your abilities and dedication could carry you.

All of you here tonight have realized that promise, and your lives are tangible testimonials to a very simple but often overlooked truth—the American system is alive and healthy. The system does work. You have proved that it works.

Still another truth about our society is that it is diverse, a pluralistic society strengthened socially and culturally by the beliefs and customs of the various nationalities and religions that found sanctuary and opportunity here.

The melting pot theory still holds. The melting process, of course, distills different social and philosophic views down into common national goals and purposes. That melting process should not, however, attempt to boil out those unique things we bring to America as members of distinct cultural groups, qualities which help to enrich our society as a whole.

Too often, I believe, we stress the sameness, the homogeneity of American life while ignoring the healthy differences and variations that give such richness to the American fabric.

The texture of our Nation, which has contributed to its unparalleled greatness, comes from many ethnic, religious and nationality

strains. America, as we know it and love it, is like a good soup. Its full flavor comes from the blending of many ingredients.

Yet from many quarters we hear a great deal of talk about assimilation—especially from the younger generation. And, of course, it is necessary that we should be alike in some ways—in our standard of justice, our concept of democratic government, our common ideal of liberty and freedom.

But, we must also recognize that we can pay too high a price for sameness. We can make our soup bland. There are differences that we cannot afford to lose.

I do not like to believe and do not concede that in this country we have Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, Afro-Americans or Jewish-Americans because the hyphen implies that different groups should be treated differently. This is wrong.

On the other hand, it is necessary to understand that different groups have added immeasurably to American life because they are different. Out of their differences have grown ideas, a fuller cultural life, and a more interesting and stimulating America. Our national outlook is broader; our character stiffer.

Rather than question in any way those who feel deep emotional ties to other countries—whether it be Israel or Ireland or Italy or Africa—we should salute this as a manifestation of the genius of our Nation. This is part of what we call Americanism. It is one of the things that make both Israel and America unique in the world. The beauty of Joseph's coat was that it was of many colors.

It is perfectly possible for Americans to hold on proudly to the best elements of their different national heritages—and yet be united in common love for our country. And let me add here that no single group of Americans has been more steadfast in standing up for our country than our Jewish citizens.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, let me mention one more basic American quality, perhaps the finest of all—the willingness to sacrifice to help your fellow man.

It's an old concept, one of the finest embodied in the Judeo-Christian tradition, the concept of charity. And perhaps no group in America has more distinguished itself for its generosity and its philanthropy than the American Jewish community. The Greek root of the term "philanthropy" means love of mankind. And I know of no people who better personify this love than those who give to the United Jewish Appeal.

You can take profound pride in your record. Since 1938, UJA funds have saved over 3 million lives and have helped make possible the transformation of Israel into a dynamic and progressive land.

As you all know, the recent fighting in the Middle East took a tragic toll. In fact, given population ratios, the number of Israelis who died each day during the recent fighting was equivalent to approximately 7,000 American deaths per day. Thus your efforts to help Israel "bind up the wounds of war" seem especially appropriate at this moment in history.

At the same time, other needs also press in Israel. For example, immigration to Israel continues and spending on immigration alone was over \$1 billion before the hostilities broke out.

This is a time of testing, and the road ahead will not be an easy one. But for the first time in decades, the road does seem passable with some of the roadblocks removed. This Administration has spent five years in attempting to clear away international obstructions to peace by building bridges to those nations with whom we once had no dialogue.

And the indications are that now such bridge building may be possible between Tel

Aviv, Cairo, and Damascus. Perhaps finally the way may be clear. Richard Tucker has given us an inspirational rendition of the Israeli national anthem here tonight, and it is in the closing lines of that anthem that we find the hope of the future expressed so clearly:

"The hope of two thousand years, To be a free people in our land, In the land of Zion . . ."

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe we will make that hope a reality.

And so I salute you—salute you for your support of a worthwhile cause—and salute you, my fellow Americans, because you have unselfishly helped pave the road to self-reliance for the people of Israel. With pride you can say you have played a major role in Israel's progress. With your head high, you know you have personally shared in an enterprise of historic significance for the survival of the Jewish people and of the spirit of human freedom and dignity to which it is dedicated. Shalom.

NEPTUNE RICHARDS, A VETERAN CRICKET PLAYER RECALLS EARLY DAYS OF CENTURY

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, in visiting the Virgin Islands, many of my colleagues have had the opportunity to observe and understand the culture of my island home. The greatest insight into a people, however, can be provided through the experiences and recollections of a lifelong native. One of these representative citizens, and a valued friend of mine, is "Captain" Halvor Neptune Richards.

In his youth, Captain Richards found time from his long hours of farm work to become a renowned cricket player on St. John. At 77, he remains vigorously active on the farm he has owned for 30 years. In November, Halvor and his wife, Florence, were feted by the St. John Pioneer Benevolent Society. This honor was noted with an interview published in the local newsletter. The opinions and reminiscences of this colorful gentleman reveal some of the character and spirit of the typical St. Johnian.

The article from the November 2, 1973 issue of the St. John Drum follows:

VETERAN CRICKET PLAYER RECALLS EARLY DAYS OF CENTURY
(By Janet Boyte)

Talking with Neptune Richards is like leafing through the pages of a picture album revealing fascinating bygone scenes of life on St. John. At 77 years of age, Halvor Neptune Richards is the oldest ace cricketer left on the island, and remembers when the captain of the St. John team "would go no place to play without me." Thus it is fitting that the Pioneer Benevolent Society should honor him and his wife, Florence, with a dinner and dance Nov. 2.

Not only is Mr. Richards the oldest surviving cricket player, but he is the last operator of a large farm. Still vigorous and sturdy, he raises livestock and grows a few crops on the Susannaberg estate of more than 100 acres which he bought some 30 years ago. Eyeing the visitor with a steady gaze, he reminisces about the St. John he knew long

ago. He was born at "Big Cruz Bay", as it was then called. As a boy he worked long hours pasturing cattle for various landowners, often "making pasture" with a cutlass to provide good guinea grass for grazing. For some years he worked at Lameshur, when large herds grazed on the slopes, lime trees yielded a regular harvest, and the fields ran up Bordeaux Mountain into the bay forest which produced leaves for Ernest Marsh's Carolina distillery.

"Young people nowadays don't know what it is to work," in Mr. Richards' opinion. "I worked for \$6 a month in those days." St. John raised cattle, horses, mules and donkeys, which were shipped to other islands. "Travel was by sail then," he points out, recalling that St. John had its own shipbuilders. "There were shipbuilders at East End—the Roberts family, Allen Smith, and Amos Sullivan; he was the last shipbuilder on the island."

In the early 1900's, St. John was a self-sufficient place. Land transportation was by mule and donkey, and people raised their own food. Meat was preserved by salting it, and was soaked before cooking. "Plenty of tannias, yams, pumpkins and cassava grew here. There were big fields of pineapple at Cinnamon Bay." Mr. Richards is particularly fond of cassava bread, and raises a little cassava himself to be sure of a supply. "In the old days, people kept cassava bread in a barrel, and it was a pleasure for them to give some to visitors. They had a demijohn or two of guavaberry rum to offer friends who stopped by."

In those independent days people depended on "bush medicine," an art in which Mrs. Richards is highly skilled. "People had to be their own doctors, and their bush medicine was great," Mr. Richards affirms. The eight Richards children were brought up on beneficial bush teas and poultices which their mother prepared.

St. John like the British Virgins, provided charcoal for St. Thomas and St. Croix households to use in cooking. But making it was hard work. "You began hungry and you ended hungry," Mr. Richards says, with the charcoal selling for 30 cents a bag. During Prohibition, charcoal was particularly in demand in Puerto Rico, where farmers made rum "in the bushes" and used charcoal because it did not smoke and reveal their operations. "Charcoal burning helped out in hard times," Mr. Richards says, describing the all-but-forgotten art of cutting, cleaning and packing the wood in a "coal pit", then "bushing it over," "dirtling it over," and checking it daily to determine when it was ready for use.

In the difficult Depression years, Mr. Richards was foreman in the Civilian Conservation Corps which built various roads in the Coral Bay area. Like many another young St. Johnian, he went to St. Thomas for better job opportunities at one time. There he worked as a milkman, getting up at three a.m. or earlier to milk and water the cows. Finally a four-months' bout with typhoid fever persuaded him to "come home," and he has always been glad of his decision.

The Susannaberg estate, purchased from the Christiansen family in St. Thomas, has many reminders of "slavery days," including its old windmill, stone cistern, and, beneath a venerable tamarind tree, the graves of estate owners who once lived there. In addition to some 30 pigs, 50 head of cattle, plus goats and chickens, Mr. Richards has peabirds, originally obtained from Mrs. Ethel McCulley. Currently the peahen is followed about by three husky young chicks who have survived predatory mongoose and thrushes.

One Susannaberg landmark along Centerline Road is the old orchard, where the cows graze, and soursops, sugar apples and custard apples still flourish. Soursops are a great favorite of his and if Mr. Richards wakes up

during the night, he raids the refrigerator for a glass of soursop juice.

The "old sport" who is to be honored by the Pioneers has had a good life on St. John, although he says most of his friends now "have gone home". Looking with calm, knowing eyes across the long vista to Turtle Bay, he chuckles, "Sports still give me the most fun I get in life." Rarely does he miss a softball or cricket match in Cruz Bay Ball Park and when he is at home he spends his spare hours watching the games on television.

PRESERVE VISIBLE MEMORIES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAM

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAM. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an editorial, "Preserve Visible Memories," published in the November 6, 1973, issue of the La Porte, Ind., Herald-Argus.

The editorial stresses the importance that communities throughout the United States should attach to the preservation of historical landmarks.

The editorial follows:

PRESERVE VISIBLE MEMORIES

We suggest that one of the prime objectives our Bicentennial commissions might set in preparing for 1976 is the preservation of historical landmarks in every community across the country.

These are vanishing like flies at the first hint of cold weather. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, a Washington-based group dedicated to saving the nation's priceless heritage, has documented the fact that over a third of America's registered historic landmarks have been destroyed over the past 40 years.

We can be thankful that an official national body has been organized in an effort to halt the thoughtless razing of landmarks that should have been preserved for the edification of future generations.

At one time the Trust and Historic Preservation group compiled and registered 16,000 landmarks in the country and classified them as official historical sites. A third of these have disappeared.

Some had genuine architectural significance. Others represented priceless Americana. Still others marked the sites of important events in American history.

Most of those structures that no longer exist were victimized by the well-known bulldozer. There are legitimate reasons for effacing some of these landmarks, but more often than not little or no effort was made to determine if they could be converted to a useful purpose.

We fail to use our imagination. Landmarks can be moved if changes dictate better use of a given site. As a matter of fact, it is frequently necessary to relocate a memorable structure in order to make it more available to the public—or to preserve it from the ravages of elements, both natural and manmade.

Many times, historians say, there are no available organizations or individuals in a given community knowledgeable or interested enough in the community's past to identify a landmark for preservation.

Authorities are emphasizing the great importance of historical societies to the community. LaPorte owes a debt of gratitude to its local historical organization for being active and determined to preserve the several footstones that remain in this community and in LaPorte county.

Changes in the face of America's urban areas have resulted in a heavy toll for historic edifices. Many are located in run-down ghettos of the big cities. Others have fallen to the necessity of modernizing downtowns of cities large and small.

An example here would be the site of the old Fairview hospital building, Pine Lake and Weller avenues. The building has been altered, but the location once was famous as Dr. Collins' sanatorium, and holds real historical significance.

The chances are this site will fall to commercial development and the changing patterns of community growth. We respect the fact of changing commercial requirements; but urge and plead for site preservation wherever possible.

LaPorte is blessed with a fine historical museum. Many communities are not.

With the nation's Bicentennial approaching in 1976, LaPorte, and every community, should become more conscious of its history and campaign to save visible memories of the significant past.

How else are future generations to see and comprehend the glorious America that was, is, and remains yet to be.

A THANKSGIVING GIFT FROM THE CITY OF MARENGO

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, the Honorable Raymond S. Clemens, mayor of the city of Marengo, communicated a Thanksgiving message to President Nixon. This message set forth many reasons for offering thanks at this season, praised the President for his many years of public service, and cited some of the special contributions which he has made in behalf of our Nation.

Sent to me by Alderman Allen W. Krech of Marengo, this eloquent and heartfelt message—entitled "A Thanksgiving Gift From the Mayor of Marengo"—reads as follows:

Each of us has his or her own personal reason for giving thanks during this holiday season.

Naturally, we all conjure the mental pictures of our country's first Americans and their Thanksgiving: the Indians—the Pilgrims—the Feast.

But, it has occurred to me and I hope you don't mind, that collectively, we might give thanks to a present day American.

A man who has devoted the majority of his adult years to public service.

A self-made man who is a Quaker, yet served this country during World War II.

A man, like Lincoln, who has known defeat, who has been misunderstood, misrepresented and personally maligned, yet had the courage to face his countrymen.

A man who has snatched our soldiers and prisoners of war from Vietnam to bring peace to this country for the first time in twelve years.

A man who despised the Communist philosophy, argued with Khrushchev, and later with mature judgment made important negotiations with major Communist countries.

A man who is ridiculed for inflation in America when the rest of the free world is combating an even worse upward spiral.

A man who had confidence and trust in

his subordinates and friends. When these trusts and confidences were broken, he suffered the agonies of misjudgment and has come to realize that he must assume the blame.

Richard Milhous Nixon happens to be our President on this Thanksgiving 1973. Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, Conservative or Liberals—let us be grateful that Watergate has taken place.

From this purge or catharsis better government must come forth.

Let us be thankful and forgiving.

Remember, to err is human, to forgive divine.

My personal best wishes to all of you.

RAYMOND S. CLEMENS,
Mayor, City of Marengo.

NATIONAL FARM WIFE MONTH

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, November is "National Farm Wife Month." I cannot think of any group more deserving of such an honor.

I have had a special respect and admiration for farm wives since a delegation representing the United Farm Wives visited Washington in April. These Kansas women were concerned about an ill-conceived effort to roll back the price of red meat and raw agricultural products and came to Washington to tell their story.

I arranged for the United Farm Wives to meet with the press and other Members of Congress. They relayed the problems of the farmer-rancher, and relayed them well.

During the 2-day visit of the Kansas farm wives, I had the opportunity to speak with each of them. I was—and am—impressed by their dedication, intelligence, and concern. I look forward to working with the United Farm Wives in the future.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following proclamation: "National Farm Wife Month":

NATIONAL FARM WIFE MONTH

(A Proclamation by the Secretary of Agriculture)

Whereas the farm women of America have made outstanding contributions to the welfare of this nation through their dedication to agriculture and its productive goals, and

Whereas these farm wives are truly partners to their husbands in the industry that feeds the world, and

Whereas farm wives have continually set outstanding examples as mothers, homemakers, community leaders, and church workers,

Therefore, in an effort to direct deserved public awareness to the farm wife's vital role in the strength, health, and future of this nation,

I hereby proclaim the month of November 1973 as "National Farm Wife Month" in recognition and appreciation of her unselfish contributions to the well being of our society.

EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary

PUBLIC OR PERISH

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to review an article written by A. B. Villanueva, professor of political science at Western Illinois University in Macomb, Ill. His article describes the in-service training seminars held at WIU in the fall of 1972. While he explains how such seminars provide a sound investment in personnel development, Professor Villanueva also presents some very thought-provoking questions.

For the review of my colleagues, I insert the following article in the RECORD at this point:

REFLECTION ON IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF CITY HALL SUPERVISORS

(By A. B. Villanueva)

1. INTRODUCTION

Inspired by the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 and spurred by the enthusiasm of "moon-lighting" college professors whose philosophy is "public or perish", instead of "publish or perish", a number of local government employees have participated in in-service training seminars to upgrade their supervisory skills and to enhance their professional development. In this article, a number of issues regarding in-service training will be reflected upon including some effects of in-service training upon the job performance of both supervisors and their subordinates, some reactions of supervisors to various aspects of in-service training, and some improvements I will propose to make in-service training programs more effective, relevant, and responsive to the problems of our time.

2. TYPES OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING

In-service training programs vary in format and objective, in scope and nature, and in employee participation and teaching technique. Some programs are like college courses offered through extension divisions of universities with academic credits, taught by college professors on or off-campus at night, and lead towards a certificate or associate degree in public administration. Others are short-term institutes or workshops varying in length from one day to one week. Still others are seminars offered at night in council chambers of city halls where college professors from neighboring institutions of higher learning are hired to moderate these seminars for at least one to two hours once a week during an academic quarter or semester in order to fit into the professor's teaching schedule. The certificate program in public administration offered jointly by the Extension Division and the former Public Administration Center of the University of Minnesota is a good example of the first; the Executive Seminar Centers of the U.S. Civil Service Commission at Berkeley, California and Kingspoint, New York are excellent examples of the second; and the regional plan for in-service training program for local government supervisors in the West Central Illinois region is the leading prototype of the third. Most of what are going to be discussed in this article will be reflections on the third which, for our present purpose, will be referred to as the West Central Illinois Plan.

The so-called West Central Illinois Plan is a regional and cooperative project of three small cities situated in the former military tract in the State of Illinois. Two of these

cities (Macomb, population: 19,643, and Bushnell, population: 3,703) are rural while the third is urban (Rock Island, population: 50,166) and is one of the cities that make up one of the bi-state metropolitan regions in the nation. The plan was designed by the Institute For Rural, Regional and Community studies, a special organizational unit of Western Illinois University, which helped the three cities obtain IPA grant from the U.S. Civil Service Commission. When the regional office of the Commission announced approval of the grant in the summer of 1972, the Institute played a major role in coordinating the seminars, recruiting moderators, doing all the "spade-work" and putting all the "nuts and bolts" of the seminars because the Institute was later designated as the "prime contractor" to implement the program.

The whole program consisted of two parts. The first part includes a series of ten seminars on supervision which were held in council chambers in the city halls of Macomb, Bushnell and Rock Island. Each seminar was held once a week from 7:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M. during which various problems of supervision were discussed under the guidance of two political science professors teaching public administration at Western Illinois University. The roles which these moderators played in these seminars were those of a discussion leader and an umpire, rather than an instructor or lecturer because of the nature of the seminar participants who prefer a group discussion of practical problems of supervision related to their jobs to a lecture on organization theory or management science. In these roles, the moderators led the seminar participants in discussing, analyzing and examining various administrative practices that will help them become better supervisors. The ICMA manual on Effective Supervisory Practices, which consists of 15 small bulletins, was used as a basic text and its short case studies at the end of each bulletin serve as the basis of group discussion.

The second part of the program was a one-day workshop which dealt with the subject of equal employment opportunity and the role of the supervisor in bringing about its goals. All seminar participants drove to the campus of Western Illinois University on December 16, 1972, to see a motion picture in which a group of supervisors discussed some forms of job discrimination due to institutional practices and behavior built into the present system of merit employment which were considered culturally biased and racially discriminatory against minorities. Forty supervisors who attended this workshop were broken up into four different groups and assigned to four separate conference rooms after the show was over. To each of these groups was assigned a political science professor from Western Illinois University and served as discussion leader. The four professors who were selected and coordinated by the Institute's Director led the groups in reacting to and commenting on the film. After a two hour "rap session" the four groups got together at luncheon time to listen to a brief discussion of the salient features of the 1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act by Congressman Tom Rallsback (R., Illinois).

3. EFFECTS OF THE SEMINARS ON SUPERVISORS AND SUBORDINATES

About a month after the seminars and the workshop were completed, a structured questionnaire was mailed by the Institute to those who participated. In each questionnaire, all participants were asked to describe the extent to which they felt their supervisory abilities have changed as a result of their participation in the seminars. Of the 28 who completed and returned the

survey questionnaires, it was the general feeling of the respondents that the seminars produced some positive results. As Table I shows most of the respondents felt that their supervisory skills have become better especially when it comes to providing leadership to their subordinates, practicing public relations, organizing and managing work, and improving work methods. On the other hand, some respondents indicated that evaluating worker performance, maintaining and developing discipline, and planning and organizing work are major areas in which they noticed no changes in their work performance at all.

Seminar participants were also asked if they have noticed any effect in the job performance of their subordinate employees as a result of their participation in the seminars. In Table 2, most of the respondents reported that there were two areas in which the performance behavior of their subordinates have improved: 1) their attitudes and morale, and 2) their concern for housekeeping. However, there were also areas in which the respondents found very little change in their subordinates' performance behavior such as their promptness in reporting to work, the regularity of their work attendance, and the reduction in employee turnover.

4. SEMINAR CRITIQUE

One part of the questionnaire contains an open-ended question in which respondents were asked to write a critique of the seminar including their comments and criticisms on the text that was used, the cases that were discussed, and the group discussion that was employed as a device in conducting seminars of this nature. As the saying goes, the respondents "told it like it was" by writing their reactions in varying degrees of compliments, objectivity, and condemnation. Fourteen of the respondents wrote positive reactions to the entire seminars, while five expressed marginal views and six were very critical of the whole thing.

Positive reactions

One of those who thought the seminars were worthwhile stated that "it does help in many ways of understanding the problems of other employees in their field of work, to learn other methods from people you work with and to share workload with each other." Another satisfied participant wrote, "For all practical purposes . . . it helped greatly to promote the supervisors' insight and job perspective. . . ." In more specific terms, the same respondent said, "I am more aware of and am attempting to improve my shortcomings in providing leadership to my subordinates, in handling employee complaints and grievances," and in broadening "my views on organization and management." Other respondents agreed that the whole seminars were productive because the participants gained the following benefits:

The opportunity to "learn not only from the materials presented but from the experiences of the people involved";

"An excellent refresher course and brought to the fore the numerous shortcomings we develop without realizing them as we grow older";

"Planning and organizing our work and keeping better records";

"Some inspiration on employee handling and work dispersment"; and

"How to handle my job better and still maintain working conditions with my men and the public."

Marginal reactions

Five of the respondents felt that although the seminars were instructive, productive, and informative and that they learned a great deal, they had some reservations about the outcome and value of the seminars to them. One reason cited was the fact that the

problems brought out in the case studies apply to big cities like Chicago but not to small ones like Bushnell. The second reason was related to the first: "the training seminars would be of greater help to larger departments with more personnel." The third reason was attributed to "the discussion of subjects unrelated to [our] particular city set-up" such as collective bargaining and job discrimination "which we do not have and other big city operations." The fourth reason was partly due to the text which was thought to be "somewhat biased in favor of the employer." The cases at the end of each bulletin were believed to suffer from limited information and unstated assumptions which made the drawing of conclusions a bit difficult. On balance, however, those who expressed marginal views generally considered the text as good and interesting. In the words of one of these respondents, "the text did present each category reasonably well."

Critical reactions

Six respondents were critical of the seminars mostly because of the nature of the case studies described and presented in the bulletins. First of all, according to one of the critics, the case studies were suitable only to lower level supervisors "such as shop foremen or head janitors" and not to higher level supervisors such as department heads. Secondly, very little time was spent on discussions of problems relating to minority employment largely due to the fact that the case studies in the ICMA manual were written without reference to the problems of disadvantaged groups in the public service. Thirdly, some of the case studies are oversimplifications and most of the questions following each case were vague, ambiguous and sometimes overlap one another as a consequence of which "most of the time was spent discussing the meaning of the questions and not arriving at answers" or skipping two or more of these questions because they appear to be asking the same thing.

Fourthly, most of the case studies were regarded as insignificant, since they are not relevant to contemporary problems of local governments with some minority employees such as blacks, chicanos and women. Fifthly, the group discussion method of handling the seminar was not looked upon as an appropriate teaching method for some of the participants who were college graduates who are now occupying staff positions in city hall such as administrative assistants to the city manager or heads of administrative city departments. Finally, one of the cases irritated one respondent who condemned the case as an "understatement." The case in point was discussed in Bulletin 9, page 3, paragraph 1c in which a supervisor was given a piece of advice as follows: "Watch yourself! Maybe you think you don't like Jews, Negroes, or Italians, but you can never be a good supervisor if you have this kind of bias or prejudice for anyone." To which the respondent shot back: "This seemingly harmless, good intentioned bit of advice sounds fine for the first time around, but the author seems to be assuming that Jews, Negroes, or Italians won't be found in supervisory positions. Why didn't he advise the Black, the Jew, or the Italian supervisor not to fall into the trap? It can't be 'explained away' by saying the author didn't imply anything subtle; overtones are there."

5. CONCLUSION

In-service training programs such as those seminars held in Western Illinois in the fall of 1972 undoubtedly are sound investments in personnel development. They produce dividends both to supervisors and their subordinates. They have a multiplier effect for they give employees who take part in these programs the opportunity to keep abreast with developments in the political environment in

which local governments operate. Furthermore, they help to develop and to sharpen the skills of the supervisor in dealing with controversial and touchy issues such as public employee militancy, affirmative action programs required by HEW under the 1972 EEO Act, and productivity in government. Moreover, participants to in-service training programs, as Tables 1 and 2 show, could improve some aspects of supervisor and subordinates' work performance.

The case approach used in the bulletins of the ICMA manual has proved to be a valuable teaching technique in stimulating group discussions, problem-solving, and decision-making. However, most of the criticisms about the cases in the manual are legitimate ones. In spite of such criticisms, it is my opinion

that there is value in the case method both as a teaching and as a research tool in public administration. The case method has its own weaknesses in that it cannot formulate a theory but it can check whether a theory is empirically supportable or not. So, if the ICMA is to be updated, it should not abandon the case method. Rather, it should use the case approach to illustrate the problems most people are talking about these days: equal employment opportunity for minorities and women, affirmative action programs to achieve EEO goals, and collective bargaining in public employment.

If in-service training is going to bring about the benefits it is capable of giving the process of selecting the training participants must be used just like a fine tooth comb so

as to separate the "non-coms" from the "generals". What kind of employees should participate? For what are they being trained for? How can they be encouraged to attend all seminars as regularly as a young man with romantic aspirations dates his sweetheart? What preventive measures should be used to reduce the number of "class skippers"? What incentives can a city offer in order to encourage more employee enthusiasm in personnel development, stimulate greater employee involvement, and attract more teachers from academia who, while engaged in publishing and teaching, can also share the benefits of their wisdom, experience, and research to public employees upon whose shoulders the delivery and quality of public services fall?

TABLE 1

[Based on your readings, discussions and analyses of various phases of supervision during the 10-week seminar on effective supervisory practices, please describe the extent to which you feel your job-behavior has changed since the completion of the seminar]

Supervisory performance ability	Changes in supervisor's performance behavior				Total
	Better	No change	Worse	Don't know	
1. Your ability to provide leadership to your subordinates.....	19	8	0	1	28
2. Your concept of organization and management.....	18	10	0	0	28
3. Your planning and organizing the work.....	13	13	0	2	28
4. Your ability to direct the work force.....	15	11	0	2	28
5. Your improving work methods.....	18	11	0	4	28
6. Your selection and orientation of employees.....	10	12	8	6	28
7. Your developing and maintaining discipline.....	10	19	0	4	28
8. Your counseling of employees with emotional problems.....	6	11	0	11	28
9. Your handling of employee complaints and grievances.....	12	10	0	6	28
10. Your evaluating worker performance.....	10	14	0	4	28
11. Your public relations.....	19	7	0	2	28

TABLE 2

[Based upon the following results, please describe the changes you have noticed in subordinate employees under your supervision since your participation in the 10-week seminar]

Subordinates' attitudes, performance and behavior	Changes in subordinates				Total
	Better	No change	Worse	Don't know	
1. Quality of employee performance.....	9	16	0	3	28
2. Attitude and morale.....	13	13	0	2	28
3. Employee concern for housekeeping.....	11	13	0	4	28
4. Employee promptness.....	5	19	0	4	28
5. Employee attendance.....	5	19	0	4	28
6. Employee turnover.....	1	23	0	4	28

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, even as we meet here today the terrible suffering and persecution of Soviet Jews continues in Russia. These Jews are, as much as ever, subject to harassment and intimidation by Russian authorities. The latest round of semiofficial persecution occurred this month throughout Russia in a series of "trials" for purported crimes by Jews.

One such victim is Leonid Zabilishensky, an activist in the small Jewish community of Sverlovsk. He had applied for an exit visa back in November 1971; he has yet to receive it. He is now under investigation for "parasitism," due to the fact that he has not been able to find employment. Police have apparently searched his apartment and confiscated bank records.

Aleksandr Feldman, who also applied for an exit visa 2 years ago, had his

apartment in Kiev searched on October 18 and shortly thereafter "disappeared." He is apparently in custody and has been charged with "hooliganism." Feldman is alleged to have beaten an unidentified old woman. A Kiev newspaper accused him of the attack and consequently judged him "guilty" before any trial. So far, no lawyer has agreed to defend Feldman against the charges.

Mr. Speaker, cases such as these point up what happens to dissident Jews or those who want to leave the Soviet Union. These Jews are denied jobs, have their homes thoroughly searched, are unable to get lawyers, and see their families suffer as well. Many more Jews would apply for exit visas were it not for the fact that those who do go through years of terrible suffering and anxiety.

Russia cannot expect to receive most-favored-nation status in trade matters if such treatment continues. We must not grant special favors to a nation that refuses to allow its citizens to emigrate and harasses them when they remain. If our détente with the Soviet Union is to continue, it cannot be at the price of the loss of basic human rights and dignity.

PROGRESS IN CANCER TREATMENT

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have served in Congress during the last decade have seen a growth in Federal spending for cancer research from next to nothing to more than a half billion dollars annually. Many forms of cancer still plague us, but notable progress has been made in finding ways to treat these diseases. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an informative article entitled "Progress In Cancer Treatment," which appeared in the October 1973 issue of the American Cancer Society's Kansas News. The article was written by Dr. Lee S. Fent of Newton, Kans.

The article follows:

PROGRESS IN CANCER TREATMENT

(By Lee S. Fent, M.D.)

With the use of specific antibiotics in the treatment of bacterial diseases during the

past 30 years, patients have come to expect a pill or injection for the cure of almost all diseases suffered by mankind.

The development of cancer chemotherapy gives promise as a method by which many cancer types may be successfully treated. Specifically, such treatment means the treatment of cancer with drugs which will either kill or retard the growth of malignant cells. Many thousands of chemicals have been and are being evaluated for use in this field. Since cancer is not one but many different diseases it is unlikely that a single drug will be developed to treat cancer in all of its forms. At the present, several drugs are being successfully used for specific cancer types. Much research and experimentation needs to be accomplished to achieve the total success we hope for. In this frontier of cancer treatment two goals are sought—the first being the cure of specific cancer types and second, the palliation and control of those many forms of cancer which are at present not curable. By palliation, we hope to extend useful life span and prevent suffering in a manner similar to the present treatment of diabetes and heart disease.

The basic ambition in chemotherapy is to provide a drug which will kill, starve or stop reproduction of cancer cells without harm to our normal body cells. At the present time this principle is only partially attained in that the margin between that dose of medication which will stop the cancer cell is near that level which will kill or severely injure the normal body cells.

Needless to say, the use of such potent drugs should be prescribed by physicians knowledgeable in the action of such medications, and such treatment must be with close medical supervision.

At the present, cancer chemotherapy is curative in some types of neuroblastoma, choriocarcinoma, Wilms' tumor, and teratocarcinoma. These are uncommon cancer types.

As a palliative measure for other forms of cancer, especially when non-operable metastasis has occurred, life may be extended for many years by retarding, or holding in check, the growth of malignant cells.

Chemotherapeutic drugs may be divided in several classes as follows:

Hormones: The substances are normally produced by the endocrine glands in our bodies and serve to regulate the growth of certain normal body cells. When cells of this type become malignant (change to cancer cells), they may still be influenced by specific controlling hormones. Examples of such hormones are thyroid, male and female sex hormones. Treatment with hormones of these types can at times control cancer of the breast, some uterine cancer and certain cancers of the thyroid gland. Other hormones and their effect on cancer cells are being at present intensely investigated.

The Alkylating drugs are those which prevent the multiplication of cancer cells by blocking the action of D.N.A., an essential complex substance within the nucleus of the cell. The principle of successful therapy here is the fact that many cancer cells are more fragile with respect to structure than are normal cells.

The Antimetabolites are drugs which starve cancer cells by interference with food absorption of the cell. Here again the aim toward success is the fact that many cancer cells, through uncontrolled rapid growth, require nourishment in greater quantities to survive than do normal cells.

Immunity factors present perhaps the most exciting research challenge at the present time, for we have observed that in many types of cancer living cells will at times lie dormant for many years only to suddenly become activated at such time when controlling factors are removed. It is believed

that hormones may play a part in such inhibition of growth to a limited extent, but more probably body immunity to the abnormal cell also plays a major part. The development of such an immunization offers an exciting and promising challenge at the present time.

The evaluation of human immune function is at present being vigorously investigated at the Kansas University School of Medicine with cooperation of many Kansas physicians. Such clinical research promises to add still another weapon in our continued conquest of cancer.

SPECIAL SCHOOL PROJECT AWARD

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am justly proud of the Newport-Mesa Unified School District for an award presented by Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education.

Project Catch-up of the Newport-Mesa Unified School District in Newport Beach and Costa Mesa, Calif., was chosen as one of 10 ESEA title I projects to be exhibited by the U.S. Office of Education at the ED Fair 1973 because it achieved to an outstanding degree its stated objectives in meeting the educational needs of children. At the fair Project Catch-up represented region IX, which includes the States of California, Nevada, Arizona, Hawaii, and Pacific Trust Territories.

The project director, Mrs. Fay Harbison, and Mrs. Jean England, a title I teacher, appeared at the fair to present two programs to invited representatives of the educational community, State superintendents of schools, and their staffs. Additionally, they hosted an exhibit booth which displayed representative equipment and instructional materials used successfully by title I staff members.

Selection of the 10 projects chosen to represent the title I program throughout the country was made on the basis of validated standardized test scores which measured the progress made by children in reading and math skills. The certificate of merit, which was presented to Mrs. Harbison for the project at a banquet at the Kennedy Center on May 10, reads:

Certification of Merit, Presented to, Project Catch-up, California in recognition of outstanding service in the field of Education. The Project was developed, at least in part, with funds provided by the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. From among the many submitted for validation and exhibition at ED Fair '73, it was chosen as an exemplary practice, worthy of being exhibited to those attending the Fair and offered by the Education Division to other State and Local school officials for possible use or adaptation in their systems. On behalf of the Department, I am pleased to bestow this Special Recognition on the Staff of the project and on its participants. May 10, 1973. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education.

Project Catch-up is designed to provide remedial instruction in reading and mathematics to disadvantaged children in schools serving a low socioeconomic suburban area of the Newport-Mesa Unified School District which serves Costa Mesa and Newport Beach, Calif., children are selected for participation on the basis of educational need, those who have scored in the lowest quartile on standardized achievement tests in reading.

The project was established, using title I funds. Now in its seventh year of operation, Project Catch-Up has served several thousand racially and ethnically heterogeneous children in grades kindergarten through 8 with noteworthy success.

Major emphasis is placed on the diagnosis of learning problems through extensive use of criterion-referenced and standardized test instruments. Learning experiences are individually prescribed and are provided by a special staff of certificated part-time teachers and instructional aides in a special "laboratory" environment.

Each project teacher is responsible for no more than 18 children, while instructional aides work with 10 and perform essentially the same roles as the teachers. Each teacher or aide works with four children at a time for approximately 20 minutes per day. The children are taken out of their regular classrooms at times when neither reading nor math is being taught.

The laboratories are large, attractive, and replete with high-interest materials which serve, along with other characteristics of the project, to elicit a positive attitude toward learning in participating children. It is clear that they enjoy the project and experience little, if any, of the stigma that is often associated with remedial programs. Developing a positive attitude toward self and project is also the objective of several special events such as a Mexican Fair put on each year by the title I children for the entire school.

The project's instructional personnel—teachers and aides—are held responsible for the achievement gains of the pupils, which are expected to equal 1.5 grade-equivalent months per month in reading and 1.0 months per month in math. They are free to use whatever teaching techniques they wish in order to achieve these objectives and are given exceptional administrative support in the form of immediate processing of requests for materials, supplies, inservice, and encouragement to advance their own professional levels.

OMB—THE SUPERAGENCY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I know that I am not alone in my concern over the growing power of the Office of Manage-

ment and Budget. Many members have expressed this concern with respect to specific policy matters and specific pieces of legislation. I believe that, since the power of OMB is power that may be held accountable to neither the public nor the Congress, that every available incidence of the exercise of this power should be placed in the public record. This is doubly true when we find the spokesmen for the administration denying the influence that OMB has brought to bear on them and their policies. A matter before the Housing Subcommittee at this time is a case in point:

Last January the administration, showing a callous disregard for the housing needs of low- and moderate-income families, suspended the operations of the housing subsidy programs. We were promised a thorough review of the programs and a new and better housing package. That new package was revealed last month and was, to say the least, a bitter disappointment. The cornerstone of the plan—at least, the only part of it that one could argue is innovative—is the proposal for a direct housing assistance payment to the poor. But the administration is not prepared to request its enactment. After 9 months of study, they want to study the idea for another year and then request its enactment as a plan to be put into effect in stages over a period of up to 10 years. Many of us were frankly suspicious of the sincerity of the administration. On the one hand, HUD Secretary James Lynn and his aides speak very enthusiastically about the housing allowance as the answer to a serious national program. Then, after making a good case, they say, "But we need to study it more."

Mr. Speaker, many of us suspected that we were not hearing the clear, unfettered voice of the Secretary and his staff which had just spent 9 months studying this subject. We have been confident that we were again hearing the voice of OMB speaking through a major Department. The spokesman for HUD has denied this, however. After an informal off-the-record discussion of the housing program sponsored by the Library of Congress several weeks ago, two members of my staff put the question of OMB's influence to Assistant Secretary Mike Moscow. Mr. Moscow flatly denied that OMB had any influence on the decision to study further, rather than now seek enactment of, the housing allowance plan.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be able to take Mr. Moscow at his word on this matter; however, the October 27, 1973, issue of the National Journal Reports makes this impossible. In its feature article on OMB, HUD and its housing recommendation is offered as a classic example of OMB calling the shots on an agency's policies. I quote directly from the article:

The HUD staff settled on housing allowances that would let poor people shop around for their own housing. When HUD formally presented its draft of the housing study to OMB in August, it proposed that a housing-allowance program go into effect in stages beginning next year.

But OMB was not persuaded by HUD's case. Sources at OMB said some of HUD's budget analysis was faulty. OMB felt that HUD did not come to grips with a basic question: Should housing allowances be used only for housing, or should they be part of a broader range of welfare reforms?

OMB was unhappy that HUD's proposals were made public before OMB had time to complete work on them. Some OMB officials felt HUD was trying to rally public opinion behind its proposals and make it more difficult for OMB to change them.

When HUD Secretary James T. Lynn went to Capitol Hill to discuss housing with Members of Congress, O'Neill [Associate Director at OMB] went with him. HUD sources said OMB finally recommended—and the President agreed—not to move on housing before developing a broader package of welfare reform.

This report, Mr. Speaker, makes clear to us all what many of us suspected, but which the spokesmen for HUD cannot bring themselves to admit—that, when it comes to housing policy, OMB calls the shots.

NAVY TESTS DESTROYER POWERED BY A LIQUID DERIVED FROM COAL

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, a significant and historic event took place which should be noticed by the House—especially now that we are in a severe energy crisis.

On that date, the U.S.S. *Johnston*, a Navy destroyer, sailed out of Philadelphia with its engines burning oil which had been derived from coal.

That oil came from a project that started 12 years ago, but I think the House should know that as far back as the late 1940's and early 1950's we were just pennies away from a process that would have converted coal to liquid fuel.

The Interior Department had a demonstration plant operating at Louisiana, Mo., but, unfortunately, the administration in office then refused to include an appropriation recommendation in its budget back in 1952, and the demonstration plants were phased out.

That was a shortsighted mistake—a case of being pennywise but dollar foolish, and at least part of the instigation of it was from other energy sources, who did not want to see coal getting greater use.

Now, we all are having to pay for that mistake, and I hope we are benefitting from it—at least to the extent of going all-out with the necessary research and construction of other pilot plants, in our coal areas, such as eastern Kentucky.

Billions of tons of coal are available for our energy needs for the Nation, and we should make maximum use of this resource as soon as possible.

We should also be going ahead on the training of the thousands of workers who will be needed in the coal industry, and and engineers.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an article from the New York Times describing the trip the Navy ship made on fuel which was converted from coal.

The article follows:

NAVY TESTS DESTROYER POWERED BY A LIQUID DERIVED FROM COAL

(By Wayne King)

PHILADELPHIA, November 15.—A World War II Navy destroyer, the U.S.S. *Johnston*, steamed out of port here today to become the first ship in history to use coal-derived oil to power its engines.

Beyond its historical import, the short one-day cruise of the *Johnston*, both military and civilian officials said, will likely have great practical significance to an increasingly fuel-starved nation.

Initial impressions indicated that the pilot test of the fuel to fire the steam generating boilers of the *Johnston* was a success, although a detailed analysis has yet to be completed. More important, Government officials predicted that, with Congressional approval of the large outlays needed for construction of coal-conversion plants to produce the fuel, fairly widespread use of it as a petroleum substitute may be only a few years away.

For more than a year, the Navy has been working with the Department of the Interior to develop a clean-burning, economical substitute for the petroleum-based fuels that the Navy consumes at the rate of 42 million gallons a year.

If all goes as planned, the coal-derived oil will begin replacing petroleum fuels in Navy vessels in about three years, and will ultimately—within a decade—account for about half of the fleet's total consumption.

Beyond that, the Department of the Interior's Office of Coal Research—an agency that began 12 years ago with a relatively meager \$1-million budget and will spend \$122-million this year—already has in operation a pilot coal liquefaction plant in Princeton, N.J., with another under construction in Tacoma, Wash. Two pilot plants to convert coal to gas are also in operation, with a third being built.

COAL-CONVERSION PLANTS

Within a decade, said Paul R. Jordan of the Office of Coal Research, the Interior Department hopes to have assisted in development of a number of privately owned and operated coal conversion plants, each capable of producing 250 million cubic feet of gas a day—enough for a city of a half a million people—and 80,000 to 100,000 barrels of synthetic fuel oil a day.

Although the Navy today became the first to make use of the new fuel, both naval and other officials said its development was keyed heavily to civilian use.

Though the coal gasification and liquefaction prospect has been under way for almost 10 years, the recently developed fuel crisis has given it new and accelerated emphasis.

The Navy, according to Rear Adm. Randolph W. King, who answered questions at a news conference at the Philadelphia Naval Base prior to the sailing of the *Johnston*, is interested in the coal liquefaction process as a means of guaranteeing an uninterrupted fuel supply regardless of the political situation in the Middle East or other oil-producing areas.

At present, he said, coal supplies in the United States are adequate for at least another 100 years. Other estimates have ranged up to 500 years and more.

Moreover, both Admiral King and the Interior Department sources said the ultimate projected cost of production of the synthetic fuel oil would average \$4.50 to \$5 a barrel, compared to \$5.25 a barrel for the fuel now

used. This estimate, however, takes into consideration the selling of byproducts from the liquefaction process to reduce the over-all cost.

Moreover, Mr. Jordan of the Coal Research Office projected capital outlays for construction of coal conversion plants at \$5 billion over the next decade or so. Present plans call for a joint effort by the Federal Government and private industry, with the process ultimately to become entirely private enterprise.

Actual plant construction beyond the pilot stage, however, would require Congressional appropriations.

Both naval and Interior Department officials were optimistic about the prospects for large-scale coal conversion in the relatively near future, however. Although officials could not come up with a specific figure, the coal derived fuel that powered the Johnston without incident today ferrying newsmen on the first leg of her pilot cruise, cost many times the \$4 to \$5 figure that the Government ultimately hopes to attain for coal-derived fuel oil—which can be used in almost identical form to heat homes and a somewhat more refined version to fuel jet aircraft.

The economic success of the project rests on the economies of extremely large-scale production in plants that were estimated to cost from one-third to three-quarters of a billion dollars each to construct.

It was not made clear whether the Government's per barrel cost estimates for the synthetic fuel included the initial costs of plant construction.

The coal-derived fuel itself should be acceptable to environmentalists, officials said, as it is of very low sulphur content, and will burn cleaner than the fuels used now by the Navy.

It is also possible to distill the synthetic oil in much the same manner as petroleum crude oil and thus convert it to higher grades, including gasoline.

CONVERSION PROCESS

The synthetic oil is obtained by a process called pyrolysis, in which the coal is crushed and then decomposed by use of heat, pressure and catalysts. This is followed by hydrogen treatment that alters the substance chemically to produce a synthetic oil-like fuel.

The process requires roughly a ton of coal to produce one barrel of oil. However, also produced is some 12,000 pounds of char, which can be further processed for extraction of fuels, and over 8,000 cubic feet of gas.

In general, officials at the news conference said, the coal fields of the Midwest and West produce the best type of coal for this process, a fact that is not expected to gain a warm reception in coal-rich Eastern states like Pennsylvania and West Virginia that are searching for ways to again utilize largely abandoned coal fields.

Renewed efforts to make extensive use of coal is expected to run into stiff resistance by environmentalists who oppose the ravages of strip mining, still the most economic method of mining coal in most cases.

Samples of the coal-derived fuel oil passed out to reporters appeared roughly the color and consistency of crankcase motor oil at about the time it badly needs changing. Its odor was somewhat sweetish, with the rather sharp, astringent cast of a disinfectant.

Early tests, indicated a strong coal-tar odor when the substance was burned, suggesting it might prove too offensive for boiler room personnel.

A seaman in the engine room today said, however, that the odor was acceptable and that the fuel seemed to perform in a manner indistinguishable from the usual petroleum oil, except for what appeared to be a slightly brighter flame.

The fuel is thicker than others used by the Navy, however, and cannot be poured at temperatures below 60 degrees Fahrenheit, a problem in some situations. Further processing may improve this, however, officials said.

CONTROL TOWERS

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of the readers of the RECORD and the Members interested in general aviation, I am inserting an editorial from the November issue of the AOPA Pilot. The editorial follows:

FEATHERBEDDING

For the year 1973 the FAA programmed 56 low-activity control towers for installation and operation at airports throughout the country. They have an arbitrary criterion for telling themselves when an airport "needs" a tower. Once it does, they then ask for the money. If Congress approves, and it invariably does, in the towers go.

Considering the breath-taking size of FAA's \$2.126 billion annual budget, and the increasing concern of general aviation for its very existence, there are other points about these 56 towers that the public should know.

General aviation (unlike the way FAA treats the airlines) was never asked whether it had a requirement for any or all of them. Nor is general aviation even aware of the scope of the way FAA makes its arbitrary standards. So far as we can determine, no one in general aviation even knows how the FAA decided on its own to spend an average \$250,000 per tower; the 56 come to \$14,000,000. Nor were we consulted about the average staffing, which (FAA decided) averages eight people and comes to an average of \$123,000 per tower per year. That's another \$6,888,000, which brings the figure to \$20,888,000 that first year. So the average cost for these "little" FAA towers is \$373,000 each.

You've heard a lot about cost allocation studies and plans. That DOT group came up with many arbitrary figures. Taking the entire FAA cost for such facilities—again without any general aviation indication of actual need—they concocted the arbitrary figure of 30 percent, which is the figure that general aviation would be expected to pay for everything in the system, needed or not. Of course, we have disagreed both with the system, as presently constituted, and with the exorbitant expenditures—repeatedly, and for years. Nevertheless, the first part of the DOT report has just been issued, and general aviation's 30 percent stands.

Just take those 56 "little" towers. Apply that 30-percent figure. That means you and I must pay directly \$6,266,400 for them. We can't help but wonder if general aviation pilots at Marysville, Calif., Bloomington, Ind., Cape Girardeau, Mo., and the 53 other locations knew of this plan. And do they realize that these towers are not being "given to them by Washington" as a gift? Are they willing to say flatly that they want and need them anyway, regardless of cost?

It's too late to go through such a democratic process, and the towers go in whether users want them or not, and at the excessive costs the FAA has contrived.

As we said in our August editorial, these 56 towers are just one small example. They represent a tiny 1.4 percent of the FAA's 1974 budget. But they are a shocking insight into the reason the FAA has gotten completely out of control with its pseudo-scientific featherbedding.

THIS IS PROGRESS?

One day recently we planned to make a 20-minute flight from Washington National Airport. The weather was CAVU. First, we called clearance delivery. Because Washington has been declared a terminal control area, everything that moves is handled as an IFR flight—including a 20-minute local flight in CAVU weather.

The frequency was so jammed it was 12 minutes before we got a clearance. Then switch to ground control; another 9 minutes. Then to local control frequency for takeoff clearance. We were finally airborne 34 minutes after setting out to make that 20-minute flight.

The FAA calls this progress. We think it's high-handed and an outrage; it's one of the many reasons general aviation just quietly tries to avoid TCAs—which is precisely what the FAA really wanted all along.

The airport itself? It wasn't busy; if we'd been operating by the old FAA standards for the same airport, where the user instead of the system came first, we'd have been off the ground within 10 minutes. There was abundant time and space available on the field itself, all going idle while the TCA "control congestion" (which is what they tell Congress this featherbedding is, when asking for more money) was taking place.

Ten years ago Washington National ranked No. 4 in the country; today it is No. 22. In those 10 years its total plane movements have increased just 11 percent, although the cost and complexity of operating all the equipment and procedures has gone sky high. The FAA, of course, waves the same tattered flag: "It's in the interest of safety!"

The safety record at National was perfect 10 years ago, as it is now. All that's changed is that the taxpayer has been fleeced, the controllers are being badgered and regimented needlessly, and general aviation is being driven out.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK TODD MEACHAM

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, Frank Todd Meacham of Chattanooga, Tenn., was a giant of a man. His untimely passing this year robbed his community and his State of a dedicated public servant with a record of many years of distinguished service.

Frank Todd Meacham was possessed of many rare qualities. His understanding of the political process from top to bottom was better than any contemporary in Tennessee. Therefore, he was respected by friend and foe alike. His word, in connection with a commitment, was as good as his bond.

Republican politicians in particular, and a multitude of Democrats as well, from the State of Tennessee, the southland, and the Nation as a whole, will miss his counsel and his reservoir of information.

As a tribute to Frank Todd Meacham, I place the following resolution in the RECORD. It was adopted recently by the Hamilton County Women's Republican Club and set forth many things we should remember about this unusual man. The resolution follows:

**HAMILTON COUNTY WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB
RESOLUTION ON THE PASSING OF HON.
FRANK TODD MEACHAM, REGISTER-AT-LARGE
OF THE HAMILTON COUNTY ELECTION COM-
MISSION**

Whereas, Almighty God, in His inscrutable wisdom, removed from our midst Frank Todd Meacham, on September 6, 1973, in the very same week the citizenry of our community were planning to honor him at a luncheon occasion, and

Whereas, Frank Todd Meacham, had served well in the rank-and-file of the Republican party, and yet became a candidate for the United States Senate at a time when his party was at its nadir, and

Whereas, Frank Todd Meacham, through the long lean years of his party's position seemed to be cast permanently in the minority, he remained a loyal, indefatigable laborer in the political vineyard, never despairing that in God's good time, the Republican party would rise from the ashes like a flaming Phoenix to a position of power on all levels of government, and,

Whereas, Frank Todd Meacham's personal and public callings gave honor to Webster's definition of the word "Politician," as one versed in the science of the governance of men, and

Whereas, Frank Todd Meacham, was a civic minded expert in the political arena, yet he was also a devoted husband, a proud father and an honored attorney-at-law, and withal a beloved figure of all the citizenry of his city, State and Nation, without regard to political affiliation, race or creed, and

Whereas, as befitting him sterling qualities of mind and heart, we believe that the words of the poet Arthur Hugh Clough well exemplify his spirit and his vision of our worldly fortunes to wit:

"For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets mak-
ing,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

"And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light;
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright."

Therefore Be it resolved that a copy of these resolutions be spread on the minutes of this organization and a copy be sent to the family of the deceased.

**JOHN F. KENNEDY: "A NEW SPIRIT
AND A NEW HOPE"**

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, millions of Americans, and millions of persons throughout the world, observed the 10th anniversary of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, who was such an inspiration to mankind.

I'm sure that hundreds of speeches were made about the brief, but promising presidency of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, because he represented "a new spirit and a new hope." It was ironic to me that the 10th anniversary of that sad and tragic day—November 22, 1963—fell on Thanksgiving Day.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for many blessings in this great country, and I often think of the four freedoms proclaimed by President Franklin D. Roose-

velt as freedom was engendered over 32 years ago. Freedom of speech and expression. Freedom of worship. Freedom from want. And freedom from fear.

I am grateful for those blessings, but I am also thankful for another deep source of inspiration: John F. Kennedy, who will always be remembered by lovers of freedom.

One of the many speeches made on the 10th anniversary of that beloved president's assassination was by my administrative assistant, Stephen G. Callas, who was accurate in pointing out that President Kennedy gave America "a new spirit and a new hope." That is the way he will be remembered by millions of Americans—and I remember him with respect and love. Steve also concluded his speech by stating what is another fact about President Kennedy: "America was proud of him—and so was the world."

I hereby include a newspaper article covering Stephen Callas' speech from the Atom Tabloid, of Woodbridge, N.J.:

PATTEN'S AIDE REMINDS US OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

EDISON.—President John F. Kennedy gave America "a new spirit and a new hope," according to Stephen G. Callas, administrative aide to U.S. Rep. Edward J. Patten (D-15th Dist.) as the 10th anniversary of JFK's assassination neared.

Callas spoke on "John F. Kennedy in Retrospect" before the United Democrats of Edison at the Fireside Lounge there. He noted that, "Carl Sandburg reminded us that man cannot live without hope—and hope was the rich legacy that John Kennedy left us—hope that is unconquerable—hope that refuses to die."

Patten's aide cited some of the creative legislation Kennedy not only signed into law, but advocated—legislation Callas called "unheralded." Domestic gains he listed included: area redevelopment, education TV, training nurses and doctors, mental health, manpower training, the first presidential advisory council on the arts, and 34 straight months of economic growth.

Callas also lauded some of Kennedy's innovations in foreign affairs: the Peace Corps, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Trade Expansion Act, Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, a full-scale outer space program, Alliance for Progress agreement, and the Cuban missile crisis victory, called by English Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, "one of the great turning points in history."

The speaker said that Dana Burnet's words reminded him of Kennedy: "The dreamer dies, but never dies the dream." Said Callas, "President Kennedy's dream still lives, because it is the dream of all people and all nations—the quest for victory over what he called 'a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.' Somehow, Kennedy generated the feeling that if anyone could conquer those enemies, he could be the one."

Historians, he said, will rate Kennedy as a good president with the promise of greatness. "I believe he would have prevented the Vietnam quagmire. He was a superbly balanced president whose popularity index was the highest of our last five presidents: 70 percent. Most of the Great Society legislation was conceived by JFK—from Medicare to aid to education—but President Johnson got the credit."

When Kennedy was assassinated, "never in history was the world so saddened on the death of a U.S. president, for the loss was universal in scope and impact."

"I remember Hemingway's indomitable Santiago and I think of Kennedy's spirit" said Callas, who quoted the Nobel prize-win-

ning author: "But man is not made for defeat. A man can be destroyed, but not defeated." Callas said, "Kennedy was physically destroyed at Dallas, but his spirit was not defeated, for death only conquers bodies, not ideals. His spirit still inspires lovers of freedom."

"To those who still mourn his death, gain strength and faith in knowing that what is remembered is never lost! And there is much to remember about John Fitzgerald Kennedy. America was proud of him—and so was the world," concluded Callas in his 20 minute address with the 10th anniversary of President Kennedy's assassination about to be observed.

THE POSSIBLE USE OF SOLAR ENERGY

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by Colman McCarthy published in the Washington Post on Tuesday, November 20 concerning the potential uses of solar energy.

In light of the present energy crisis, I concur with our former colleague the Honorable George Miller, who was one of our most distinguished and influential Members as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, quoted in the article stating that—

Many scientists and engineers dismiss solar energy because they think it too far out or conceptually inefficient by current engineering standards. However, we cannot afford the luxury of this easy attitude . . . the nation today depends on a host of operating technologies which were quite unknown only 25 years ago.

The article follows:

LETTING THE SUN SHINE IN

(By Colman McCarthy)

Two years ago this month, writing in The Smithsonian magazine, environmentalist Wilson Clark sounded a note that has the ring of this morning's front page:

Energy, the handmaiden of man's progress through the centuries, is in the deepest trouble. Demand in the United States for all sources of energy is rising at a steady five per cent, and demand for electricity alone is skyrocketing at nine per cent per year—it is doubling every decade. Continuation of this trend is clearly impossible, given the current means of obtaining energy. In a few decades there will be no oil for conversion to electricity or for transportation, nor will there be any natural gas, the cleanest burning fossil fuel . . . Thus the energy crisis, one that has little to do with summertime difficulties of power companies or the political considerations of importing Mideast oil. It requires recognition of the fact that our energy resources are dwindling, the bitter realization that at some not-so-distant hour the party will be over.

The significance of Clark's article was not just that it had the jump on today's headlines but that it focused on the potential uses of solar energy. Clark proposed solar energy as one of the major solutions to the energy alarm. It was possible to dismiss his view two years ago as fanciful dreaming, another one of those distant stars—like steam-powered cars, protein from petroleum—that occasionally shoots through the sky of American technology. But now, two years later, solar energy is being taken seri-

ously. In Congress last week, the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1973 had 170 co-sponsors. It offers a \$50 million research program to show in three to five years that solar energy is practical and economical.

By definition, solar energy is the power of the sun. At its simplest, this can be demonstrated when sunlight streams through the window of a house, warming the room beyond the normal temperature. At its most complex, solar energy can be used in processes to generate electricity, to heat and air condition buildings, to generate furnaces that can reach 4,000 degrees. "Much of this is complex technology," says Clark, a writer ("Energy For Survival" to be published by Doubleday next year) and consultant for the Environmental Policy Center, "but much of it is basically simple. For example, to heat a house or small office building, glass collectors are built on the roof or sides to trap the heat from the sun's rays. This technology has been used for years in private houses and office buildings. The experiments proved workable and the designs were perfected. But the initial cost was high, so the idea did not spread. But the costs would not be high in the long run." The latter is a hard concept in America where we live short run: discarding cars in a couple of years, throwing away paper and meals used but once, tearing down usable office buildings. So little is built for permanence that much of the economy depends on wastefulness. But once a solar energy unit is installed, it can work for decades.

Clark recently found examples of this in Florida where solar hot water heaters built in the 1920s are still working well today. A reason the solar heaters did not spread nationally was the turn to natural gas and oil in the 1930s; the market on solar heating trailed off. But now, 40 years later, when gas and oil are trailing off, the sensible economics of solar heating still persists. The high initial cost is easily offset by the low lifetime operating costs. For example, a University of Florida survey of solar hot water heaters reported a homeowner in Ft. Lauderdale who installed a 180 gallon tank for \$1,500, an unusually expensive unit. Despite this, he expects to save more than \$175 per year in prevailing electricity costs. Thus, in less than 10 years he will make up the \$1,500 investment, and thereafter have almost free hot water heating.

When he first began researching solar energy, Clark believed, like most people, that it meant only building the technology to trap sunlight. "It's much more than that," he now says. "Before the last few decades of large exploitation of fossil fuels, our food system was based on solar energy, not oil energy. Currently, our supply of food is precarious because the agricultural system is heavily dependent on oil. It takes, for example, about ten calories of oil to give us one calorie of food. Huge amounts of oil are used not just for the planting and harvesting machines, but oil is also used to make the synthetic fertilizers and pesticides. It need not be this way. On the farms, rather than making our synthetic chemicals from oil, we should be letting solar energy trigger the production of chemical nutrients in the agricultural system. Right now, we dismiss organic farmers as health food nuts, but we forget that their farming methods use only a fraction of the energy used in the centralized farming practices of agribusiness. I'm not pushing organic farming of itself; I'm only for maintaining our current level of productivity without excessive use of oil. There is a lot of potential solar energy in agriculture that we don't use. Solar energy, for example, makes the chemicals in plants that could reduce our dependence on synthetic chemicals now made from oil. In a solar-based agricultural cycle, animals eat the plants and produce manure for fertilizer, rather than the current system which depends on fertilizer made from

dwindling fossil fuels. I'm no alarmist, but unless we begin now to change over, we will face serious food shortages soon." Clark is not alone in his assessment.

How soon could the nation begin using solar energy in a large way? Clark believes two decades, but he makes some presumptions. One is that we will begin getting leadership from the White House and business—not pep talk chatter about lowering the speed limit and thermostats. Solar energy has been mentioned in presidential messages but an urgency is lacking. We are mistaken to think that once the gas and oil run out, then we can switch over immediately to sun power. It doesn't work that way because fossil fuel must first be used to build the solar equipment. If we are short of fossil fuels and keep wasting it at the current rate of profligacy, then we will have none to build economically feasible solar systems. We will be out in the cold in more ways than one.

Rep. George P. Miller (D-Calif.), chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, said recently that many scientists and engineers dismiss solar energy "because they think it too far out or conceptually inefficient by current engineering standards. To my mind, however, we cannot afford the luxury of this easy attitude. The stakes are too high. Moreover . . . the nation today depends on a host of operating technologies which were quite unknown only 25 years ago."

KEVIN DAVEY

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. P. Kevin Davey, a member of Florida Blue Key, the Men's Leadership Honorary organization at the University of Florida, was the general chairman of homecoming this year. At the Florida Blue Key Banquet on Friday, November 16, 1973, he delivered a speech, though short in length, was long in thought.

This message, coming from one of our young leaders, I believe is thought-provoking and should be an inspiration to all of us. It follows:

TIED OF WATERGATE

Next Thursday, November 22, 1973, marks the 10th Anniversary of the assassination of John F. Kennedy, the man who ignited the country with the words,

"Let the word go forth from this time and place . . . the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans . . . So let us begin anew." 20th January 1961.

And so, with impregnable faith in the ideals upon which it is founded, the country survived through burning cities, assassinations, and war. In the past months, Americans have grappled with a deeper crisis, affecting the moral fabric of our government. As you are well aware, during this time we have seen unwavering patriots question the authority and ability of the present administration to govern. These doubts are more serious than burning cities or external wars for as any student of history knows, the strength and power of a nation disintegrates from within, not from outside threats.

In the past days, efforts have been made towards re-establishing the foundations of faith and credibility. To this unique assembly of political leaders, judges and prominent citizens, I ask that we not move too rapidly towards an artificial confidence, but that the questions and doubts which have arisen be

answered and answered fully. Many people are "tired of Watergate" and would rather see it forgotten. But we must remember that it is like a cancer which, even when ignored, continues to fester and destroy life. The life of our country is based on the faith of its people in the democratic system. When this system falters, the strength of America is that we can "begin anew". Let us not let the torch dim again.

ODIE M. HOOVER PASSES

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on November 7, 1973, one of Cleveland's most distinguished and internationally known citizens departed this life. The Rev. Odie M. Hoover was a gifted orator, a dedicated minister, a civil rights leader, and a man who was able to influence the political spectrum of our city and the Nation. I had the privilege of personally enjoying his warm and enduring friendship. He made a significant impact upon my life and that of my brother, Carl B. Stokes, the former Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio. He was a man who walked with kings and yet never lost the common touch. Mr. Speaker, I submit his obituary so that my colleagues can read about my friend, the late Reverend Odie M. Hoover:

OBITUARY

Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of his understanding. He giveth power to the faint: And to them that have no might he increaseth strength. Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and young men shall utterly fall: But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength: They shall mount up with wings as eagles: They shall run, and not be weary, and they shall walk, and not faint.—Isiah 40:28-31.

The Reverend Odie Millard Hoover, Jr. was born in Nashville, Tennessee, September 21, 1921. He was the son of Susie and Odie M. Hoover, Sr.

He received his early education in the public schools of Nashville, Tennessee where he graduated with honors in 1941 and was the recipient of the Cameron Award for Scholarship. He attended Tennessee A & I State University where he majored in Science. He studied music at Fisk University under the late Professor John Work. His undergraduate work which was done at the American Baptist Theological Seminary resulted in his earning a Bachelor of Theology Degree. Over the last ten years he participated in special studies and advanced theological training at Boston University, University of Chicago, Virginia Union University and Yale University.

For the last three decades he had pastorates at Mt. Olive Baptist Church in Carthage, Tennessee, Mt. Zion Baptist Church in Fayetteville, Tennessee, Beulah Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama and Olivet Institutional Baptist Church in Cleveland, Ohio.

When he assumed the pastorate in Olivet in 1952, the membership was far less than five hundred, it now exceeds five thousand.

In the nineteen years of pastoral services to the Olivet Institutional Baptist Church, he completed the building of a large modern

Sanctuary and the O. M. Hoover Christian Community Center which was dedicated in 1965.

He served as a member of the Board of Directors of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, The American Baptist Theological Seminary, The American Academy of Clergymen, The Martin Luther King Foundation and People United to Save Humanity which was founded by the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson.

His other organization affiliations included the Kiwanis Club, the Cleveland Baptist Association, The Baptist Ministers Conference of Cleveland, The Urban League of Cleveland and many others.

He was an Associate National Chaplain of the Independent Benevolent Protection Order of Elks. He was a 33 Degree Mason.

His ministry included a broad spectrum of activities in and outside of the United States. He has preached and lectured throughout North and South America, Scandinavia, the Orient and the Holy Land.

In 1964, he accompanied the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize to Oslo, Norway.

He was involved in the civil Rights Movement in the city of Cleveland and on a National level. Because of his dedication and commitment to the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, he raised thousands of dollars for the Civil Rights Movement in the early and middle sixties.

He is survived by his son and daughter-in-law, Odie Millard Hoover, III and Frances Taylor Hooper, residing in Nashville, Tennessee, Eva Patricia Hoover, residing in Washington, District of Columbia and his eldest daughter Carole Frances Hoover, residing in Cleveland, Ohio.

In July, 1973, Rev. Odie Millard Hoover celebrated his 21st Anniversary in service to his congregation at the Olivet Institutional Baptist Church.

Most Respectfully,

ODIE MILLARD HOOVER, III.
FRANCES TAYLOR HOOVER.
EVA PATRICIA HOOVER.
CAROLE FRANCES HOOVER.

BAN THE HANDGUN—VI

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, Mayor John Lindsay of New York City spoke before the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, calling for stringent gun controls. Referring to wholesale imports of handguns into New York City from States having virtually no controls, the mayor stressed the need for registration at the Federal level.

I commend the remarks of Mayor Lindsay to my colleagues as further evidence that strict Federal gun controls are essential to make our communities safe places to live and work.

The mayor's address follows:

ADDRESS BY MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY

I'd like to talk this morning about 6 people who were killed in a war one day last October. They were all Americans.

The war that claimed them was not in the Middle East. It did not make any headlines and will never have any winners. It ranks with the Civil War as being the most unique-

ly American of all wars. It has been going on for decades and intensifying every year. And it will be raging still more furiously next year—unless we do something about it.

On October 4, 1973, Police Officer Robert Marshall interrupted a hold-up in Philadelphia. He was shot and killed with a handgun.

On October 4th, Howard Lee got into an argument with some friends in his Cleveland apartment. He was shot and killed with a handgun.

On October 4th, Richard Anderson, a Denver businessman, committed suicide by shooting himself with a rifle.

On October 4th, in Seattle, 16 year old Lloyd Smith got into an argument over a narcotic transaction. He was shot and killed with a handgun.

On October 4th, Robert Seville's store in Jackson, Mississippi was held up. He was shot and killed with a shotgun.

On October 4th, in New York City Howard Schwartz's dog got into a fight with another dog. The owners of the two dogs argued. Mr. Schwartz was shot and killed with a handgun.

Though the names of this death list have been changed, nothing about it is unreal. In fact, if October 4, 1973, was just an average day in America, 57 people were killed in accidents, murders, and suicides that involved the use of what has become an American trademark—the gun.

It doesn't have to be that way. We can save many of tomorrow's 57 victims. All we have to do is treat guns not like toys, or badges of manhood, or symbols of the great American tradition—but like guns.

There are as many firearms in the United States as there are people.

This includes as many as 40 million handguns, which are now being manufactured and pumped into the civilian population at the rate of more than 2.5 million a year.

Which means that a new handgun is sold in the United States every 13 seconds. And one is used every hour of every day to murder one of our citizens.

But the legal restrictions we impose on the distribution of these weapons are almost non-existent.

In only three states and two cities is a license or identification card needed to acquire or carry a rifle or shotgun.

And in 42 states no license is required to purchase a handgun.

The only restriction on buying handguns in these 42 states is a provision in the Federal Gun Control Act of 1968 which requires that the purchaser fill out a form giving his name and declaring that he is not a minor, and has no history of alcoholism, mental disorder, or felony conviction. But this requirement is almost worthless since it mandates no verification—such as fingerprints and a police background check—to substantiate the purchaser's identity and his declarations.

And while the Act of 1968 banned the importation of cheap handguns—known as Saturday Night Specials—it allowed for the importation of their parts and their domestic assembly and distribution. And so, one million cheap handguns that can have no conceivable sporting purpose and cannot be used for anything other than killing human beings at close range were put together and sold in the United States last year—with no real controls on their distribution.

In a country that requires prescriptions for penicillin and licenses for dogs, that kind of legislative policy on firearms is incredible.

Indeed, that kind of permissiveness is suicidal.

It means that in the next two years more Americans will die at home from firearms fatalities than were killed by the enemy in the twelve years of the Vietnam War.

And nowhere are the numbers more fright-

ening and our disregard of them more intolerable than in the category of police killings.

In 1967, there were 57 police officers killed in the United States. By 1972, the death toll reached 112, of whom 108 were killed with firearms and 74 were killed with handguns.

From 1966 through 1972, 621 policemen were killed across the United States. Ninety-five percent were killed with firearms, and seven out of ten were killed with handguns.

Indeed it is the cop on the beat who has the most to fear in a gun-crazed society. He is trained and equipped to defend himself. But there is little he can do about the bullet that greets him as he chases a suspect down an alley, interrupts a hold-up, or comes between a husband and wife in a family dispute.

That is why police leaders—including the late J. Edgar Hoover—have long supported stringent gun control. That is also why the President's consistent opposition to strong gun control makes his election campaign promise to "strengthen the peace forces against the crime forces" hard to believe.

The United States stands alone as the only supposedly civilized country in the world that does not regulate the ownership of firearms. Our per capita gun ownership rate is between five and thirty times that of any other free country. And in 1969, our murder rate was 16 times that of Finland, 120 times that of Sweden and 360 times that of Norway.

There will be more Americans killed by handguns in the next 39 hours than were killed by handguns in all of England in 1972.

It is illegal to own a handgun in Japan. And so in Tokyo, there were 217 murders in 1972, and only three of them were committed with handguns. In Detroit, with one tenth of the population of Tokyo there were more than twice as many murders in 1973.

When I was in Japan last year the police told me they couldn't understand how we survived without gun controls. The answer is that many of us don't.

But we need not look overseas to see that gun control can work.

The fact is that even domestic comparisons between states or localities with weak versus strong firearms laws tell the same story.

The South, which has the highest rate of firearms ownership and generally the weakest gun control laws in the nation, also has the highest rate of homicides committed with firearms and the highest rate of accidental gun deaths.

New York City has the nation's most stringent state and local gun controls. And, so far in 1973, New York's murder rate ranks 9th among the ten largest cities.

In New York City, every gun is required to be registered and every owner licensed. To get a license, an applicant is first fingerprinted and his background is carefully checked by the Police Department, to weed out those with histories of alcoholism, mental disorder, or felony convictions. In addition, to get a license to carry a handgun in New York City, the applicant must not only go through this same background check, he must also prove to the Police that he has a specific, legitimate need for the handgun.

Only 24,000 New Yorkers have these handgun licenses. And we know the system works—because only a handful of these 24,000 have ever used their weapons to commit an assault, robbery or murder.

But just as New York City shows how gun control can be effective, our experience here also demonstrates how even the best state and local controls are tragically undermined by the absence of stringent federal firearms control.

Although New York ranks 19th in crime among the largest 25 cities, the number of assaults and robberies involving firearms is rising sharply. And the City's chief Medical

Examiner attributes almost the entire increase in murder in recent years to the increased availability of guns.

These were crimes that are almost always committed with illegal guns, not by our licensed owners. Crime guns almost always come from jurisdictions outside New York.

We have learned, in fact, that these guns are coming to us by the thousands through black market "gun running" networks. These operations thrive on the absence of strict federal standards which makes it possible for a gun runner to walk into a store in the South, give a false name and address on that federal form and exchange cash for several hundred handguns. In one case, for example, one man in South Carolina purchased 600 handguns in one day so that he could resell them in Northern cities.

Police Commissioner Donald F. Cawley and I have intensified efforts to put a dent in this deadly interstate traffic. We recently met with the City's District Attorneys and administrative judges to seek their cooperation in getting better information from those arrested on gun possession charges as to the origin of the gun they were carrying, and to seek stricter enforcement of New York's strong gun laws. In this way we hope to work our way back to the major profiteers in these operations.

We are also working with the Treasury Department's Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Unit on a study aimed at learning more about these black market networks and quickly uncovering the most blatant of them. With AFT, we have begun tracing the approximately 3000 handguns seized by our police from persons arrested in the last six months in order to determine each handgun's last legal point of transfer.

Though the results of the survey are not yet complete, they promise to confirm our worst fears about how the absence of strict national gun control undercuts New York's tough local laws. Approximately 98% of the guns surveyed thus were either stolen or have been traced to retail sales outside of New York State. Two thirds of those traced outside the State came from just four states in the South: South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Virginia. Most alarmingly, South Carolina thus far accounts for almost one third of the total traceable guns seized.

Many of you may have read about the man who went berserk on 34th Street last week and killed two people before being gunned down himself. Of the two handguns he used, one has been traced to South Carolina and the other has been tentatively traced to Virginia.

A recent gun running operation uncovered by a joint Federal-City investigation tells us in broader terms what this interstate traffic means. The defendants in this case are alleged to have brought 200 handguns in just one shipment from South Carolina to New York—and the New York City Police Department has already seized 169 of them from persons arrested for attempted murder, assault and armed robbery.

That, very simply, is the case for federal gun control.

To put it another way, permissiveness in states such as Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, and Virginia is threatening the safety of police officers and citizens in New York City, and across this nation.

That is obviously a federal problem of the highest order.

Is Washington listening?

For seven years as a Congressman and eight as a Mayor I have pleaded for national gun control.

Specifically, this legislation would:

- Require the registration of all firearms;
- Ban the manufacture of sale of all cheap hand-guns not suitable for sporting purposes;
- Require the licensing of all firearms owners; and

Require special licenses for handgun ownership, to be issued only after that the applicant proves that he has an overriding legitimate need for this dangerous weapon. Though the standard for such overriding need could vary among states and localities, it would surely not allow a civilian in South Carolina to buy 600 handguns at a time;

In addition, a strong federal law would mandate that firearm manufacturers, shippers, and retailers take strict safety measures to help prevent gun thefts, which now run into the tens of thousands every year, and which account for almost 20% of the guns traced in our survey so far.

Essentially, then, what we need is to treat guns the way we treat cars: they must be registered and those who use them must be licensed. That is hardly an extreme or unreasonable restriction on these tools of death.

And this must be done at the federal level—because we can't allow guns to slip through a hodgepodge of non-uniform state laws.

This kind of federal legislation has been supported for years by mayors and police chiefs across the country. And every public opinion poll has found that a large majority of American citizens support it as well.

But in Washington our voice is drowned out by the power of the National Rifle Association—an industry funded lobby whose tax exempt status is mystifying, and whose half-truths are designed to mislead thousands of hunters into burying Congress in postcards everytime someone says gun control.

And this is one of the most unregulated industries in the nation, with barely any Federal monitoring of production and sales. This, itself, is a national scandal. If these firms were also producing heroin, there would be Federal action and national outrage. But their outpouring of guns, which annually kills far more people than drug addiction, barely causes a stir in Washington.

The only hunting that gun control would stop would be the hunting Americans do against each other.

All of us here know that.

But our knowing it isn't good enough. We must shatter the myths about guns and about gun control. We must disabuse those who believe that "If guns are outlawed only outlaws will have guns." That just isn't true. Police will have guns. Licensed owners will have guns. And the odds will be much better that more criminals will not.

We must also point out one more shocking truth. Almost three fourths of all murders are actually committed not by random thugs, but by normally law abiding citizens who get into an argument with a friend or relative and reach for a gun that is all too available. Nor should we forget the thousands of suicides and accidents that are the direct consequence of too many guns in too many places.

Indeed we must lead the way in re-examining the role of guns in our society and the myth that the gun has some sacred place in the American tradition.

This country was founded on cherished ideals, not guns.

The frontier was conquered by plows and axes and hope—not gun-slinging.

The hope we have always offered ourselves and the world has been that man could be free, not that he could carry a gun.

And today, in the wake of Watergate, we know too well that freedom depends on the rule of law not the exercise of raw power.

The question of how we face our gun mania is really a question of what kind of society we want to be.

Can we expect to be a nation of peace and good will abroad and yet be a country that sells handguns like bubblegum at home?

Indeed, can we show our children the glory

of guns on television and in the movies and then convince them that the law—not the gun—is the great equalizer?

No one who loves his country can hide from these questions any longer. We must face them.

We must teach our children to think of torn flesh and slabs in the morgue when they think of guns, not mythology and manhood. We must remind them that the gun-slinger is the enemy of democracy—that here in America one Presidential election has been nullified, and two have been frustrated by firepower in just the last ten years.

And we must make Washington face these same questions.

We must stiffen up the Congress in the face of a lobby that for too long has used lies and cash from the gun industry to bully this country.

The crisis in Washington today is a crisis in confidence in the rule of law. There can be no better time to get on with the business of passing gun control legislation, for that would assert the rule of law over the rule of force.

It's time we ended the war at home. It's time we made freedom under the law—not the gun—once and for all the trademark of America.

In the last eight years, I have been to more than 20 funerals of police officers killed in the line of duty by guns. Each one has left an indelible mark on my memory.

I promise you, for as long as it takes, I intend to continue the fight to honor those slain men by passing the kind of stringent gun control law that will protect their comrades and the thousands of other Americans whose lives depend on it.

I hope you will join me.

CONGRESSMAN CULVER SPEAKS ON WORLD TRADE, DEVELOPMENT, AND INTERDEPENDENCE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I had an opportunity to read a speech delivered by our colleague, Congressman JOHN CULVER of Iowa, before the One World Conference in Des Moines. This was a large gathering of citizens and public interest organizations concerned with questions of world trade, development, and interdependence. The conference this year gave special emphasis to world interdependencies in food and energy. Not only were the themes timely and critical, but Congressman CULVER brought to them an incisive understanding of the interplay of trade, foreign agricultural, and energy policies.

Mr. CULVER has had a significant influence on the shape of pending trade legislation, especially in its incorporation of a more humane, workable, and versatile trade adjustment section. In his capacity as chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee he held searching hearings on energy almost a year and a half ago which clearly foreshadowed the domestic and international emergency which now exists.

This year he has joined with me in chairing an additional set of hearings seeking to analyze the interconnections between energy and other aspects of foreign policy, especially in the Middle

East. He has been a foremost expert on foreign agricultural policy, and he was the principal author of the recent influential House report on the Oversea Private Investment Corporation.

This speech by Mr. CULVER reflects the qualities of foresightedness, breadth of understanding, and balanced judgment which have made him so effective in this important realm of public policy.

The speech follows:

WORLD TRADE, DEVELOPMENT, AND
INTERDEPENDENCE

(By JOHN C. CULVER)

No conference could be more timely than this gathering which is devoting itself to an intensive consideration of the problems of world interdependence, development, and trade. We are often told that the people of this country are fatigued by the subject of world development and aid and that this Nation's role in furthering human opportunities and economic growth in the developing world has become a marginal one. If such a mood is widespread—and this coalition gathered here surely gives one pause—there are many present facts which sharply contradict such an impression.

In Nairobi this week plans are going forward which will hopefully lead to the most sweeping reform of the international monetary system since Bretton Woods.

In Rome this past week there has been an emergency meeting to assess the international food situation and to seek concerted international remedies for both foreseeable and future food shortages across the world.

In Washington the House of Representatives is nearing its final deliberations on the Trade Reform Act, the most decisive enactment of its kind since 1962 and perhaps even World War II.

Almost every community in this country has this year had a sudden awareness of an energy crisis. Though not every one perceives it in the same way, it is also shared in many countries abroad, and it opens a whole new set of relationships between developed and some of the less developed nations.

Here in Iowa, the second largest agricultural exporter of the 50 States, there is an inescapable sense of the interconnection between trade and the health of the domestic economy—all the more at a time of world inflation and commodity shortages.

So this meeting is surely not chasing fantasies or merely trying to breathe life into a dying or slumbering set of issues. It is coming to grips with the most urgent realities and most pressing prospects facing an increasingly interdependent world. Moreover, when we speak of food or energy, we are not dealing with economic abstractions or remote speculations about world development, but with the elemental and understandable issues of human livelihood and dignity. Looked at in these terms, the "world without borders" which keynotes your meetings, is not a figure of speech, but a fact reinforced by the attention now riveted on food, energy, and the new terms of world trade.

I need hardly stress that the consideration of the trade bill by Congress and the imminence of concurrent trade and monetary negotiations can have momentous consequences in the impulses they give both to our foreign policy and to the future character of our economy. How we handle the trade bill will be a shaping force for national foreign economic policy for years to come, both among industrialized and developing nations. It could have paralyzing effects: It can be liberating. This is not an isolated or intramural domestic drama. How the trade bill and associated issues are handled is integral to the positions of our trading and economic partners and to the confidence they place in our economic good sense, stability, and staying power.

The uncertain prospects and timetable of the trade bill has been one factor, for example, in the more vulnerable position of the dollar abroad. The outcome of trade legislation will be a major index for countries in assessing the nature of United States foreign policy—whether we are realistically concerned primarily to limit untenable and debilitating security commitments or whether we are unrealistically attempting to devise some form of indiscriminate modern day political and economic isolationism with all the pitfalls that creates for the world community.

Equally the consideration of trade legislation—an event which does not occur more than once in a decade—or at even longer intervals—has large portents for our domestic economy as well. Though the United States in raw arithmetical terms is less dependent on the flow of international trade than many industrialized nations, nonetheless it is of heightening importance as it is plain to see not only in our historic relationships with the countries of western Europe, but also in our unfolding new relationships with the Soviet Union, eastern Europe, China, and of course, Japan. And if one considers so large a question as the future of our domestic energy sources—much of it from countries developing some independent financial and political leverage of their own, the pivotal importance of trade is inescapable. But a spreading awareness of the changes in world trade brings with it a greater sense of dependency, of accelerated change, and of greater competitive vulnerability here at home. That is why it is especially important to seize the opportunity to mesh a trade adjustment and manpower policy with trade negotiations and initiatives.

For the past four decades the United States has pursued a generally outward-looking foreign trade policy—a policy designed to seek expanded trade, from which all nations could benefit economically and politically. The United States did not take this course until after learning, from the hard experience of the depression and smoot-hawley tariff years, the grave disadvantages of indiscriminate trade restrictions—political isolationism and retaliatory trade barriers, which in turn forced many American businesses to lay off workers. Since 1934 and the enactment of the reciprocal trade act, and especially after World War II, the United States has encouraged cooperative and interdependent international economic policies.

On balance, the result of our outward-looking foreign economic policy coincided with unparalleled United States economic growth, stimulated increased sales abroad, strengthened economic and political relations with foreign countries, and an increased standard of living at lower costs to consumers in the developed countries, including the United States.

In recent years, however, there has been growing concern in the United States about our mounting trade and balance-of-payments deficits, combined almost uniquely with a persistent and intolerable 5 to 6 percent domestic unemployment rate and also a surging inflation suffered by many nations. We are confronted with these facts, but have generally been unable to reach a consensus as to their root cause, and more importantly, have, to date, been unable to develop truly constructive solutions.

Some concerned citizens have pointed to unfair trade practices engaged in by foreign companies and governments, which have gone unchallenged by the executive. Others have suggested that the roots of our employment and trade difficulties are to be found in our domestic economy, through the lack of economic policies effectively controlling inflation, and the failure to develop and rely on forward looking economic policies to stimu-

late innovation, productivity, and vigorous competition.

In spite of these various views, three facts are clear. First, millions of American workers are gripped by the fear that imports are undermining their job security, and they are joined in this fear by diverse industries which feel the pressure of foreign competition. Second, the concerns being voiced by labor and management in the adversely affected sectors of our economy are genuine concerns, and cannot be ignored or answered by resorting to the vague conceptual slogans of either "free trade" or "protectionism." Finally, the post World War II economic system and era have come to a close, and a new set of domestic and international economic policies, relationships and institutions need to be developed.

These events are clear signals that the United States must develop and pursue fresh concepts to meet the problem of economic dislocations caused by imports and further economic interdependence. This points unmistakably to the need for new trade legislation to confront the requirements of greater job security and opportunities for American workers—and in a way which is truly humane, effective economically, and consistent with the best interests of the U.S. role in the world economy.

In April and May of last year, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, of which I am chairman, held seven days of hearings to examine workable mechanisms for economic conversion as an alternative to trade wars.

The wide consensus reached during the hearings was that trade adjustment assistance in its present form is burial assistance, but that a trade adjustment assistance program could be designed to provide prompt and effective assistance to workers, firms and communities who need it, at a lower cost to the economy, and without the foreign policy disadvantages of import restrictions.

For the purpose of providing a workable alternative to trade restrictions and trade wars.

Trade adjustment assistance should put delivery system, more substantive assistance and an early warning network to spot in advance those industries and companies which are running into trouble. Then effective government assistance can be useful before the company is beyond hope and it can enroll workers into training programs before they are unemployed and their skills become obsolete. In an age of "future shock" the Government must anticipate problems and identify industries which need assistance. But, most important, the assistance must be adequate, practical and quick. Otherwise, we will always be in a position of doing too little, too late, and there will be no viable political alternative to protectionist tariffs and quotas.

H.R. 4917, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Organization Act of 1973, provides, I believe, the proper emphasis for an effective trade adjustment assistance program, whose costs are less than those imposed by import restrictions. 300-600 million vs. 12-15 B. The Ways and Means Committee is giving the concepts contained in these proposals favorable consideration and I am hopeful that the House will adopt a strong and coherent version of this bill.

The social and human costs of economic dislocation caused by rapid technological change, changes in consumer tastes, Government procurement programs, international trade, and other factors, make the development of effective adjustment mechanisms imperative where such dislocations occur.

Moreover, as our orientation toward a military economy winds down, and as the 1970's bring a new awareness of the human and environmental problems which confront the Nation, we must develop national prior-

ities and an economic conversion program which will serve to shift industry from less productive areas to those for which there is a need for greatly expanded services, manpower and capital investments—health, education, energy, housing, pollution control, mass transportation, and rural and urban development. Trade adjustment furnishes such a model.

What our experience has increasingly underscored is that trade and monetary negotiation and the necessary adaptations in the world system will require time, persistence, and skilled judgment, both professional and political. These problems will not evaporate with the passage of trade legislation, with the convening of formal trade negotiations, or with any automatic sequence of programmed decisions. Their solution requires more than expert prescription alone; they demand also political insight, leadership, and a proper interplay between the President, Congress, and the public.

Nowhere are the tasks of such foresighted leadership and future-mindedness more demanding than in the topics to which you have given perspective here—the new fabric of relationships required with the third world. These have their own new profile and their own independent claim on the attentions of the policymaker and citizen. They are not any longer—if they ever were—merely the byplay of great power relationships or a distracting and spasmodic object of concern for the trilateral industrialized association of North America, Japan, and Western Europe. Even if we leave aside all considerations of humanitarian assistance—which we cannot in a world in which as many as 20 million may die this year from starvation and serious malnutrition alone—the new realities are compelling:

The United States and most of the rest of the industrialized world is growingly dependent on the third world for a critical portion of its energy and basic commodity needs. To be sure, for each item the sources tend to be few in number, giving a relatively small number of countries considerable strategic market power and leverage. For example, 4 countries dominate in world copper, 2 countries in tin, 4 in coffee and 4 countries have more than half the world market in rubber and bauxite. And there are also commodities such as timber which could well develop scarcities. A few of these countries, especially those with oil, will accumulate large earnings which can seriously effect money flows and markets as well as monetary stability.

There is no longer any question that U.S. foreign investment and multinational corporations must adapt in many places to changing environments in which their political consequences, intended and unintended. In response to the changing investment environment in less developing countries, the multinational corporations must be willing to use forms of investment which they ignored in the past—such as joint ventures, fade-out arrangements and non-equity production sharing and management contracts. In addition, the investor, the host country and the investor's country must, in cooperation with multilateral organizations, develop reasonable and workable rules of conduct for all the parties involved in international investment transactions.

Overall, our foreign investment has been beneficial both to the host countries and the United States. But, if this is true in the aggregate, it is also true that some U.S. companies have shown dangerous insensitivity to the environment in which they operate and that often too little direct benefit has accrued to the countries in which they locate. In some extractive mineral industries, for example, some of the commodity boom in the past year shows up in disproportionate profits for foreign investors rather than to the developing countries

themselves. Though under the best of circumstances U.S. and other foreign or multinational enterprise in the third world cannot be completely sanitized from political flare-ups and differences, there are a number of practices and policies which can be undertaken to limit their number and virulence.

We are entering an era in which some third world countries—a small minority now, but perhaps a larger number in the next decade—will have the capacity for reverse investment in the United States. This is a development which we have hardly foreseen but whose wise and balanced resolution is highly important to our future relationships with all countries and particularly at the moment to our relations with energy producing countries.

We are already in a phase of foreign affairs where international collaboration in the environment, in the oceans, and seabeds vitally depends on shared understandings with the nations of the third world. Many of these countries have important rights to declare and responsibilities to assume as symbolized in the decision to hold the Law of the Sea Conference next year in Santiago. No big power arrangement will resolve these large matters which affect the lives of all of us quite as much as issues which go under the name of national security.

During the next year, for example, we must act on these realities. Again the trade bill offers an early chance if it includes the extension of tariff preferences to third world nations. So also we may hope that with world monetary reform means may be found which will permit developing countries to participate and benefit more directly from the functions of the international monetary system.

Finally, any look at the coming contours of world cooperation must include an attack on the problems of world food supply—meeting the base needs of the famished and undernourished and providing new international mechanisms for stockpiling and emergency supply. We in Iowa—with our traditions in and knowledge of farm practices and technology—should have a special awareness and contribution to make. So far we have worked on the international scene in response to situations as they occur year by year. This year events have conspired to illustrate painfully that this is no longer enough. In one year we have seen shortages, transportation bottlenecks, depletion of stocks, widespread famine in sub-Saharan Africa, Pakistan, Philippines, and elsewhere, and also the entry of the USSR and possibly China as major food purchasers. In addition, we are now on the verge of crippling fertilizer shortages which could seriously cut back world agricultural production.

This sets a large but not hopeless task before us all—both to meet the unfulfilled needs that still exist across the world at the present time and to prevent future famines. Last year the developing countries actually had nearly a 1 percent drop in aggregate agricultural production, and for several years have not matched their population increase. Yet it is also true that a 2-3 percent voluntary reduction—less than 100 calories a day—in food consumption by people in developed countries would at least bridge the starvation gap in the world.

This is a problem, therefore, whose solution demands government foresight, international collaboration, and the assistance and counsel of private groups and educational institutions such as are represented here. The newly enacted farm legislation puts us in a better posture to attack the problem. The realization that no nation is exempt from the effects of major food deficits helps also. But the full medley of actions and initiatives necessary have not yet crystallized. We must be careful that a better year, if it occurs in world agriculture, does not lull us into a new complacency.

If there is one prospect that is certain for the decade ahead, it is that we have entered an era of economic diplomacy and restructuring throughout the world. This fact does not lessen the need for the industrialized nations to take common counsel and action. But it also means that the world in an important respect is again becoming more nearly one. It will still be a world with the stresses created by the divisions between rich and poor. But it will no longer be sufficient to speak of an undifferentiated third world or to assume that its needs or its powers are dimly submerged below the larger requirements of security and traditional diplomacy. Economics may be a dismal science. But it nonetheless contains within it much of our future destiny.

I congratulate this conference for having raised these themes and for spreading in Iowa so clear a future awareness of the tasks we have as citizens of this state and of the world community.

THE COST OF THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, now that we have ended the U.S. fighting role in Southeast Asia, I think it would be useful to reflect on what we have spent in dollars on this costly war.

Richard L. Strout has written a thoughtful article based on a study done by Tom Riddell of Bucknell University, examining the costs of the war. It seems to me that it is worth noting that Mr. Riddell estimates that these costs will continue into the middle of the next century. He also estimates the overall total cost of the war to each American family—a total greater than an average American family's income for an entire year. Given the fact that there is still no peace in Vietnam, one begins to wonder about these sacrifices.

Mr. Strout's article appears below, and I call it to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the American public:

AN EXPENSIVE WAR (By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Does anyone recall the Vietnam war? That was the one that we ended last July you remember—or the Cambodia part of it. Congress wrote a cutoff after it discovered that Mr. Nixon had been secretly bombing Cambodia for 14 months.

The war was the longest in American history. So much has happened in the meantime—Watergate, inflation, the astronauts' trip, the Middle East—no wonder you're a little leary about it.

Now comes a doctorate study by Tom Riddell of Bucknell University, printed in the Progressive magazine, saying that overall cost of Vietnam will be around \$575 billion, of which perhaps half has been paid. He estimates costs will continue into the middle of the next century.

To refresh my memory I have looked through my files. One thing you can say, everybody in authority was optimistic about the 10-year war. "Every quantitative measurement shows we're winning the war," Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said in 1962 . . . "The corner has definitely been

turned to victory in South Vietnam," Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense said, March 8, 1963 . . . "Victory . . . is just months away," forecast Gen. Paul Harkins, Saigon Commander, Oct. 31, 1963 . . . "We are not about to send American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves," declared President Johnson, Oct. 21, 1964 . . . "We have certainly turned the corner in the war," Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, (announced) July 23, 1969. "This action (the invasion of Cambodia) is a decisive move," said President Nixon, May 9, 1970. "Peace is at hand," said Dr. Henry Kissinger, Oct. 28, 1972.

Public men should be optimistic in wartime and illustrations like the above show that U.S. leaders fully fulfilled their obligation.

Just the other day President Nixon spoke at the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention at New Orleans (Aug. 20) and he rejoiced that "we finally do have peace with honor." Mr. Nixon used the phrase "peace with honor," or some variant, five times in his brief address. His audience warmly applauded.

One difficulty is, as Time noted last August in quoting an unnamed "U.S. analyst": "The North Vietnamese haven't given up any of their goals. It's just that they've given themselves a period of years without military struggle." However, some kind of a "military struggle" still seems to be going on. Every little while, when television doesn't have more exciting news to report, there are still items about the Vietnam struggle. The war isn't over. What has happened is that the U.S. has withdrawn. That makes nearly everybody rejoice.

So how much did it all cost? This is the way Mr. Riddell works it out:

	Billions
Budgetary expenditures 1950 to 1971	\$168.2
Future budgetary expenditures (pensions; interest)	358.3
Costs of efforts to end the war	.2
Costs of conversion (war to peace)	6.8
Human resources costs	143.6
Total	676.1

It becomes at once evident that the Riddell figures are tentative. Some things are down-to-earth statistics: The U.S. exploded over 15 million tons of munitions; saturated South Vietnam with over 100 million tons of chemical herbicides and lost about 8,000 aircraft [2,500 planes and 4,000 helicopters]. Total casualties incurred—to "secure self-determination for the South Vietnamese and to halt the spread of international communism"—were 53,813 Americans killed and over 100,000 wounded.

Dollar cost is harder to measure. They include interest, aid to Indo-China, and veterans' payments. Veterans' payments in past wars continued for 100 years. Historian James L. Clayton says, "Most of the costs of wars in American history have come after the fighting stopped."

I am dubious about Mr. Riddell's estimate of "human resource" costs: what the boys might have been creating and earning at home if they hadn't been killing in Indo-China. Certainly there was an economic loss. At least Mr. Riddell wisely doesn't try to estimate the cost of current inflation, which is due, in large part, to the huge war deficits.

Future generations may find it hard to understand—our willingness to spend so much money for 10 years in a war 10,000 miles away in Asia. Mr. Riddell figures the total cost to each American family is \$12,000. What would they otherwise have done with that \$12,000, I wonder—cars, homes, education? Was it worth it?

TRIBUTE TO SKYLAB 3 ASTRO-NAUTS

HON. JOHN WARE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 28, 1973

Mr. WARE. Mr. Speaker, students in an English seminar at Henderson Senior High School in West Chester, Pa., want to share with all America tributes they have written honoring Astronauts Alan Bean, Jack Lousma, and Owen Garriott of the successful Skylab 3 mission.

As stated by their teacher, Mrs. Rosemary R. Powers, the students want to salute these three men "who through their personal ability, determination, courage, and faith brought honor not only to themselves and everyone at NASA, but also to all other Americans as well."

I commend the students for their fine efforts; and I am pleased to insert their original poems, as follows:

IN ORBIT

There are no trees
No horses and no gulls
There is only the Universe.

The sun beats down
On the metallic shell
Even when the day's work is done.

With cameras and telescopes
The astronaut is alone
To study the stars that do not twinkle.

He analyses the cloud's turbulence
And the silent sea
For they are there for him to understand.

With knowledge he shields himself from the sun
And determines where he is
And where humanity is going.

—PAUL GARRETT.

Brave and unfearing in your tiny tin can,
Are you dreaming of what lies below?
Do you long to be on Earth once more,
Or would you rather stay above, giving your only life
To science, and the Infinite quest for knowledge?

Are you prepared to die for those?
What makes you give so much
And accept so little in return?
Isolated and free from strife, are you aware
Of the struggles in the lives beneath you?
Yet, you will go on, thinking of what you can do for man,
And blind to personal gain.
God holds your fate in his hands;
He makes the decision that you shall return safely,
Or sacrifice your life for those here on Earth.
And when you return,
Will someone cast a tear for Humanity?

—MS. GINNY BEYER.

PERILOUS PRIVILEGE

In this what of a world
Who,
But you,
Has experienced a place
Like space

Outside his soul
As part of the larger whole
To find
Your mind,
To risk detachment
And feast
Your heart?

—BETH FLEMING.

AT LEAST ONE ANSWER

Origin of the stars, moon, earth, universe?
Even if all questions are left unanswered,
unsolved,

Men who travel the blackness of space
Make a great, perhaps the greatest discovery,
Appreciation of the earth.

—DEBBIE PENRY.

IN APPRECIATION

Surely men do not toy with the idea death for their own personal gain. Nor do they walk into a rocket that guarantees almost nothing for these men a million miles from the planet Earth, for the simple reason of receiving several weeks of recognition. No, these men who so willingly risk their futures risk them for mankind still sitting securely on Earth.

Life is so very finite and yet such men deal in the infinite futures of men by investigating that beautiful black and unknown space outside of our own stable hemisphere. So, my good astronauts, I thank you and appreciate the very strong and boosting support you have given humanity while living in the darkness of space and placing your trust in both God and mankind.

—ANN ZIEGLER.

Space, a galaxy of glittering stars,
An enormous expanse—fresh—exciting—
Untarnished.

The Universe, its unique simplicity,
Both puzzling and charming man—
With its beauty.

A beauty transcending time,
Present long before us, it will always be—
There to touch.

Man strives to conquer and learn,
But all that is to be found—Lies in his soul,
And in the unterminating beauty Of a life fulfilled.

—JANET DiBELLA.

Oh brave and valiant men of space,
Now that you have returned,
We thank you for the knowledge gained,
The things that we have learned.

It takes a special man to do
All that the scientists ask.
You three were chosen specially
To do momentous tasks.

Through all the perils, problems, risks,
You did your very best.
You showed us strength of character.
You stood up to the test.

Oh brave and valiant men of space
America wants to say,
God bless you, and we're glad you're home,
We're proud of you today.

—KATHY FULMER.

A million miles away, a million miles away,
and who cares for them?
Certainly not those computerized men to whom a job is only a responsibility which ends at five o'clock.
Certainly not the General Public to whom their accomplishment is only second-page news,
And maybe tomorrow's page six in the obituaries.

The Soul of the people, that underlying thrive which flows through all of humanity worries over these Disciples of the Future.

They have left their mark on the Immortal Soul in perpetrating such a mission.
They have become a bit immortal in contributing to the common cause of harnessing the Unknown.

Therefore, don't fret ye pioneers of the universe.

Take comfort in the fact that the people's collective Soul does not terminate its anxieties at five o'clock.

—DEBBIE TREDINNICK.

COUNTDOWN

- 101 Such brave men!
Like Astronaut Glenn
91 Your tin foil suits shine
While rocket engines whine
81 Soon you will accelerate
Ignorant of your fate
71 Onward, upward to heaven
Just like Apollo 11

- 61 Your seatbelt neatly clicks
While the clock steadily ticks
51 Nerves electric and alive
No one's certain you'll survive
41 Into the empty space you'll soar
Heroic men of the Air Corps
31 Only He can foresee
What will become of thee

- 21 Up, up into the blue
Farewell! Adieu!
11 Your long trek has begun
It cannot be undone
01 All systems go!
To explore the long ago

—RAYMOND RORKE.

SENATE—Thursday, November 29, 1973

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Seth R. Brooks, pastor, Universalist National Memorial Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who through Thy wisdom didst permit men and women to bring forth our Nation, we offer our thanksgiving. We remember famous men and women and the unknown and unsung for the deeds and accomplishments they wrought in our Nation. We are aware of all those who would be men of present valor and would keep pure the springs of national purpose. We pray that in coming generations there may be gratitude for a goodly heritage.

We ask Thy blessing upon this body and upon the transaction of its business. We pray that each Member may be given health, strength, and courage. May the minds of those who carry grave responsibilities be held upon lofty things. May those who labor and toil find refreshment of spirit with the realization that eternal verities abide and that the arc of the universe is long and bends toward justice. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 28, 1973, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 7446) to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and for other purposes.

The bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not desire recognition at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I

have elected not to disturb the peace of this body.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) is to be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have control of the time allotted to the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RULES AND PRECEDENTS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to raise a question that deals with the rules and precedents of the Senate, and I wish to do so merely for the benefit of future guidance of the Senate.

I suppose I have two or three questions that I would like to have resolved, if it can be done.

The first question would be this: A motion to table having been made, and the Chair having duly recognized the Senator who made that motion, can a point of order be entered at that point, thus displacing the motion to table?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that after considerable research there appears to be no decision of the Chair exactly on point; however, in 1964 there was a ruling by the Chair that is very closely related. In that instance a resolution was being considered under a unanimous-consent agreement when the Chair stated that a Senator who had the floor could not be interrupted against his consent and that he was not required to yield for a question of personal privilege or a parliamentary inquiry.

In that instance the Senator who had the floor was subsequently called to order under rule XIX for the use of alleged objectionable language. The Presiding Officer, however, ruled that in his opinion the speaking Senator had not violated the rule. The Chair then having held that an appeal from the ruling was in order and subject to debate under the rule, an appeal was taken. The time for debate of the resolution having expired, a motion to table the resolution was made and carried. Subsequently, in reply to parliamentary inquiries, the Chair informed the Senate that the motion to table which was not debatable having been made was in order, and having been agreed to, the previous appeal from the ruling of the Chair was carried with it.

It would appear to the Chair that an appeal from the decision of the Chair and a point of order have comparable standing.

The procedure for the case in point, based on the above precedent, reasonably would have been as follows: A point of order against any procedure is in order at any time until that matter has been disposed of, but that does not mean that it has a higher privilege over all other motions. In this case the pending question had moved from the amendment per se to the motion to table and a point of order could be made against that motion to table as being in order or not being in order at that point, but the Senate had then moved one step from the amendment per se to a privileged motion—a motion to table had been made, which was not debatable. If the motion to table had carried, there would be no need for a point of order. If the motion to table failed, a point of order against the amendment as not being germane would still be in order.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. So, Mr. President, if I can provide my own interpretation of that precedent as I understand it this is the only precedent that the Parliamentarian has been able to find that would be anywhere near the point that I raise. It would be my own interpretation that, as the Chair has stated, a point of order has equal standing with an appeal from a ruling by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In respect to this situation it would appear so.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. And a motion to table having been made had precedence in that instance over an appeal from a ruling by the Chair. Am I correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It becomes a question of interpretation, because we have no exact ruling on that point.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. But in that instance, the effect was to give precedence to the motion to table over the appeal. Am I correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The previous ruling had that effect.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. And that is the only similar ruling that can be found?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Except that there have been numerous rulings on points of order which hold that they may be raised until the said question is disposed of.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I understand that. I say most respectfully to the Chair that as I heard the Chair read the precedents, the motion to table in that instance took precedence over an appeal from the ruling of the Chair. Am I correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would appear so.