

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ACTION ON AUTO EMISSION CONTROLS REPORTED, DISCUSSED IN BUSINESS WEEK MAGAZINE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on November 28, the Committee on Public Works ordered reported legislation modifying the emission control requirements for automobiles under the Clean Air Act of 1970. This measure, presented to the committee by the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), was reported to the Senate on December 4 as S. 2772. This action eliminated an extensive series of inquiries and thorough discussion of the issues by the committee.

This action was realistic considering the status of our knowledge about the effects of automobile pollution and the available technology for its control. The question of emission controls has attracted widespread attention throughout our country and has been widely discussed in the media.

Mr. President, the December 1 issue of Business Week magazine contained a thorough report of the committee's action and an editorial discussing the automobile pollution control effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Business Week article and editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NOD GOES TO GM'S CATALYTIC CONVERTER

For months, the auto industry has been split over the effectiveness of catalytic converters to control exhaust emissions. Chrysler has argued loud and long against the devices, General Motors has come out strongly for them, and Ford has been somewhere in between. At midweek, the Senate Public Works Committee refused to change the 1975 standards—in effect, endorsing catalysts and GM's position.

There is no longer much doubt: All 1975 cars sold in California, plus most sold elsewhere, will carry the catalysts. GM is expected to equip nearly all its cars with the devices, Ford as many as 65%. Chrysler will use catalysts, but on how many cars is uncertain.

The committee also agreed to freeze the 1975 standards for one year, giving the auto makers more time to meet the still-tougher standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons originally mandated by the 1970 Clean Air Act.

The decision to go to catalysts next year was engineered by Senator Pete V. Domenici (R-N.M.). Fighting much sentiment to freeze the standards at the current level, as Ford and Chrysler had requested, Domenici drafted a proposal, which passed 11 to 3. Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.), author of the Clean Air Act, dissented.

THE ARGUMENT

Two main factors persuaded the committee to go to catalysts. First, GM said it had made substantial progress with the devices. It has engineered the price of the 1975 cata-

lytic system down to about \$150 per car, will warrant the system for 50,000 mi., and claims that fuel savings will offset the \$150 price tag. In fact, GM planned to put catalysts on some of its 1975 cars even if Congress had frozen the standards.

Secondly, the committee felt that the catalysts would save fuel. Until now, auto makers have sacrificed engine efficiency, and hence fuel mileage, to curb pollution. With the catalysts, however, they can tune their engines for optimum efficiency and let the catalysts clean up emissions. As a result, GM says it expects a 13% boost in fuel mileage. Ford also testified that fuel mileage will increase with catalysts, but less than GM says it would.

The committee was concerned that, because the catalysts require unleaded gasoline, as much as 4% or 5% more crude might be needed to refine the unleaded fuel. But the 13% gasoline saving that GM expects means a crude savings of about 6½%. After weighing evidence from the oil companies (some say there will be hardly any crude penalty to produce unleaded fuel), the committee decided, in Domenici's words, "that there is indeed an energy saving in going to catalysts."

NOX RULE

Meanwhile, the auto makers will probably win a reprieve on the third major pollutant, nitrogen oxide. The Environmental Protection Agency, conceding that a measuring error overstated the concentration of NOX, recommended to the committee this week that it set the 1977 NOX standard at 2.0 grams per mile instead of the 0.4 grams per mile now required. If approved by the committee and then by Congress, the more lenient standard means that Detroit will not need a second catalytic system to curb NOX.

In all, the week's events represent an almost complete victory for GM, which has poured thousands of people and hundreds of millions of dollars into catalysts. Says President Edward N. Cole: "General Motors believes the committee's action is in the public interest, both from the standpoint of improving the nation's air quality and also for obtaining maximum value from America's energy resources."

For Chrysler, the compromise was a bitter disappointment. It had argued strongly that catalysts would raise costs, would not help fuel economy, and would not affect pollution.

Is what's good for GM good for the country? Not according to Senator Muskie, who called the committee's action a "retreat." But the committee's chairman, Senator Jennings Randolph (D-W. Va.), said: "I do not believe it's a retreat because the statutory standards still have to be met by 1977. It's only a little stretching out."

THRIFT NEED NOT BE DIRTY

As a result of the auto industry's efforts to curb exhaust emissions, fuel mileage has slowly declined 7% to 10% since 1967. Now that the energy crisis has erupted, some people have suggested that emission controls be dropped altogether. Others have been trying to persuade Congress to delay the even tougher 1971 standards.

Either move would be a mistake—as the Senate Public Works Committee recognized this week. Cars are still the major source of pollution in many cities. To decontrol cars would erase four years of progress, and to postpone the 1975 standards would stall the program just short of a major achievement.

Moreover, the catalytic emission control system now planned for many 1975 models may actually boost fuel mileage. The reason: Until now, auto makers have sacrificed en-

gine efficiency to curb pollution. With the catalyst system, the auto makers can tune their engines to optimize efficiency (and hence gas mileage) and let the catalytic converters clean up the emissions. General Motors says it expects a 13% boost in fuel mileage. So confident is GM that it may equip some of its 1975 cars with the catalysts even if Congress freezes the standards at 1974 levels.

It is true that the catalysts need unleaded gasoline, which could require up to 4% or 5% more crude oil to refine than leaded gas. But the 13% gasoline saving GM expects could mean a crude saving of about 6½%. In short, catalysts could save fuel.

It would be an ironic mistake to stop the progress on the threshold of success. Rather, the industry should couple its hard-won and costly gains with a new drive to produce smaller cars. Their overweight gas-guzzlers have contributed far more to the energy crisis than any pollution control system has.

DISORDER IN THE COURTS

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, since I am not a member of the legal profession, I am hesitant to criticize those who earn their livelihood by practicing law. But even lawyers recognize that there are degrees of competence in the profession just as in any other field of endeavor and the true course of justice is often hampered by those who have less competence than others.

That is why it was important for Chief Justice Warren Burger to speak out as he did recently on trial lawyers and their role in achieving a more responsive judicial process. An editorial in the December 10 issue of U.S. News & World Report under the title of "Disorder in the Courts" comments on what Justice Burger had to say and how it applies to the American public in eliminating the waste of "time, money, and talent" in courtroom procedures.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I feel my colleagues should heed the Chief Justice's words and the editorial comments of U.S. News & World Report, so I place the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

DISORDER IN THE COURTS

(By Howard Fieger)

The other day the Chief Justice of the United States, Warren E. Burger, put into blunt words some things that have been worrying a lot of people for a long time.

On the basis of two decades of law practice and 18 years as a jurist who has studied thousands of cases, Mr. Burger has concluded:

At least a third, maybe half, of the trial lawyers in this country are incompetent. To put it another way—they simply don't know what they're doing.

Many don't know how to frame a proper question to put to a witness.

All too often, they're not clear on the rudiments of the rules of evidence.

Those among them who learn courtroom practice—if they learn at all—do so by trial-and-error. Anybody who holds a law license can be a trial lawyer. But becoming skilled at it often is a matter of on-the-job training, to the detriment of all concerned.

Said the Chief Justice: "We are more casual about qualifying the people we allow to act as advocates in the courtroom than we are about licensing electricians."

Mr. Burger was talking about incompetence through inexperience. But what he said can be applied in equal measure to the "antic trials" that have for years made a mockery of American courtrooms.

The current best seller, "The Onion Field" by Joseph Wambaugh, details a case in point.

Two men kidnapped a couple of Los Angeles policemen and took them to an onion field, where one of the officers was shot to death. That was in 1963—apparently an uncomplicated, open-and-shut case of murder.

Instead, it became a courtroom epic that lasted seven bewildering years. It went through trials, mistrials, reversals, retrials. A dozen or so judges were subjected to months and years of courtroom bickering. One had heart failure. A juror developed what was diagnosed as a mental ailment. A prosecutor quit in frustration. Once a defendant went on a hunger strike—apparently because his aunt had diabetes, not because of the case.

There were motions to change venue, to dismiss the jury, to postpone, to discharge counsel and judges—one hassle after another.

The crime faded into obscurity. Incoming judges had to try to pick up the threads from outgoing judges, the surviving policeman became a shell of his former self.

At one point one of the distraught lawyers for the State declared:

"Sometimes I get a crazy feeling that it'll never be over. . . . The American system of justice is the laughingstock of the English-speaking world and totally incomprehensible to the rest of the world!"

The record of the case, when it was completed, filled 45,000 pages in 159 volumes.

This was a trial? It was a record-breaking run of a courtroom circus. It would have been hilarious—if it weren't so tragic.

This was not a case Mr. Burger was talking about. He was in general deploring the dock-et-choking stagnation of trials caused by a large number of courtroom lawyers who, when you come right down to it, simply don't know their business.

The Chief Justice, a student of the need to modernize and speed the path of justice, urges that lawyers be trained as trial specialists. He favors some form of the British system under which only 3,000 of the country's 30,000 attorneys are recognized as barristers, qualified to serve as trial lawyers.

This may or may not be the way to do it. Lawyers, themselves, disagree on remedies.

But it is distressingly clear that something has to be done. Jurists, jurors, dedicated lawyers—and the American public—simply cannot tolerate the time, money and talent wasted in a courtroom comedy of errors.

DR. CHARLES HOLMES HERTY, OF
GEORGIA

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the city of Savannah set aside December 4 in honor of a great and industrious Georgian, Dr. Charles Herty, who was principally responsible for the prosperity

which came to the State of Georgia and the South through the development of the pulpwood industry and the attraction of new industry.

This outstanding chemist, business and civic leader, and humanitarian was first to prove that southern pines could be utilized for the production of a strong and high-quality newsprint paper. Thus was born the giant pulpwood industry, which grew to become a vital part of the economy of Georgia and the South. The paper industry is the fifth largest in the Nation. The South produces more than 60 percent of all paper and pulp in the United States, and Georgia leads all other States in this production.

A major share of the credit for the success of this industry goes to Dr. Herty, who died in 1938, and whose birthday was celebrated by the city of Savannah on December 4.

Mr. President, Savannah and the entire State of Georgia is greatly indebted to the work of Dr. Herty, and I ask unanimous consent that Savannah Mayor Pro Tempore Frank P. Rossiter's remarks on this occasion be printed in the RECORD, along with the proclamation of the city of Savannah declaring December 4 in Dr. Herty's honor.

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

REMARKS OF FRANK P. ROSSITER, MAYOR PRO
TEMPORE OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH

It is indeed fitting that we should be gathered in a grove of pine trees to honor Dr. Charles Holmes Herty. And it is likewise fitting that we should be in the shadow of a football field where the University of Georgia team once played for Dr. Herty was the first football coach of the Georgia Bulldogs.

Such was the vision of this eminent scientist that he saw the immense value of the Southern pine many years before others of his time. He preached the potential of the pine from one end of the country to the other, never missing an opportunity to appear on the program at a chemical meeting, a gathering of paper makers or industry-seeking groups.

Dr. Herty was the catalyst for a tremendous development of the paper industry in the South. Truly, "The spark of his genius and energy touched Georgia's pines, and forests of smokestacks began growing in the South."

Today the paper industry is the 5th largest in the nation, and the South produces more than 60 percent of all paper and pulp in the U.S. with Georgia leading the parade of states in production. Certainly the magnitude of this great industry is appreciated by Savannahians.

Dr. Herty was born December 4, 1867, in Milledgeville. He graduated from the University of Georgia in 1886, and obtained his Ph. D. degree from Johns Hopkins University four years later.

He served as professor of Chemistry both at Georgia and the University of North Carolina. His development of the Herty Cup for collecting the gum from pine trees was credited with saving the important gum naval stores industry—an industry vital to the well-being of Savannah for generations.

Dr. Herty was rounding out a great career in the chemical field as a consultant with a large New York firm when the depression struck the nation in 1929. He returned to his native state bent on helping lift Georgia by its bootstraps from this difficult period.

Next to the people of Georgia, Dr. Herty quickly realized that the state's greatest asset was the pine. At the time, there was a shortage of newsprint in this country and the

paper industry was building new newsprint mills in Canada.

"Why not move South and use the Southern pine?" Dr. Herty preached.

Paper engineers ridiculed him, contending the high resin content of the Southern pine would foul the clothing of the paper machines.

Dr. Herty went back to the laboratory, and with an assist from Hercules Powder Co., proved that the resin content of second growth pine was less than Northern spruce and hemlock.

He obtained a \$50,000 grant from the Chemical Foundation, headed by his friend, Dr. Francis Garvin, and set up shop in Savannah, which he found to be the most progressive city in the state at the time. The Savannah Port Authority and the Savannah Electric & Power Co. assisted him with a staff, power and laboratory on the banks of the Savannah River at the foot of West Broad Street.

His laboratory included a pilot paper machine which could run tests paralleling the results on the giant paper machines. Incidentally, that same pilot machine is in use today at the Herty Laboratory on Brampton Road where some 30 scientists continue research and study for the paper industry as a living memorial to the man we honor this day.

As a cub reporter, I covered Dr. Herty's work at the laboratory on River Street, and got to know the enthusiasm and drive of this tall, kind, affable man who combined the talents of a great scientist and promoter. I shared his thrill when the laboratory turned out this first pulp from pine and shipped it to a mill in Thorold, Canada, where it was converted to newsprint. The finished paper was returned to Georgia and put through test runs on the nine leading newspaper presses in the state, including the Savannah Morning News. There were no web breaks. The Southern newsprint performed exceedingly well in all aspects. A new day had indeed dawned for the South!

When Dr. Herty looked at a pine tree, he saw more than a mere tree. He saw a God-given resource for providing paper, valuable chemicals, cellulose for making beautiful dresses and swim suits, cellulose for photographic film and a multitude of other uses. Most of all he saw untold thousands of new jobs.

Throughout the years many Savannahians have held the erroneous belief that Dr. Herty's fame rested on the discovery that kraft paper, such as is turned out today by Union Camp, could be made from Southern pine. Actually, paper had been made some time earlier from pine with the kraft process. Dr. Herty was the first to make newsprint from pine.

Dr. Herty never stopped singing the praise of the Southern pine, citing its rapid growth as compared to the slow rate of growth of spruce and hemlock in the colder climes of the North.

At the time Dr. Herty was spreading the fame and the value of this great resource, the pine was being treated rather poorly in Georgia. Cattlemen let their pineywoods stock graze over the land of their neighbors under Georgia's antiquated Fence Laws. Frequently these cattlemen would set a fire in the woods to burn off the underbrush and thus assure a new crop of grass for the cattle in the spring. It mattered not to them that hundreds of acres of pines were destroyed in the process.

Now the woodlands of our state are well protected against fire and all Georgians appreciate the value of the forests as an important money crop.

Dr. Herty died in Savannah, July 28, 1938.

Today as we gather to honor Dr. Herty on the 106th anniversary of his birth, the finest tribute we could pay his memory would be to warn the burgeoning wood products in-

dustry to treat our forests with tender loving care—lest the energy crisis we are experiencing today might one day be duplicated with a scarcity of pulpwood and saw timber and all of the other products so vital to our economy and well being. That would be the message of Charles Holmes Herty were he here this day. Thank you.

PROCLAMATION: THE CITY OF SAVANNAH

Whereas, Dr. Charles Holmes Herty was a native Georgian, born in Milledgeville, Georgia, December 4, 1867; graduated from the University of Georgia 1886; attended Johns Hopkins University, graduated and awarded Ph.D. in Chemistry 1890; returned to University of Georgia as Professor of Chemistry and furthered his studies of chemistry in Germany and Switzerland; and

Whereas, He revolutionized and revitalized the Naval Stores business in the south, and improved methods of procuring gum and invented a ceramic cup for gathering same; he concentrated his studies on the pine-improved methods of planting of pine trees to spread growth and increase size for greatest yield for paper making and many other practical productive uses to benefit more people—raising the standard of living his prime interest; and

Whereas, He was elected president of the American Chemical Society in 1915, was reelected in 1916, and aided largely in making the chemical business one of our giant industries of today. He recommended widespread research and cooperation between businesses for the common good of all. He was an active chemurgist and worked closely with the National Chemurgic Council, whose prime purpose is to use sensibly and profitably surplus farm crops; and

Whereas, He started football at the University of Georgia in 1892—first game with Auburn in Atlanta—Auburn won 10-0. He loved all sports and encouraged participation in them to help make life more enjoyable; and

Whereas, He was honored in 1943 by having a Liberty Ship named in his honor at Southeastern Ship Building in Savannah. He was also honored in 1946 by having a bronze bust placed in the rotunda of the State Capitol in Atlanta with the following inscription: "The spark of his genius and energy touched Georgia's pines and forests of smokestacks began growing in the south"; and

Whereas, The citizens of Savannah having enjoyed and shared the last and most fruitful years of his life, it is fitting and proper to set aside December 4, 1973, his birthday, and celebrate same in a manner magnifying his good works so that they may shine forth for generations to come and his great benefactions multiply.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL ENERGY INFORMATION SYSTEM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, if this Nation is going to manage and contain the energy crisis, the public must be able to get quick, reliable answers to extremely complex questions. At the moment, the Congress and the people are totally dependent on the oil companies for most of the information on which we base our governmental decisions.

I, for one, do not want to have to rely on the major oil companies for this essential information.

It is quite disturbing to me that in the past few weeks, the Federal Government, based largely on information provided by oil companies, has approved measures which the oil companies themselves have been seeking for years but which had been denied to them, because of admitted dangers to the environment or obvious, unreasonable profit gouging:

The Alaskan pipeline bill was approved by the Congress and signed by the President despite formidable opposition which lasted a number of years;

Environmental standards, which were established after prolonged debate and over the opposition of the oil companies, have been relaxed or postponed;

Offshore drilling permits will apparently be granted to once again put the Santa Barbara Channel shoreline in danger of oil spills; and

The Cost of Living Council has permitted increases in heating fuel prices, because refineries operated by the oil companies have refused to produce this needed fuel without such increases.

On top of this, the exorbitant profits that the major oil companies are reaping are well known.

Mr. Speaker, the record is quite clear. The major oil companies have the Nation over a barrel and are being permitted to use the energy crisis to satisfy their unquenchable thirst for profits.

One way, I believe, that we can halt this incredible series of events is to obtain timely and accurate information to help us define our energy needs and resources. In my view, we must take steps to enable the Government to make decisions that greatly affect the oil industry and the Nation on the basis of data and information other than that supplied solely by the industry itself.

Therefore, I am today introducing legislation, entitled the Energy Information Systems Act, which is designed to provide for the collection, organization, and dissemination of energy information by one Federal organization.

It is my belief that this bill, over the long run, will enable energy policymakers in the Government to make decisions and recommendations on the most complete, timely, and unbiased information available. It will enable the Congress as well as the executive branch to discharge its responsibilities to see that energy shortages are borne equitably and that danger to individual Americans due to the lack of energy is minimized. But most important of all, perhaps, is that the bill enable the people to make real and meaningful judgments of those who govern them and of those who have so much power over their very lives.

MR. SAM SIEGEL

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to one of the most outstanding men in my district, Mr. Sam Siegel of Bruce-

ton, Tenn., who has just been presented the "Outstanding Tennessean Award" by Governor Winfield Dunn at a ceremony in Nashville on November 27. This award is in special recognition for outstanding service to the handicapped. In presenting this award to Mr. Siegel, Governor Dunn praised him for his great efforts in providing employment opportunities to handicapped Tennesseans throughout the year.

Receiving awards is nothing new to Sam Siegel. Last year he received an outstanding employer award from the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. In 1969 he was honored as West Tennessee Regional Employer of the Year for the Handicapped. Mr. Siegel has never turned away anybody seeking employment who has a handicap. He has built ramps into his plant and removed other barriers. He has also adapted machinery so handicapped employees could operate it efficiently.

Sam Siegel's service does not stop here, however. He has served as mayor of Bruceton for several years, and has been active in numerous community service projects, including the West Tennessee Heart Association. Carroll County, his home, has led the Nation in per capita contributions to the Heart Fund for the past 10 years. He works very closely with the less fortunate, and on November 26 treated 39 boys from Boys Town in Jackson, Tenn., to a dinner and provided clothing for them.

This modest man who has contributed so much to so many accepts these awards with humility and the desire to do more for the less fortunate. Truly his "cup runneth over" with kindness. I am proud to call him my friend.

INEQUITIES OF FEDERAL SUBSIDIES

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent letter I received from the president of a company in my district that serves as a wholesale distributor of golf and tennis fashions. In his letter, Mr. R. Holton Confer, Jr., points up the inequities that result from Federal subsidies.

I urge the Members of the House to reflect on Mr. Confer's letter and to remember it the next time we consider legislation authorizing subsidies—no matter how meritorious the cause may appear to be. The letter follows:

LAKE HAVASU CITY, ARIZ.,
December 6, 1973.

Mr. SAM STEIGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: I noticed in yesterday's Wall Street Journal our government had been officially notified by Pan American Airways the company would need subsidies if the current fuel crisis were to intensify or last for a prolonged period of time.

I wish you would officially notify our gov-

ernment that PoCoJo Enterprises, Ltd., will also need subsidies if the current fuel crisis intensifies or lasts for a prolonged period of time.

Our reasons?

PoCoJo is a wholesale distributor of men's and ladies' fashions to golf and tennis professionals in six southwestern states.

The major ingredient of our fashion wear is polyester. A petroleum derivative, polyester yarn production is being reduced by DuPont (the major manufacturer) by 15%.

Our method of distribution is to visit our customers with three fully stocked 27' motor homes—fuel usage 6 to 7 miles per gallon.

Our customers, especially at this time of the year, depend on northern tourists for much of their business—tourists who are not traveling.

We are a prime source of supply for our customers and are just as important to them as Pan Am is to its customers.

Since we enjoy similar corporate status (especially at tax time) we'd certainly like to have similar status to stand beside them in the subsidy line. Maintaining corporate position is just as important to us as it is to Pan Am.

Think about it.

Sincerely,

R. HOLTON CONFER, Jr.,
President.

ERIE COUNTY HOUSEWIVES TO END POLLUTION SPEAK OUT FOR CONSERVATION OF ENERGY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as the debate continues over the best methods to employ to cushion the severity of our present energy shortage, it frequently seems that our demand for energy is directly at odds with our environmental concerns. Great progress has been made in the last few years toward reclaiming our environment from the ravages of pollution and many now wonder if it is possible to keep our country warm as well as clean. I believe we can, Mr. Speaker, but with this controversy in mind, I think a letter which I recently received is particularly noteworthy. The Erie County Housewives to End Pollution has been one of the most active and effective groups in the effort to safeguard our land, our air and our water through recycling. Mrs. Ruth Parnes, chairman of the Energy Task Force of HEP, shows by her recent letter that meeting our energy demands need not be incompatible with our environmental standards as this letter to the President points out.

The letter follows:

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: We wish to voice our strong support for the recommendations mentioned in your speech on energy aired over TV on Nov. 7, 1973. We feel the problem was well explained and the solution practical.

To be more specific we support the reduction of speed on highways to 50 MPH; lowering of heating temperatures in homes, industry, government and commercial establishments; use of mass transit, car pools; and the burning of coal where possible rather than oil or gas. The use of coal however must be carefully considered in light of what we know its effect to be on human

health. For it does a man little good to bring home \$175,000 a week if a great deal of it must be spent on doctor's bills, hospital bills, medicines, lost days of work and physical disablement.

As far as future long range plans are concerned we strongly support research in the areas of use of coal (gasification), solar energy, fusion and thermal energy. To a lesser degree we would like to see the use of shale oil. Deriving oil from shale will leave mounds of refuse that would be acceptable only to keep from freezing.

Unfortunately we find the spread of nuclear energy unacceptable at this time. There are already problems with disposal, transport, thermal pollution and operation; and proliferation of these light water nuclear reactors will only multiply the problems. We must urge a go slow policy on growth of this type of energy until such time as these problems are solved.

In the meantime we shall keep our thermostats low, drive slowly, form car pools, take the bus, and ride our bicycles.

Thank you.

Mrs. RUTH PARNES, Chairman.

ENERGY CRISIS PROVIDES AMTRAK WITH GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY TO IMPROVE NATION'S RAILROADS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial pointed up one of the positive aspects of the current energy crisis: the opportunity for Amtrak to expand its service and improve the national railroad system.

Obviously, with gasoline shortages, more and more Americans will look to railroads for public transportation, and if railroads can demonstrate efficient service and pleasant surroundings, railroad travel habits can be increased and improved.

This energy crisis provides Amtrak with a golden opportunity to grow, develop, and expand our Nation's railway system—because even if the crisis subsides, the supply of fossil fuels is limited and Americans must depend to a greater degree on rail transportation.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the editorial in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

AMTRAK NOW HAS BEST CHANCE EVER

A First century maxim warns: "Never find delight in another's misfortunes." At the risk of broaching that maxim, we observe with optimism the resurgence of interest in passenger rail service, the obvious offshoot of the nationwide fuel shortage.

Gasoline-gulping automobiles have been hit hard. The nation's fuel shortage has forced Americans to restudy their travel habits, giving Amtrak the best opportunity yet to make passenger rail service a viable alternative to other modes of travel.

The situation in Nashville is similar to that of other rail centers across the country. Amtrak officials are having to turn away would-be passengers. The south-bound trains to Florida through Nashville are booked solid through the holidays.

Some of this can be attributed to normal increased patronage at holiday times. But much of the interest stems from the prospect of travelers not being able to get gasoline for their cars. The closing of service stations on Sunday has cast a pall on weekend motor-ing.

When President Nixon signed a bill for more money for Amtrak last month, he pointed out the efficiency—energy-wise—of railroads: "Railroads can carry more passengers over greater distances per gallon of fuel than automobiles or airlines are able to do while adding fewer pollutants to the air."

But however efficient railroads are energy-wise, the public will ultimately judge Amtrak on the basis of other efficiencies: schedules, convenience, comfort, reliability, etc. The railroads have fared poorly in these areas in the past.

Officials here have announced plans to improve conditions on the Floridian, the Chicago to Florida train that passes through here, which is Nashville's only passenger train.

That is encouraging news, for if rail service is ever to become a popularly-accepted mode of travel the trains will have to project a warmth that has not been there before.

We hope that Amtrak seizes the energy crisis as an opportunity to prove itself to the traveling public. With imaginative thinking and with proper leadership, rail service could become a primary, rather than a last-resort, means of travel.

THINKING THINGS OVER

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, as we pass emergency legislation for ever-increasing allocations, rationing, and controls it might be worth our while to consider how far we have departed from the principles of a free economy. I call attention in this connection to two recent articles in the Wall Street Journal, which I insert in the RECORD, as follows:

THINKING THINGS OVER

(By Vermont Royster)

BEEFING ABOUT SHORTAGES

Putting one little word after another, whatever happened to the beef shortage?

So many things have happened so fast this year that last summer is almost ancient history. The past gets obliterated in memory not by decades but by months. Sitting in the chill before the TV set it's hard to recall the heat of summer and the dramatic pictures on the evening news of those bare counters in the supermarket meat department.

But for a time back there the TV pictures were also of empty corrals down at the old stockyards, and at our house hamburger was as rare as pheasant under glass. Poses of housewives were ready to hang the butcher and Congressmen from urban districts were muttering dire things about greedy cattlemen, sounding for all the world like sheepherders in one of those range wars right out of "Gunsmoke."

Meanwhile sophisticated commentators were telling us that the beef shortage was permanent and we were just going to have to learn to get our protein from soybean concoctions. A few even viewed this as a good thing, since it would break our horrible habit of munching on burgers and french fries.

So a recent visit to the local supermarket in the interests of journalistic enterprise was something of a surprise. The meat counter

was obviously beefed up—ground beef, rump roast, eye round, all-beef frankfurters, even steaks from varying parts of the beast, all spread out in tempting array.

To be sure, the prices were beefed up too. Plain old ground beef was 99 cents a pound, the rump roast was \$1.38, the eye round roast was \$1.88, while the price of sirloin was reserved for J. Paul Getty.

Higher prices, yes. Shortages, no. The bare shelves of summer were created not by the butchers but by some gentlemanly agronomists on the Cost of Living Council. As soon as these gentlemen in their wisdom lifted the price ceilings on beef, the shortages vanished.

For there is a relentless correlation between the two, between the price of a commodity and its availability in the market place. Which is something worth pondering now that we begin to shiver through the winter, industries begin to cut back production and the unemployment lines lengthen.

The choice is between higher prices for energy or a cold, cold winter for everybody. Worse, between higher prices for energy or a cold, cold decade. It's an unhappy choice, true enough, and it would be marvelous if some bureaucrat could issue an order and save us from it. But no rationing program, no matter how elaborate, will produce another barrel of oil, another cubic foot of gas, another BTU of energy from any source. Rationing and price controls can only assure that the shortage will last as long as the programs do.

The problem here—as in the beef shortage or any other shortage—is three-fold. To reduce demand, to allocate the present supply in the most efficient manner and to increase the supply.

Artificially depressed prices and rationing don't decrease demand, they merely shift the pressure from the open market to the black market or the political arena where it's decided who gets what at the artificially cheap price. They don't allocate the supply on an economic but on a political basis. They encourage no new production.

A freely operating market price will do all three. Right now the price of energy would rise, all right, just as did the price of beef. But with the price rise every user, industrial or home consumer, would take a hard look at his energy use.

There's nothing like a pocketbook pinch, whether on the household budget or a company profit-and-loss sheet, to cut out waste and promote the economic use of any resource. As between users, particularly heavy industrial users, price allocates usage on some rational economic basis rather than by the whim of some government bureaucrat.

Meanwhile, of course, the rising price would encourage all sorts of people to dig more oil wells, tap more gas pools, research new energy sources in areas not economic at the present price levels.

To all this there are objections. One is that rising prices fall heaviest upon those who can least afford them. This is true of all prices, whether of beef or gasoline, but the choice is always between a price to put goods on the market or no goods. And in this case with the shortage resulting in unemployment and other assorted ills the real choice for many will be between letting prices rise or no jobs—and no money to buy at any price.

Another objection is that rising prices will benefit producers, all those oil and gas companies. Let us hope so. Looking at the stock market right now, who is going to put up capital to dig new wells or lay new pipelines? Is the objective to restrict "profits" of cattlemen or wildcatters, or to get more beef and more oil? To refuse to reward those who will get more of what we need is, in the old adage, to cut off one's nose to spite one's face.

No consumer, and I am one, likes high prices. But when nature is unkind or politicians foolish we are sure to get them. With

energy, nature is unkind in that the sources remaining are expensive to get at. The politicians have foolishly compounded the problem by, first of all, plaguing us with an inflation that forces up the prices of everything necessary to produce energy, from the steel to make drills, to the labor to do the drilling.

Then the politicians penalized capital formations, refused to let pipelines get laid, discouraged the opening of new gas heads, restricted the uses of coal, delayed the construction of nuclear plants—and now act stunned that a shortage is aggravated into a crisis.

There's no use pretending there's an easy way out. We're in for a cruel time, no matter what. But whatever else is done, in the real world we're going to have to pay the real cost of energy or do without—that is, have a permanent crisis. The real price of energy will surely be higher, though not as high as a black-market price. On the other hand, the price of not paying it is a shortage not only of energy but of chemicals, paper, medicines, electricity, food and everything else that requires energy.

So maybe the oil controllers in Washington ought to wander over and have a chat with the beef controllers.

NOTABLE AND QUOTABLE

(Maurice F. Granville, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Texaco Inc., before the Independent Natural Gas Association of America:)

I am indebted to an individual outside of our industry, Bruce Henderson of the Boston Consulting Group, for a succinct analysis of how a great nation can go about creating an energy shortage. Following is his scenario:

"First, with regard to natural gas, get a ceiling price. This discourages exploration and increases use. Keep the prices down in spite of inflation. This amplifies the effect and guarantees a shortage eventually.

"With regard to coal, ban the use of coal with sulfur content. This sharply restricts the supply. Sharply restrict strip mining for cosmetic reasons. This further restricts the supply. Then suddenly impose drastic new safety rules which will substantially cut output from existing mines. Freeze prices so no one can offset cost increase from reduced output or justify further investment.

"For atomic power, delay construction a matter of years by uncertainty about licensing requirements. Delay operation at full power after construction. Delay start of construction by environmental suits.

"With natural gas, coal and atomic power all severely restricted, that leaves only petroleum. First, grossly increase automotive consumption of gasoline, by requiring drastic reductions in engine efficiency because of pollution-related modifications. That alone will insure a severe shortage of energy. Then ban the use of oil containing sulfur. This severely reduces refining capacity.

"Put into effect new pollution objectives which make refineries far more expensive. At the same time, introduce great uncertainty into the requirements that must be met. That will virtually stop refinery construction or expansion.

"Eliminate practically all new refinery sites because of environmental delaying tactics. Further curtail refinery investment by making supplies of crude oil very uncertain. Block the use of Alaska North Slope by arguments on the cosmetic effects in uninhabited and unreachable regions. Stop the use or search for oil offshore in California because of pollution leaks. Slow all offshore operations for environmental reasons. For good measure, hold down the price of gasoline to half that in Europe. This encourages large cars.

"To be sure that all of the above is misunderstood by the general public, bring a law suit which charges all the large energy

companies with being noncompetitive and therefore causing the energy shortage."

THE NIXON-KISSINGER MIDDLE EAST DILEMMA

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, it is time to put the recent Middle East peace settlement in its proper perspective. The fact of the matter is that the President's Middle East policy is not as successful as some would lead us to believe. As a direct consequence of the Nixon-Kissinger peace settlement, we are faced with a severe shortage of fuel. The tragedy of this peace is that we could have easily averted our present oil and gas shortage, if we had properly used our strength.

By October 20, 1973, the Soviet Union realized that it was in their best interest to try and bring about a ceasefire. They needed, however, U.S. support to accomplish this. The President quickly agreed to the Soviet's request and sent the Secretary of State to Moscow to help arrange the peace negotiations. This appears to be where we made a crucial mistake. At this point, we could have insisted that the Soviets force their Arab allies to lift the oil embargo against the United States. Instead, "nice guys" that we are, we let ourselves be used to bring about the peace, and received nothing in return. President Nixon and Secretary Kissinger call this peace settlement a triumph. I do not think so.

A recent article in the Washington Post demonstrates clearly how we partially failed in the Middle East. True, we did bring about a peace settlement, but only at enormous expense to ourselves; and an unnecessary expense at that. Naturally, I am happy that a peace accord was reached. The point is, however, that this agreement could have been achieved, and the Arab boycott lifted, if the United States had properly pursued its role as a world leader. The following article by Martin E. Weinstein, which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, December 2, addresses itself to this point. I am enclosing Mr. Weinstein's excellent article for the consideration of my colleagues:

MISSING THE BOAT IN THE MIDEAST

(By Martin E. Weinstein)

There is a widespread illusion that the Nixon-Kissinger policy in the Middle East crisis has been a diplomatic success. It has been widely publicized as a masterpiece of timing, agility and firmness that saved the structure of peace, got the Arabs and Israelis moving toward a lasting settlement, and restrained the Soviets from sending their forces into the war.

Like most illusions, this one has shreds of evidence and wisps of logic to hold it together. After all, a cease-fire is in effect, Arab-Israeli negotiations are being planned, and the Soviets didn't send in their troops.

But the harsh truth behind the illusion is that the Nixon-Kissinger policy has conceded to the Soviet Union military predominance in the Middle East and has confirmed the Arabs in their belief that they can rely on Soviet military protection in the pursuit of their policies, either on oil or Israel. The

U.S. policy also has seriously, and perhaps irreparably, damaged our vital alliances with Western Europe and Japan—the relationships which are the basis of American security and prosperity. And, finally, it is leading the United States, along with the rest of the non-Communist world, toward an economic abyss—a severe depression, induced by a shortage of oil and complicated by shortsighted economic nationalism.

UNDERESTIMATING THE EMBARGO

The major flaw in the administration's Middle East policy has been its underestimation of the Arab oil embargo and its consequent failure to have that embargo lifted. The embargo was threatened within a few days of the Egyptian-Syrian attack on Oct. 6, and was officially announced on Oct. 17. From the moment the embargo was declared, it constituted a terrifying threat to American interests—not simply to our interests in the Middle East, but to our entire position as a world power—a threat which Mr. Nixon and Kissinger did not perceive.

The immediate effect of the embargo, as President Sadat and King Faisal intended, and as the Soviets must have understood, was to give an unprecedented battering to the Western Alliance, and by so doing to push the United States toward diplomatic isolation. The Western Europeans and Japanese, whose industries would be crippled without Arab oil, had to choose between placating the Arab producers or backing the United States in its "even-handed" policy of equivocal support for Israel. The administration minimized the importance of the oil embargo, brushed off the allies' economic concerns as selfish, and left them no alternative but to appease the Arabs. That, of course, is what they have proceeded to do.

Our position, however, was not irretrievable. Within a few weeks of the war's outbreak, the administration was given an opportunity to correct its initial errors and to act positively on the oil embargo. By Oct. 20, when Secretary Kissinger flew to Moscow to negotiate a cease-fire, it was obvious that the Egyptians and Syrians, despite the advantage of a coordinated, surprise attack and ample supplies of advanced Soviet weapons, were getting into military difficulties. It was a mistake for Secretary Kissinger to have flown to Moscow at all. It was the Arabs and the Soviets who needed a cease-fire, and he should have let them come to him. Instead, he rapidly worked out a cease-fire scheme with the Soviets and rushed it through the U.N. Security Council on Oct. 21, with the stipulation that the cease-fire was to take effect on Oct. 22.

By Oct. 22, however, the Israeli's had a sizable tank force west of the Suez Canal. The Egyptians, after underestimating the scope and power of the Israeli crossing, belatedly realized that the Israeli were moving into a position from which they could cut off the Egyptian forces east of the canal and simultaneously attack the Egyptian reserves or even threaten Cairo. Given these circumstances, it is understandable that both sides ignored the cease-fire of Oct. 22 and 23—the Egyptians in the hope of preserving their initial gains and the diplomatic advantages inherent in those victories, the Israelis to compensate for their early setbacks, and to strengthen their bargaining position in the expected negotiations.

By the next day, Oct. 24, it was clear that the Israelis were winning decisively. Suez City was in their hands and the Egyptian 3d Army was cut off from its supplies, including its food and water. Unless the cease-fire was immediately honored, Egypt faced a military disaster.

THE SOVIET NOTES

The Soviet leaders, fully realizing the desperate position of the Egyptians, sent President Nixon several urgent notes, correctly pointing out that the cease-fire was being violated and insisting that we act to-

gether to enforce it, especially on the Israelis. According to administration accounts, in one of these notes the Soviet proposed joint Soviet-American intervention to stop the fighting and stated that if the United States did not act together with the Soviet Union, "we the Soviets should be faced with the necessity urgently to consider the question of taking appropriate steps unilaterally."

In plain language, the Soviets were telling the President either to put a leash on the Israeli or the Soviet Union might send in its own forces to save the Egyptians.

The Soviet notes should not have been a shock. They hinted at unilateral intervention but left room for diplomatic maneuver. And why not? They had successfully rattled their missiles in the 1956 Suez Canal crisis. Why not threaten intervention again in 1973, especially since the United States and its allies already had shown themselves weak and divided in their reaction to the oil embargo.

Mr. Nixon and Kissinger responded to this quasi-ultimatum by promptly stopping the Israelis and simultaneously called a worldwide strategic alert. Then, on Oct. 25 and 26, the secretary and the President held televised news conferences at which they stated that their alert had averted a superpower military confrontation in the Middle East. The President announced that this was "the most serious crisis we have had since the Cuban confrontation of 1962," and he strongly implied that he had faced the Soviets down.

A number of critics of the administration promptly charged that the alert was unjustified, that the President had staged a military crisis to divert attention from his Watergate problems. These critics were wrong. The President did face a serious contest with the Soviets. But he avoided it. He did not save the day with his alert. Rather, he avoided a crucial test by giving the Soviets what they demanded and what Egypt desperately needed—an immediate honoring of the cease-fire.

WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN

But what of the oil embargo? There is not the slightest evidence that Mr. Nixon or Kissinger ever saw a connection between the cease-fire and the embargo. It should have been clear to them by Oct. 20 that the oil embargo is a more potent weapon in the Middle East war than the Egyptian and Syrian forces, or Soviet arms, and that it is a weapon aimed only indirectly at Israel but directly and menacingly at the United States and the entire Western alliance.

In brief, the administration should have made the lifting of the Arab oil embargo the prerequisite for our support of the cease-fire. This should have been our stand throughout the crisis. Our government should have told the Soviets and the Arabs that we favored a cease-fire and that we wanted negotiation for a lasting peace settlement, but that we could not work for a cease-fire or participate in negotiations while the embargo continued. How could we be expected to press the Israelis to stop fighting in Egypt and Syria while the Arab oil producers persisted in their economic warfare against the United States? If the fighting was to stop, it must stop on both the military and the economic fronts.

The sensible, unprovocative policy the United States should have followed was to stand firmly on the necessity of the embargo being rescinded as part of the cease-fire agreement while opposing intervention in the war by the armed forces of either of the superpowers.

Such a policy would have distributed the tasks of peace-making equitably. It would have breathed life into Secretary Kissinger's repeated but still hollow declarations that he intends to revitalize our alliances with the Europeans and the Japanese. And, most importantly, such a policy would have

made it clear to the Arabs that the Soviet Union is not an omnipotent protector and that they cannot use the oil weapon with impunity.

If the administration had perceived the crucial importance of the oil embargo, and had stood fast on the necessity of the embargo being rescinded, then the President's claim to firmness and to coolness under fire would have substance and the secretary's reputation as a diplomatic genius would be at least debatable. As it is what we have are merely illusions.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on December 12 I introduced legislation which would allow the operation of motor vehicles without emission control devices in areas which lack significant air pollution. The current requirement under the Clean Air Act that manufacturers attach emission control devices to all late-model cars discriminates against the majority of Americans who live in rural and moderately populated areas where pollution is not severe, or very minimal but who are forced to pay extra money for cars with emission control devices they don't need.

Environmental quality is of concern to everyone. We are all familiar with the cities which are constantly plagued with the cloud of gloom which hangs above them and areas where certain weather conditions bring on pollution warnings which keep many people indoors. These citizens in such locations should be protected and my legislation would require the Environmental Protection Agency to identify areas of significant pollution where auto emission controls are needed. Auto emission controls would then not be required on cars operating outside the areas specified by EPA. EPA would develop an identifications system, possibly a window sticker system which would inform law enforcement officials at a glance whether the vehicle carried an emission control device.

This legislation would allow the removal of antipollution devices by individuals, or an individual could order an automobile from a dealer without the emission control device if the dealer operated in an area which lacks significant pollution. All States would be required to conform to these regulations, so that any area determined by EPA to lack significant air pollution could not require the occupants of that area to place antipollution control devices on their autos.

This legislation could have a tremendous impact on fuel savings in a large majority of the United States. According to the 1970 Census, 72.2 percent of the population lives in areas where the population is less than 100,000 and 55.2 percent live in communities of less than 25,000. Areas of this size would probably be similar to those which lack significant air pollution.

A factor of primary concern in the current shortage is the phenomenal increase in the demand for gasoline. This legislation would decrease that demand. Since 1962, the demand for gasoline has

increased over 54 percent, and the Office of Emergency Preparedness—OEP—has reported that the demand for gasoline in the first quarter of 1973 was 5.5 percent higher than during the same period only 1 year ago. Several factors have contributed to the increased demand for gasoline, but of these factors, the single most important one—according to a study prepared by the Congressional Research Service at the request of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee—appears to be the gasoline penalty imposed by antipollution devices. Figures indicate that the new emission control devices on cars decreases mileage by 7 percent or more. OEP estimates that these devices have increased annual gasoline consumption by more than 300,000 barrels a day.

These devices have a greater impact than the number of new cars on the road first indicates. New cars are driven further than older ones each year; that is, a 1-year-old car is driven on the average of 13,200 miles a year in comparison to a 6-year-old car which is driven 8,700 miles a year. The percentage of emission-controlled cars increases daily and the Chase Manhattan Bank has estimated that one-half of the expected growth in gasoline demand will be the result of emission control devices on late model automobiles.

A recent report printed in the April 1937 issue of the Oil and Gas Journal cited the following results of a study:

One private set of fleet tests indicated the mileage loss of 1971 models over 1970 at 7%, 1972, at 6%, and the 1973 over 1972 at 8%. This represented accumulated mileage loss of 19%; but two direct comparative tests of 1973 models against 1970 models showed a loss ranging from 11% to 17% depending on the number of miles the 1970 models had been driven prior to testing.

These data showed much greater mileage declines than governmental tests made for the Environmental Protection Agency which reported losses of only about 7%.

The issue of Oil and Gas Journal also included a chart, which I have included here, with regard to gas mileage which will be helpful in seeing how stricter controls have reduced gas mileage which in turn has resulted in increased cost for automobile operation. Soon, these controls will bring us to the level of 6.8 miles per gallon which EPA recently released as the gasoline mileage of the 1974 Oldsmobile Toronado. The people in my district, which is one of the larger districts in terms of area, cannot feasibly live with cars which perform at such a gas guzzling rate especially with rumors that gas will go up to a dollar a gallon.

A LOOK AT LATE-MODEL AUTOS

	1970	1971	1972	1973
Horsepower ¹	268	253	168	165
Compression ratio.....	9.5	8.6	8.5	8.4
Axle ratio.....	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.77
Weight (pound).....	4,362	4,403	4,505	4,653
Acceleration (second):				
0-60 mi/h.....	10.7	12.0	12.8	13.0
25-60 mi/h.....	7.8	8.5	9.6	9.5
Miles/gallon.....	14.1	13.1	12.4	11.6

¹ 1970-71 data are gross horsepower, 1972-73 are net horsepower. All data are based on fleet tests of autos representing range of models produced by GM, Ford, Chrysler and are not averages for all U.S. autos.

The initial cost of this pollution control device on automobiles is an unnecessary waste of money for those in rural areas. The cost of this device is estimated to add \$100 to \$200 to the sticker price of a car to meet the 1975 interim standards. In a time when the buying power of our citizens has already been eroded—by increasing taxes—and income is decreasing, why should we force the people in areas where pollution is not a problem to purchase such devices. They should have the option to buy them just as they would any other accessory.

I urge my colleagues, representing both urban and rural districts to support this legislation which would contribute greatly to energy savings—a goal which we all support.

BINARY WEAPONS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in October, immediately prior to the House Armed Services Committee hearings on nerve gas storage and transportation, the Army provided several Members with a memo that explained the binary concept of chemical munitions and announced the selection of Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas as a site to produce one of the chemical components of the binary weapons. The Army's rationale for the new weapons stemmed in part from public concern over the storage of mustard gas, phosgene, and GB at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal just 10 miles from the center of Denver. The new binary concept would allow the relatively safe and separate stockpiling of the weapons' two chemical components, neither of which is lethal by itself.

But while the Army's move to protect our own neighborhoods from disaster may be laudable, its decision to produce and stockpile binary chemical weapons as a "deterrent" may prove to be disastrous to any hope of international agreement on their control. Further, by the Army's switch to binary weapons the central question of why we must stockpile these weapons at all has been neatly avoided.

Chemical weapons, cluster bombs, and napalm are designed to exterminate a population, not win ground, liberate, convert or pacify. Such weapons transform killing from a means to an end in itself. As for the deterrent argument, a Washington Post editorial points out that no canon of war requires the United States to respond with the same weapon used by a foe.

Following is the Post editorial on chemical warfare which appeared this morning:

CHEMICAL WARFARE

A major opportunity exists to move toward a more responsible policy on chemical warfare but the opportunity may be overwhelmed by Army singlemindedness unless others pay

heed. The opportunity was created by a wave of public concern over the storage, testing and transport of nerve gas. Plainly, this was the moment to question whether the United States needed to be in the chemical warfare business at all. The Army, however, plans to solve the problem—which it defines as a public relations problem involving storage and transport—by producing a new brand of nerve gas. To produce the new and destroy the old will cost something like half a billion dollars. As any close student of government ought to know, once a new investment of that scale has been made, the Army's institutional interest in protecting it will be very large.

In fact, what is the reason for this country to remain ready to engage in chemical warfare? The Army's reason is to deter the Soviet Union from using chemical agents. This is like saying that in order to deter the Russians from trampling us with elephant herds, we must raise our own elephant herds. It is, in a word, ridiculous. No canon of war requires the United States to respond with the same weapon used by a foe. We would still retain a broad range of other choices if we relinquished nerve gas and like chemical agents. By relinquishing chemicals, however, the United States would be making a modest but real contribution to a more civilized international society. For the truth is, chemical warfare conveys an image of horror out of proportion to its military potential. Mere possession of chemical agents has come to be a political debit. Whatever the military effectiveness of the chemical agents used by the United States in Vietnam—certain tear gases and herbicides—few detached observers would contend that they outweighed the political opprobrium attached to their use.

In his first term, of course, President Nixon did renounce "the first use of lethal chemical weapons" and of "incapacitating chemicals" as well. He has not, however, moved on to sign the international treaty, known as the Geneva Protocol, which outlaws first use in war of chemical (and biological) agents. Mr. Nixon submitted the Protocol to the Senate in 1970. But because he explicitly excluded control of "riot control agents and chemical herbicides"—not "lethal" or "incapacitating," he claimed—the Foreign Relations Committee referred the treaty back to him. The committee's entirely reasonable view was that it would lower rather than raise the barrier against chemical warfare to ban all forms except the ones which the United States actually was equipped to use.

This is a good time to review the whole question of chemical warfare. The pending need for a half billion dollars for changing models of nerve gas makes the issue acutely topical. The end of American combat in Vietnam makes it possible to consider the Geneva Protocol in an atmosphere free of the turbulent currents of the war. One of the moral highlights of President Nixon's first term was his courageous renunciation of biological warfare—the production of biological agents, their possession and their use. He could well match that achievement with a step forward on chemical warfare now.

A TRIBUTE TO ERNIE TAYLOR

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the attached "Tribute to Ernie Taylor":

A TRIBUTE TO ERNIE TAYLOR

Hugo, Oklahoma's Ernie Taylor has continued the legacy of Oklahoma professional calf ropers by being crowned this past week in Oklahoma City during the National Finals Rodeo, the 1973 World's Champion Calf Roper.

By winning a total of \$38,772, Ernie established a new world's record for money won in a single rodeo event. More than a quarter-century ago, the late Clyde Burk won the World's Title, becoming the first Oklahoman to do so, after the creation of the Rodeo Cowboy Association. Ernie Taylor has been moving steadily up the ladder the last six years on this event as witnessed by his 4th place finish in 1971 and 7th place finish in 1972.

Like many professional cowboy champions of this era, Ernie started his competition in a winning way, by being crowned the Oklahoma High School Champion Calf Roper and later the American Junior Association Calf Roper crown. He was a standout on the Hardin-Simmons University rodeo team. Competing in more than ninety rodeos this year kept Ernie on the road steadily all year long.

In accepting his World's Title in Oklahoma City, December 9, 1973, Ernie paid a moving tribute to his wife, Paulette, for her encouragement and possession of those traits that it takes to be a "rodeo wife." The Rodeo Cowboy Association numbers more than 3,000 members who competed this year in almost six hundred rodeos in the United States and Canada for an alltime payoff record of more than five million dollars. There is a difference between being a male and a man. Ernie Taylor personifies the latter and has perpetuated those traits of rugged individualism that this country so sorely needs. Without a team doctor or trainer, without a guaranteed salary, and without the benefit of state or federal matching funds, this man from Hugo, Oklahoma, with ability and luck, which is the American way, has carved for himself a niche of greatness. The people of his hometown, Hugo, Oklahoma, are honoring him December 15th with a parade and Testimonial Dinner. I join them and Speaker Carl Albert, who represents Choctaw County, Oklahoma, as well as thousands of rodeo fans all over America, in my sincere congratulations to Ernie Taylor—Champion.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC
TRANSIT EXPENSE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill which would allow a tax deduction for workers who use public transportation to and from their jobs.

I introduce this measure not as any long-term solution to the energy problem. Rather, I consider it at least one initial step the Congress can take to assist the lower middle income worker who is becoming the economic scapegoat in our current panic over energy.

At the outset, I would like to say that I believe not only Congress, but all of the American people, are not being properly informed of the dimensions of the energy situation. The first duty of this administration should be to adequately inform

the public and its elected officials of exactly what the problem is.

It is clear, however, that the administration is following a time-honored tactic of taking short-term steps to help industry while asking the public to "tighten its belt." We have been told in the so-called phase 1 of the energy plan that Americans must restyle their living habits and learn to suffer. The latter admonition, it should be noted, comes from Mr. William Simon, the executive President Nixon has empowered to administer the new energy agency.

Until the Congress has the explicit details on the scope of our energy needs and reserves I feel the legislation introduced today is needed to benefit the average working American. This bill would offer means of transportation in any energy crisis, a definite incentive to use public transportation.

The bill would allow a commuter to deduct all ordinary and necessary expenses used on mass transportation facilities during a taxable year if travel trips are used to reach work and return home.

This would be a direct and meaningful tax deduction for the average taxpayer who, unfortunately, cannot contribute personal papers to the national archives and end up paying little or no tax to the Federal treasury.

If gasoline prices increase significantly or if prohibitive tax is attached to fuel, both of which actions are being considered by the administration, the working man will be hit the hardest.

The measure also would provide a valuable incentive to the public to use rapid transit facilities. Use of these facilities could lead to broader participation by Federal, State and local sources on enlarging and improving public modes of transportation.

POLITICAL PRISONERS IN
YUGOSLAVIA

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, although Yugoslavia is usually thought of as sort of a liberalized version of Soviet communism, it still has its secret police and suppression of political dissent. In a recent article in the Daily Telegraph of London for November 27, 1973, a comparison of Yugoslav prison conditions with that of political prisoners in the U.S.S.R. is made. I think this comparison will interest my colleagues and the article follows:

THE PRISONERS OF TITO

On Thursday the Communist regime in Yugoslavia will be 30 years old and there are rumours that President Tito will declare an amnesty for people in prison. Will any such amnesty extend to political prisoners, whose numbers have risen in recent years?

Take the case of Vlado Gotovac, the Croat poet and former editor of the *Hrvatski*

Tjednik, now serving a four-year sentence. I have just received this account of his conditions in the Stara Gradiska prison camp:

"Vlado is working in the carpenter's shop, so that when he comes out of prison he will be able to make furniture for us all! He has no opportunity of reading or of writing, because he is a 'political criminal,' and in fact can do nothing at all. He is permitted to write his wife one letter of 30 lines a month and to receive one of the same length. His wife can visit him once a month for 20 minutes in the presence of a warden. Every other month he is allowed to receive a food parcel weighing 8lb."

For a writer to be deprived of reading matter and the materials for writing is worse than making him perform physical labour. Even Andrei Sinyavski, the Russian author now safely in France, was allowed to write and to bring out of his Soviet camp the "prison notebooks" now published in the West.

Marshall Tito was himself a political prisoner in the thirties. But prison conditions under the Yugoslav monarchy were such that Tito could make use of his sentence to study Marxism. It is significant that 30 years after he took power he does not permit his own political prisoners equivalent facilities.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER GEORGE L.
SMITH

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the State of Georgia this week said goodbye to one of her greatest sons, the Speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives, the Honorable George L. Smith.

George L. Smith never sought, nor did he receive, wide popular acclaim throughout this Nation. But he was loved and respected by those he touched outside Georgia, as well as by those he served in his native State.

Mr. Speaker, Speaker Smith was my friend, personally and politically. I first came to know him when I was a green reporter attempting to cover the workings of State government in Atlanta. Very early on, I found a friend in this remarkable man, and formed a friendship that endured until his untimely death. He and I had a relationship based on trust and truth. I both loved and respected this man, and I shall miss him, as will all who knew him. He will also be missed by millions of Georgians who did not know him personally, but were richer for his service.

He was a man who sat in a seat of power, conducted himself with style and grace, radiated dignity, and exemplified integrity.

I am submitting for the RECORD, only two of the flood of articles that filled our State's newspapers on the death of this great Georgian.

HOUSE SPEAKER SMITH DIES

(By David Morrison and Celestine Sibley)

House Speaker George L. Smith died at 4:45 p.m. Sunday, the victim of a massive

stroke that kept him unconscious for three weeks.

"He had moments in which he responded to his relatives," an attending physician said, "but he never fully regained consciousness."

After family members were notified and word of the speaker's death circulated, state officials, politicians and friends of the family flooded the switchboard of Piedmont Hospital in Atlanta with expressions of sympathy.

"George L. Smith was one of the finest leaders Georgia has ever known," said Gov. Jimmy Carter, who arrived at the hospital shortly after the speaker's death. "He was a close personal friend of mine and he will be sorely missed in the future."

Carter praised Smith, a 27-year veteran legislator, for "enlightened leadership" in the lower house of the General Assembly. Carter said Smith possessed in innate "ability to bring order out of chaos."

The body will lie in state at the Capitol Tuesday, Gov. Carter said.

Mrs. Smith, daughter Sally and other family members present at the time of the speaker's death planned to stay in Atlanta overnight Sunday before returning to Smith's hometown of Swainsboro to make funeral arrangements.

Former U.S. Sen. David Gambrell, also present at the hospital, said Smith's death is "a very sad occasion for this state. He was a man of great ability."

"We have seen a lot of changes in the legislative system and he has been a leader in that," Gambrell said. "It will be difficult to replace a man of his ability."

The death of the popular Democratic leader left many questions unanswered for the 1974 session of the General Assembly.

However, Carter predicted that Smith's death will cause state lawmakers to set aside political differences and create a productive atmosphere in the General Assembly.

"George L. was one of the greatest Georgians that ever lived," Carter said. "He's put his leadership to great use."

"He has set an example for integrity and competence that many other politicians will emulate for years to come."

Dr. Lamont Henry, an associate of Smith's personal physician, Dr. Bernard Wolf, said there was little chance during the speaker's fight for life that he would survive. Smith suffered a massive stroke at the base of the brain three weeks ago Sunday which Henry described as the ultimate cause of death.

Such a stroke is caused primarily by the filling in of chief arteries, Henry said. The result is sudden or gradual obliteration of the blood supply to the brain.

Wolf was out of town at the time of Smith's death. However, the speaker was attended by another of his associates, Dr. Charles Upshaw Jr.

Mrs. Smith was present as was Smith's daughter, Sally, an airline stewardess, who arrived on a flight from Tampa, Fla., Sunday afternoon.

Speaker Smith, whose 61st birthday anniversary occurred after he was admitted to Piedmont Hospital, visited the Georgia Capitol for the first time when he was a small boy. He saw the House of Representatives in operation—and it was the beginning of a lifetime love affair.

Other men have used legislative service as a stepping stone to more exalted political office. Other men consider the Georgia House or Senate a way station on a trip to the post of governor, congressman, judge or even President of the United States.

George L. Smith II considered the position of Speaker of the Georgia House "the best job any man could ask for—the highest calling."

He held that job for 14 of his years as a seldom opposed, never defeated House member, bringing to it a fierce love and pride that did much through the years to burnish the image of the House itself. He came to the House in 1945, a largely wool hat legislature controlled by the governor he had supported, Eugene Talmadge. Peanut hulls rattled underfoot on the floor, cuspidors were awash with amber and it wasn't unusual to hear the clink of liquor bottles in members' desks. Rep. Smith quickly became a member of the celebrated law-making triumvirate which included Rep. Frank Twitty of Mitchell County, long-time floor leader, and Rep. Jack Ray of Warren, later state treasurer.

They were a formidable trio who could marshal the votes to pass any bill in which they were interested. One of their strengths was later to become Smith's greatest asset as Speaker of the House.

He knew the House rules "backwards, forwards, right side up and upside down," as one member remarked. He studied the rule book as much for pleasure as for profit and he mastered parliamentary procedure for love of its stately language as for the advantage it gave him in a law-passing maneuver.

Later he would make a study of British parliamentary practice, sitting long hours in the House of Commons and tracing the origins of Georgia's parliamentary ritual to its source. Friends he made in the British parliament occasionally returned his calls, visiting with him in the Georgia House.

Rep. Smith became Speaker of the House in 1959 with the administration of Gov. Ernest Vandiver. When Carl Sanders became governor in 1963 George L. Smith was replaced by George T. Smith as Speaker. When neither Republican Howard ("Bo") Callaway nor Democrat Lester Maddox received a majority vote in the 1966 general election for governor, Rep. Smith got the chance he had been awaiting for 20 years.

The General Assembly took to itself the responsibility of naming a Speaker, heretofore the privilege of the governor, and George L. Smith got the job.

It was the first "independent" legislature in history and the man who had loved it since boyhood became its leader, possessing powers he always denied holding. The stories of his political power were legion but efforts to give him the nickname "King George" fizzled out because of his accessibility and easy informality with members and the press. However, he was zealous to enforce the rules of the House, wielding a heavy gavel at the first sign of disturbance, particularly if a member used profanity in debate or appeared in the chamber with a bottle of liquor in his possession.

He believed that House members, particularly Senate members by association with the House, were entitled to more pay and he worked unsuccessfully to get a law passed to increase their terms of office from two to four years. By the same token he expected House members to work and he kept a weather eye on the calendar to be sure no bills were caught in a log jam in the final days of a session and failed of passage. (Some bills, he sometimes pointed out with wry humor, were introduced by their authors with death on the calendar in mind as their most desired destiny.)

"MR. SPEAKER" GEORGE L. SMITH BURIED IN SWAINSBORO SERVICES
(By Celestine Sibley)

George L. Smith II, "Mr. Speaker" to the Georgia House of Representatives for 11 years, was laid to rest in his native Emanuel County Wednesday afternoon in the midst of friends, neighbors and more than 500 political figures who flew in from all parts of

Georgia and from Washington, D.C. for the funeral.

The First United Methodist Church of Swainsboro, for which Smith obtained the building site nine years ago, was filled to overflowing, and a throng stood in a chill north wind on the lawn to hear the funeral service broadcast over the speaker system.

The Rev. Vernon Robertson, former pastor of the church, who left Swainsboro to serve as district superintendent and is now chaplain of the Methodist center at Epworth-by-the-Sea on St. Simon's Island, eulogized Smith as a man "who stood tall among us, a man of authority with a spirit of humility and a sincere love of the people of Georgia."

Recently, the minister said, there has been a loss of faith "in the integrity of men in high office," and he cited the speaker of the House as a man whose strength "was based on simple integrity."

"My prayer is simple," he concluded, "God give us more men like George L. Smith."

As the organ played the "Going Home" strains from the New World Symphony, the copper coffin with its blanket of red roses was carried down the aisle by the speaker's six nephews. The speaker's staff formed two lines as an aisle for the passage of the family and the honorary pallbearers, an honor guard of House officials, Gov. and Mrs. Jimmy Carter, Lt. Gov. and Mrs. Lester Maddox, U.S. Sen. Herman Talmadge and Mrs. Talmadge, U.S. Sen. Sam Nunn, and U.S. Rep. Dawson Mathis and Rep. Bo Ginn. Great numbers of members of the House who could not find room in the church crowded close outside, and a row of state patrolmen stood at attention.

At the cemetery following a brief service, Gov. Carter presented the speaker's widow, Sally, with the American flag which had covered her husband's coffin as his body lay in state in the rotunda of the Capitol. Mrs. Smith and her daughter Sally were escorted to the church and to the cemetery by the widow's brother, Arthur Mobley of Monroe.

Smith, who was to have begun his 29th year in the Georgia House in January, died last Sunday in Piedmont Hospital from a stroke suffered in his Swainsboro law office Nov. 11.

Crowds began gathering in the church as early as 1:30 p.m. to wait for the service, which began at 3 p.m. The chancel was banked with flowers in arrangements ranging from simple sprays and wreaths to an elaborate replica of the state Capitol. Both walls of the sanctuary were also banked with flowers, as was the grave site.

The four-acre site for the church was contributed by a member of the Baptist church after the Methodists had tried unsuccessfully to buy it, he related. George L. Smith visited the owner and talked to her and she said, "My father told me never to sell any property, but he didn't tell me I couldn't give it away."

PETROCHEMICALS—THE MINIA-TURE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, while there is evidence accumulating that gasoline and oil are in short supply in some parts of the United States, a minicrisis is coming to a head on petrochemical products. In some cases, there is nothing available.

A firm in my own 18th District of Michigan is halting all production within a few days if a supply of the petrochemical product it uses cannot be found. Press reports confirm that this is true across the country. Firms manufacturing plastic products and drugs are approaching a dangerous point due to this situation. In order to try and alleviate this situation, I am joining some of my colleagues in introducing legislation to prohibit export of these items until the present price controls are lifted on these products. Without this action, we are getting into the same silly situation we did on meat not too long ago, where it was more profitable to ship beef to Japan rather than sell it in the United States. The law of supply and demand has not been repealed, I believe. Therefore, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues the two articles from the Washington Star-News of December 10 and 11, which describe this situation.

[From the Washington Star-News,
Dec. 10, 1973]

PETROCHEMICAL EXPORTS GREATER DESPITE SHORTAGE

NEW YORK.—Although petrochemicals are in short supply at home because of the energy crisis, Commerce Department figures show that petrochemical exports from January through October were above 1972 levels.

November figures are not yet available, but some industry sources said exports continued to exceed 1972 levels because of higher prices abroad.

At home, the drug industry, a big user of petrochemicals, warned last week that domestic shortages could put medicines in short supply this winter. Manufacturers of other products dependent on petrochemicals have issued similar warnings of cutbacks.

The Arab oil boycott threatens to cut deeply into the production of petrochemicals, which are derived from petroleum and natural gas. Petrochemicals are vital to the manufacture of such varied products as drugs, plastics and synthetic fibers.

Experts analyzing the complicated Commerce Department figures said that export volume was running about 10 to 15 percent above 1972 levels through October. They said the dollar value was about 35 percent above the 1972 figure.

Petrochemical sales, domestic and foreign, totaled \$20 billion in 1972. Exports were \$2.4 billion.

"We're definitely feeling the supply squeeze, but we have not had to cut back production for penicillin and other drugs," said a spokesman for Pfizer, Inc., a major drug manufacturer. "The situation could get considerably worse if allocations are reduced."

Toy manufacturers are big consumers of plastics made from petrochemicals. The Toy Manufacturers Association said there were enough supplies to complete normal production for this Christmas. But plastics cannot be purchased in sufficient quantities to begin making Christmas toys of 1974, a spokesman said.

In a recent study, Arthur D. Little, Inc., a Massachusetts-based research firm, said that a 15 percent reduction in petrochemical output could leave 1.6 million to 1.8 million unemployed in industries dependent on petrochemicals.

The study said a 15 percent cutback in petrochemical production would cost the economy \$65 billion to \$70 billion annually. The annual Gross National Product is \$1.3 trillion.

The Commerce Department figures were for each of the many petrochemicals exported, but were not totaled. In many of the numerous categories, exports for the first 10 months of 1973 exceeded figures for all of 1972.

Polypropylene exports, for example, totaled \$58.02 million from January through October, compared with \$36.68 million in all of 1972. The 1972 export volume was 165.21 million pounds, compared with 262.06 million pounds for the first 10 months of this year.

Polypropylene is used in the manufacture of synthetic fibers for carpeting, plastic toys, plastic bottles, microfilm and other products. It sold abroad in some areas for 25 to 30 cents a pound, compared with 15 cents at home.

Exports of synthetic dyes were \$42.83 million for 32.74 million pounds through October, compared with \$34.02 million for 28.97 million pounds for all of 1972.

Benzene, toluene and similar solvents brought \$40 million from foreign sales through October, compared with \$30.85 million in all of 1972. In the case of benzene, 1.12 million gallons were exported in 1972 compared with 2.3 million in the first 10 months of this year.

"There's no doubt, that price controls have resulted in this increase in exports," said Murray Weidenbaum, an assistant secretary of the Treasury from 1969 to 1971, now a professor of economics at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Under President Nixon's Phase 4 regulations, petrochemical manufacturers can raise prices to offset some cost increases, but they can't increase profits. Price controls do not apply to exports.

A spokesman for Dow Chemical Co., a major petrochemical producer, said Dow exports were up from 1972, but the percentage of increase was not as much as the percentage increase in domestic sales.

Spokesmen for Exxon Chemical and Union Carbide made similar statements when questioned by a newsmen. None gave specific figures.

"There might be a short-term gain overseas because of higher prices, but we're trying to take care of our domestic customers," said the Dow spokesman. "At the same time we can't desert customers overseas with whom we've done business for many years."

[From the Washington Star-News, Dec. 11,
1973]

PLASTIC FIRMS ASK UNITED STATES TO LET THEM PAY MORE (By John Holusha)

It's a bit analogous to a group of housewives storming into a market and demanding that the butcher raise the price of meat:

An association of small plastics manufacturers plans to ask the Cost of Living Council today to decontrol the prices of resin, a raw material they buy from giant petrochemical companies. They say they are taking the admittedly unusual step of asking to be allowed to pay more because the present low prices are driving them out of business.

It's not that they don't like getting things at a bargain. The problem, they say, is that what they need is just not available. Most of the producers of the needed resins are multinational companies. Since demand overseas is great and the prices uncontrolled, they're exporting to the highest bidder, the U.S. customers say.

Added to all this is the shortage of petroleum which is the basic raw material for most plastics.

Sheldon M. Edelman, executive director of the New York-based Plastic Products Manu-

facturers Association, says that as many as 4,000 workers have already been laid off due to the resin shortage. The association represents 174 medium to small firms in the New York area, primarily in labor negotiations.

Edelman explains that the association is pressing for decontrol so that the U.S. firms can at least bid for the supplies they need.

The economics of the industry make price secondary to a steady source of supply. "These injection moulders are so expensive that you've got to work them around the clock to make money. Some of our people are only working one shift now—they aren't even making enough to pay off their notes," Edelman says.

"What most of these people want to do now is simply exist for another year and hope things will get better. They aren't that concerned at the moment about making money."

Although most of the companies, which produce small items like phonograph records, knobs, cases for electrical appliances and buttons, are not under direct control, Edelman said stiff competition would keep most from passing through all cost increases.

The big petrochemical companies, led by Union Carbide and Dow Chemical, understandably agree that lifting prices is the solution. Union Carbide said if price relief isn't granted it will increase exports "significantly."

The resin situation and the spectacle of consumers pleading to let prices increase is what economists term a distortion in the economy caused in this case by price controls. Classic theory says that in cases like this black markets and price gouging will break out.

This is just what has happened, Edelman says. "I can't get anyone to file a complaint, but I hear plenty of rumors about 'middlemen' buying up supplies and charging what they can get."

Edelman said association officials had met with CLC representatives and that government's response was "very favorable." He said several unions representing the plastic workers were supporting the price increase plea.

A CLC spokesman said the plastic producers request is apparently the only case of a consumer requesting price increases. "We get quite a lot of the other kind, you know, but I don't think I've ever heard of this before," the spokesman said.

ADMINISTRATOR SIMON SHEDS LIGHT ON CHRISTMAS TREES

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the following clarification by William Simon, Administrator of the Federal Energy Office, on the subject of Christmas tree lighting. This statement should help clear confusion surrounding previous statements which were ambiguous:

ADMINISTRATOR SIMON SHEDS LIGHT ON CHRISTMAS TREES

William E. Simon, newly appointed Administrator of the Federal Energy Office, today announced his position on the use of Christmas tree lights during the holiday season. "Promotional, display, and ornamental lighting of homes and apartments will be banned as soon as I receive authority to enforce this regulation," he said. Administrator Simon has already called for adherence to

these proposed regulations on a voluntary basis.

"Many patriotic citizens, however, have interpreted the ban on ornamental lighting to include the traditional lights on Christmas trees inside their homes," he explained, "and I feel this would be carrying energy conservation above and beyond the call of duty."

The Administrator said families should be sure to turn off lights in other parts of the house to compensate for the electricity being used to light their trees. He also urged everyone to eliminate exterior lights around their homes this holiday season, and to limit the use of Christmas tree lights to those times when the family is gathered together for holiday festivities.

"For most American families, a beautifully decorated tree with strings of colorful lights has been the focal point of the good fellowship that makes Christmas such a special holiday. I do not want American families to lose the festive spirit of Christmas because of the energy crisis," the Administrator said, "especially when good conservation habits can more than make up for the electricity they will use to light their trees."

Temporary telephone numbers of Federal Energy Office public affairs: General Information, 395-3537; Press Interviews, 395-3497; and Allocation Program, 395-4672.

CALLS FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger, gave a most significant address last night in London, and called for a positive program of international cooperation to meet the energy crisis.

It is no secret that relations between the United States and our traditional European allies were strained even prior to the most recent Middle East war, but the pressures and divergent interests of that conflict increased the possibility of erosion within the Atlantic community, and made it imperative that we take the initiative not only to repair any current fissures, but to regroup and take advantage of the enormous talents and resources available to deal with our mutual, worldwide energy problem.

I applaud the President and the Secretary of State for these actions. The proposal of an Energy Action Group, comprised of expert representatives from Europe, North America, and Japan, to develop an initial program for international cooperation within all areas of the energy problem is a major step forward. The group would focus on energy conservation; the discovery and development of new energy sources; how to give producers sufficient incentive to increase supply; and the coordination of international energy research.

As we in Congress today are seeking the best means to deal with the energy shortage here at home, it is most encouraging that our Government is also taking the lead on the international front.

DR. KISSINGER'S SPEECH

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the RECORD the text of Dr. Kissinger's December 12 speech, which was given before a meeting of the Pilgrims of Great Britain in London. It is a major statement of U.S. policy toward Europe:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY A. KISSINGER, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE A DINNER MEETING OF THE PILGRIMS OF GREAT BRITAIN, DECEMBER 12, 1973

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to you this evening because, like most Americans, I am seized by a mixture of pride and terror when invited to appear before a British audience. In my particular case and without any reflection on this distinguished assemblage, it is probably more terror than pride for there is no blinking the fact—it is there for all to hear—that my forebears missed the Mayflower by some three hundred years.

Our two peoples have been more closely associated than any other two nations in modern history—in culture and economics, in peace and in war. We have sometimes disagreed. But the dominant theme of our relationship in this century has been intimate alliance and mighty creations.

In 1950, while the Atlantic Alliance was considering a continuing political body, my great predecessor Dean Acheson spoke to this Society. Describing the travails of creation, Acheson noted that a "strange and confusing dissonance has crowded the trans-Atlantic frequencies." But he added that this "dissonance flows from the very awareness that difficult decisions must be made and is a part of the process of making them."

Again today America and Western Europe find themselves at a moment of great promise and evident difficulty—of renewed efforts to unite and old problems which divide. It is a time of both hope and concern for all of us who value the partnership we have built together. Today, as in 1950, we and Europe face the necessity, the opportunity and the dilemma of fundamental choice.

THE YEAR OF EUROPE

Because we have an historical and intimate relationship, I want to speak tonight, frankly, of what has been called the "Year of Europe"—of the difficulties of 1973 and the possibilities of 1974 and beyond.

Last April, the President asked me to propose that Europe and the United States strive together to reinvigorate our partnership. He did so because it was obvious that the assumptions on which the Alliance was founded have been outstripped by events.

Europe's economic strength, political cohesion, and new confidence—the monumental achievements of Western unity—have radically altered a relationship that was originally shaped in an era of European weakness and American predominance.

American nuclear monopoly has given way to nuclear parity raising wholly new problems of defense and deterrence—problems which demand a broad reexamination of the requirements of our security and the relative contribution to it of the United States and its allies.

The lessening of confrontation between East and West has offered new hope for a relaxation of tensions and new opportunities for creative diplomacy.

It has become starkly apparent that the great industrialized democracies of Japan, Europe and North America could pursue divergent paths only at the cost of their prosperity and their partnership.

These historic changes were occurring in a profoundly changed psychological climate in the West. The next generation of leaders in Europe, Canada and America will have neither the personal memory nor the emotional commitment to the Atlantic Alliance of its founders. Even today, a majority on both sides of the Atlantic did not experience the threat that produced the Alliance's creation or the sense of achievement associated with its growth. Even today, in the United States, over forty Senators consistently vote to make massive unilateral reductions of American forces in Europe. Even today, some Europeans have come to believe that their identity should be measured by its distance from the United States. On both sides of the Atlantic we are faced with the anomalous—and dangerous—situation which in the public mind identifies foreign policy success increasingly with relations with adversaries while relations with allies seem to be characterized by bickering and drift.

There exists, then, a real danger of a gradual erosion of the Atlantic community which for 25 years has ensured peace to its nations and brought prosperity to its peoples. A major effort to renew Atlantic relations and to anchor our friendship in a fresh act of creation seemed essential. We hoped that the drama of the great democracies engaging themselves once again in defining a common future would infuse our Atlantic partnership with new emotional and intellectual excitement. This was the origin of the initiative which came to be called the "Year of Europe."

Let me lay to rest certain misconceptions about American intentions:

The President's initiative was launched after careful preparation. In all of our conversations with many European leaders during the winter and spring of 1972-73 there was agreement that Atlantic relations required urgent attention to arrest the potential for growing suspicion and alienation between Europe and America.

We do not accept the proposition that the strengthening of Atlantic unity and the defining of a European personality are incompatible. The two processes have reinforced each other from the outset and can continue to do so now. The United States has repeatedly and explicitly welcomed the European decision to create an independent identity in all dimensions—political and economic. Indeed, we have long—and more consistently than many Europeans—supported the goal of political cohesion.

We have no intention of restricting Europe's international role to regional matters. From our perspective, European unification should enable Europe to take on broader responsibilities for global peace that ultimately can only contribute to the common interest. The American initiative was meant to mark Europe's new preeminence on the world scene as well as within the North Atlantic community.

A comprehensive reexamination of all aspects of our relationship—economic, political, and military—is imperative. It is a fact that our troops are in Europe as a vital component of mutual defense. It is also a fact—indeed a truism—that political, military and economic factors are each part of our relationship. In our view, the affirmation of the pervasive nature of our interdependence is not a device for blackmail. On the contrary, it is the justification for conciliatory solutions. For the specialized concerns of experts and technicians have a life of their own and a narrow national or sectarian bias. The purpose of our

initiative was to override these divisive attitudes by committing the highest authority in each country to the principle that our common and paramount interest is in broadly conceived cooperation.

THE EUROPEAN IDENTITY

Since last April Europe has made great strides toward unity—particularly in political coordination. The United States strongly supports that process. But as an old friend we are also sensitive to what this process does to traditional ties that in our view remain essential to the common interest.

Europe's unity must not be at the expense of Atlantic community, or both sides of the Atlantic will suffer. It is not that we are impatient with the cumbersome machinery of the emerging Europe. It is rather the tendency to highlight division rather than unity with us which concerns us.

I would be less than frank were I to conceal our uneasiness about some of the recent practices of the European Community in the political field. To present the decisions of a unifying Europe to us as faits accomplis not subject to effective discussion is alien to the tradition of US-European relations.

This may seem a strange complaint from a country repeatedly accused of acting itself without adequately consulting with its allies. There is no doubt that the United States has sometimes not consulted enough or adequately—especially in rapidly moving situations, but this is not a preference; it is a deviation from official policy and established practice—usually under pressure of necessity. The attitude of the unifying Europe, by contrast, seems to attempt to elevate refusal to consult into a principle defining European identity. To judge from recent experience, consultation with us before a decision is precluded, and consultation after the fact has been drained of content. For then Europe appoints a spokesman who is empowered to inform us of the decisions taken but who has no authority to negotiate.

We do not object to a single spokesman but we do believe that as an old ally the United States should be given an opportunity to express its concerns before final decisions affecting its interests are taken, and bilateral channels of discussion and negotiation should not be permitted to atrophy—at least until European political unity is fully realized. To replace the natural dialogue with extremely formalistic procedures would be to shatter abruptly close and intangible ties of trust and communication that took decades to develop and that have served our common purposes well.

The United States recognizes the problems of a transitional period as Europe moves toward unity. We understand the difficulty of the first hesitant steps of political coordination. But we cannot be indifferent to the tendency to justify European identity as facilitating separateness from the United States; European unity, in our view, is not contradictory to Atlantic unity.

For our part we will spare no effort to strengthen cooperative relationships with a unifying Europe, to affirm the community of our ideals and to revitalize the Atlantic relationship. That was the purpose of our initiative last April. It remains the central goal of our foreign policy.

THE COMMON CHALLENGE

The leaders of the European Community meet this week. They will consider the nature of European identity; no doubt they will adopt common policies and positions. In the light of this important meeting, let me outline the position of the United States:

Detente is an imperative. In a world shadowed by the danger of nuclear holocaust there is no rational alternative to the pursuit of relaxation of tensions. But we must take care that the pursuit of detente not undermine the friendships which made detente possible.

Common defense is a necessity. We must be

prepared to adjust it to changing conditions and share burdens equally. We need a definition of security that our peoples can support and that our adversaries will respect in a period of lessened tensions.

European unity is a reality. The United States welcomes and supports it in all its dimensions, political as well as economic. We believe it must be made irreversible and that it must strengthen trans-Atlantic ties.

Economic interdependence is a fact. We must resolve the paradox of growing mutual dependence and burgeoning national and regional identities.

We are determined to continue constructive dialogue with Western Europe. We have offered no final answers; we welcome Europe's wisdom. We believe that this opportunity will not come soon again.

So let us rededicate ourselves to finishing the task of renewing the Atlantic community.

First, let us complete the work before us; let us agree on a set of declarations equal to the occasion so that they may serve as an agenda for our governments and as an example and inspiration for our peoples.

Second, let us then transform these declarations into practical and perceptible progress. We will restore mutual confidence if our policies begin to reinforce rather than work against our common objectives. And let us move quickly to improve the process of consultation in both directions. The United States Government made concrete suggestions in this regard at the recent meeting of the foreign ministers in the North Atlantic Council.

But let us also remember that even the best consultative machinery cannot substitute for common vision and shared goals; it cannot replace the whole network of intangible connections that have been the real sinews of the trans-Atlantic and especially the Anglo-American relationship. We must take care lest in defining European unity in too legalistic a manner we lose what has made our alliance unique: that in the deepest sense Europe and America do not think of each other as foreign entities conducting traditional diplomacy, but as members of a larger community engaged, sometimes painfully but ultimately always cooperatively, in a common enterprise. The meeting to which the foreign ministers of the Community were courteous enough to invite me marks a significant step forward in restoring the intangibles of the trans-Atlantic dialogue.

Let us put false suspicions behind us. The President did not fight so hard in Congress for our troops in Europe, for strong defenses, for a conciliatory trade bill, for support for allies around the world; he did not strive so continually to consult on SALT and develop common positions on MBFR; he did not stand up so firmly to challenges in crises around the world—suddenly to sacrifice Western Europe's security on the altar of condominium. Our destiny, as well as the full strength of our military power, is inextricably linked with yours.

As we look into the future we can perceive challenges compared to which our recent disputes are trivial. A new international system is replacing the structure of the immediate post-war years. The external policies of China and the Soviet Union are in periods of transition. Western Europe is unifying. New nations seek identity and an appropriate role. Even now, economic relationships are changing more rapidly than the structures which nurtured them. We, Europe, Canada and America, have only two choices: creativity together or irrelevance apart.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND ENERGY

The Middle East crisis illustrates the importance of distinguishing the long-range from the ephemeral. The differences of recent months resulted not so much from lack of consultation as from a different perception of three key issues: Was the war primarily a local conflict or did it have wider

significance? Has the energy crisis been caused primarily by the war or does it have deeper causes? Can our common energy crisis be solved by anything but collective action?

As for the nature of the Middle East conflict, it is fair to state, as many Europeans including your Foreign Secretary have, that the United States did not do all that it might have done before the war to promote a permanent settlement in the Middle East. Once the war began, the United States demonstrated great restraint until the Soviet effort reached the point of massive intervention. Once that happened, it became a question of whether the West would retain any influence to help shape the political future of an area upon which Europe is even more vitally dependent than the United States. We involved ourselves in a resupply effort, not to take sides in the conflict but to protect the possibility of pursuing after the war the objective of a just permanent settlement which some of our allies have urged on us ever since 1967.

At the same time, we must bear in mind the deeper causes of the energy crisis: It is not simply a product of the Arab-Israeli war; it is the inevitable consequence of the explosive growth of worldwide demand outrunning the incentives for supply. The Middle East war marks a chronic crisis acute, but a crisis was coming in any event. Even when pre-war production levels are resumed. The problem of matching the level of oil that the world produces to the level which it consumes will remain.

The only long-term solution is a massive effort to provide producers an incentive to increase their supply, to encourage consumers to use existing supplies more rationally and to develop alternate energy sources.

This is a challenge which the United States could solve alone with great difficulty and that Europe cannot solve in isolation at all. We strongly prefer and Europe requires a common enterprise.

To this end, the United States proposes that the nations of Europe, North America and Japan establish an Energy Action Group of senior and prestigious individuals, with a mandate to develop within three months an initial action program for collaboration in all areas of the energy problem. We would leave it to the members of the Nine whether they prefer to participate as the European Community.

The group would have as its goal the assurance of required energy supplies at reasonable cost. It would define broad principles of cooperation, and it would initiate action in specific areas:

To conserve energy through more rational utilization of existing supplies;

To encourage the discovery and development of new sources of energy;

To give producers an incentive to increase supply; and

To coordinate an international program of research to develop new technologies that use energy more efficiently and provide alternatives to petroleum. The United States would be willing to contribute our particular skills in such areas as the development of the deep seabed.

The Energy Action Group should not be an exclusive organization of consumers. The producing nations should be invited to join it from the very beginning with respect to any matters of common interest. The problem of finding adequate opportunity for development, and the investment of the proceeds from the sale of energy sources would appear to be a particularly important area for consumer-producer cooperation.

As an example of a task for the Energy Action Group, I would cite the field of enriching uranium for use in nuclear power reactors. We know that our need for this raw material will be great in the 1980's. We know that electric utilities will wish to assure their supply at the least possible cost. We know that European countries and Japan will wish

to have their own facilities to produce at least part of their needs for enriched uranium. Such plants require huge capital investment. What could be more sensible than that we plan together to assure that scarce resources are not wasted by needless duplication?

The United States is prepared to make a very major financial and intellectual contribution to the objective of solving the energy problem on a common basis. There is no technological problem that the great democracies do not have the capacity to solve together—if they can muster the will and the imagination. The energy crisis of 1973 can become the economic equivalent of the Sputnik challenge of 1957. The outcome can be the same. Only this time, the giant step for mankind will be one that America and its closest partners take together for the benefit of all mankind.

We have every reason of duty and self-interest to preserve the most successful partnership in history. The United States is committed to making the Atlantic Community a vital positive force for the future as it was for the past. What has recently been taken for granted must now be renewed. This is not an American challenge to Europe; it is history's challenge to us all.

The United Kingdom, we believe, is in a unique position. We welcome your membership in the European Community—though the loosening of some of our old ties has been painful at times. But you can make another historic contribution in helping develop between the United States and a unifying Europe the same special confidence and intimacy that benefitted our two nations for decades. We are prepared to offer a unifying Europe a "special relationship," for we believe that the unity of the Western world is essential for the well-being of all its parts.

In his memoirs Secretary Acheson described the events of his visit to London in the spring of 1950. He described the need of his time for an "act of will, a decision to do something" at a crucial juncture.

We require another act of will—a determination to surmount tactical squabbles and legalistic preoccupations and to become the master of our destinies. We in this room are heirs to a rich heritage of trust and friendship. If we are true to ourselves, we have it in our power to extend it to a united Europe and to pass it on, further enriched and ennobled, to succeeding generations.

WE NEED A NEW MINIMUM WAGE BILL

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, nine bills have been vetoed this year. One was overridden, but eight were sustained. Of the eight sustained, the Congress has been able to compromise, or at least move toward compromise, on all but one: a new minimum wage bill.

I am not altogether surprised, however. A few weeks ago, I suggested that if our General Labor Subcommittee chairman could not get the job done perhaps George Meany could. This being the Christmas season, it seems George would rather be a Scrooge than a "meany."

Perhaps after he gets his own Christmas shopping done he will be able to get into the spirit of resolving this unfinished business.

"ASSAULT BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 57

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Boston Globe of November 30, by Jeremiah Murphy, reminds me once again of the senseless crimes that easy access to handguns helps make possible. The tragedy of John Rockett's shooting, and the simple manner by which it and thousands of other shootings could have been prevented, leads me to urge my colleagues once again to take up the many gun control bills pending before Congress. Every day adds to the list of murders and wounding that might have been avoided had Congress acted sooner.

Included below is the Boston Globe article:

THE NIGHT EVERYTHING CHANGED

NORWOOD.—Sometimes everything can change in one awful moment, and John Rockett found out about that a few months ago. His whole world changed.

Things were going pretty good for Rockett until that Aug. 17 night, because he was 50 years old with a wife and three sons and a job in Boston as assistant manager for American Airlines.

He was a lector at the early Mass at St. Catherine of Siena Church in Norwood and had been honored by the Knights of Columbus Council as its man of the year.

He and his family were planning to leave their home at 50 Gay st. here in another week and fly to Switzerland for a vacation before the kids went back to school. Things were going pretty good for John Rockett.

But it all changed that night after he drove to Sherwood Shopping Plaza in Natick because his 20-year-old son couldn't get his car started. Chris Rockett worked at Hanlon's Shoe Store and had parked the car behind the store.

Chris was still working so his father went behind the store to check the car. He got out a flashlight and was looking at the engine when he noticed a young man get out of a white Mustang and stand in the darkened area.

Rockett's back was turned when the man approached him and said: "Having trouble?"

"No, I'm just going to leave."

"Give me your money," the man said.

Rockett decided later it was reflex action, because he swung around sharply with the flashlight and struck the man a glancing blow. Then he realized the man was holding a .38 caliber revolver.

Rockett started to run and a shot was fired and he was hit in the shoulder and fell to the ground. The man walked over and took Rockett's wallet out of his pocket. Then the man got into the car and drove away.

Everything changed after that because Rockett was seriously wounded. The bullet had damaged his spinal column and he is paralyzed from the shoulders down.

He spent a long time in Carney Hospital in Dorchester and then was transferred to the Veterans Administration Hospital in West Roxbury.

He is on the South Wing of the second floor, and the other afternoon his wife and Msgr. Robert Sennott of Catherine of Siena Church and two friends were there because the hours are always long in a hospital.

Rockett is a nice looking, middle-aged guy with brown, wavy hair and glasses. Now he has difficulty speaking because of the injury.

He grew up in Newton and Watertown and served in the Army during World War II and then married and was raising a family and looking forward to that trip to Switzerland and . . . then came last Aug. 17.

Mrs. Rockett summed it all up pretty well: "You read about these things happening to others, but you never think it could happen to you."

It happened to John Rockett and everything changed in that one awful moment, and now he doesn't know how much longer he will be in the hospital or when he will be able to return to work. He doesn't know if he will ever walk again.

There is a bitter and tragic postscript. The young man with the white Mustang was never caught. He escaped with the four dollars in Rockett's wallet.

AMERICA SHIFTS TOWARD METRIC

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, "The Shift Toward Metric" is expanding in the United States at an increasing rate, which a greater awareness of this method of measurement by the American public is a proof. This subject is the thesis of an excellent article by Prof. Frances J. Parker, chairman, Home Economics Department, New York State University College, Oneonta, N.Y., which appeared in the November issue of the Journal of Home Economics.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this Congress in passing vitally necessary metric legislation is underlined by a point made by Dr. Parker:

Modern man frequently relies on the information and advice of certain key individuals, or opinion leaders, whom he knows and respects. He relies on them for information and advice concerning any new information and advice concerning any new products, ideas, or procedures, and he depends on these people to "legitimize" such things.

Mr. Speaker, without this metric legislation being passed, the country will continue on its slow but progressive drift toward adoption of the metric system by all segments of the society and industry, but without the guidance of the Congress, the opinion leaders, who must "legitimize" the changeover to the metric system. That is why the Secretary of Commerce in his report in 1971 recommended that the Congress establish a metric conversion board to oversee the changeover to the metric system in this country in a planned and coordinated manner. This is not too much to ask.

The following article was adapted from Dr. Parker's paper, "Preparing the Consumer for Metric Conversion," read at the American Psychological Association's meeting in Montreal, Canada, on August 28, 1973. An outstanding scholar, Dr. Parker has involved herself in the problems of metric conversion and is the organizer of the metric instructional kits used by the new Center for Metric Education at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, where she was chairman of the department of home economics.

THE SHIFT TOWARD METRIC

(By Frances J. Parker)

In envisioning change, we are all aware of the importance of positive attitudes. For example, I recall the enthusiasm with which our young son described our first dishwasher: "It used to take 30 minutes to do the dinner dishes. Now it only takes half an hour!"

That difference in time sums up the change there will be in American cooking habits after metrication is in general use by business and industry. A different way of measuring will make no real difference in our customary way of going about things in the kitchen, and many of us will be delighted both with the novelty and ease of weighing ingredients in attractive new devices and with the quality of products produced with such precise measurement.

Of course, some individuals will never change to metric measures in their kitchens. Some people have never accepted or used the standard measuring cup; they still use "a handful of this and a dash of that."

The observation made by Senator Charles Sumner in 1866 is as true in 1973 as it was then: "Those who have passed a certain period of life may not adopt the metric system, but the rising generation will embrace it, and ever afterwards number it among the choicest possessions of an advanced civilization."

A survey of home economists by AHEA's Consumer Interests Committee in August 1970 and a national survey (1) of public attitudes toward change to metrication showed that the more knowledgeable a person was about it, the more receptive he would be to the conversion. Those surveyed who were less familiar with the system tended to expect the change to be costly in time and money. Therefore home economists, as agents of change, must launch extensive and intensive educational programs on metrication.

CENTER FOR METRIC EDUCATION

Home economists will find help with their role as agents for change from the U.S. Center for Metric Education, established in 1972 as the first and only center of its kind in the United States. It was located at Western Michigan University and given a \$163,000 federal grant from the U.S. Office of Education, to introduce the metric system of measurement into technical education in the United States.

To achieve this goal, the center's first year of operation is being devoted to the development of instructional material. During the second and third years the center will offer in-service seminars for teacher educators in colleges and universities across the nation.

AIDS FOR TEACHERS

Packets of teaching aids for home economics and industrial arts teachers are currently being collected and developed at the center to introduce the metric system into the classroom and thus into the homes and jobs of tomorrow's citizens. The home economics teaching packets will include:

background information about the metric system in other nations and about the impending changeover in the United States to this system.

a description of the role home economists can play in implementing this changeover both in the classroom and in students' homes

suggested learning experiences
inexpensive teaching aids and transparency masters

lists of sources from which teachers can obtain other teaching aids (e.g., metric dress patterns, tape measures, scales, measuring cups, etc.).

Fitted kits are also being prepared to use in various in-service programs for vocational areas of home economics and industrial arts. These kits include measuring devices, course outlines, and audiovisual materials.

TEACHING ABOUT THE CHANGEOVER

Directors of the instructional-material development project at the center have given talks before groups interested in metrication; my own approach has generally been of a persuasive nature, discussing pros and cons of metrication, both showing and telling how simple, logical, and sensible is the impending and inevitable changeover to metrication.

The center has an internationally known board of advisers who are assisting its work. This advisory board recently made a 1-hour videotape, available from the center, which has appeared on numerous television channels in order to acquaint the public with the impact of conversion to metrication at home and on the job.

Other work of the center has been the building of the best metric library in the United States. Since January, its staff has been collecting books, films, tapes, catalogs, and other teaching materials from around the world.

HOW CAN WE REACH MOST PEOPLE?

P. R. Mort has reported a 50-year lag between the creation of knowledge in education and its dissemination.² However, we do not have 50 years to "go metric"; 10 years is the lengthiest conversion period commonly recommended. Nor will we reach everyone through the classroom. A strategy is therefore necessary to facilitate implementation of the metric system.

In spite of a vast array of sophisticated communication media and advances in the general population's educational level, studies done in many fields besides home economics show that modern man frequently relies on the information and advice of certain key individuals, or opinion leaders, whom he knows and respects. He relies on them for information and advice concerning any new products, ideas, or procedures, and he depends on these people to "legitimize" such things. Such opinion leaders are reached through communication media, and at least some of the center's work is designed to educate these opinion leaders through articles and programs in the media.

ARE IDEAS CHANGING?

In an effort to discover if the publicity and widespread educational efforts in the Kalamazoo area (where the U.S. Center for Metric Education is located) had had effect on consumer acceptance of metrication, I conducted a very limited replication of selected questions from the U.S. Metric Study.¹

Testing the premise that the more knowledgeable one is about the metric system, the more accepting of the system one will be, I made a random telephone survey of 137 Kalamazoo area residents using most of the original questions. A comparison of the results of the original survey and the Kalamazoo survey is shown in the table on the facing page.

In questions 1 through 4, consumers did demonstrate more awareness of the metric system; there was also greater confidence about the ease of adjusting to the new system in the answers to questions 9 and 10. The current sample showed in the answer to question 11 that 50 percent of those surveyed thought that U.S. conversion to metric was a good idea; in the original survey 2 years ago, only 25 percent thought it was a good idea.

It is evident that there has been a shift in thinking and that information about, for example, the cost of metric kitchen devices

¹ "U.S. Metric Study Interim Report," The Consumer. National Bureau of Standards, Special Publication 345-7. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1971.

² P. R. Mort, "Studies in Educational Innovations for the Institute of Administrative Research: An Overview." In M. B. Miles, Innovation in Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964, pp. 299-337.

is reaching the public. Only 29 percent in the recent sample thought that the changeover would be too costly, compared with the 50 percent who thought that in the original study (question 19). While 58 percent of the recent sample believed that metric measures would make cost comparison simpler, only 7 percent disagreed. Only 4 percent disagreed with the idea that the metric system would be easier for our children to use than the present system.

Although this recent survey is both limited and unsophisticated, it is an indication that our informal educational efforts are making an impact on consumer knowledgeability about and attitudes toward the metric system.

RESPONSES TO 1971 AND 1973 METRIC SURVEYS

(In percent)

	1971	1973
1. Have you ever heard of the metric system?		
Yes.....	70.0	81
No.....	30.0	19
Total.....	100.0	100
2. Could you tell me the names of some measures in the metric system?		
Meter, millimeter, centimeter, kilometer, other prefix with meter.....	23.0	11
Gram, milligram, centigram, kilogram, other prefix with gram.....	1.0	4
Liter, milliliter, centiliter, kiloliter, other prefix with liter.....	1.0	2
Two of the above.....	13.0	18
Three of the above.....	4.0	15
Incorrect response, don't know.....	28.0	31
Not asked this question, never heard of the metric system.....	30.0	19
Total.....	100.0	100
3. Do you happen to know how the metric measures relate to each other? For example: How many centimeters are in a meter?		
One-hundred.....	17.9	30
Incorrect response, don't know.....	23.5	31
Not ascertained.....	.2	15
Not asked this question, never heard of metric or unable to name measures.....	58.4	24
Total.....	100.0	100
4. Do you happen to know the relation of any metric measure to our customary measures? For example: About how many kilometers are in a mile?		
1 kilometer equals $\frac{5}{8}$ or $\frac{9}{10}$ of a mile or 1 mile equals 1.6 kilometers.....	3.9	12
1 kilometer equals $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile or 1 mile equals 1.5 or 1.7-2 kilometers.....	3.1	5
Incorrect response, don't know.....	34.4	43
Not ascertained.....	.2	10
Not asked this question, never heard of metric or unable to name measures.....	58.4	30
Total.....	100.0	100
5. Thinking about our customary system, can you tell me: How many pints are in a quart? How many inches in a yard?		
1 correct response.....	15.0	16
2 correct responses.....	82.0	77
No correct response.....	3.0	7
Total.....	100.0	100
6. Have you as an adult, ever lived or traveled extensively in a foreign country, other than the British Commonwealth countries, where you had to deal with a different measuring system than ours?		
Yes.....	17.0	26
No.....	83.0	74
Total.....	100.0	100
7. Did you have any problems in adjusting to the measuring system? (I do not mean problems with money.)		
Yes.....	3.2	4
No.....	13.6	31
Don't know, not ascertained.....	.2	5
Not asked this question.....	83.0	60
Total.....	100.0	100
8. Suppose speed limits were posted as say 80 kilometers an hour instead of 50 miles an hour. Do you think the Ameri-		

RESPONSES TO 1971 AND 1973 METRIC SURVEYS

[In percent]

	1971	1973
can people as a whole would adjust fairly easily or with considerable difficulty?		
Fairly easily.....	20.0	31
With considerable difficulty.....	74.0	55
Don't know, not ascertained.....	6.0	14
Total.....	100.0	100
9. Do you think the American people as a whole would adjust fairly easily or with considerable difficulty to having the temperature reported as zero degrees centigrade instead of 32 degrees Fahrenheit?		
Fairly easily.....	29.0	39
With considerable difficulty.....	64.0	45
Don't know, not ascertained.....	7.0	16
Total.....	100.0	100
10. Do you think that it would be a good idea or a bad idea for the United States to change to the metric system of measure?		
Good idea.....	25.0	50
Pro-con.....	4.0	9
Bad idea.....	59.0	23
Don't know.....	12.0	18
Total.....	100.0	100
11. Why do you say that?		
Rest of world uses metric.....	15.0	38
Metric decimal easier; U.S. system outdated.....	14.0	9
Customary system good; we're used to it.....	23.0	12
Cost reference (cost of change to households, business; taxes).....	6.0	0
Age reference (hard for old; easy for young).....	11.0	7
Change would be inconvenient, difficult.....	33.0	15
Other.....	3.0	0
Don't know, not ascertained.....	11.0	29
Total.....	(9)	(9)
12. Shopping and price comparisons would be easier because the metric system can be divided or multiplied by 10.		
Agree.....	47.0	58
Disagree.....	37.0	7
Don't know.....	15.0	31
not ascertained.....	1.0	4
Total.....	100.0	100
13. The metric system would be easier than our present system for our children to learn.		
Agree.....	55.0	69
Disagree.....	22.0	4
Don't know.....	23.0	27
Total.....	100.0	100
Opinions of people who don't think the United States should change to the metric system. Tell me if you agree or disagree with these statements		
14. Life would just be more complicated; we would have to use conversion tables and that would be difficult to handle.		
Agree.....	61.0	45
Disagree.....	31.0	30
Don't know.....	7.0	21
Not ascertained.....	1.0	4
Total.....	100.0	100
15. It would be too costly to change over our household measuring devices.		
Agree.....	50.0	29
Disagree.....	42.0	49
Don't know.....	7.0	18
Not ascertained.....	1.0	4
Total.....	100.0	100
16. The rest of the world should change to our system.		
Agree.....	12.0	4
Disagree.....	77.0	76
Don't know.....	11.0	20
Total.....	100.0	100

¹ "U.S. Metric Study Interim Report," The Consumer National Bureau of Standards, special publication 345-7. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1971.

² Survey by Frances J. Parker, Western Michigan University, of 137 respondents, Kalamazoo, Mich. area, 1973.

³ Adds to more than 100 percent because some respondents gave more than one answer.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAXES

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times carried an excellent article by the distinguished journalist, Anthony Lewis. The questions raised by Mr. Lewis are serious and thought provoking. Many of the questions raised by Mr. Lewis have special relevance for Members of Congress. I commend this article to my colleagues:

NOBLESSE OBLIGE

President Nixon, Nov. 17, explaining why he had paid "nominal" income taxes: "It wasn't because of the deductions for, shall we say, a cattle ranch or interest or all of these gimmicks . . ."

(By Anthony Lewis)

Boston, December 12.—Part of the fascination of President Nixon's financial disclosures lies in the previous statements made inoperative. We know now, for example, that interest deductions were, in fact, a most significant reason for his modest tax payments. Over the first four years of his Presidency he deducted \$275,376.15 in interest. His accountants went so far as to list a department store finance charge of \$1.24.

Then there is the odd little case of Herbert Kalmbach. Last summer, when Mr. Kalmbach admitted arranging the disbursement of cash in bundles to the Watergate defendants, a White House spokesman said he was no longer the President's personal lawyer. Now it turns out that he handles Mr. Nixon's salary checks and California bank account.

The more interesting aspect of the Nixon financial statement is what it tells about the American tax system—and about this President's attitude toward it.

We have not recently had so neatly packaged a demonstration of how the Internal Revenue Code helps the rich get richer. The interest deduction, for instance, is seemingly impervious to tax reform efforts because so many Americans deduct their mortgage interest. But the provision is infinitely less helpful to the average citizen than to the rich, who can borrow vast sums and have the public pay a large part of the cost.

Mr. Nixon is not the only near-millionaire who paid less than \$1,000 in Federal income taxes in 1970 and 1971. Some richer men paid less. Recent tax reforms have introduced the concept of a "minimum tax," due despite deductions, but the Nixon case shows what derisory levels of tax obligation it imposes.

Nor is Mr. Nixon the only person to charge off part of the cost of running a house as a business expense. The principle is a familiar one. It may be just a little unusual that the President deducted the entire cost of maintaining his Key Biscayne home because he has an office there, as well as 25 per cent of the upkeep of his San Clemente house.

One view, therefore, is that the disclosure of what Mr. Nixon has done to avoid taxes should evoke only criticism of the system. He has done no more than hold a mirror to our general corruption, it is said; rather than criticize him we should become serious about reforming the grotesque inequities in our tax law.

But that view misses a central doubt about the conduct of Mr. Nixon's tax affairs. The suspicion remains that he has had especially favorable treatment—advantages beyond the loopholes open to all—precisely because he is President.

Why did the Internal Revenue Service approve a \$576,000 deduction for the asserted gift of papers to the National Archives without checking the Archives to see whether the

gift had been made before the legal deadline?

How could Mr. Nixon avoid tax on the sale of his New York cooperative apartment by putting the money into a new "principal residence" in San Clemente, and then escape California income tax by claiming he was not a resident there?

By what arithmetic could he avoid paying a capital gains tax on the sale of part of his San Clemente land, when the price per acre was higher than its listed original cost without even counting the value of the house he retained?

Why did the I.R.S. not even audit his 1970 return, which showed total income of \$262,942.56 and a tax of only \$792.81?

Those are just a few of the questions that raise doubts. Most serious of all, from a legal point of view, is the device of having a Congressional committee judge disputed points in his returns. As in the tapes case, the President in effect wants to pick his own court. Then we heard about "Judge Stennis"; now presumably it will be "Judge Mills."

After all that has happened it is scandalous that senior members of Congress should agree to such a special proceeding. And it is disheartening that the Internal Revenue Commissioner, Donald C. Alexander, a man once highly regarded in the profession, should let a precedent so damaging to the idea of equal treatment in tax matters be set. There may be a good argument for a system of independent audit for the returns of those with tax authority—the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commissioner—but it must be a general system, not special Congressional treatment for one man.

Finally, it has to be said that there is more involved than law. For a man to grow rich while President of the United States by cutting the tax laws so fine is hardly a noble example to his fellow citizens. We want our President to make us seem better than we are. That may sound unfair, but no one is compelled to be President.

COMPUTER CARPOOL EFFORT LAUNCHED BY WICHITA RADIO STATION

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Energy Office in fuel allocation regulations published today in the Federal Register requests private transportation operators to conserve fuel by reducing vehicle operations, carpooling, using mass transportation, using more energy efficient vehicles when possible.

I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Congress and the public a project which has been launched by radio station KLEO in Wichita, Kans., to assist in energy conservation on a voluntary basis. KLEO has announced creation of a commuter computer carpool for Wichita residents.

Listeners who fill out applications will be matched by computer with other workers who live nearby and work similar hours.

Such a project is worthy of the support of citizens who must rely on private transportation to get to work. In addition the success of such carpooling efforts in Wichita and across the country could

help us avoid the need for gasoline rationing down the line.

KLEO, its staff and management, are to be commended for their interest and participation in this vital national effort.

A VERY SERIOUS ENERGY CRISIS

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the American people are faced with a very serious energy crisis. The United States is confronted not only with current energy shortages, but also with the challenge of meeting our ever-increasing long-range energy needs. Now that the crisis is here, many people are asking "Why didn't they know about this ahead of time?"; "Why weren't they prepared for it?"; "Why has the Government waited until now to do something about it?"; and "What can be done to prevent a similar crisis in the future?"

Given the complexities of this energy "crunch" and the confusion and concern it has created among the American people, I want to take this opportunity to present some thoughts which may help to answer these and other questions my constituents have raised—hopefully with a view toward achieving a better and more balanced understanding of what it is all about, and how we can deal with it.

ORIGINS OF THE ENERGY CRISIS

President Nixon expressed an awareness of and concern for America's energy supplies as early as September 26, 1969, when he said:

I believe it is essential to develop our resources, when, as we look at the Mideast and other sections of the world, many of our oil supplies could be cut off in the event of a world conflict.

At the same time our colleague, Senator "Scoop" JACKSON was voicing this same concern in the Congress.

To gain some ideas about why and how our energy problems arose let us look at some "facts and figures":

The United States, representing 6 percent of the world's population consumes more than one-third of the world's energy.

Demand for petroleum and petroleum products in the United States has been increasing at a rate of over 6 percent every year. In other words, the United States has been doubling its energy consumption about once every 16 years. It was estimated that this "geometric progression" of demand would exceed available energy supplies in 1972.

Current estimates indicate that while petroleum demand will range from 18 to 20 million barrels per day within the next year and only 11 to 12 million barrels per day can be produced domestically.

Domestic oil exploration has declined by some 40 percent in the last 10 years, while imports have risen to 35 percent of U.S. oil consumption.

In short, more people, with more money to spend, are demanding more energy-consuming goods and services than ever before, and this demand has simply exceeded the supply available to us.

What are some of the other factors that have contributed to the energy dilemma? Here are some that are frequently mentioned:

The American oil industry has not upgraded and expanded oil production here at home to keep pace with the growing demand for oil.

The public and private sectors did not move "far enough fast enough" to develop technology that would allow more efficient use of our oil and coal resources while moving more rapidly in the direction of "harnessing" alternative energy sources such as nuclear, geothermal and solar power.

Overdependence on the automobile and underdevelopment of public transportation.

Environmental demands did not adequately recognize or realistically consider the economic and social impacts created by delays in construction of the Alaskan pipeline, automobile emission control devices and other measures on a society which has become far too dependent on oil to meet its energy requirements.

To the American people, energy waste, rather than a commitment to energy conservation, became a way of life.

More recently, the Arab oil embargo and the problems experienced by the administration in "gearing up" its efforts to deal with the current fuel shortages have only added to the complexities and confusion.

EARLY WARNINGS

For a variety of reasons, our Nation now faces a serious problem that has been developing for some time, and apparently the Government, the oil industry, and the public failed to fully recognize or accept the seriousness of the problem in its early stages.

With this in mind, I have asked myself—did I, as one Member of Congress, do enough to alert the people I represent on the north coast of California of an impending energy crisis? Did I take the necessary steps to prepare for or help ease this crisis? Recognizing that the words "enough" and "necessary" contain judgmental values, here is what my research on this question developed.

On February 19, 1972, I issued a public statement and district wide news releases under the headline: "Clausen Sees Cheap Energy Ending." In it, I warned that—

American consumers may be nearing the end of cheap, plentiful energy in this country and that testimony just presented to the Congress by a House Task Force on Energy and Resources revealed that the U.S. is entering an era of rapidly diminishing energy resources and alarming increases in the costs of producing energy.

On April 10, 1972, I publicly announced that the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on which I serve had begun a week of congressional hearings on the Nation's fuel and energy crisis which I felt were of particular interest

to the people of the north coast. In that statement, I said:

For this reason, I have decided to issue daily summaries to the press for the balance of the week outlining the essential testimony presented to our Committee on this important question.

The following is a brief chronology of those daily summaries:

April 11, 1972: Dealt with the testimony of Administration officials on the President's Energy Message to the Congress in June of 1971 and legislation proposed by the President as "actions designed to provide a clean, abundant and assured supply of energy to the nation at reasonable prices."

April 12, 1972: Summarized the testimony of some of the Nations leading experts in the fuel and energy fields who warned of insufficient fuel resources between now and the year 2000.

April 13, 1972: Reported that testimony to date revealed "the existence of a very serious national problem that many Members of Congress and much of the general public do not fully understand or appreciate."

April 14, 1972: Focused on the question of "energy versus the environment" and highlighted the testimony of several leading environmentalists, some of whom questioned whether or not an energy crisis really existed.

April 17, 1972: In this release I said: While not everyone agrees on the cause, the extent or the cure—the richest nation on earth has suddenly discovered that it is 'energy poor' and that this new form of 'poverty' threatens our balance of trade, our attempts to clean up the environment, and our desire for clean, cheap energy and fuel."

April 18, 1972: "While I was aware of our dwindling fuel and energy resources prior to these hearings, quite frankly I had no idea of the complexity or the actual severity of this crisis—nor did I have any idea of the 'lateness of the hour.' We, as a nation, have some very serious soul-searching to do and very little time to do it in. We must decide whether, as our national policy, we are going to direct our efforts toward meeting the increased demand for fuel and energy in the future, or make every effort to reduce the demand and consumption thereby extending available services."

Despite these efforts and other warnings issued by many of us in the House and Senate, I believe it is fair to assume now that the public could not really envision an "energy crisis" at that time. I remember well, for example, that my eight public statements on our energy dilemma in that period were met with what I can only describe as public apathy. Some people criticized my efforts as an attempt to divert attention from other issues of the day. Others "charged" it was a "plot" by the major utility companies and oil producers to justify price increases. Overall, there was a general unwillingness on the part of people to accept the fact that the energy crisis was serious or even real.

SOLVING OUR ENERGY PROBLEMS

The Middle East war, the oil "cutoff" and subsequent fuel allocation limitations, plus massive "energy conservation" messages in the media have finally caused Americans to realize that the energy crisis might amount to more than the inconvenience of an occasional fuel shortage or power "brownout." They now know what some of us in the Congress have been attempting to get across for many months—in terms of our national

economy, our vital interest in maintaining a relationship with the free world and our efforts to improve the quality of life for all Americans—the energy crisis is our most serious domestic problem. Many now are looking to their elected representatives in the Congress and in their State and local governments to develop and implement effective solutions to bring our Nation through this crisis.

What can we in the Congress do? We can begin by "telling it like it is" to the American people. This is the way I see it from here:

The energy crisis is serious and "for real." It was not contrived to help the oil industry make greater profits. It was not artificially created by the administration as a "smokescreen" for Watergate, as some here implied. Nor is it an attempt to halt the significant progress made in "cleaning up" our environment.

The energy crisis is not simply a temporary program. While there are steps we can, must, and will take to deal with immediate inconveniences and shortages and these steps will bring a measure of relief, we cannot afford to "kid" ourselves that the problem will be completely resolved in the immediate future. The energy supply problem will be with us for some time to come, and it will require far-reaching solutions and all of the ingenuity, cooperation, understanding and commitment we can muster.

The energy crisis is more than just an oil shortage. The problems we face have resulted not only from shortages of petroleum, but because America is so dependent on petroleum, to the exclusion of other less expensive and more plentiful fuel alternatives. Our fuel problems will not magically disappear even if the Arab nations resume full and increasing shipments of oil to the United States in the near future.

Accordingly our energy problem-solving approach must fulfill two basic objectives. First, we must deal with our short-term energy problems which, as I see it, are those we can effectively deal with in the next few years. Then, during the next 20 years, we must meet the challenge of planning and satisfying our long-term energy needs. The Congress and the Executive have recognized this challenge, and are now "gearing up" for a massive research and development effort, so that we can become a self-sufficient nation in the energy field.

SHORT-TERM SOLUTIONS

The answers to our short-term energy shortage problems lie essentially in upgrading and expanding our capacity to produce and make more efficient use of fossil fuel resources.

For example, we must encourage maximum energy conservation here at home so that scarce resources are more efficiently utilized. And if we expect the people to conserve energy, Government and business should not only take the initiative but set an example for every American to follow. In my view, every Government official, including the President, Cabinet-level, and other high-level officials and Members of Congress must curtail the use of gas-guzzling Government limousines, helicopters, and jet aircraft and otherwise "practice what

they preach." Nor should the Department of Defense or any other department or agency of Government be exempted from the energy "belt-tightening" in which we are asking everyone to participate. Similarly, oil and utilities companies should discourage rather than encourage increased energy consumption, and should contribute more of their profits and advertising dollars to promote energy conservation.

In my view, these measures, together with the shift in refinery production and the allocation of gasoline at the wholesale and retail levels ordered recently by the President; the mandatory allocation of diesel and other distillate fuels; opening of Elk Hills to increase the available supply of domestic crude oil; implementation of daylight savings time on a year-round basis; a reasonable speed limit on our Nation's roads and highways; and other conservation measures we can take will bring us through the height of this immediate crisis, which as I see it will extend through this winter into next year.

In this regard, there has been a great deal of discussion over the pros and cons of gasoline rationing to individuals and/or imposing additional gasoline taxes. While there is no doubt in my mind that we are facing serious fuel shortages, and I believe we must explore and be prepared to use every available alternative to minimize the impact of these shortages, rationing of gasoline on an individual basis should be a last resort. Based on information I have received, it is estimated that a gas rationing program might require as many as 10,000 employees and an expenditure of many millions of dollars to operate effectively and those of us who remember the gasoline black market of World War II understand the many questions that have been raised as to whether or not a rationing system that would insure fair treatment for everyone is even possible. By the same token, however, I am in complete agreement with the view that a dramatically increased gasoline tax will only hurt low-income families, senior citizens, and others who can least afford it.

In any case, these measures alone will not be enough. We must move forward rapidly to upgrade and expand domestic oil and gas production.

In order to process increased supplies of petroleum with maximum economy and efficiency, however, we must accelerate the construction timetable for the Alaskan pipeline, expand other domestic refining capacity, and modernize our shipping and transportation facilities. The need to move rapidly on these measures is pointed out in a recent independent study which made these projections:

Unless current demands are checked or reversed by 1980, the United States will consume 10 million barrels of oil a day more than at present.

This 10 million barrels per day increase is the equivalent of 5 times the production expected from Alaska's Prudhoe Bay.

Fifty-eight refineries will be required to process this additional crude oil.

If all of this additional petroleum is

brought in from foreign nations 325 new "supertankers" will be needed.

At the same time, we must continue the process of making better use of petroleum resources by encouraging use of smaller cars, car pools, and the development of public transportation.

Similarly, we can no longer afford to delay efforts to revitalize our coal industry. In the words of Arnold Miller, president of the United Mine Workers of America:

We sit squarely on top of the largest readily available supply of coal on earth. . . . Sheer common sense should tell us to put all our efforts into developing coal.

With between one-third and one-half of the world's coal reserves, the United States can meet its energy needs for hundreds of years. But to put this energy potential to work, new more effective and environmentally acceptable mining techniques, improved mine safety, gasification, liquification, and efficient sulfur-removal techniques must be developed so that coal will become an economical, "clean" fuel substitute.

LONG-TERM ENERGY ALTERNATIVES

These steps will help ease the energy "crunch" we are now feeling and will allow us to turn our full attention to long-term planning research and development of new energy sources and technology.

For example, we can vastly expand exploration for and production of geothermal energy, particularly in California where geothermal reserves are known to be extensive; we can greatly improve the "state of the art" in nuclear power generation, to include finding safer, more efficient methods of disposing of or regenerating radioactive wastes; and we can find ways to "harness" and utilize the energy of the Sun.

NEEDED: A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

I strongly believe that all these energy alternatives must be directed, and coordinated and funded within the framework of a national energy policy which has the full support of Government, the business and industrial community and the consuming public. In my view, such a national energy policy can and will prevent the confusing "hit and miss" approach to the energy problem-solving efforts of the past, by establishing our energy goals and a timetable for achieving those goals; by allowing and requiring a more balanced and responsible analysis of the environmental, economic, and social impacts of energy exploration, development, and consumption; and by serving as a focal point for the coordination of all energy-related Government programs, policies, and activities under one "umbrella."

A comprehensive and far-reaching national energy policy must also serve as America's "action plan" for attaining energy "self-sufficiency" which, in my judgment, is vitally important to our foreign policy negotiations and national security interests.

CONCLUSION: OUR ENERGY FUTURE CAN BE BRIGHT

I believe the American people are responding magnificently to the energy crisis, just as they have met the chal-

lenges of other major crises our Nation has faced in the past.

However, it will not be an easy task. The challenge of meeting our energy needs both now and in the future will carry a high "price tag." For example, energy economists with the Chase Manhattan Bank recently estimated that the outlay necessary to meet our petroleum demands between 1970 and 1985 will be a whopping \$1,350 billion. As I said before, the days of "cheap" energy are over, if we are to maintain our social, economic, and environmental objectives.

But I firmly believe that if all Americans will positively participate in working toward the energy alternatives I have outlined here today, our energy future can and will be bright.

Considering the total energy question, and in retrospect, America has been on a collision course with itself ever since the end of World War II. "The Land of Plenty" suddenly is not any longer and an ancient adage is about to replace a contemporary American credo. How many times have we heard the statement:

There's plenty more where that came from.

Now, it has become clear that the favorite American pastime of squandering must be stopped. We must return now to the wisdom of the ages that tells us to "use it up, make it do, wear it out."

A recent Time essay on the energy crisis said:

(It) has forced consumers to do something unprecedented—to consider tomorrow. It is a feat that past generations found impossible. To see the future and see it whole, demands the confrontation of unpalatable facts.

Time said:

Until now, "Power to the People" was only a slogan. Today, the American future is literally in its citizen's hands—hands that rest upon ignition keys, electric switches, purses and wallets. How will America's citizens react? They could continue to do what they have always done; spend and damn the consequences. Or they could acknowledge that the forgotten virtue of thrift, as Ben Franklin preached, is not against the American grain but deep within it.

WHO WOULD SIGN THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE TODAY?

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, if our Nation is to continue to be strong in the years to come, it is imperative that we strive to maintain the dedication and courage exhibited by the founders of our country. The future demands that we fully realize our responsibilities, and I believe that the following item expresses the importance of this matter very well:

WHO WOULD SIGN THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE TODAY?

Unless it had been signed, there would be no United States today. And no such high wages as Americans enjoy—the highest on earth. And no such high standard of living, which Americans generously share with the poor of the world.

But the men who signed it put their lives and every penny they owned on the line, and many of them lost their fortunes, their homes, their businesses or jobs as a result. But they signed.

How many Americans would do as much for the long-range future of their country today?

Would you?

THE PROBLEMS WITH GAS RATIONING

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion on the question of rationing gasoline as a means to conserve energy. A perceptive analysis of the question was recently presented in a column by Mr. Allan C. Brownfeld entitled "The Last Thing Needed is Gasoline Rationing":

THE LAST THING NEEDED IS GASOLINE RATIONING

WASHINGTON.—The Senate has passed an emergency conservation bill that would give President Nixon broad authority to ration gasoline, reduce speed limits and cut off fuel for activities he deems "nonessential."

The vote in the Senate was 78 to 6 and the bill now goes to the House, where the Commerce Committee has held hearings on the same subject. More than likely, the House will follow suit.

In these actions there is the all too familiar abdication of authority by the Congress. As was done in the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (which told President Johnson to do "whatever is necessary" to combat aggression in Indochina) the Congress has now told the President to "do whatever is necessary" concerning the energy problem.

In a democratic society, in which the voters elect their representatives and expect them to determine national policy, this provision of a blank check to the executive may not be good enough. If we are, for example, going to have gas rationing, then the Congress should vote for it. It should not be left to the President, and his non-elected advisers, to make such a decision.

That, however, is more a question of who should make the necessary choices rather than what the right choice might be.

At this time, the Nixon administration is split down the middle on the question of gasoline rationing, with at least two top officials, Treasury Secretary George P. Schultz and Council of Economic Advisers Chairman Herbert Stein, dead set against it. They recommend instead a high tax on gasoline—high enough to reduce consumption—with low-income Americans being able to write off the gasoline tax on their income tax.

IRRATIONAL APPROACHES

The fact is that gas rationing is the last thing we need. A high tax on gasoline is close behind it. Both represent irrational approaches to a real problem—approaches which will make things worse, and not better.

The major argument being advanced for rationing is that it is the only way to be "fair" to the poor. The fact is, quite to the contrary, that absolute equity is impossible to achieve. Rationing, in the long run, is unfair to everyone—and to provide a system of rationing for the 100 million automobiles on American roads would require the institution of a huge and costly new bureaucracy.

The current oil crisis, we often forget, has little to do with the Arab boycott—but has

a great deal to do with government interference in the free market. In the matter of natural gas, federal regulators kept the price artificially low, which discouraged exploration and encouraged consumption. At the same time, import quotas on oil kept us from meeting the increased demand for petroleum. This is, of course, in addition to the environmental protestors who held up the development of the Alaska pipeline which could provide us with some two million barrels of oil a day—who prevented full development of offshore oil reserves—and who promulgated anti-emissions standards for automobiles and factories which have created vehicles that consume more fuel for less performance.

Thus, long before the Arab boycott—during the past spring and summer—we have been hearing about an "energy crisis." As with so many other alleged "crises," the problems were brought about by government interference in the economy. And, as with other situations of this kind, those who want to solve the problem do not call for an end to governmental involvement—but want to make it total, as with rationing.

CLEAR THE MARKET

Economist Milton Friedman notes that, "If all Mideast oil is shut off, we shall have to do without some 10 per cent of our present oil supplies. That is no tragedy. It means going back to the rate of consumption of 1970 or 1971—when no one thought we had a catastrophic shortage of fuel."

Dr. Friedman states that, "The most effective way to cut consumption and encourage production is simply to let the prices of oil products rise to whatever level it takes to clear the market. The higher prices would give each of the 210 million residents of the U.S. a direct incentive to economize on oil, to increase the supply of oil."

The only alternative to the free market, he points out, is "artificially low prices accompanied by governmental rationing. This method induces each of us to oppose the general interest rather than further it. Our separate incentive is to wangle as much as we can from the rationing authorities . . . 210 million persons each with a separate incentive to economize or 210 million persons dragooned by men with guns to cut down their use of oil—can there be any doubt which is the better system?"

While not as dangerous as rationing, the surtax proposal would also push the nation further away from self-sufficiency in energy. Shale oil might become economically feasible, the Wall Street Journal noted, if the price of crude oil reaches \$8.50 a barrel, but only if industry can capture that \$8.50. If the equivalent price of crude is pushed to that level with a surtax, the government gets the revenues and shale will remain unprofitable and thus undeveloped.

After our experience with the failure of government controls—it is surely time to give the free market a chance to work.

THE WASHINGTON POST AND DÉTENTE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, December 12, the Washington Post in a front page headline stated "Trade Bill Passed With Soviet Curbs." In an accompanying article written by Dan Morgan, a Washington Post staff writer, Mr. Morgan makes the statement:

The administration setback came on two votes in which House liberals, concerned about Soviet domestic repression and restrictions on Jewish emigration, sided with hawks who oppose détente.

The "two votes" refers to the passage of the Vanik amendment restricting credits to the Soviet Union and the defeat of the move to remove title IV from the bill.

Since I do not consider myself a "House liberal," I must be one of the "hawks" Morgan is discussing. I do not mind being labeled a hawk as I define a hawk in this context as an American citizen who guards American national security and realistically appraises the designs of foreign powers.

As a hawk I do question Morgan's following statement, "hawks who oppose détente." Speaking as one "hawk," I do not oppose "détente" but the illusion of "détente." And that is a very important distinction. Webster defines illusion as "the state or fact of being intellectually deceived or misled" or "something that deceives or misleads intellectually." This is what has happened. Many have been deceived or misled—some by their own wishful thinking and some by Soviet efforts. But détente has proven to be an empty shell—an empty shell some in policymaking positions and in opinion-making positions are loath to recognize.

The Soviets, judging by their actions, recognize détente as a technique to obtain Western, particularly American, technology to improve their industrial base and military might and to use every opportunity to expand their influence at the expense of the United States. Examples of Soviet actions to back this thesis are legion—Soviet arms deliveries to the Middle East and support for Arab oil cutoffs to the West, Soviet supply of weapons to North Vietnamese, growing Soviet strength in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf area, Soviet submarine patrols off the American east coast, Soviet building of new missiles, and numerous others.

We must not confuse realities with illusions. Our national security depends on us being able to make these distinctions and translate them into policies which guarantee our continued strength. If we do not have the will to do what is necessary to withstand the Soviet threat, no one else will do it for us.

WHO IS THE FARMER?

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a long way from Wall Street to Main Street, but the distances are being cut down.

Just as the energy crisis makes it obvious how interdependent the nations of the world have become, recent agricultural fluctuations make it obvious how interdependent are the various segments of our own economy.

With the vast majority of our population now living and working away from

the farm, it is helpful, I think, to stop and take a look at the fellow American who puts the bread on our table.

An article in an International Harvester Farm Report does just that, and I would like to reprint the article at this time.

WHO SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH?

"Most people think the farmer is a fellow who's got a straw hat on, a pipe or a chew of tobacco in his mouth, and a pair of overalls on with the tail of them out, and one suspender is hooked and a pair of shoes or maybe none."

The speaker is a young farmer in a business suit from Alabama, an expert, like any young farmer, on the danger of stereotypes. He relates the essence of the farmer's image today. An image that is perpetuated in spite of the fact that in these times farmers are coming into their jobs better educated. The new generation is not only well read, but many are college graduates and trained in any number of the hundreds of farm-oriented programs that have emerged since World War II. These young farmers are strong managers and very cosmopolitan.

The lure of the cities for rural young people is a fact of our century. Jobs money, prestige and material comfort for all have been the promises of city life.

What are the young people like who chose to remain on farms? And why did they stay? Going beneath the stereotype, what do we find? Young farmers today look like businessmen, act like businessmen—are businessmen.

More than once, young farmers have told International Harvester in a series of in-depth interviews: "If you're farming the same way you did two years ago, you won't be farming two years from today."

HOW DO THEY KEEP UP?

Most young farm operators have had some college experience—and more and more are college graduates. For instance, Gordon Mann of Chickasaw County, Iowa, holds three college degrees. After earning two engineering degrees and a business degree from Harvard University, he and his wife returned to the farm.

Like many young businessmen, young farmers take continuing education courses. Hundreds of classes on vocational-agricultural subjects are offered in the U.S.

And non-farm business people, familiar with annual sales meetings, would be amazed, probably, to find the equivalent information resource for farmers. But especially during the winter, farmers gather to hear about what's new, from neighbors and manufacturers.

"Business is behind a lot of this," says an Ohio farmer. "Fertilizer companies, seed companies, equipment companies. Because they're in business, too, to sell their products. And they're out to help the farmer to use their products, to raise more and better crops. Agriculture is a primary growth industry in the United States. They've had the greatest increase of production per man since World War II that there is."

True enough. In 1950, the U.S. population was 151,325,798. By 1970, we had 203,211,926 people—a growth of 34 per cent in twenty years. Farmers, working 48 million fewer acres since 1950, and working 6.5 billion hours compared to 15 billion hours in 1950, fed and clothed more Americans in 1970. In 1950, one farmer fed and clothed 15 urbanites, compared to more than 47 in 1970.

Farm productivity between 1950 and 1970 increased by these numbers: vegetables up 82 per cent; cotton, 60 per cent; Irish potatoes, 73 per cent; milk, 251 per cent; poultry, 471 per cent; beef, 127 per cent. In 1950, corn farmers got 37 bushels an acre; in 1970, production was up to 87 bushels. Wheat yields were increased per acre by 83 per cent.

And this despite government controls which have kept production down.

TOIL AND ITS REWARDS

So if today's young farmer reflects touches of affluence that have come to many Americans, he is more than entitled to his share. As Emerson said, "The farmer is covetous of his dollar, and with reason . . . He knows how many strokes of labor it represents."

No stereotype is completely unfounded, but the perpetuation of stereotypes is a tragic flaw. And no group suffers more deeply than the young farmer. Because the false bib-and-overalls image is what puts him, according to a recent poll on professional status, so far down the list in terms of what urban America thinks of him. His status in the eyes of his fellow-Americans is part of what a young Ohio farmer meant when he said, "It's a pretty hard thing to start out to be a farmer."

The danger in stereotypes is their one dimensional character. And so it would not be correct to begin and end the "new image" of today's farmer with either overalls or a business suit. Because the farmer doesn't wear a business suit when he's working. But then, neither do the airplane pilot or the cab driver or even the Shakespearean actor. You dress to fit the role. But people play lots of parts. People are complex.

No man is more complex than the farmer. More often than not, he's laborer, manager, carpenter, banker, repairman, employer, mechanic, weatherman scientist and more—all rolled into one hard-working, individual, satisfied to be called "farmer."

And job satisfaction is hard to find these days. The latest Gallup poll on the subject says only 77% of American workers are satisfied with their job, a 10% drop from last year.

Ask most people why they do like their jobs, and they'll probably mention income, fringe benefits. Maybe occasionally the people they work with.

But ask today's young farmers, and you sometimes hear a touch of the poet.

Ohio again: "I think when you work land and work livestock, you really know what creation is all about. Because you see life, you see life every day. You see life, creation, germination. You see birth, you see death, you understand what the whole universe is about, what's going on."

"You know that you have to fit into this pattern, that you don't abuse nature. That you work with nature. And that when you abuse nature, nature aborts."

A young California farmer puts it this way: "We are trying to take better care of the land. In other words, we would like to have the land better after each crop than the prior crop. And I know that practically all the farmers here, the crop is in better shape after they have been farming it than it was before they came. So we are trying to do a better job on it and keep the land in preference."

And a Georgia farmer says: "We see the demand for our grain for Russia, China, India, and so forth. It's good to be a part of knowing that what you are producing is needed. And not only needed, but the bare necessity of life. We can do without a lot of things. Food we cannot. And everyone of us are a part in unity here of accomplishing a part that's more important than defense. More important than any segment of our government, and that's our bare existence from food."

IH has produced a film for both farm and non-farm audiences, "Farming's First Day." And the revealing segments on today's young farmer, themes keep occurring: challenge, freedom, self-reliance, love.

Where does profit stand in the picture? Probably few non-farmers have heard it described this way:

"Farming you are involved with mother nature as well as you are never assured of a market. It is the element of marketing and

weather. You are always battling it. So basically a farmer is a gambler. I mean, it is just like rolling the dice in Las Vegas, you might say.

"He plants it today, but he doesn't know for at least a minimum of ninety days how he's come out. He is not going to know whether he won the toss of the dice or not. But he still spent all his money. He put his money on the table, he rolled the dice and it is going to take ninety days to find out whether he won or not."

Another farmer says, "I think that maybe farmers in American society and culture do not necessarily measure by monetary values. Just about how you go about things and have some pride in what you have done, and if you feel like you've done your best and try to preserve what natural resources we have and you try to utilize them in a way that would be beneficial to everybody else."

So, huge gamble notwithstanding, today's young farmer has made a commitment to his job, and to himself. In city life, he finds no attraction. Although some have tried the life.

"I wasn't a farmer all my life. I spent 13 years in a factory, and it just got to me; I quit. Everyday the same thing over and over. Never a chance to go anywhere. Having somebody tell you what you have got to do all the time; when you have got to do it; how you're supposed to do it."

"I could see, all these other people going to work at 7 o'clock and coming back at 5 and I said to myself, 'If that's all life has got in store for me, it ain't going to be worth living.' And these people running around these cities, they don't know what the world's all about."

Whatever negative aspects of farming are cited, the farmers always return to the fact that they love the land and their life with the land.

"I think there is one other satisfaction and that is working with nature. You are with the soil and with the animals and that is different, working with animals, that it is working with people. You talk to them and they don't talk back. And I like this thing of getting up early in the morning in the summertime and getting outside where the air is fresh and clean. That is the part of it I like."

SONS OF FATHERS

Today's young farmer is the son of his father, the son of his forefathers, and the son of these times. He's a Thoreau with 20th Century enterprise. For all his understanding of "a time to every purpose under Heaven," he has to move fast.

For all this, the farmer can't be considered larger than life. Like the rest of Americans, he's confronted with debt, taxes and other enormous problems. He has to rent much of his land because it's too expensive to buy—if he can find it to buy.

But, unlike most Americans, the farmer works with life. And the young farmer, articulate and self-aware, knows he's lucky to understand what others don't.

"Now the big kick is the pollution kick, environment and all this. Why this is nothing new for farm people. They've worked with environment all their life, cause they know that nature is boss. And this is their livelihood. And it doesn't take them long to understand this. When you really appreciate what nature does, what it has to offer, other things fall in place."

The fathers of young farmers, like the majority of fathers at this point in time, knew the Depression. And getting money out of their land had a different meaning than today. Because today's young farmer thinks as much in terms of putting money into the land, in equipment and chemicals. Machines and materials their fathers never knew.

"My dad has been out of farming and out of the state for 20 years. And he understands the basics, but I deal with words he never had to contend with. Pre-emergence, post-

emergence and all of this thing, you know. Everyday, everyday you learn, just like going to school. Everyday you learn a new word, and some you can't spell, but everyday there's something new that comes along.

"I think this is what is fascinating, just not going to work everyday putting two bolts in the same hole, and you go home. Everyday it's something new."

In the farmer's immediate experience with seasons and generations of crops and animals, he can appreciate the natural conservatism of his father.

"He's still with us and he's 72 years old. But there's still a lot of knowledge in a man's head when he's 72 years old that you just don't get in 35. Sometimes it's a hindrance. They still remember the Depression a lot. But that's what parents are for, to make you stop and think. Not to tell you what to do, but talk to you."

Many times, of course, the generations confront one another. Because it's not very often that a young farmer will move very far from where he grew up. He knows that land, and to him, that land is better than any other. "Everybody's from someplace and that's the way you are."

You're here and so you're here."

A BOB WILLS TRIBUTE

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Floyce Korsak article, a "Bob Wills Tribute—Recording a Musical Legacy."

BOB WILLS TRIBUTE—RECORDING A MUSICAL LEGACY

(By Floyce Korsak)

Back in the early 30s when America was at its lowest ebb in a depression, a Texas farm boy picked up a fiddle, listened to the homespun music of his elders; the songs of the blacks in the cotton fields of West Texas and to the different drummer in his own heart.

Bob Wills and his fiddle gave birth to a brand new folk music, country-swing, that helped the country sing and dance as it worked its way out of a trying time.

Through the intervening years, the appeal of country music has always held strong in broad segments of the nation, but in recent months, with the economic and emotional barometer of the land again at low ebb, there has been almost phenomenal resurgence of its popularity. This is particularly true among young people.

Thoughts like these were threaded through the conversations of a score or more of musicians who played with Wills, and personnel from United Artists who gathered this week at Sumet Sound Studios to cut two albums of classics made famous by Wills and his Texas Playboys.

Wills himself, who has been disabled by a stroke, was well enough to come to the studio for a few hours and contribute his classic trademark "Ah . . . ha . . ." to a few of the melodies.

Lynn Schlitz, who heads sales and promotion for United Artists in Nashville, says there has been a tremendous increase in sales of country music among young people.

"Young people," he says, "are groping for the past. They are looking for a base to hang on to. I remember how I enjoyed sitting and talking for hours to my grandparents. This satisfied a need for security. I just don't think kids have that now."

The youth of America, and Europeans as

well, are packing places where they can hear and/or play country music.

"You can see further proof of this in music store sales. For a long time they sold only guitars. Now kids are buying mandolins, banjos and fiddles.

"The demand by younger people for Bob Wills memorabilia and his contributions to folk music ranks at the top.

The two-day recording sessions at Sumet Studios was old home week in its purest sense. Perhaps country-western singer, Merle Haggard, expressed the feelings of everyone in a simple but eloquent way when he said, "I am here out of love and respect for Bob Wills. If it were not for this man I would not be where I am today."

Four of the original Texas Playboys, Leon McAuliffe, Smokey Dacus, Al Strickland and Eldon Shamblin took part in the sessions this week. Other names easily recognized by the middle-aged generation—Johnny Gimble, Keith Coleman, Leon Rausch and Hoyle Nix—were present.

Nix, a long time friend of Wills, and who can simulate Wills' voice so that it is practically impossible to tell the difference, dubbed in for him at the second session.

Late Tuesday, just as the group was about to tape the Wills classics, "San Antonio Rose" and "Faded Love," word came to the studio that Wills had suffered another severe stroke at his Fort Worth home.

They completed "Faded Love." But with Nix's voice giving forth with Wills' "Ah . . . ha," in "San Antonio Rose", the music suddenly stopped. There wasn't a dry eye in the studio.

"A moment like this will never happen again," commented an old friend, Harry Fenstermaker. "It got to everybody. It struck a chord in on everyone's heart."

The legacy that Bob Wills has given the world can best be described in his own words.

"I slurred my fiddle to play the blues."

STRONG MORAL LEADERSHIP NEEDED IN ENERGY CRISIS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the strike and highway blockages by truckers in utter disregard of public welfare demonstrates what happens when a nation loses confidence in its leaders. These actions argue more eloquently than words for the speediest possible conclusion of the congressional investigation of President Nixon—in the words of Senator AIKEN, "Impeach the President or get off his back." If impeachment is the result, which I doubt, then evidence of impeachable offenses should be presented to the House. So far that has not been done. If, as I suspect, impeachment is proved not warranted, then the President's critics should get off his back and permit him to cope with the immense challenge which is before him and the Nation.

This winter, and the coming few years, may require more Presidential leadership than our Nation has needed since the days of the Great Depression and World War II. Americans who have lost faith in the President are unlikely to heed his pleas that they turn down their thermostats and conserve scarce energy supplies. Yet, that is exactly what must be done. Only Congress has the ability

to restore public confidence in the Presidency.

Public disenchantment with the institutions of Government is growing. The following letter from a small Illinois oil distributor indicates the depth of public concern. It also indicates why Congress must get the impeachment question settled and out of the way, so that the President can go about the business of leading the Nation through the energy crisis:

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: Perhaps you are unaware of the bitterness and disgust of the heating oil consumer. They cannot understand why the Cost of Living Council permits and in fact encourages repeated heating oil price increases while those heating with natural gas and electricity do not share in the increased costs of energy. In addition, beginning Dec. 27 they are allocated 15% less fuel oil while those heating with gas and electricity are only asked to reduce their consumption but their supply is not reduced.

The COLC, and apparently the newly created Federal Energy Commission, reasons that with higher prices less heating oil will be consumed and that refiners will produce more fuel oil and less gasoline. The fact that the home users supply is being reduced 15% and other classifications of users is being reduced various amounts makes less consumption of fuel oil mandatory, so that higher prices are not needed to achieve this objective. As far as the argument for higher prices for fuel oil to encourage higher percentages of production is concerned, in the Wall Street Journal of 12-3-73, M. A. Wright, Chairman of Exxon, states that "distillate production from available crude currently is being maximized". And Standard of Indiana in full page ads in major city newspapers state, "We are producing as much heating oil as we can, and investing heavily to produce even more." Perhaps other major oil companies are already producing as much middle distillate as they can and if not they should be ordered to. In this critical energy crisis why should additional incentives in the way of higher profits on fuel oil be offered to spur its production when tremendous increases in profits is already being realized by the refineries?

According to a report on a St. Louis TV station, in the St. Louis area, of which we are a part, about 10% of the homes are heated by oil and approximately 90% is heated by natural gas and electricity. Most of those heating with oil live in older homes and are people in the lower income group. These are the people who have to suffer the double penalty of a 15% reduction in supply and unrestrained price increases. They cannot understand why they are being singled out to suffer this burden and the only explanation we can give is that our margin remains constant and it is the suppliers who raise prices—with the encouragement of the government. Since January of this year Shell has raised heating oil prices 6.7 cents per gallon, which is in excess of 50%, and the COLC and the Federal Energy Commission is encouraging further increases. Does that make sense to you? Mr. Dunlop's objectives seem to be pneumonia and bankruptcy for the poor.

In contrast to concessions to the large oil companies, nothing has been done to alleviate the plight of the small gasoline dealer and oil jobber whose margins remain constant while product availability decreases and operating expenses increase. It is understandable why the smalls keep griping about the favoritism shown big business. It appears that the major oil companies have been getting just about every thing they ask

for—and then some—from the COLC and judging from what is to be read in the newspapers there will be more of the same from the Federal Energy Commission. The plans for gasoline allocation and rationing seem to be just as fouled up—give as little as possible to the poor and make it available to the wealthy who can afford to pay a higher price or an additional excise tax. It is all very disgusting. Protests are beginning to spread beyond the grumbling stage, and I think the truckers blockage of highways is just the tip of the iceberg. Most of the truckers who complain, among other grievances, about high diesel fuel prices are probably unaware that it is the large oil companies who with government encouragement are unrestrained in price increases. The resellers margin has been pegged for months.

I am aware of your efforts in behalf of the gasoline dealer and the oil jobber in the past and I want to express my sincere thanks. I hope that you and other members of the Congress can correct some of the inequities I have described.

Sincerely yours,

IMPACT OF OIL EMBARGO IS "DISTORTED"

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, after Watergate the energy crisis is probably the most talked about subject in America today.

Unfortunately, like Watergate, the truth about this crisis is a very elusive thing. However, a copyrighted article was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on this subject. This outstanding piece was written by Donald L. Barlett and James B. Steele and it dispels many of the myths about the energy crisis.

It also raises some very disturbing questions. The article points out that the Nixon administration has been issuing conflicting statistics and statements constantly about this problem and that the needs and interests of the major multinational oil companies are in conflict with the needs of the American people.

My subcommittee will shortly be looking into one aspect of this problem, the Interior Department's administration of the oil reserves located under the Outer Continental Shelf. There are indications again, that the needs of the oil companies are not the same as those of the people of the United States.

Yesterday I inserted the first half of the report published in the Philadelphia Inquirer. At this time I insert the concluding portion:

FOCUS ON OVERSEAS SALES HURT DOMESTIC MARKET

UNITED STATES DOES NOT KNOW

The popular predictions of assorted national disasters brought on by the Arab shut-off seem to grow naturally out of the inflated statistics tossed around casually by the federal government's oil policy authorities.

While it is possible to come up with reasonable estimates of the amount of crude oil imported into the United States directly from Arab states, such is not the case when it comes to computing the volume of products refined in other countries from Arab crude oil and then shipped here.

The federal government never has been

much interested in charting the flow of international oil and, indeed, the Bureau of Mines has had only one minerals specialist assigned to the task.

As for the data available from foreign countries, it is even more sketchy than that for the United States. And naturally the information is not subject to independent checks.

Then, too, refineries may receive crude oil from a half-dozen different countries. The oil is pooled for refinery runs and the gasoline, home heating oil and other products turned out actually are derived from both Arab and non-Arab oil.

How then does the Interior Department come by its refinery statistics?

Largely from the oil companies themselves, an Interior Department official acknowledged, adding: "We try to pick up statistics wherever we can. But you can guess to a degree."

And that is still another reason for all those conflicting figures coming out of Washington.

Although the Bureau of Mines maintains data on the source of crude oil going into refinery centers in the Caribbean area—which accounts for a sizable volume of United States imports—the information from elsewhere around the world is vague.

In some countries, like Israel and South Africa, oil statistical material is considered secret. Countries like Iran, a major oil producer, do not publish information showing the final destination of all of their exports.

There are reasons for all this secrecy. Iran, for example, which borders the Arab state of Iraq, for years has been sending oil around Arab lands into Israel. Neither government wants to acknowledge the shipments.

But the figures the Bureau of Mines has pulled together for the Caribbean area—the single largest foreign supplier of finished petroleum products to the United States—at least offer some indication of the amount of Arab oil included in refined products that are imported.

During 1971, the most recent year for which figures are available, a refining complex in the Netherlands Antilles received 751,000 barrels of crude oil daily from at least six different sources.

The largest supplier was Venezuela, which shipped in 613,000 barrels a day, or 81 percent of the refinery center's total input.

Other crude oil came from Brazil, Gabon and Nigeria. And there were 33,000 barrels a day that came from some unaccounted-for source.

Only 5,000 barrels a day, or 1 percent of the oil the refinery complex received daily, was shipped from an Arab country, in this case Libya.

WHAT COULD BE DONE

At another Caribbean refinery center, this one in Trinidad, the shipments of Arab crude oil were much higher. The center received 293,000 barrels of crude oil daily, of which 154,000 barrels, or 53 percent, originated in Saudi Arabia and Libya.

The remaining 139,000 barrels a day came from eight different countries—Venezuela, Iran, Angola, Gabon, Indonesia, Brazil, Colombia and Nigeria.

But while Arab crude oil accounted for 53 percent of the crude oil sent to the refinery center, the United States imported only 217,000 barrels of petroleum products a day, or 54 percent of the refinery's total production.

And therein rests another fascinating aspect of the Arab boycott: The multinational American oil companies play a major role in policing the oil embargo for the Arabs.

For in theory, at least, the Trinidad refinery center could take the non-Arab crude oil, refine it and export the finished products to the United States.

It then could take the Arab oil, process it and ship the refined products elsewhere around the world, to those countries not under the Arab embargo.

There is, though, another way in which the

international oil companies control the worldwide flow of oil, and that is through their huge tanker fleets.

If the companies were so disposed, and if the Arab cutoff had created truly serious problems, then tankers carrying Arab oil could be directed to those refining centers producing petroleum products for countries not under the embargo.

Similarly, tankers carrying non-Arab oil could be steered to refining centers processing crude oil for distribution in the United States.

But the trading off of oil shipments can work both ways. If the multinational oil companies wanted to emphasize American dependence on Arab oil, then tankers carrying Arab oil could be directed to refining complexes that normally would use non-Arab oil.

Last year, the largest exporter of crude oil and petroleum products to the United States was Canada. The second largest exporter was Venezuela.

In fact, these two countries accounted for imports of 2,068,000 barrels daily—or well over twice as much as the United States received from Arab countries.

But such is not the case with America's five largest international oil companies, which last year produced well over 6,000,000 barrels of crude oil daily in Arab countries.

A Bureau of Mines official told The Inquirer that although the figures for the Caribbean refineries are for 1971, and the volume of oil processed has changed, there is no reason to believe that the percentages of distribution have changed.

He said a survey of the 1972 operations of a Virgin Islands refinery complex showed about the same percentage of crude oil imports by country as in 1971.

REASON FOR SITUATION

With all of the talk about American dependence on Arab oil, it is important, perhaps, to keep a few other statistics in mind.

The growing bind the American oil companies now face in the Arab world is the result of some two decades of multibillion dollar expansion of the Middle East oil reserves.

It was during the early 1920s, when the United States once before feared it was exhausting its domestic oil reserves, that the federal government urged major oil companies to obtain oil reserves in foreign countries, including the Middle East.

A worried Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, met with oil industry leaders on August 16, 1921, in Washington and stressed the need to obtain secure sources of foreign oil under the control of American companies.

"Unless our nationals reinforce and increase their holdings abroad," Hoover said, "we shall be dependent upon other nations for the supply of this vital commodity within a measurable number of years . . . We must go into foreign fields in a big way."

Aided by the United States State Department, the oil companies had soon done just that.

The department conducted extensive negotiations with the British, who already had a foothold in Iran where oil was discovered in 1908, to open the door for American companies to explore for oil around the Persian Gulf.

Even so, a glut of oil discoveries in the United States in the 1920s and 1930s dampened interest in the Middle East as American companies were hard-pressed to sell all the oil they had found back home.

American companies reported major oil discoveries in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia in 1938, but it was not until after World War II that production began to rise dramatically, from roughly 700,000 barrels daily then to 12,300,000 daily by 1973.

Once again, in the 1940s, as it had in the 1920s, the State Department played an active role in encouraging the multinational oil

companies to secure more foreign oil holdings.

After the war, the oil companies made a fundamental shift in their worldwide distribution system of crude oil due to rising production in the Middle East. Increasingly, they shifted that oil into Europe, a market that previously was served by oil from the United States and Venezuela.

Since then, of course, Arab oil has played an ever greater role in the economies and life of European nations, with the oil companies investing billions of dollars to supply their growing market there and in Asia. Much of the development has come at the expense of the United States.

In the case of Exxon Corp., for example, the company increased its already sizable reserves in the Middle East and Africa, mostly in Arab states, from 24 billion barrels in 1963 to 34 billion barrels in 1972.

At the same time, Exxon's United States reserves increased only slightly, from 5.1 billion barrels to 5.5 billion. Such figures help explain America's slide from self-sufficiency.

But the explanation as to why the multinational oil companies have continued to explore and develop the oil reserves of Arab states while ignoring other regions is found in the nature of the oil industry itself.

The oil industry has a herd instinct, not unlike the 19th century gold rushers who flocked to the Yukon and California in search of quick fortune.

"It's not really a very sophisticated industry," said Donald L. Campbell, a vice president of J. C. Sproule and Associates of Calgary, Canada, a geological consulting firm. "It has a follow-the-leader psychology."

Campbell said substantial exploration was underway in Canada's lower Mackenzie Valley above the Arctic Circle in the late 1950s. Then oil was discovered off the coast of southern Alaska and in the North Sea. The oil rigs soon disappeared from the desolate north and were on their way to the new strikes, he said.

Not only is exploration easier in countries around the Persian Gulf than in less accessible regions, but the oil wells in the Middle East flow with incredible force. Thus, production costs are much cheaper than in places such as Texas.

That powerful economic attraction of Middle Eastern oil development in the past has created the mistaken impression that the Middle East is the only place left in the world with sizable oil deposits. Such is not the case.

In the United States alone, roughly only a third of the oil that has been found in the country's history has ever been produced. The rest is still in the ground. The oil industry has always maintained that it is uneconomic, in most cases, to extract more than one-third of a reservoir's oil.

But that does not mean the oil cannot be produced. In fact, the Quaker State Oil Refining Corp. of Oil City, Pa., has been conducting tests for several years to increase the amount of oil recovered from oil reservoirs.

A company official said most oil eventually can be recovered. "It's really just a matter of economics," he said. "The trick is to get the price down far enough to equal the price of crude."

Or put another way, as the prices of petroleum products rise, the companies will begin extracting the oil that is more expensive to reach and the nation's reserves figure will go up once again.

Indeed, even if there were no more oil discoveries in Alaska or elsewhere in the United States, there remains enough oil in the ground to keep the country running well into the next century.

And that does not include the substantial offshore oil deposits—which are at least five times greater than the present proved reserves of the country. Nor does it include the huge reserves in the Arctic, nor the more

exotic sources such as shale oil and tar sands. Nor does it include the massive coal supplies which can be converted into gas.

Computing all these sources together, there are sufficient supplies of petroleum to keep the country running for centuries.

While developing the Arab oil reserves and making much of the world overly dependent on them for supply, the multinational oil companies were ignoring other promising and more politically-stable petroleum regions such as the Canadian Arctic.

To this day, the little exploratory work that has been undertaken in the Canadian Arctic has been done largely by a consortium made up of the Canadian government and independent Canadian oil interests.

The consortium, Panarctic Oils Ltd. of Calgary, has so far discovered five major gas fields in the Arctic islands, and the company estimates it has found roughly 10 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Panarctic believes it must find about 30 trillion cubic feet to make a pipeline economical. Geologists have estimated total recoverable natural gas reserves in the Arctic islands at 342 trillion cubic feet.

As an indication of the size of Panarctic's natural gas finds to date, the company has found enough gas to provide residential and commercial heating to Philadelphia for 200 years.

"The major international oil companies were noticeable by their absence, though they surely knew of the area's potential," said R. G. S. Currie, a vice president of Panarctic, in a paper given last May in France. He also offered an explanation for the companies' lack of interest:

"It is understandable that companies having large reserves of low cost oil, in foreign countries of unstable government, would prefer to produce and market these reserves first rather than spend large sums of money to find more oil at home, which would only serve to reduce the market for the foreign crude."

With their interests tied so closely to the Middle East's future, it is not surprising that some of the oil companies publicly urged the United States this summer to give the Arabs more support in working out a peace settlement with Israel.

"There must be understanding on our part of the aspirations of the Arab people and more positive support of their efforts toward peace in the Middle East," Otto N. Miller, California Standard's president, wrote to stockholders and employees in July.

FIT IT TO THE CLOTH

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion as to whether the All Volunteer Military Force has been working well. As one who supported the concept of an All Volunteer Army, I think it is workable.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch in an editorial on December 7 points out that the main obstacle to this system working properly "is that the Pentagon is still trying to impose the all-volunteer concept on the existing military structure, which is based on obsolete foreign policy assumptions and the luxury of an unlimited supply of involuntary manpower."

The Post-Dispatch offers some alternatives for making the system operative. I want to share this editorial entitled "Fit

It To The Cloth" with my colleagues. The editorial follows:

FIT IT TO THE CLOTH

Enlistments for the all-volunteer military force are falling significantly behind quotas, raising "considerable doubts," the House Appropriations Committee said in a report, "on the long-range effect of the all-volunteer force concept on America's military posture." Enlistments in September in all branches of the armed forces, for example, amounted to 32,110, whereas the objective for that month was 38,201. The Army appears to be having the greatest difficulty, having obtained only 82 per cent of its manpower quota in September.

Possibly the easiest way to bring enlistments in line with manpower needs is to reduce the needs, and the House did in fact agree to cut troop levels by 48,000, but that would still give the country a military force of almost 2,200,000. Greater emphasis on recruiting women, raising the age limit and transferring many men from assignments that do not truly require military training to genuine military jobs would also help close the gap.

Perhaps the principal obstacle, though, is that the Pentagon is still trying to impose the all-volunteer concept on the existing military structure, which is based on obsolete foreign policy assumptions and the luxury of an unlimited supply of involuntary manpower. Rather than conclude so quickly that the volunteer system cannot work for America, Congress and the Administration ought to consider how to make the military system accommodate to manpower availability. Some refreshing new perspectives on national defense might emerge.

AN INSPIRATIONAL FAMILY

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the very distinct pleasure of visiting in my Washington office with two good friends—and a truly outstanding couple—from my hometown in Columbus, Ga., Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Pharis.

Mr. and Mrs. Pharis are the parents of two very talented and successful adult sons—Mr. Hugh Pharis, also of Columbus, and Mr. Robert Pharis, of Albany, Ga. Hugh, an award winning pianist, teaches music in the Muscogee County school system dividing his time between students at five different schools. Robert, also an accomplished pianist and musician, who accompanied his parents on their recent visit with me, is a former schoolteacher and now manages a concession stand in the Albany Post Office. Both are active church members, and active in civic affairs as well.

Both Hugh and Robert, incidentally, are blind.

These remarkable men and their family have set an inspirational example for other handicapped individuals and, indeed, all of us to follow in overcoming seemingly insurmountable adversities to make our lives as meaningful and full as possible. Coincidentally, I was a fellow passenger with Mr. and Mrs. Pharis on their flight home and Hugh was there with his wife to meet them—it was my good pleasure to meet them also.

I highly commend the following arti-

cles written about the Pharises—the first from The Sunday Columbus (Ga.) Ledger-Enquirer magazine of October 8, 1972, and the second from The Columbus Ledger of July 3, 1973—to the attention of our colleagues.

The articles read:

[From the Sunday Ledger-Enquirer Magazine, Oct. 8, 1972]

BROTHERS PERFORM MUSIC WITH THEIR EYES CLOSED

(By William Rowe)

Students at five Muscogee County schools look up to their vocal music teacher—far up. Hugh B. Pharis is a tall man—six-foot-six—and he is slim at 165 pounds.

When he sets up a movie projector to show a music education film, plays the piano, rigs up tape recorder equipment, or pulls out his pocket watch to check the time, students do not realize how unusual he is.

Hugh Pharis is probably the only public school teacher in Georgia who is sightless. He was informed a few years ago that this was true and he has heard of no change.

How does a person who is blind become a public school teacher?

"I tried for the job on a dare," Pharis said. "Some years back, I visited the classroom of my wife Mary (who now teaches fourth grade at Rosemont Elementary) and listened to how she taught the children. Shortly before Christmas holidays I helped her teach her students Christmas music. Then I had a chance to help a physical education instructor with some classes and the principal asked me why I didn't apply for a job as a regular teacher."

Hugh had applied. He had already attended the Georgia Academy for the Blind in Macon, Georgia, Southwestern College, the American Foundation for the Blind in New York, and LaGrange College, earning his B.A. degree in voice and piano, with a minor in psychology.

"But the response to my applications was discouraging," he said. "I received few answers. It seemed nobody believed a blind man could teach public school music."

Hugh Pharis has been proving differently for more than five years, going to a different school each school day, staying the full number of hours, teaching just as any qualified, sighted person does.

"People just don't realize what a blind person can do," Pharis said.

When his sensitive fingers touch the raised numerals and minute marks on his pocket watch, he knows the time. Hugh uses a stick in walking about school grounds and rooms after his wife drives him there. He operates the clothes washer and dryer at home, he climbs a ladder up onto the roof of his home at 5524 23rd Ave., Columbus and uses a house broom to sweep off pine straw—also using the broom to keep tabs on where the edge of the roof is.

Hugh Pharis plays chess and scrabble on Braille boards, he reads novels and non-fiction books translated into Braille, keeps up with radio and television news, he listens to Mary dictate music and he types it out on a Braille writer so that he can practice the composition until he has learned it by heart.

He instructed members of the Jewish Ladies Aid Society of Columbus in the transcription of Braille during one of their projects. He has taken three Columbus College courses along with his wife.

Hugh is an active member of the Columbus Lions Club, which meets Tuesday evenings, and Beallwood Baptist Church, where he is chairman of the music committee. As a Lion, he is co-chairman of the club's school safety patrol committee and serves on sight conservation and publicity committees.

"There are so many jobs a blind person can handle," he said, "such as lawyers, college professors, piano tuning and repair, playing music and entertainment."

More than 30 years ago, when he was not

more than nine years old, Hugh had eyesight, although it was not good. He was able to see and learn the colors of his surroundings—the sunsets, the dark thunderheads—and those stored memories enable him to visualize colors today in his mind's eye when someone describes them. Glaucoma cost him the last of his vision at age 17.

In those early days he and his younger brother Robert attended East Highlands Elementary School and East Highland Methodist Sunday School.

So it will be a homecoming today when Hugh and Robert Pharis present a program of piano and organ music at East Highland United Methodist Church at 3:30 p.m., followed by a reception at 4:30 p.m.

Hugh began playing the piano when he was eight years old, studied under "a cracker-jack teacher at Macon, a demanding perfectionist who enjoyed music and who was totally blind." Hugh won district and state medals while in high school.

"Robert will play the piano in the program today and I will play the organ," Hugh said. "We have not had much time to practice together, so we will improvise."

Robert Pharis, now 38, manages a concession stand in the lobby of the post office in Albany. He works daily and on Saturday mornings and has manned this post since 1959.

The brothers are the sons of Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Pharis of Columbus, the only two in the family to inherit poor vision.

Robert attended Young Harris and LaGrange College and took piano lessons paid for by the Jewish Ladies Aid Society of Columbus. He took a B.A. degree in English, taught in Canton and Cummings public schools until failing vision forced him to resign in 1969.

Albany postmaster Leon Mott says, "Bob is an inspiration to everyone. Why, when I'm feeling low sometimes, I'll leave my office and go out and just stand and watch Bob or talk with him a few minutes and I feel a lot better."

Optimistic in outlook and active in Albany's First Baptist Church, Robert plays the piano for services and sometimes sings in the choir. He also serves as chaplain and pianist for the Lions Club.

These two sons of Mrs. Pharis, named "Mother of the Year" in Columbus several years ago, presented a program at East Highland Methodist Church in Columbus last year. The congregation moved to invite them back for this afternoon's program.

The performance the Pharis brothers will give required more effort than sighted musicians have to give, because the blind must memorize all their music, "bar by bar, hand by hand and then put it all together," Hugh said. "It takes longer to learn."

But these are brothers who can do it and have. Hugh has years of experience teaching public school children vocal and folk music, enriching their learning with movies and tapes, stimulating their imaginations with challenges that they draw pictures to go with music, taking his vocal group for television performances.

Today's program will not only be a message in music, but will demonstrate what a good use two men have made of their time and talents.

[From the Columbus Ledger, July 3, 1973]

HUGH PHARIS DAY IS DECLARED TO HONOR BLIND LIONS MEMBER

(By Martha Evans)

It might be only an embarrassingly bald head, but everyone, no matter who he is, has a handicap, the chaperone would tell one civic club audience after another.

The handicap his charges shared was blindness.

Hugh Pharis was in that group of singers who appeared before civic clubs across the state, brought by a chaperone determined to

show the sighted world just how bright and capable his young charges were.

As a result of the tour, Pharis came to associate the Lions Club with sight conservation. In 1968, he became a Lion himself.

Now he has been presented a state award, the Lions International Outstanding Blind Person Award at the Multiple District 18 convention held recently in Macon, Ga. And the Columbus Lions Club was to honor him today by designating their luncheon meeting as Hugh Pharis Day.

Pharis, a music teacher in the Muscogee County School District, has apparently reached a point in life where "no" is not a word he hears so frequently.

Previous Ledger stories have told how Pharis, unable to get a teaching job because of his handicap, helped his wife Mary, who was a classroom teacher herself, teach her students several songs.

The principal was impressed and asked Pharis why he didn't apply for a job. Pharis explained how school systems just didn't seem to want to take a risk with a blind teacher but the principal insisted, "Well, one more 'no' wouldn't hurt."

Pharis, to his amazement, got a "yes" and now divides his time among five different elementary schools.

He also knows the meaning of the word "almost," almost being able to see again, but is not bitter that some 30 operations failed to correct the congenital condition.

Pharis was a young student, riding home in a train after another eye operation with his head swathed in bandages. Through a tiny peephole, he could, amazingly, see.

Two days later, the eye hemorrhaged. The surgeon had already given up on the other eye.

Says Pharis, in explaining his lack of bitterness, "I had lived in an environment (the Georgia Academy for the Blind at Macon) where I knew too many kids who had never even seen the light of day." (Pharis was sighted as a child, though his eyes steadily worsened.)

Pharis and his wife Mary enjoy an easy camaraderie which puts visitors and friends at ease about his blindness.

Pharis admits he hopes his membership in the Lions Club here has had that same effect of making members less self-conscious about blindness.

Indeed, a club officer recently called on Pharis to draw a name from a box as the winner of the week's "pot," pocket change contributed by members. Jokingly, the officer noted the drawing would have to be fair.

The only lingering disappointment shared by Mr. and Mrs. Pharis is their failure to adopt a child.

They have been certified by both the local and state adoption agencies since 1970 but have not gotten a child.

With growing competition for available children, Pharis feels they are passed over by caseworkers for a couple where both potential mother and father are sighted.

Congress. The remarks which appear in the RECORD for December 6 reflect Mr. YOUNG's prepared statement rather than his actual comments. I therefore would like to include for history at this point in the RECORD what I believe to be a truly inspirational expression of hope for the future of the Nation and our new Vice President:

STATEMENT OF ANDREW YOUNG

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, there is no decision that I have had to make in the House that has torn me so much, because I find myself torn between my political judgments and my personal judgments. I find myself coming to vote against what I feel to be my own best political interests in disagreeing with many of the colleagues in this House that I respect most.

I do it because I feel a desperate sense of urgency about the division and crisis that besets this nation. I think I make this vote more as a vote of faith and hope than any objective political consideration, for if Gerald Ford had had his way in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I would not be a member of this House. The amendments which he supported would have kept me in the South, doing whatever I might have been doing at that time.

But it is the very fact that I am from the South, and during the time of my own political life and prior to that, I have seen so many men, about whom I had questions and about whose past I had grave doubts, rise to the occasion.

I remember in 1960 not being pleased at all with the record of John F. Kennedy and wondering what would happen if he were elected President. But, given the choice, I made the right choice. He vindicated me in that choice.

I had doubts about Lyndon Johnson as his successor; but nobody spoke or moved more forthrightly in the civil rights area when he became President of the United States than Lyndon Johnson did.

So I guess my vote for Gerald Ford is coming out of that Southern experience. It is an experience that says that people, given an opportunity to serve in time of crisis, can grow to meet the challenge of that crisis.

I hope and pray for the sake of this nation that Gerald Ford measures up. I hasten to say that I also reserve the right to criticize and will be the first to do so, should he not. I would hope that, along with the American people, we could rise up to express our discontent with anybody that seeks to further polarize and divide this nation along lines of race, class or party. It is time for us to heat the homes of those who are cold, to educate our children. It is time for us to bring a sense of confidence in our government that I hope Gerald Ford can bring. I sense in him the kind of personal integrity that somehow makes me override all my political considerations; so I will vote today to confirm Gerald Ford as Vice President of the United States.

a citizen and as a businessman, Mr. Vincent has made a major commitment to rebuilding the black capital of America.

Now the CAV Building is being dedicated, the largest black-owned and operated office building in the United States. I was privileged to participate in the groundbreaking ceremonies for the building and I have watched it rise on 125th Street. Its opening signifies a belief in the economic future of Central Harlem.

I congratulate Charles A. Vincent on this landmark step and wish him continued success in his endeavors on behalf of the people of Central Harlem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an article on Mr. Vincent at this point in the RECORD:

HIS GOOD OFFICES

(By Sandra Satterwhite)

Charles Avery Vincent is noticeably proud of the fact that he got a \$15 million private loan to build a 15-story office building in Central Harlem which will house federal offices. The 43-year-old lawyer, a Republican, who seems disdainful of government-sponsored minority capitalism programs, is quick to point out, "I didn't get any subsidies. I borrowed every cent for this project."

And on a more philosophical note, "This is a capitalistic country and it's time for blacks to get into the mainstream of the American economy."

His showcase is the textured brown brick and bronze C.A.V. Building at 55 W. 125th St. (between Lenox and Fifth Aves.) It's billed as "the largest black owned and operated office building in the nation" with 230,000 square feet of rental space, a cafeteria for employees, a cocktail lounge, a reservations only restaurant (or executive dining room) and underground parking.

There'll be an official opening for 500 invited guests next Wednesday in "Vincent's Place" (the cocktail lounge and both dining facilities, an affiliate of Vincent's C.A.V. Enterprises). Tenants will move into the first five floors this month and the rest of the building will open by Feb. 1.

Manufacturers Hanover Trust, which provided the \$15 million loan, will move its 125th St. branch into space on the ground floor and Rep. Charles Rangel of the 19th C.D. is expected to be a third-floor tenant. Vincent said that about 90 per cent of the space has already been leased, but he won't give names of corporations because "they want to hold their own press conferences."

Vincent talked about his new building in between numerous incoming phone calls, and seemed to relish his ability to handle two or three at a time. He sat behind the desk at C.A.V. Enterprises (the initials are taken from his name), his real estate development corporation at 82 E. 57th St.

He said that the offices will provide jobs for 2000 and that there should be an improvement in city services. "You can get better police protection, better lighting and transportation because your services depend upon your real estate taxes." He expects to pay at least \$250,000.

He had the idea for federal offices because the city has leased a major portion of a building between Seventh and Eighth Aves. and the State Office Building is a block away. "I thought it was a good target to go after. Why shouldn't the federal government be in Harlem?"

Acting through the General Services Administration, the federal government has leased 45,000 square feet. So far the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration have made plans to open district offices there.

A Southerner who migrated North, Charles Avery Vincent was born on March 4, 1930 in Greensboro, N. C. Both parents died when he

STATEMENT OF ANDREW YOUNG

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the confirmation of our colleague, JERRY FORD as Vice President of the United States, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia set aside his prepared remarks and delivered one of the most eloquent, impassioned statements I have been privileged to hear since being elected to

CHARLES A. VINCENT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the leaders in the regrowth of Central Harlem economy is Charles A. Vincent. I have had an opportunity to work closely with Mr. Vincent and to observe his efforts on Community Planning Board No. 10 in my congressional district. Both as

was young and an older brother supported the family. He's the youngest of eight children. He moved to Rocky Mount in that state when he was six.

He attended the public schools and graduated from Booker T. Washington HS in 1946. He went on to Lincoln University where he majored in political science and finished in three and a half years in 1949. He got his law degree from Catholic University of America in 1954.

In the '50s he was admitted to the bar in both North Carolina and in Washington, D.C.

Before and shortly after law school he was an assistant historian in the National Archives in Washington, D.C. Moving to Long Island in 1957, he worked in the legal departments of several insurance companies. In 1969 he was an underwriter and clearance officer with the Chicago Title Insurance Co. (Home Title Division of New York), then an assistant vice-president in the Law Dept. of Title Guarantee Co. of New York before leaving in June, 1970 to form C.A.V. Enterprises.

"I'd dealt in this [real estate] for the past six or seven years, only I was doing it from the angle of insuring it and I decided to try it on my own," he said about his decision to launch his company. He thinks this experience had a lot to do with getting his bank loan. I went to them with a package that was well put together and I had gotten some "Triple A" leases."

He's divorced and lives with his 17-year-old son in Huntington, where he often plays bridge, and in the summer hits the tennis courts and swimming pools.

He now plans to use the 11th floor of the C.A.V. Building for his real estate corporation and hopes to increase the five-member staff. He'll probably have some leverage as chairman of Community Planning Board No. 10, which covers Central Harlem, in getting proposed projects off the drawing boards. But he won't reveal his plans. "I'm still negotiating for additional property but I don't want to go into that."

CHUCK RILEY OF WIBC, INDIANAPOLIS, MAKES POINT THAT THERE IS MUCH RIGHT WITH OUR COUNTRY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, that is something we are inclined to forget—or someone is forever telling us how bad off we are. Following is Mr. Riley's broadcast over station WIBC, Indianapolis, Ind., recently:

COMMENTS BY MR. RILEY ON WIBC

It was the immortal Robert Burns who wrote:

"O would some power the gifti'g us
To see ourselves as others see us".

We Americans are probably the most self-critical of any people on earth. Our columnists and commentators, yes even our comedians, find much that is wrong with our country. The extent to which we flagellate ourselves sometimes oversteps the reasonable limits of freedom of speech.

We're also probably the most harshly criticized nation in the world by the press of other countries. Our economic and political foreign policies attract frequent fault-finding in the foreign press.

Against this background of displeasure both at home and abroad, it is rewarding to encounter a favorable public statement about Americans from a radio broadcaster in another country. An editorial presented by

Gordon Sinclair on CFRB Radio in Toronto, Canada last June 5th spoke encouraging words about us in a way that would have been difficult for an American. Even though the editorial is now several months old, it is still meaningful enough to merit quotation here in part. My name is Chuck Riley and I'd like to read to you what Mr. Gordon Sinclair had to say:

"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. As long as sixty years ago, when I first started to read newspapers, I read of floods on the Yellow River and the Yangtze. Who rushed in with men and money to help? The Americans did."

"They have helped control floods on the Nile, the Amazon, the Ganges and Niger. Today the rich bottomland of the Mississippi is underwater and no foreign land has sent yet a dollar to help."

"Germany, Japan and to a lesser extent, Great 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 earthquake it is the United States that hurries in to help . . . Managua, Nicaragua, is one of the most recent examples. So far this year, over 59 American communities have been flattened by tornadoes. Nobody has helped."

"The Marshall Plan, the Truman Policy, all pumped billions upon billions of dollars into discouraged countries. Now newspapers in those countries are writing about the decadent war mongering 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. Does any other country in the world have a plane to equal the Boeing Jumbo Jet, the Lockheed Tri-star or the Douglas DC 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 Americans get out of this bind, as they will, who could blame them if they said the Hell with the rest of the world. Let someone else buy the Israel bonds. Let someone else build or repair foreign dams or design foreign buildings that won't shake apart in earthquakes."

"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 even think there was outside help even during the San Francisco earthquake. And finally the American Red Cross was told at its 48th annual meeting in New Orleans recently that it was broke. This year's dis-

asters, with the year less than half old, has taken it all and nobody has helped."

"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 these present troubles."

"I hope Canada is not one of these."

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS T. MURPHY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound and deep sense of personal loss that I pay tribute today to a great man, Francis T. Murphy, former New York State assemblyman, lawyer and distinguished Democratic Party leader, who died recently at the age of 77.

Frank Murphy led an exemplary and rewarding life. He was a man of great personal integrity, dedicated to the proposition of serving his fellow man. He was a rare man, educated and literate, who used his own God given talents to benefit others.

Francis Murphy was a life long resident of the Bronx, a fact which greatly enhanced his effectiveness as a Bronx political leader. He was born in the Throgs Neck section, and was educated at the great institutions of Fordham Prep and later the university.

He served his country in World War I and by rising in rank from a seaman to an ensign, demonstrated the leadership characteristics which were to mark his later career in public service.

In 1923, the same year in which he graduated from New York Law School, he founded the now prestigious law firm of Goldenkoff & Murphy, and served as its senior member until his death. His law career was an active one, he specialized in real estate law, and was a member of many bar associations.

In 1945-46 Frank Murphy served with distinction in the New York State Assembly. His career in the assembly was characterized by the same fundamental beliefs which he carried throughout life, honesty, integrity, and providing service to the residents of the Bronx.

Even though Frank Murphy did serve in the assembly for 2 years, he became more interested in seeing others become elected than himself. After his career in the assembly, Frank Murphy embarked upon a distinguished career in the Bronx County Democratic Party, which was to span nearly a quarter century. In 1949, he was elected a district leader in Bronx County, a position he was to serve in for almost 20 years, during which time he became a close friend and adviser to the current Bronx County Democratic Chairman, Patrick J. Cunningham.

However, most people feel Frank Murphy will be best remembered for his service as the leader of the Chippewa Democratic Club from 1949-72. It was while serving in this capacity that he was best able to demonstrate his unique brand of

political prowess, based on a calm disposition, a winning smile, but above all an overriding concern for justice and fairness, and an extensive knowledge of the community and people he served.

As a result of these fine attributes, Frank Murphy's advice was actively sought by all political figures in the Bronx, whether they were aspiring or established, and each was assured that once Frank's advice was offered it was unquestionably sound, coming from a man who knew the art of politics inside out. I remember when I came upon the threshold of the political sphere, he provided me with the opportunity to attain higher goals for which I will be eternally grateful.

His strong belief in high ethical standards for all men in public office was clearly and consistently reflected in the manner in which he conducted his own personal and professional affairs. He truly served as an inspiration for all of us who had the pleasure of coming in contact with him in any capacity.

Yet, despite all of his time-consuming duties in other fields, Frank Murphy prided himself as a loving and dedicated father.

The most rewarding moment of his illustrious career came the day he witnessed his son, Francis T., Jr., sworn in as an associate justice of the New York State Supreme Court.

To his beloved widow, Bertha, his distinguished son, and his daughter, Mrs. Irene McInerney, I wish to extend my heartfelt condolences, and assure them that their loss will be deeply shared by thousands of New Yorkers.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially difficult to pay tribute to a man of the caliber of Francis T. Murphy, difficult in the sense that his passing represents such a tragic loss. With the death of Frank Murphy, the citizens of Bronx County are losing a real statesman, and his family and loved ones are losing a devoted father.

THE DIET WORKSHOP

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned with the future of these United States of America and that each citizen should have a healthy, happy life. Because we are a Nation of plenty, ironically, we are an overweight Nation. This problem frequently has its onset in childhood, for the fat child often grows up to be the fat adult. This adult goes on to be a statistic in the growing numbers compiled by the organizations and agencies that deal with the end results of obesity: cardiovascular disease, emotional disturbances, and disabilities caused by accidents.

During the past years, as the public has become aware of the dangers of overweight, there has developed a search for an answer. One of the answers found has been a system of weight control through group interaction as typified by the program of the Diet Workshop.

In its 8 years of existence, the Diet Workshop has aided hundreds of thousands to lose weight safely, and to remain slim permanently through a thoughtfully developed program of group dieting and nutritional guidance. The founder and national director of the Diet Workshop, Lois L. Lindauer, started with her own weight loss experience. In her desire to help a friend in Boston, she flew to that city weekly from her Long Island home to teach a group of women what she had learned about the role of nutrition in losing weight. With that group, the Diet Workshop was founded in 1965. Today, it has grown into a major organization contributing to the health of the American people through its hundreds of weight control groups across the country.

Lois Lindauer has converted her loss of one-third of herself into a gain for the entire country. With her interest in helping others and her boundless energy, she has awakened members of the Diet Workshop to the importance of sensible diet in personal and family life. She introduced the concept of a medical nutritional consultant for weight control organizations by selecting a physician with an international reputation as nutritional consultant for the Diet Workshop so that her program would always be on sound footing. She initiated nutritional training and certification for staff instructors to assure responsible and knowledgeable leadership in such programs. It is this type of dedication to the requirements of those who entrust their weight loss to her that has brought commendations to Lois Lindauer from the medical and allied professions.

Because Lois Lindauer is a wife and mother as well as a businesswoman, she understands the necessity for inculcating good eating habits at an early age. Her concern is not just for the dieter who comes to her groups for assistance with a personal weight problem, but for the well-being of the whole family involved. By teaching total nutrition to one family member, the Diet Workshop hopes to spread the gospel of proper eating throughout the populace.

As technology eases the burdens of physical work, the need for high caloric intake decreases. Yet as a Nation, we are teaching our button-pushing sons and daughters to eat as their more physically active grandparents did. With all the bounties of nature at hand to supply us, we are not intelligently selecting those foods that will benefit us nutritionally.

Through weight control classes in the Diet Workshop, mothers and fathers learn not only to reduce, but bring to their family tables and their children a diet that is wise in selection and variety—a diet that will insure to us and our dependents the blessings of health and well-being so that the future of coming generations will rest on sturdy shoulders.

By educating the public to the dangers of fad and crash diets, by providing them with a method and recipes for food preparation that make dieting pleasant, the Diet Workshop and its founder, Lois L. Lindauer, are providing Americans with the knowledge they need not only to slim down but to face up to a healthy life.

ELK HILLS NAVAL RESERVE OIL FIELDS AND OTHER ENERGY CRISIS PERSPECTIVES

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ralph D. Jackson of Deerfield Beach, Fla., recently called my attention to an editorial by the editor, Jack W. Gore, which appeared in the Tuesday, December 4 edition of the Fort Lauderdale News. The editorial mentions one of the several possible untapped sources of oil which our Nation could utilize during the energy crisis and suggests action by the Congress to implement its availability. I insert Mr. Gore's editorial in the RECORD at this point, for the consideration of my colleagues in the House:

COUNTRY MIGHT BE BETTER OFF IF GOVERNMENT TOOK SABBATICAL NOW AND THEN

Back on Nov. 25, there was an editorial in this space commenting on President Nixon's Nov. 7 energy message and, in particular, on his plans to ask the Congress to give him the authority to use some of the vast oil reserves currently earmarked for the U.S. Navy for civilian purposes.

In his message the President said, if given this authority, 160,000 barrels of oil a day could be flowing from the Elk Hills Naval Reserve field in California within two months.

This particular field, we pointed out, contains about one-fourth of all the oil in California, and is only one of at least four oil-rich areas in this country and Alaska reserved specifically for the future needs of the Navy.

Inasmuch as it was reported to us that these reserve fields supposedly contain enough oil to last the Navy for 500 years, we recommended that the Congress initiate quick action on the President's request to divert some of this earmarked oil to civilian use at this particular time.

To date we have seen no action from the Congress along this line. But even more surprising to us has been the fact that the existence of these reserve fields doesn't even seem to be a matter of common knowledge in Washington.

A friend of ours, for instance, sent copies of this particular editorial to several congressmen who expressed some surprise at the extent of these oil reserves and who replied they would most certainly look into the situation.

But even more surprising, if not downright astounding, was something else our friend told us.

He said he had contacted John A. Love, just prior to his being shunted aside as the President's chief energy adviser, and Love told him he was unaware of these Naval Petroleum Reserve fields.

Love did say, however, he would check into the matter and call our friend back. When he did call back Love said he had confirmed the existence of the fields and he indicated he would get right to work in support of the President's plan to expand production from the Elk Hills field and to begin the exploration and development of one of the fields in Alaska.

Now, if this is true, and we have no reason to doubt it, here was the President's chief energy adviser who wasn't even acquainted with the measures the President told the people of this nation, via a nationally-televised speech back on Nov. 7, he was planning to take to ease the current oil shortage.

Well, John Love is now out as the President's chief energy adviser. Over the past

weekend he was apparently relieved of his duties because other high administration officials disagreed with the stand he had taken favoring a gasoline rationing program.

His replacement is Deputy Treasury Secretary William E. Simon who will head up a whole new superagency which will be known as the Federal Energy Administration.

We must presume that Simon knows a little more about the energy problems facing this country than Love apparently did but who can count on this in the wonderful world of bureaucracy that runs things in Washington today?

Offhand, we can't see how an import from the Treasury Department can qualify as an energy expert knowledgeable enough to head up a powerful new government department in charge of all energy conservation programs.

But stranger things happen in Washington every day. Our latest information happens to be that, despite the President's request for congressional authority to open these Naval Reserve oil fields, no bill has been introduced to accomplish that purpose.

If and when a bill is introduced it will be sent to the powerful Armed Services Committees of the House and the Senate which are well-sprinkled with strong Navy supporters, and the chances of such a bill being approved and sent to the President for signature before the end of the year are just about nil.

That's the way it goes. As we have said before, while the people of this nation are expected to make all kinds of sacrifices to tide us over the energy crisis, the bureaucrats in Washington make a lot of speeches but do little to change their time-old ways.

The more we look at this entire situation the more we wonder about the ability of our government officials to run a corner grocery store much less the affairs of the biggest and most powerful nation in the world.

It is no wonder the Arab leaders have got us over the proverbial barrel.

They seem to know what they are doing and where they are going while here in this country our own people are being inconvenienced in a dozen different ways while our elected officials can't seem to figure out what is going to happen tomorrow much less a couple of months from now.

There are times when we think this country would be a lot better off if our whole government would take what school teachers call a long sabbatical and let our people solve their own problems for a change, and this is one of those times.

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I am greatly concerned about the current situation wherein the Congress and the American public are being forced to make decisions regarding the energy crisis solely on the basis of information provided by the major oil companies.

I have therefore introduced legislation which would assure an independent evaluation of our energy needs and an independent evaluation of how we can meet these needs.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the Record, a letter I recently received from Local 1-5 of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union which sets forth many of the very relevant questions that must be

answered concerning our present energy situation and highlights the fact that we do not now have the means of answering those questions.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the letter follows:

OIL, CHEMICAL AND ATOMIC

WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION,

Martinez, Calif., December 12, 1973.

HON. JEROME WALDIE,
Concord Calif.

DEAR SIR: The Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, Local 1-5 membership is deeply concerned about the energy crisis and has some suggestions and questions we would like to bring to your attention.

We recommend that a legislative investigating committee with the power to make effective recommendations be formed to investigate the so called "energy crisis".

There are several questions we believe this committee should check out.

1. Did the oil industry make the decision that there was a shortage of crude oil? If so, how was this checked on and by whom?

2. Why are oil wells, that a short time ago were pumping, now shut down?

3. How many producing wells does the oil industry have that are capped?

4. How can the oil industry claim that the reason they have to raise the price of gasoline is because the price of crude is so high when most of the oil companies own their own oil fields?

5. Why, at the time when fuel oils are short has the oil industry shut down refineries?

6. Was the energy crisis contrived by the oil industry for their own self interest to get the following items?

- (a) Alaskan pipeline
- (b) resumption of offshore drilling
- (c) higher crude import quotas
- (d) raise the price of crude
- (e) to drive all independent service station owners out of business.

These are the type questions that our membership is asking, and we believe there are proper questions at this time and somewhere along the line there should be some answers.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES A. GAFFNEY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY CANNON

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of one of New York's finest sportswriters, Jimmy Cannon. His departure truly signifies the passing of an era in sports journalism history.

Jimmy Cannon was a New Yorker in the finest tradition of the word. Born in the Greenwich village section, he lived in New York all of his life, thus adding to his overall effectiveness in covering the New York sports scene. His incisive and lively coverage of the always varied and exciting New York sports world delighted readers for almost 30 years.

Jimmy Cannon was able to capture in words many of the significant events which occurred during the years he wrote, first for the Journal American and later the New York Post. What avid sports fan could ever forget, Jimmy's dramatic coverage of such monu-

mental sports events as Joe DiMaggio's 56-game hitting streak, and Roger Maris' successful assault on the coveted home run record of Babe Ruth in 1961.

Despite having many of the great sports figures as close and personal friends, Jimmy never lost the quality essential to be a good newsman—objectivity, a quality which most New Yorkers will remember most fondly about Jimmy Cannon.

Few people realize that before embarking on his illustrious career as a sportswriter, Jimmy Cannon was a noteworthy general news reporter for various newspapers. One of the highlights of this era of his life was being assigned to cover the famous Lindbergh kidnapping, and later the trial of the convicted kidnapper, Bruno Hauptmann in the early 1930's.

Yet sports was always his first love, and fortunately for the millions of sports fans who followed his column, he decided to make sportswriting his vocation. As an avid reader of his column throughout the years, I, too, feel a distinct loss at his passing. Many of the famous sportswriters of today owe much of their success to Jimmy Cannon. I know my loss is shared by millions of New Yorkers, who realize that a part of New York died with Jimmy Cannon.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the Record an article of the New York Daily News on Jimmy Cannon: JIMMY CANNON DIES, SPORTS COLUMNIST, 63

(By Jim McCulley)

Jimmy Cannon, veteran sports columnist who died yesterday at 63, was every ounce a New Yorker. Part of an era passed with him.

Cannon loved Broadway and its people and enjoyed nightlife although a teetotaler for more than 30 years.

Jimmy rubbed elbows with most of the greats of his time in show biz, the sports world, writing and elsewhere on the national scene. He was pals with Mark Hellinger, his boyhood idol, Ernest Hemingway, Damon Runyon and Walter Winchell.

Although a lifelong bachelor, Jimmy was reported from time to time to be engaged to various screen actresses. Lindy's and Toots Shor's were among his favorite haunts.

HAD HIS HEROES

Though a tough, hardened reporter, Jimmy was not free of some hero worship himself. He was close to Joe DiMaggio, Joe Louis and Billy Conn, and towards the end, he believed that Joe Namath was the greatest and could do no wrong. But he frequently carved up sacred cows when he thought they deserved it.

One time he got pushed aside by Roger Maris, when that Yankee was going for Babe Ruth's home run record. He went after Maris in print at the drop of a typewriter keyboard.

He loved to needle the brass by giving them nicknames. He once referred to the late George Weiss, major domo of the Yankees, as "Lonesome George." The name stuck, much to Weiss' irritation, recalls Max Kase, who was his boss on the Journal American.

"He had an original way with words," Ike Gellis, Post sports editor, points out. "The young writers of today were students of his style and his prose, and how he put it all together."

WAS DAILY NEWS COPYBOY

Born in the Village, April 10, 1910, to Thomas J. and Loretta Monahan Cannon, Jimmy started his newspaper career in 1926

with the New York Daily News as a copy boy. Though seriously debilitated by a stroke, suffered as he was preparing to go to the Kentucky Derby in May of '72, Jimmy was until recently writing a weekly column for the New York Post, the paper he served as columnist from 1946 to 1958.

During his long and active career, Cannon also worked for the World Telegram, International News Service, P.M., and twice for the Journal-American. He left the Post to succeed the late Bill Corum as sports columnist on the Journal American. When the Journal-American-World Telegram-Tribune combine closed, Jimmy was retained as a columnist for Hearst Headline Service. And following his illness and partial rehabilitation, the Post rehired him last April.

Before turning to sports writing, Cannon was copyreader and a general news reporter and one of his memorable assignments was the Lindbergh kidnapping and the subsequent trial of convicted kidnapper Bruno Hauptmann in the early 30s.

Cannon's body reposes at the Universal Funeral Home, 52d St. and Lexington Ave. Visiting hours are today from 1 p.m. to 10 p.m. A mass will be said at St. Patrick's Cathedral 10:30 a.m., Friday. Burial will follow in Calvary Cemetery, Queens. Cannon is survived by two brothers, Jack, and Thomas J., Jr.

NEW BICENTENNIAL MAGAZINE PRAISES AMERICAN NAVY AND MERCHANT MARINE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, lately, a group deeply conscious of the American heritage started the publication of a new magazine, exclusively devoted to the coming Bicentennial of the American Revolution.

The editor of the magazine is my friend of long-standing Dr. Z. Michael Szaz, who taught as an associate professor for several years at Seton Hall University in South Orange, N.J. The editor-in-chief and publisher is Alex Ostojka-Starzewski, a former Polish Baron who fought both the Nazis and Communists during and after World War II, and served as chief engineer of the Communication Department with the Department of Defense in Vietnam for 4 years. The society editor is Mrs. Maria Fisher whose musical career and charitable and social works are well known to Washingtonians.

The new magazine is aptly called the "American Bicentennial." Its first issue is due to appear in January 1974 with about 20 articles devoted to the American War of Independence, traditions from colonial times to the recent past, the contribution of industries, heritage groups, and intellectuals to the building of America socially, economically, and culturally.

The editors and publishers already issued a sample magazine and one of the articles was printed in full. This article is of particular interest as it gives a bird's eye view of the development of American Merchant Marine in the late 18th century.

I insert into the RECORD the article by the curator of the South Street Seaport Museum of New York, an author of 10

books on American ships and shipping, Mr. Frank O. Braynard:

SHIPS MADE AMERICA

(By Frank O. Braynard)

Ships made America. Ships are in our blood. Without ships there would have been no "New World."

The bicentennial is a fine time to remember this because America has drifted away from its maritime birthright. Today many Americans have forgotten what we owe to ships and to the sea. The foundation for our nation was laid not on rock but on the oceans of the world. We are a maritime people, no matter how we seem to overlook it.

The American Merchant Marine in the late 18th and early 19th century was the right arm of our earliest national growth and identity. Between the Revolution and the end of the War of 1812, American maritime initiative broke ground on four major new fronts. We sailed to the Orient beginning the surge of expansion that would end in the opening of Japan. We created the practical steamboat. We originated the packet. We built the first steamship—the first steam-propelled craft to cross any ocean.

Since the 1920s our maritime strength has declined, despite the brilliance of the clipper ship era. The Civil War forever it seems ended our greatness on the high seas. In the wars after that, the Spanish war, the first great war and the second world war our weakness at sea resulted in great stirring on the shipbuilding front but no permanent change in our downward trend was made. It is a sad story of national neglect and maritime decay.

Before expanding on our four great maritime accomplishments a quick review of even earlier ties to the sea. The Norsemen lived in their ships. Viking ships did discover America, no matter what the debunkers say. In 986, the same year that Eric the Red led 1,000 colonists from Iceland to his "greenland," another of his breed, a hero named Bjarni, sighted three different lands or islands far to the south of Greenland—but did not land. He probably was as far south as Cape Cod, according to Fred Pohl, lifetime scholar in these matters. From then on North America was seen, visited and explored for 500 years by countless Norsemen.

The story of Norse visits to America is only partially documented, but there are many who believe their exploring reached as far inland as Minnesota. Future scholars will look to this thrilling era for whole new chapters of history.

Ships of Columbus and other explorers have been glorified in moving pictures and through artist's conceptions. In reality they were far more impressive than most people realize. They were tiny, smaller than many yachts of today. They were frail and frequently they were old. The hearts that beat in the bodies these ships brought across the oceans of the globe were brave hearts. It is a truism, but a truism worth restating, without these ships how impossibly crowded would be the Europe and Asia of today.

Between Columbus and his Santa Maria of 1492 and the Pilgrims and their Mayflower of 1620, ships of these interplid explorers expanded the world to its present size. Ships were the space craft of that day. The little settlement on the banks of the Kennebec River in Maine, known today as the Popham Colony, gained a place in history far beyond what might be expected because there they built the first ship ever constructed in North America—the "faire pinnace" Virginia of 30 tons. This was in 1607 and seven years later Adrian Block built another little craft on an island colony of Holland known as Nieuw Amsterdam. The Popham colony died out, but Nieuw Amsterdam prospered and is now New York City. From then on shipyards sprang up all along the coast of Colonial America, but our maritime enterprise was closely held in check by jealous British merchants.

With the Revolution things were different. The bars were down and American maritime enterprise was quick to respond. An 80-ton sloop not much larger than a lifeboat on a modern liner sailed from the East Coast, crossed the Pacific and reached Canton, commanded by Steward Dean. The year was 1784 and Captain Dean and his 15-man crew led the way for an era of maritime expansion that shocked British maritime interests to their innermost being. The Experiment was the name of Dean's craft, and her arrival was something of a sensation. She swung into her assigned wharf at Canton frigate fashion, with strains of martial music intermingling with the piping of the boatswain's whistle and with all the pomp and style of a war vessel. Because she passed through areas where there were pirates she was armed with six guns, muskets, boarding pikes and cutlasses.

American maritime initiative which produced such voyages as that of the Experiment and the Grand Turk that followed and many others was not entirely based on imagination and boldness for the sake of boldness.

One famous shipowner with a marvelous name, Preserved Fish, had planned to build several steamboats for trans-Atlantic service when the Savannah was first new, but seeing how people feared to send goods aboard her he turned back to sail. He founded the Swallow Tail Line of sailing packets and made a million.

It is odd, but quite true, that the ship, which built America, was, in turn, destroyed by the America it built. The famous phrase by Horace Greeley—"go West, young man, go West"—tells the story better. By binding the country together through the use of steam on its waterways, the steamboat opened such a vast area as men went inland, our money and drive went to developing the North American continent.

The clipper ship era of the 1850s was really a step backward. We perfected the sailing ship, stripping England of its maritime dominance in the process. But we neglected steam. When the Civil War drove our shipping off the high seas because of prohibitive insurance rates due to Confederate raiders, our merchant marine never revived.

The spirit of the early Orient traders, the vision of John Fitch, the practical genius of Robert Fulton, the bravery of Captain Moses Rogers—all these American characteristics were given expression in a new generation of Daniel Boones, gold rush prospectors, trans-Continental railroad builders and Indian fighters. Ships of the desert, the Conestoga wagon, took the place of ships of the sea.

Coastal shipping lasted on. It had been the oldest part of our merchant marine, for in colonial days the coastwise water routes were the roads binding the colonies together. And it was the last to go, killed by World War II when German submarines lurked off our coasts sinking ships silhouetted against the glow of our nighttime lights ashore.

American maritime initiative is not dead, however. The modern merchant marine is showing signs of new life. The American-invented container ship has revolutionized world cargo handling. By reminding us of the nation's past glories, bicentennial planners hope that the nation's 200th birthday may help revive our nautical pride. A great power cannot turn its back upon the sea.

EGYPT, SYRIA KILL ISRAELI POWS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Sub-

committee on Europe, I have recently returned from a study mission to Israel and Europe.

While in Israel I saw documents and photographs showing that Israeli prisoners captured by the Arabs had been bound, blindfolded, mutilated and shot or stabbed to death.

Although the Israelis and Egyptians have completed their exchange of prisoners, the Syrian Government denies the International Red Cross access to Israeli prisoners, will not release the names of those held captive and refuses requests for an immediate exchange of wounded.

I have written to Secretary of State Kissinger asking him to instruct our representatives at the United Nations to introduce a Security Council resolution calling on Syria to fulfill Geneva Convention requirements in the exchange of wounded prisoners.

I also am calling upon our Government and the American Red Cross to exert all their influence through other nations and appropriate international bodies to persuade the Syrian government to abide by the accepted norms of civilized conduct in war.

Israel has already released the names of all prisoners she holds and has permitted International Red Cross access to those soldiers. The fact that Syria has refused to reciprocate threatens the fragile cease-fire and the peace talks which are scheduled to begin next week in Geneva, and it leaves the families of captured Israeli soldiers without information as to the fate of their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the text of formal complaints submitted by the Government of Israel to the International Committee of the Red Cross in Geneva and to the Secretary General of the United Nations regarding the killing of Israeli prisoners of war by Egypt and Syria.

The formal complaints follow:

DECEMBER 11, 1973.

EGYPT KILLS ISRAELI PRISONERS OF WAR

(Complaint submitted by the Government of Israel to the International Committee of the Red Cross in Geneva, and to the Secretary General of the U.N., December 9, 1973)

Complaint by the Government of Israel respecting grave breaches of the Geneva Convention of 12th August 1949 relative to the treatment of the Prisoners of War perpetrated by the Egyptian Authorities in the course of the hostilities in October and November 1973.

1. The Government of Israel hereby submits to the International Committee of the Red Cross a grave complaint respecting crimes of murder, torture, acts of brutality and other serious breaches of the Geneva Convention of 12th August 1949 relative to the treatment of Prisoners of War perpetrated by the Egyptian Authorities upon Israeli Soldiers taken captive by Egyptian Forces in the course of the hostilities in October and November 1973.

2. Information from various sources indicating crimes perpetrated upon Israeli Prisoners of War in the hands of the Egyptian Authorities came to the knowledge of the Government of Israel during the course of the fighting. With the return of the Israeli Prisoners of War who had been in Egyptian captivity this information was wholly confirmed. The comprehensive investigation now

being undertaken by the Israeli Authorities into the treatment meted out to the Israeli Prisoners of War by the Egyptian Authorities has already revealed a shocking chronicle of inhuman acts of cruelty perpetrated on the Israeli Soldiers who were taken captive by units of the Egyptian Army, deeds unimaginable in relations between civilized nations.

3. The Government of Israel would be failing in its duty if, at this stage of the investigation it did not submit a preliminary report on the murders and on the monstrous acts of brutality committed in the case of Israeli Prisoners of War who were in the hands of the Egyptian Authorities. Additional reports and evidence to supplement the particulars enumerated in the present complaint will be transmitted to the International Committee of the Red Cross in due course.

4. WILLFUL MURDER

The Government of Israel is in the possession of proven evidence indicating beyond any doubt that a large number of officers and men of the Israel Defence Forces taken prisoner by Egyptian Troops were deliberately murdered, many of them while lying wounded and helpless. It is not open to doubt that the many instances of murder, acts of brutality and calculated humiliation are the result of planned policy of the Egyptian Authorities. A decisive proof of this may be found in a pocket booklet for the Egyptian Soldier published on 30th June 1973 by the Armed Forces Command of the Egyptian Army entitled, "Our Religious Belief—Our Road to Victory". On Page 9 of the booklet may be found a message of the Chief of the General Staff of the Egyptian Army General Saad Al Shazli, addressed to the officers and men under his command in the following terms:

"Kill them wherever you find them and be careful that they do not trick you, for they are a people of deceivers, pretending to surrender so that they may overcome you and kill you easily. Kill them and do not show any pity or mercy".

A number of cases of proven willful murder are described below. Additional cases will be submitted to the International Committee as soon as possible.

I. On 7th October 1973 the garrison of a strongpoint of the Israel Defence Forces north of Kantara-East was taken into captivity. An Egyptian Officer assembled the Prisoners of War and handed them over to the Commander of the Local Egyptian Force.

This Commander drew his revolver and killed one of the captured soldiers. At the same place, three other soldiers of the Israel Defence Forces who had previously been taken prisoners were also shot dead by Egyptian Troops.

II. On 8th October 1973, members of an Israel Defence Forces Unit withdrew from a strongpoint near Kantara-East, in an attempt to link up with the Israeli Forces.

Seventeen soldiers from this position entered a house in the town of Kantara-East. After discovery by Egyptian Forces, they were forced to surrender. Eight of them left the room in which they had concentrated with their hands raised and gave themselves up to soldiers of the Egyptian Army. Nine others remained lying in the room, wounded and helpless. These men indicated to the Egyptians in the clearest possible way their intention to surrender. Despite this, Egyptian Soldiers shot and killed all the wounded soldiers lying there in cold blood.

III. On 8th October 1973 the garrison of an Israel Defence Forces Strongpoint at the southern end of the Suez Canal surrendered after their position had been surrounded by units of the Egyptian Army. The Israeli Soldiers came out of the entrance of the strongpoint with their hands raised. Egyptian Troops opened fire and four Israeli Soldiers

were shot and killed. Another soldier was wounded.

IV. On 8th October 1973, a member of the garrison of the Israel Defence Forces Strongpoint opposite the Firdan Bridge on the Suez Canal attempted to surrender. He left the entrance of the strongpoint and approached the soldiers of the Egyptian Army with his hands raised. Egyptian Troops opened fire and killed him.

V. On 8th October 1973, ten men of the Israel Defence Forces from a strongpoint situated north of Kantara-East on the Suez Canal were taken prisoner by Egyptian Forces.

An Israeli Officer who was also taken prisoner has testified that a number of Israeli Soldiers remained stretched out on the ground at the entrance to the strongpoint, some dead and some wounded. According to the officer, Egyptian Soldiers went up to the soldiers lying on the ground and stabbed them with their bayonets, killing the wounded among them. The Egyptian Soldiers accompanied their foul deed with cries of joy and triumph.

VI. On 8th October 1973, an Israeli tank was damaged by a missile near a strongpoint of the Israel Defence Forces about 10 kilometers east of the Firdan bridge. Some of the members of its crew managed to escape from it. One of them, a tank gunner, fell to the ground in a state of exhaustion. Two Egyptian Soldiers approached him and kicked him in the stomach. They then opened fire on him at close range and killed him on the spot.

VII. On 21st October 1973, an Israeli tank was hit in the Suez sector. The four members of the crew and two other soldiers who were on the tank were taken prisoner. The Egyptian Soldiers into whose hands they had fallen lined up the six prisoners of war and shot them point blank. All six were killed.

VIII. On 21st October 1973, another Israeli tank was hit in the Suez sector. Two members of the crew, including an officer of the rank of captain, fell into the hands of Egyptian Soldiers. The Israeli Prisoners of War were made to sit down next to each other in a depression in the ground. After they had been in the depression for an hour and a half, one of their guards came up and without any reason shot the Israeli Officer in the chest. The Officer died on the spot and his head fell on the shoulder of the Israeli Soldier who was sitting next to him.

IX. On 21st October 1973, an Israel tank was hit by a missile near an Israel Defence Forces Strongpoint half-way between Tassa and Ismailiya. The members of the crew who jumped from the disabled tank hid in a hole in the ground nearby.

After they had been surrounded by Egyptian Soldiers, they surrendered and were taken prisoner. One of them who had been wounded in the foot was shot and killed by an Egyptian Soldier as soon as he noticed the wound.

X. On 21st October 1973, a number of Israeli tanks were hit near a strongpoint situated north of the Great Bitter Lake. The crews jumped from the disabled tanks into a depression in the ground nearby. After they had been surrounded by Egyptian Troops, they surrendered and were taken prisoner. One of the Israeli Prisoners of War, who had been wounded, was then shot and killed by an Egyptian Soldier.

5. CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

From the testimony of former Israeli Prisoners of War who have returned from Egypt there emerges a horrifying chronicle of incessant tortures and humiliation which were the lot of the Israeli Prisoners of War throughout the duration of their captivity. All of them report that, notably during the early part of their captivity, they were most cruelly beaten all over their bodies, particu-

larly while being transferred from the place where they had been taken captive to prisons in Egypt, and during the course of interrogation. The cruelty and callousness of the Egyptian Soldiers who were entrusted to look after the Prisoners of War was especially brutal.

They did not confine themselves to beating and kicking the prisoners of war in every part of their bodies, but made a point of stopping at inhabited places en route and inciting the local population to physically assault the helpless Israeli Prisoners of War. As a result, several of the Israeli Prisoners of War arrived at the prisons beaten and bruised all over their bodies, while some of them had open wounds in their heads caused by blows of rifle butts.

The unbridled savagery of the Egyptian Soldiers is seen more than anything else, in the fact that they made a point of assaulting wounded soldiers more than the others: Many of the returned Israeli Prisoners of War have testified that Egyptian Soldiers kicked them cruelly on their open wounds and even spat on them instead of bandaging them.

6. When the captives finally reached prisons in Egypt, their Egyptian jailers made a point of competing with each other in inventing acts of brutality and humiliation such as forcing the Prisoners of War to kneel on the floor of the prison and lick it with their tongues, or urinating into the palms of their hands. The following is a representative sample of the acts of brutality and degradation as related by the returning Prisoners of War.

I. BLOWS

The Israeli Prisoners of War were beaten over all parts of the bodies, with any weapon that came to hand from rifle butts to clubs, whips and palm branches. Many of the returnees still bear marks of the beatings on their bodies, despite the long period of time that has passed since then.

A particularly favoured means used by the Egyptian Jailers was the beating of the Prisoners of War over their heads and on the soles of their feet with rubber truncheons.

II. TORTURE AND DEGRADATION

The Egyptian Jailers made a practice of putting out the stubs of their cigarettes on the necks and backs of the Prisoners of War. Some of them would order the Prisoners of War to kneel on the ground and would then sit on their shoulders and order them to crawl the length of the room with their jailers astride them.

Another system of torture used by the jailers was to perform their bodily functions on the faces and hands of the Prisoners of War. On several occasions they prevented the Prisoners of War from performing their own bodily functions and brought them to a stage where they were forced to perform these functions in their clothes accompanied by the shouts and laughter of their jailers.

III. MEDICAL TREATMENT

As described above, in a great number of cases the Egyptian Soldiers did not give any first aid treatment to the wounded Prisoners of War and even made a point of persistently hitting them on their wounds in order to aggravate their suffering and pain.

Many of the Israeli Prisoners of War refrained from asking for medical treatment in the knowledge that any such request would be answered with blows and torture.

IV. FOOD

During the first days of their imprisonment the Prisoners of War were deliberately deprived of sufficient food and water. A most common system of torture employed by the Egyptian Jailers was to pour a glass of water on the ground before the eyes of a wounded prisoner of war suffering torments of thirst. When the Prisoners of War were finally given food it consisted of dry bread (pitta), un-

cooked potatoes and onions. The Prisoners of War were hungry most of the time and many of them lost considerable weight during their captivity.

V. SANITARY CONDITIONS

The Egyptian Jailers systematically deprived the Israeli Prisoners of War of washing and minimal sanitary facilities. When they were finally permitted to wash after about three weeks in captivity, they were put into a trough filled with sewage water in which they were required to wash. The cells of the Prisoners of War were full of bugs, lice and other insects, whose deprivations deprived them of sufficient sleep.

VI. SEXUAL ASSAULTS

According to the testimony of some of the Prisoners of War sexual assaults, unnatural acts and sodomy were committed on a number of Israeli Prisoners.

There are attested cases of sharp objects having been inserted into the anus of Israeli Prisoners of War.

CONCLUSIONS

7. It is clear from the foregoing that the murders and acts of brutality described herein were part of a deliberate policy and were committed in accordance with systematic instructions issued by a high central authority.

8. The murder of Prisoners of War is a serious breach of Article 13 of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of Prisoners of War (The Third Geneva Convention). Under Article 130 of the Convention the wilful killing of a Prisoner of War is defined as a grave breach of the Convention.

9. Acts of Brutality committed on Prisoners of War and the display of Prisoners of War to gratify public curiosity constitute a breach of Articles 13, 14 and 17 of the Convention.

10. The abandonment of wounded soldiers on the battlefield without providing medical treatment for them and the deliberate infliction of suffering or a serious abuse of the body of a soldier, constitute grave breaches of Articles 12 and 50 of the Geneva Convention of 12th August 1949 for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armed forces in the field (First Geneva Convention).

11. In accordance with the First Paragraph of Article 12 of the Third Geneva Convention the detaining power is responsible for the treatment given to Prisoners of War who fall into its hands. There is, therefore, no doubt that the Egyptian Authorities bear responsibility for the heinous crimes committed by their troops.

DEMANDS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL

12. The Government of Israel calls upon the International Committee of the Red Cross to condemn the barbaric and revolting crimes committed by members of the Egyptian Armed Forces.

13. The Government of Israel demands of the Egyptian Authorities that they give firm undertakings and issue clear instructions to ensure that there shall be no repetition of the horrendous crimes described in this complaint and that the Government of Egypt will respect the Laws of War and the relevant International Conventions.

14. The Government of Israel demands of the Egyptian Authorities that in accordance with the provisions of Article 121 of the Third Geneva Convention they conduct an official enquiry into the acts of murder and brutality described in this complaint and they forward a report on the matter to the International Committee of the Red Cross.

15. The Government of Israel, in accordance with Article 52 of the First Geneva Convention and Article 132 of the Third Geneva Convention demands that an enquiry shall be instituted into the grave violations of these conventions by the Authorities of the

Arab Republic of Egypt as enumerated in this complaint.

The Government of Israel will submit to the enquiry statements, attestations, medical reports and other evidence in support of the charges contained in the present complaint.

DECEMBER 10, 1973.

SYRIA KILLS ISRAELI PRISONERS OF WAR

(Second Complaint submitted by the Government of Israel to the International Committee of the Red Cross in Geneva, and to the Secretary General of the U.N., on December 8, 1973)

Second complaint by the Government of Israel respecting grave violation of the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 relative to the treatment of Prisoners of War perpetrated by the Syrian authorities in the course of the battles in October 1973.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Government of Israel hereby submits to the International Committee of the Red Cross a second grave complaint respecting crimes of murder, brutality and serious violations of the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 relative to the treatment of Prisoners of War perpetrated by the Syrian authorities, and by Syrian, Moroccan and Iraqi soldiers serving in Syria, upon Israeli soldiers taken prisoner there.

FURTHER CASES OF MURDER

2. Since the submission of the first complaint on 10th November 1973 fresh facts have come to light pointing to further cases of barbarous murders not previously known. These facts, taken together with those recorded in the first complaint by the Government of Israel, justify at this stage the conclusion that no fewer than forty-two separate cases of murder have been committed.

Details of the places in which the further cases of murder have been discovered, and of the number of victims found in each place are as follows:

(i) NAFAH

In the vicinity of the village of Nafah on the Golan Heights, the Israel Defense Forces found the body of an Israeli soldier who had been shot while his hands were fettered behind his back with telephone wire and a bootlace. His army shirt was wrapped around his breast, his body naked. There were no personal documents and no identity disc on the body or near it.

(ii) Hermon strongpoint

A number of revolting murders and acts of brutality were perpetrated at the Israel Defence Forces Strongpoint on Mount Hermon. Some of the cases were recorded in the first complaint submitted by the Government of Israel. Other cases, as detailed below, have now come to light:

A. It is clear, from the evidence of Syrian Prisoners who fell into Israeli hands after the Syrian capture of the Strongpoint that five Israeli prisoners, with their hands tied, were taken into the gamesroom of the Strongpoint, where Syrian soldiers maltreated them, struck them with riflebutts then killed them.

The blows and the cries of the Israeli prisoners were plainly heard throughout the Strongpoint.

When it was recaptured the bodies of five Israeli soldiers were found in it by the Israel Defence Forces. Guided by the evidence of a Syrian Prisoner of War who was present at the time of the murders and of the burial of the murdered men, it may be assumed that these were the five Israeli soldiers killed in that spot. The hands of all five were fettered, in three cases in front, in two cases behind their backs, with telephone wire. The faces of all five had been shattered by bullets fired at their heads from close range.

B. The body of another Israeli soldier was

found on the road from the Hermon Strongpoint to Majdal Shams. The discovery was made on the evidence of an Israeli soldier who had succeeded in getting away from the Strongpoint after its capture by the Syrians and had seen his comrade taken prisoner by the Syrian soldiers. He had hardly got away when he heard a burst of fire. After the Syrians were driven back, he identified the exact spot and found the body there. There is no doubt that the Israeli soldier had been murdered in cold blood after being taken prisoner: The body was lying on its back, shirt and trousers unbuttoned, boots and socks scattered some distance away.

(iii) Murder of Israeli pilots

1. According to authenticated material in the possession of the Government of Israel an Israeli pilot who parachuted into Syrian territory was murdered in the precincts of the military airfield at Dumeir. He was stabbed to death by Iraqi soldiers who had taken part in the fighting.

2. According to trustworthy information in the hands of the Government of Israel, six Israeli pilots who parachuted into Syrian territory at different times and places have been murdered. They were shot by bursts of small arms fire.

ABUSE OF ISRAELI PRISONERS

3. In the course of the investigation into the circumstances of the murder of Israeli Prisoners of War and the collection of bodies of Israeli soldiers killed on the battlefield, facts have been ascertained pointing to acts of brutality committed on Israeli Prisoners of War as detailed below:

A. The eyes of an Israeli soldier murdered at the Hushneya Junction, as recorded in the first complaint submitted by Government of Israel, had been gouged.

B. The lower part of the body of the Israeli soldiers murdered in the Hermon Strongpoint showed numerous bruises caused by blows and kicks.

C. Syrian Prisoners in our hands have testified that Syrian Soldiers physically abused a group of twenty-four Israeli Prisoners when they were being marched from the Hermon Strongpoint to the Syrian Lines: They were beaten, knifed and struck with rifle butts.

D. Another Syrian Prisoner has testified that, while the Israeli Prisoners were being taken from the Strongpoint to Damascus, the lorry stopped in the center of Qatana Townlet, so that the inhabitants could look at the Israeli Prisoners. According to this testimony, a Syrian civilian climbed on to the lorry and started pummeling the prisoners. The Syrian soldiers entrusted with the transportation of the prisoners made no attempt to stop him.

E. Another Syrian Prisoner had testified that he and other Syrian soldiers trampled upon the heads of six Israeli Soldiers, the crews of two Israeli tanks that had been hit. This barbarism was committed although some of the Israeli soldiers were still alive.

F. The Government of Israel has reliable information that a Moroccan soldier serving with the Syrian Forces had a sack filled with parts of bodies of Israeli soldiers (palms and tongues), which he intended to send home as souvenirs.

G. Syrian Prisoners have testified that an Israeli soldier taken prisoner in the Hermon Strongpoint and badly wounded in the stomach was interrogated by the Commander of the Syrian Battalion which had captured the Strongpoint in person. Next morning the prisoner was found dead of his wounds in the very place in which he had been left.

H. Most of the murdered Israeli soldiers were found in the battlefield unclad, only in their underpants. There is no doubt that before killing them, the Syrian soldiers had stripped them of their uniforms as an act of humiliation and dishonor.

DESTRUCTION OF POSSIBLE EVIDENCE AS TO THE IDENTITY OF ISRAELI DEAD

4. (A) The Government of Israel has reliable information that, already prior to the outbreak of the war, instructions were issued to the Syrian Army Troops to remove the identity discs from the bodies of dead Israeli soldiers so as to render their subsequent identification more difficult.

(B) Thus in many cases, the bodies of I.D.F. Soldiers were found with all means of identification, including Identity Discs, removed. Moreover, Syrian Prisoners of War were found to be in possession of the identity cards of Israeli soldiers.

CONCLUSIONS

5. It is patent from the foregoing that murders and acts of brutality described in this complaint and in the first complaint submitted by the Government of Israel on 10th November 1973 were part of a deliberate policy and perpetrated in compliance with systematic directives issued by a high authority.

6A. The murder of Prisoners of War is a violation of Article 13 of the Third Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of Prisoners of War. Under Article 130 the willful murder of a prisoner of war is defined as a grave violation of the convention.

B. The abuse of Prisoners of War, and their display to gratify public curiosity are a violation of Articles 130, 14 and 17 of the Convention. The torture and inhuman treatment of a prisoner of war are a grave violation of the Convention, as defined in Article 130.

C. To abandon wounded soldiers on the battlefield, without providing medical treatment for them, is a violation of Article 12 of the First Geneva Convention of 12th August 1949 relative to the amelioration of the condition of wounded and sick among the members of the Armed Forces of the battlefield. The deliberate infliction of much suffering, or a serious abuse of the body of a soldier, is a grave violation of that Convention, as defined in Article 50.

D. The removal of identity discs from the bodies of the fallen and the making of difficulties in respect of their location are a violation of Article 17 of the First Geneva Convention.

7. In accordance with the first paragraph of Article 12 of the Third Geneva Convention, the detaining power is responsible for the treatment given to prisoners of war who fall into its hands. There is, therefore, no doubt that the Syrian authorities bear responsibility for the heinous crimes committed by Syrian soldiers.

EVIDENCE BY SYRIAN PRISONERS

8. The Government of Israel is prepared to furnish the International Committee of the Red Cross with the testimony of Syrian Prisoners of War referred to in this complaint, which points clearly to the identity of the perpetrators of the murders and acts of brutality and gives particulars of the commanders who ordered these acts.

DEMANDS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL

9. The Government of Israel calls upon the International Committee of the Red Cross to take immediately the necessary steps to condemn the barbaric and revolting crimes that have been described in this complaint and to ensure that proper and full protection is extended to Israeli Prisoners of War.

10. The Government of Israel demands of the Syrian Authorities that they give firm undertakings and issue clear instructions to ensure that there shall be no repetition of the horrendous crimes described in this complaint and that the Government of Syria will respect the Laws of War and the International Convention.

11. The Government of Israel demands of the Syrian Authorities that, in accordance with Article 121 of the Third Geneva Con-

vention, they conduct an official enquiry into the murders and acts of brutality described in this complaint and in the complaint submitted by the Government of Israel to the International Committee of the Red Cross on 10th November 1973 and that a report on the matter be sent to the International Committee of the Red Cross.

12. The Government of Israel demands, in accordance with Article 52 of the First Geneva Convention and Article 132 of the Third Geneva Convention, that an enquiry shall be instituted into the violations of these conventions by Syria, as enumerated in this complaint and in the first complaint submitted by the Government of Israel to the International Committee on 10th November 1973.

STATEMENT ON THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, over the last few weeks, I have heard from hundreds of thoughtful and concerned constituents who have raised many questions about the energy crisis—its origins, dimensions, and possible duration—and what can be done to ease its impact.

Recently I have devoted a great deal of attention to these problems and have consulted with government and industry spokesmen representing a wide range of views. Officials from the American Petroleum Industry, Department of Interior's Office of Oil and Gas, Library of Congress' Environmental Policy Division, and the State Department's Office of Fuels and Energy have met with me and my staff for extended discussions of this problem.

In addition, I have been in close contact with General Motors and other firms in Flint, Mich., to determine what impact the fuel shortages are going to have on employment and the general economy of the district. My district staff has also conducted a survey of the local fuel and gasoline dealers to determine the supply situation in the area.

In the following report, I would like to summarize the results of my research on the energy problem and outline my views on this critical national issue.

The report follows:

THE ENERGY CRISIS: BOTH A LONG AND SHORT TERM PROBLEM

The energy crisis has the potential for being the most important and perhaps the most difficult economic and political problem facing the United States. While the Middle East war and the Arab oil embargo have brought the energy situation to the "crisis" stage, our country has fast been approaching a serious energy shortage.

As one indicator of this, economists studying energy use in the United States have observed a change in the relationship between BTU's of energy consumed and national production over the previous five years. Prior to 1969 as the gross national product (GNP) grew from year to year, the amount of energy annually consumed for each unit of GNP decreased. However, beginning in 1969, this trend was reversed. Now we find that the amount of energy consumed for each unit of GNP has been increasing each year instead of decreasing. This is partly ex-

plained by the greater "non-productive" use of energy—such as for air-conditioning and the use of poorer quality oil which requires a greater investment of energy to obtain the same amount of energy. Based on this and related findings, economists project that it would only be a matter of years before national consumption would outrun our available supply, and we would face a serious energy shortage.

A useful way to examine the energy problem is to break it into two separate problems. The first is the long term problem of the next fifteen years and beyond; the second is the immediate crisis which suddenly confronted us with the worldwide shortage of crude oil caused by the Arab oil cutbacks.

The long term problem can best be described as finding a way to get the world's ample supply of energy reserves from the areas where it is located to the places where it is needed—in needed quantities, in environmentally desirable forms, and at an economical cost. The long term problem has actually been with us for some time but all of the evidence indicates that steps to avert a future fuel shortage were not being taken. I would also note that for a number of years the United States' refining capacity has been diminishing as few refineries were built to replace old ones, and the need for ports capable of handling supertankers was not met. What is more discouraging is that research into new sources of energy and methods of producing energy compatible with environmental standards has not been adequately supported by the Federal government or private interests.

As we all know this problem of fuel shortage started to catch up with us last winter. Even though the winter was an unusually mild one, there were instances of fuel oil shortages. If the winter had been normal or colder than normal, we could have experienced widespread shortages. This past summer serious gasoline shortages were also predicted, and motorists were warned of serious inconvenience and even hardships. The real possibility of shortages resulted in an allocation system and an abnormal reduction in automobile travel. Partly as the consequence of reduced travel, the shortages never really materialized.

There were a number of factors which contributed to the energy shortage that we experienced last winter and summer.

Federal pollution standards caused an accelerated demand for fuel oil and a major shift from coal to oil-burning boilers took place. In particular, it caused a great demand for low sulphur or "sweet" crude.

Automobile gasoline consumption per car increased about 8% for cars equipped with emission control systems and the added weight needed to meet U.S. safety standards.

U.S. refinery capacity has not expanded at the rate necessary to keep up with demand. In 1971 oil experts were predicting a petroleum shortage in the mid-70's because of this lack of refinery capacity.

A dramatic increase in U.S. energy consumption occurred; total U.S. energy use has been doubling about every ten years, with the demand for electrical power doubling every decade. (The amount of electricity consumed in the decade of the 60's equaled the total consumed in all of our history up to 1960.)

A decline in domestic crude production and a peaking of our natural gas production. Environmental considerations restricted the use of coal and strip mining for coal.

Delay in tapping the oil reserves discovered on the North Shore of Alaska and the offshore continental shelf.

The lack of any effective Federal leasing policy delayed the development of our oil shale resources.

The above factors have all in one way or another contributed to the U.S. dependence upon foreign supplies of oil. During the first

quarter of 1973, imports represented 35% of the U.S. petroleum supplies and were growing rapidly. Some experts anticipated imports reaching 7.4 million barrels per day, or 39% of the U.S. petroleum supplies by the first quarter of 1974. Others predicted that domestic needs would require 8.4 million barrels per day in the first quarter, further increasing our reliance on foreign imports.

The second and in many respects the most important aspect of the energy problem is the short-term "crisis" caused by the Arab-Israeli war. The effect of the Arab embargo of oil to the United States is difficult to determine as the political situation is changing daily. At this time, the latest reports promise a partial lifting of the embargo if the United States "guarantees" the withdrawal of Israeli force from all Arab lands occupied in the 1967 Middle East war and the October 1973 war. However, if and when such a withdrawal begins is highly speculative. A great deal hinges on the Arab-Israeli talks opening in Geneva this month.

While the United States imported only 2½% of its oil needs from the Middle East in 1972, this percentage had increased to 6% in 1973 and some believed would reach 10% if the war had not interrupted trade. Indirectly, the United States had actually received a much higher percentage of its oil from the Middle East when you include oil that is refined in Canada, Western Europe, and the Caribbean. The indirect and direct imports total over 20%.

Currently our domestic production of oil meets about 70% of our present oil needs. However oil companies maintain that our domestic sources of oil—excluding Alaska and the continental shelf—are already fully tapped, and any increase in demand must be met by increased imports.

This situation made us very vulnerable to the embargo of oil by the Arab oil-producing countries. Before the embargo, we faced a 10% increase in oil demand. Most people agreed that shortages would occur if fuel was not properly allocated and conserved. Thus when the Arab embargo did come, an energy shortage ranging as high as 35% (and 50% in some parts of the country) was predicted.

II. IMPACT OF THE SHORTAGE

Estimates of the shortages we can expect in oil, gas and distillate deliveries vary dramatically. The Administration has consistently been conservative in its estimates of the shortage. The President predicted a 17% shortage of oil due to the loss of imports from the Middle East. On the other hand, estimates from the Congressional Research Service's Environmental Division ranged as high as 35%, if imports from the Caribbean and Canada were also cut off. One spokesman from the Office of Oil and Gas indicated that we were already experiencing a shortage of 15% last month, before the last tanker of Arab oil arrived in this country.

Notwithstanding the ambiguity of these estimates, two important points should be emphasized. First, even without the interruption of Arab oil imports, our country was going to be short of fuel this winter—by at least 5% and in some areas by 10 to 15%. Second, if the Arab embargo lasts 90 days or more, which is expected, we will experience shortages throughout the winter.

According to the National Petroleum Council, shortages in the three major products—gasoline, distillates, and heavy fuel oil—are expected to average 25% during the first quarter of 1974. Heavy fuel oil shortages would average 38% nationally and could reach 50% on the East Coast. The northern Midwest, including Michigan, would be next hardest hit. The states of the northern Midwest consume over 4 million barrels of oil a day, second only to the East Coast states which consume almost 6 million barrels per day.

A survey conducted by my district office in Flint, Michigan last month of the local oil

distributors indicated that there was no serious supply problems, although two gasoline suppliers were having difficulty getting gasoline supplies. This is a very early survey however, and an effect of the Arab embargo will not be felt until the beginning of January when the winter climate is known.

From all reports, the United States can expect a serious shortage of fuel oil this winter, and the Midwest will be one of the areas that can expect to feel it most.

There have been many projections of unemployment increases because of the energy crisis. The National Petroleum Council projected 7.5-8% unemployment if the embargo lasts through the first quarter of 1974. Other estimates range from 6% to 14% unemployment depending upon different predictions about a number of unknowns—such as duration of the embargo, how cold the winter will be, how much oil will be available from Europe, and how effective our allocation system will be.

In my district of Flint, Michigan, General Motors plant officials announced that 14,000 workers will be laid off for at least a week in December. The lay-off is the result of a decision by GM to stop production of full-size and intermediate size cars for a week at 16 plants, including the home plants of Buick, Pontiac and Oldsmobile. Slack demand for the larger cars, and the uncertain psychology of the consumer was cited as the reason for the lay-offs.

In a recent report, GM officials indicated that they were planning on a lower sales potential for the year 1974 than they had estimated earlier. Total sales were estimated in the range of 13 to 13.5 million units or about 8% to 12% below calendar-year 1973. The total would be composed of 10 to 10.5 million passenger cars and about 3 million trucks—total sales still above any sales prior to 1972.

III. SHORT TERM APPROACHES TO THE ENERGY CRISIS

Faced with such a serious shortage of energy, there are only marginal things that can be done to increase supplies. There is little doubt that our country can not avoid shortages this winter. Decisions are currently being made to determine how the available energy will be distributed—who will be affected and to what degree—and how we can reduce the demand for energy, especially petroleum.

A year ago last September the oil industry projected a fuel shortage for the winter and a gasoline shortage for the spring. And as previously noted there were other warnings, but the Administration took no action to forestall it at that time.

In April, the Congress authorized the President in the Economic Stabilization Act to allocate fuel supplies as he saw fit. In May there was talk about a mandatory allocation program, but the Administration chose to use a voluntary program, and increased demand was met through higher refinery runs.

This fall, the Administration instituted a mandatory allocation plan for middle distillates (includes home heating fuel, diesel fuel) and propane supplies. But this plan did not specify priority uses, so schools and farmers got no more than amusement parks. The middle distillate allocation program used as its base period 1972. The distributors were allowed to control the program and no administrative machinery was set up to control distribution.

Although under the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of April, the Administration was given the authority to allocate fuels on a mandatory basis, they have been very reluctant to do so, and resorted instead to a voluntary system. This reluctance to move decisively is due to several things: 1) they did not learn the available oil facts; 2) they did not believe the situation was as serious as it was; 3) philosophical inclination made them reluctant to bring government into the oil logistics business; 4) they had five dif-

ferent advisors on energy between March and December, and 5) they recognized the limitation of solutions that did not increase the available supply of oil.

While the President has delivered several messages about the energy crisis, the situation has only been growing worse. The Administration, in a less than candid explanation of the problem, has been making the energy crisis appear far less dangerous than it is.

The personnel turnover we have witnessed as Mr. William Simon now replaces Governor John Love in the long succession of energy "czars" seems to indicate the confusion within the Administration on what tactics to take. Business and industry officials who want to know what actions the Administration is going to take have spoken out forcefully on the economic uncertainty that this hesitancy to act is causing.

While the Administration has held gasoline rationing as a last resort, many reports indicate the necessity of implementing rationing. Recently, the White House announced that it would postpone any decision on rationing until the end of December. However, it is unlikely that the fuel supply situation will be any clearer at that time. So much depends on the Arab/Israeli talks which are not totally under Administrative control.

Further, any delay in implementing some kind of rationing program means a further reduction in our dwindling fuel reserves. A recent staff study published by the Senate Interior Committee suggests that we will exhaust our reserves within 2 months—even with thermostats turned down to 68 degrees and gasoline service stations closing on Sundays.

The Administration alternative seems to be to let the price of oil increase from the present \$5 a barrel to \$7 which would be passed through to the consumer at the pumps. Fuel costs for consumers could rise as much as 50%. From the hundreds of calls, letters and telegrams I have received from constituents, the preference is clearly for a rationing system over sharp increases in prices.

It is clear that skyrocketing prices or added taxes on fuel would have a severe impact on the poor, those on fixed incomes, and those who are dependent on the automobile for their livelihood. While it seems inevitable that prices will rise for gasoline and other petroleum products, every effort should be made to keep this price in line with the oil companies' actual production costs. There is little doubt that their profit levels have been excessive.

IV. CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSE TO THE ENERGY CRISIS

Since the beginning of the 93rd Congress in January, there have been over 800 different bills introduced concerning the energy problems. Over thirty have already had action on the House floor and an equal number have had action in the Senate. The President was granted authority to allocate fuels by the Emergency Stabilization Act of 1970, passed April 30, 1970. Legislation in the 93rd Congress makes Congressional priorities and directives much more explicit.

On November 27, 1973, the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 became public law. This legislation gave the President temporary authority to implement allocation programs affecting suppliers of fuel oil, residual oil, and refined petroleum products. This legislation "directed" the President to make regulations providing for mandatory allocation system within fifteen days.

On November 19, 1973, the Senate passed the National Energy Emergency Act of 1973. This bill is much more specific in setting the priorities of Congress for energy measures and is more comprehensive than the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act. The President is required to develop and implement nationwide emergency energy "rationing

and conservation plans." In addition, the bill allows the President to take certain measures to increase domestic petroleum production. The highlights of the bill include provisions to:

- Minimize the impact of energy shortages on employment;

- Amend certain portions of antitrust laws; Modify the Clean Air Act;

- Authorize the President to allocate materials, equipment and fuels associated with energy production; and

- Allow tax deductions and low-interest loans for energy conservation improvements.

The House passed a similar energy emergency bill on December 13, 1973. The main provisions of the House bill also included authority to create a Federal Energy Administration and required the President to submit proposed energy conservation plans to Congress within 30 days after enactment. Oil- and gas-burning power plants are required to burn coal if they are capable of doing so. Further, petroleum producers and marketers are authorized to implement voluntary agreements for energy conservation purposes and exempts such agreements from the antitrust laws.

In addition to these bills, the Congress has passed legislation authorizing daylight savings time year round and to provide funds for research and development of new energy sources. Many bills have actively promoted mass transportation and high speed railways, such as the Urban Mass Transportation Act and the Railway Reorganization Act. A good deal of the material contained in the eight hundred bills introduced in the Congress has been incorporated in the National Energy Emergency Act.

V. LONG-TERM APPROACHES TO THE ENERGY CRISIS

There seems to be a general consensus that for the next five to ten years there will be no new economical alternative sources of energy. We will have to deal with a relatively static supply of oil for the next five years that will force us to use strict conservation measures to close the gap between supply and demand. Coal and natural gas will also be available, but our supplies are not unlimited and the environmental problems involved in coal as a major energy source are significant.

I think there will be a dangerous temptation to believe that the energy crisis is over when the Arab states lift their embargo. The Arab cut-off did not create the energy shortage; it merely contributed to an already serious energy problem. As a nation, we must fully realize that we can not return to our former consumption habits. With a population of one-sixteenth of the world's population, we consume one-third of the world's energy.

In the days that lie ahead, I urge all Americans to participate in a voluntary conservation effort that goes beyond the guidelines set by the Administration or by legislators. It is the duty of all of us—not just the Administration, Congress, or other governmental organizations—to make sure everyone is treated fairly and equitably and the burden of the energy shortage is shared by all.

EPA PARKING SURTAX—A BUREAUCRATIC ABSURDITY

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in an announcement last Friday, the Environmental Protection Agency stated that

they were postponing implementation of their proposal to levy a surtax on parking spaces in several areas of the country, one of which was the San Francisco Bay Area.

The original proposal touched off a round of fire from public official and private citizen alike. The announcement by EPA that they were postponing action on their ill-fated proposal was, in my judgment, a direct result of the heat generated by that outcry.

In a recent editorial, the San Mateo Times called the proposed parking surtax a "Bureaucratic Absurdity," and I could not agree more. The proposal that EPA has wisely put off until July of 1975 was more than just absurd; it was arbitrary, discriminatory, and had it been implemented, it would have caused economic chaos in all of the affected areas.

The editorial in the San Mateo Times is an excellent example of a newspaper responding to the concerns and needs of the community that it serves. I insert it in the RECORD:

EPA PARKING SURTAX—A BUREAUCRATIC ABSURDITY

Congressional action is needed to stop some foolishness about to be foisted on the people of California.

While one segment of the federal government is wrestling with the energy crisis to provide sufficient fuel to keep motor vehicles on the road, another and separate governmental agency known as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has adopted rules and regulations for the purpose of removing as many motor vehicles as possible from our highways so that people will turn to public transportation as a substitute.

EPA has promulgated a set of regulations known as the "California Transportation Control Plan" which, among other things, provides for a prohibitive tax in the form of a surcharge on commercial parking spaces, free parking spaces, and on parking spaces provided by employers for their employees. The regulations also provide that "... any zoning or land-use requirement specifying that an employer shall provide a given number of employee parking spaces for any given number of employees ... be of no force or effect" except as approved by the administrator of EPA.

The parking surtax provisions, apart from any other provisions in the regulations, constitute a bureaucratic absurdity apparently dreamed up by bureaucrats in the Agency who wish to turn the clock back to the turn of the century when there were no motor vehicles, no modern highways, and people traveled either by mass transit, bicycle, or by horse and buggy.

The regulations provide for a staggered series of effective dates, and when completely effective there will be parking surcharges in the form of a tax at the rate of 25 cents per hour added to commercial parking fees, a \$450 per year surcharge for each parking space on all owners and operators of more than five free parking spaces, and each employer who provides free parking space for his employees will be required to charge his employees \$2.50 per day for each employee's free parking space—unless the employee comes to work in a car pool, in which event the rate is 50 per cent if it is a two-person car pool. The charge will be remitted if the employee participates in a three-person car pool.

In addition, the employer is required to institute a program to reimburse employees for expenses in utilizing mass transit in an amount not to exceed \$200 per year per employee and to take "all reasonable steps to encourage employees to commute to work by

subscription or charter bus and similar privately owned mass transit facilities."

It is estimated that the surcharge will cost a shopping center, such as Hillsdale in San Mateo, approximately \$2 million per year. The surcharge could spell financial ruin for private operators of parking garages. Parking meters are not exempt and would be subject to a surcharge of 25 cents an hour over and above the regular fee when the parking tax becomes completely effective. Unmetered curb space in commercial districts would be subject to the \$450-per-year surcharge per parking space unless the city in which the curb parking is available installs meters to collect the hourly surcharge rate.

City planning ordinances which have carefully provided that new buildings cannot be constructed without providing adequate parking space for employees are void as to their parking requirements and an employer could construct a new plant without providing any free parking space for employees.

The city attorney of San Mateo has estimated that the total economic impact during the first year of the application of the regulations would be approximately \$20 million in San Mateo alone. The cost would go higher as the fees increased annually over a period of three years. Under the penalties for non-compliance a person who knowingly violated any requirement of an applicable implementation plan could be punished by a fine of not more than \$25,000 per day of violation or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. For second convictions, the penalty is increased to \$50,000 per day or two years' imprisonment, or both.

A number of legal actions have already been filed to invalidate the EPA regulations. The state attorney general has filed a legal action. The City Council of San Mateo has authorized the city attorney to file a suit in Federal District Court to obtain a stay order and to test the constitutionality of the regulations.

The legal actions which have been filed and those which will be instituted to invalidate the EPA parking surcharge regulations may result in a favorable court decision which will either postpone or totally invalidate this absurdity. However, the only procedure which is certain to invalidate these regulations would be the adoption of federal legislation amending the Federal Clean Air Act to delete from the Act the authority of EPA to proceed in this ridiculous manner to accomplish the purposes of the Act.

Letters written to the United States senators from California, Alan Cranston and John Tunney, and to the congressmen representing the readers' congressional districts requesting an amendment to the Federal Clean Air Act to eliminate any authority for the EPA to impose taxes or parking surcharges would, in our opinion, be the most effective way to express concern about and opposition to the EPA parking surtax regulations.

SUPPORT FOR WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARIES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of a bill to authorize the President to convene a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the signifi-

cant support which has recently been evidenced for such a conference.

I should remind my colleagues as well, Mr. Speaker, that our former colleague, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, the distinguished Vice President of the United States, is sponsor of a similar resolution, House Joint Resolution 734.

Under the sponsorship and leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island the Honorable CLAIBORNE PELL, the Senate has already passed such a resolution.

On December 8, 1973, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post featured an editorial applauding Congress for providing funds for Federal library programs, funds which President Nixon, in his fiscal 1974 budget, had proposed we eliminate.

The editorial also supported the Ford-Brademas-Pell proposal for a 1976 White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services.

Said the editorial:

The conference is important. It is not just that we need libraries; what is also needed is serious discussions on how to make them better as the demand for their services increases.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Washington Post editorial as well as a letter in support of such a conference from the Federation of the Indiana Chapters of the American Association of University Professors:

NEW LIFE FOR LIBRARIES

The attack of the Nixon administration on libraries appears to have been repelled. As part of the budget for the Departments of Labor and Health and Welfare, the House and Senate included \$170 million for libraries. In the 1974 budget proposals of the administration, no federal assistance was requested for libraries, the idea being that state and local money should take over the full responsibility. The logic of this proposal had a superficial appeal that did not hold up under the kind of scrutiny given by several congressional friends of libraries.

The first argument defending zero funding said that, since the federal share for libraries was approximately 5 to 7 per cent, no libraries would close down when federal funds were withdrawn. This argument, however handy for the purposes of rationalizing, overlooks that many library projects are demonstrations initially funded by federal money, in the hope of stimulating state and local support that would eventually take over. But such demonstrations would have been cut out completely or curtailed. Some of these projects include services to the blind and handicapped, service to prisons, hospitals and mental health institutions. A second argument for cutting off funds was that libraries would become part of revenue sharing, thus categorical assistance was not needed. When the American Library Association examined the situation, however, it found that of the \$2.96 billion that went out between January and June of this year, libraries received only \$21.7 million, or less than 1 per cent of the total.

Congress did well to rally in support of libraries. In fact, it is taking even further interest—with the introduction of several bills calling for a White House conference on libraries and information services in 1976. The Senate has already passed this legislation and one House bill was offered by Gerald Ford, now Vice President Ford. With this kind of support, a 1976 conference is likely to occur. The conference is important. It is

not just that we need libraries; what is also needed is serious discussions on how to make them better as the demand for their services increases.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS,
December 5, 1973.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAs,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAs: On behalf of the Indiana Federation of Chapters and its 2,100 members on 46 college and university campuses in Indiana, I would like to endorse the resolutions now before your Select Subcommittee on Education requesting and authorizing the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

There is much merit in the proposal. It would provide an excellent opportunity for persons of diverse background, inside and outside the academic community, to focus upon the future needs, goals, and policies of a major national educational resource. By evaluating the current role of libraries and by projecting their future relationship to the educational process, the conference would be of considerable assistance to postsecondary education.

Having recently hosted a statewide conference in Fort Wayne to discuss the academic status of librarians, our Federation is particularly pleased by the suggestion that attendant State Conferences be held in conjunction with the White House Conference.

I would also like to express our appreciation to you for the leading role you have played in promoting this bipartisan proposal.

If we may offer any appropriate assistance to you in this area, please feel free to call upon us.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE W. GEIB.

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE: FREE ENTERPRISE IS THE ANSWER

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, although the energy crisis is serious, the situation is not hopeless. We need self-reliance to meet this challenge. A thorough analysis of the historical background and significance of the energy crisis appeared in an article by Prof. W. Philip Gramm entitled "The Energy Crisis in Perspective" in the Wall Street Journal of November 30, 1973. I agree with his conclusion: We must allow the free market to work in order to solve the energy crisis.

The article follows:

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE

(By W. Philip Gramm)

Much of the prevailing rhetoric on the "energy crisis" expresses this kind of logic: Since there is just so much oil, coal, natural gas and other energy sources, sooner or later we are going to run out. We must, therefore, begin to ration these resources not only to meet the current crisis but to conserve energy in our time and move the day of reckoning further into the future. Ameri-

cans have been "energy pigs," according to Stewart Udall, and have been operating on the misguided assumption that there is no limit to the quantity of energy. Since we are at the end of the era of cheap fuel and dealing with a problem without precedent, strong and previously unacceptable policies are called for: government regulation of the production and distribution of energy.

Ignored is the fact that mankind has frequently experienced instances of increasing scarcity, and by ingenuity and free action has solved all of them. In fact, we are currently experiencing the second major energy crisis in American history.

From the colonization period until the Civil War the major source of artificial lighting in the U.S. and Europe was whale and sperm oil. Since there were no good substitutes for these oils as sources of light, the world's supply of artificial light depended almost exclusively on the whaling industry. People did not need computers to project that the supply of whales could not keep pace with the rapid expansion in demand.

Sperm oil rose from 43 cents per gallon in 1823 to \$2.55 a gallon in 1866. Whale oil rose from a low of 23 cents in 1832 to \$1.45 a gallon in 1865. As prices rose, gas distilled from coal became an economically feasible substitute causing whale oil demand to fall off sharply in Europe.

In 1859, sperm oil was over \$1.36 a gallon. But that same year, an event which in nine years would end the whale oil crisis forever occurred: petroleum was discovered in Pennsylvania. In the meantime, the demand of the Civil War boomed whale oil prices. Not only was there increased demand, the war disrupted production. Conscription of whaling vessels as freight ships and the capture or destruction of ships by Southern privateers caused a decline of more than 50% in the number of U.S. ships in whaling and a 66% decline in tonnage. By 1866, sperm oil had reached a high of \$2.55 a gallon.

The high prices for whale and sperm oil between 1849 and 1867 provided a growing profit incentive to develop an efficient refining process for crude petroleum and induced the investment required for the production of kerosene. Beginning in 1867, kerosene broke the sperm and whale oil market and prices tumbled. By 1896, sperm oil was cheaper than it had been in any recorded period—40 cents a gallon—but whale oil lamps were no more than relics for succeeding generations.

TWO VITAL FUNCTIONS

Aside from providing an incentive for the development of petroleum products rising whale and sperm oil prices performed two other vital functions. Rising prices caused consumers to act out of their own self interest to economize the use of oil. Rising prices gave an inducement for producers to increase output of whale and sperm oil through increases in investment, improvements in technology, and increased labor input. The rise in prices from 1820-1847 induced a rise in the tonnage of whaling vessels of almost 600% and produced numerous technological improvements in the whaling industry. It appears that rising prices caused output to increase perhaps by 1,000% or more. Had government possessed the power and volition to ration whale and sperm oil to hold its price down or to levy a tax on oil to reap the gains from the price rise, the shortage would have been catastrophic and the advent of kerosene and other petroleum products might have been delayed for decades.

The whale oil crisis is a case study of how the free-market system solves a scarcity problem. The end product of this process of discovery and innovation is the Petroleum Age in which we live. We owe the benefits and

comforts of the present era to free enterprise and the scarcity of whales.

The history of our first "energy crisis" demonstrates that there is no reason to believe that we face long-term doom. If technology were suddenly frozen, some of the dire projections being made now might be realized in several hundred years or less, depending on which "expert of the week" one believes. But technology is not frozen. It is instead progressing at a rate unprecedented in history. The Petroleum Age will pass as did the Stone Age (and the Whale Oil Era). The real danger is that we may foolishly restrict the exploitation of current energy sources and allow them to become valueless. Only if we eliminate the market incentives for innovation and investment will we face a real, long-term "energy crisis."

Though there is no long-term "energy crisis" there is a short-term problem. Economic science teaches that shortages cannot exist in free markets. In free markets prices rise in order to eliminate shortages. "Crisis" as opposed to simple scarcity, results from market disruptions; and the only sector of society which possesses the power to disrupt a large market is the government. Government price ceilings on natural gas at the well-head have been one of the most disruptive public policies. By setting the price of natural gas artificially low, the government has stifled the incentive of producers to increase supplies, while the artificially low price has stimulated demand. Furthermore, since profits are low at these artificially low ceiling prices, investment and exploration have fallen off sharply.

Price controls have also had a detrimental impact on the supply of petroleum products and the construction of refinery capacity, essential to increasing domestic energy supplies. Due to the pressure to keep prices below what the free market would specify, shortages of petroleum products have occurred at both the retail and wholesale levels. Had prices been allowed to rise, the quantity supplied would have expanded to meet the quantity demanded; and each consumer would have had direct incentive to economize on usage. We are only now beginning to realize the distorting impact on the production of inputs essential for fuel production (drilling equipment, tubular steel, etc.) which four phases of price controls have produced.

Environmental legislation and court action also have had a significant impact on the supply and demand for energy. Injunctions against atomic and conventional power plants have prevented the supply of electricity from keeping up with the demand. The injunction against the Alaskan pipeline has impeded the growth of oil supplies. Pollution control devices on automobiles have increased fuel consumption and, thereby, increased the demand for gasoline. Mass conversion from high sulphur to low sulphur fuels in order to comply with EPA regulations to abate pollution has caused a change in the composition of energy demand from plentiful, cheap sources of energy to scarcer more expensive ones.

The energy crisis has made it clear that pollution abatement has a definite cost to society. Only by understanding the costs involved in various forms of pollution abatement can we choose how much environmental protection is optimal.

The bureaucratic method of looking at the supply and demand for energy products differs substantially from the market-directed approach. The bureaucrat presumes first of all that the supply of the product is absolutely fixed. Price does not matter. A price rise, he argues, will not put more oil in the pipelines—at least not before the next election. People "need a certain amount" of the product, and they will always buy the same quantity regardless of price unless they are

too poor to afford it at all. These views are, of course, economic nonsense. In weighing the various courses of action which might be followed in minimizing the cost of dealing with the current energy problem it is useful to make a ball park estimate of the price level that the free market would yield in the shortage period.

ESTIMATING OUTPUT AND DEMAND

Estimates of how much the demand for energy sources would decline in a period less than a year, if prices rose by 1%, range from roughly 0.2% to 1.2%. Estimates of how much the quantity supplied would rise in the same period, if prices rose by 1%, vary from roughly 0.6% to 2%. A reasonably conservative estimate is that a price rise of 1% will provoke a decline in the quantity demanded of 0.5% and a rise in the quantity supplied of 1%.

The practical importance of these estimates is that a 10% shortage in the supply of fuel at current prices would yield a free market rise in price of less than 7%! If we are more pessimistic about the shortage and assume that demand exceeds supply by 20% at the current price, we might expect a price rise of less than 14%.

The above estimates, though conservative, do not take account of the disruption produced by the crisis atmosphere that surrounds this issue. Since the magnitude of the crisis has been blown out of all reasonable proportions and people fear shortages and rationing, hoarding by both the supplier and demanders is a genuine possibility. In the very short run (up to three months) we might expect prices to rise above the long-term market price. After roughly one to three months we should expect the crisis mania to pass and a general dishoarding to occur so that prices would fall to a level below the above estimates. The estimates are of course based on the assumption of unhampered market adjustments. Government attempts to interfere with this market process would tend to shift the estimates upwards.

The first step in solving the energy shortage is to allow the free market system to work. All price ceilings and government controls should be eliminated. Such action would greatly stimulate the supply of energy sources and eliminate shortages. Prices would rise but the expansion of output would hold prices to the minimum which current conditions dictate. Furthermore, the free market will insure that energy will be allocated to the highest priority users. Price increases are not pleasant, but they are better than low prices and no energy. If these higher prices work hardships on the less fortunate among us, special provisions, which would be preferable to the distortions and waste of rationing, could be provided for this small minority.

There is an additional advantage of allowing domestic prices to rise. As prices rise in the U.S., the cost to the Arabs of maintaining the restriction on sales to the U.S. will get higher. If we simply allow the market to work, the agreement to restrict sales to the U.S. will break and with it Arab unity will break. The Arabs are playing a dangerous game. If we allow prices to rise we can expect the development of new domestic sources such as oil shale and domestically produced substitutes for petroleum.

COSTS AND CLEAN AIR

Another step in solving the energy problem is to inform society of the cost of environmental and ecological programs and allow the people to choose. If people want the end products of such programs, they will have to pay the cost in higher energy prices. Without adequate information, society will not be able to decide which programs are worth the cost and which are not. If people prefer cleaner air to lower fuel cost they can choose

to convert from coal to oil. If they choose lower fuel cost they can burn cheaper and dirtier fuels. Such a system seems preferable to allowing a bureaucrat to decide for them.

To increase supplies we should open the continental shelf for drilling but make firms liable for oil spills and other forms of ecological disturbances. Most oil spills are not from drillings but from tankers. By employing the Naval oil reserves, the continental shelf and areas which will become economically feasible at higher prices, output could be greatly expanded.

We should institute peak-load pricing for electricity in shortage areas. Brownouts and blackouts occur because in peak use periods overloads occur. By charging more for power in peak use periods, nonessential use would occur in nonpeak load periods when power is cheaper. Under the current system there is no incentive to spread out power use. Peak load pricing could minimize overloads in the current system and allow time for supply sources to catch up to peak load demand.

In a free market, when the price of a good starts to rise, three simultaneous forces are produced. First, people start to use the good more judiciously, second, producers and consumers who use the product begin to search for cheaper substitutes, and third, producers of the product attempt to expand output by using and developing technology to meet the demand. It is this process which has always forestalled doom. We will run out of energy only if we prevent the free market from working. Herein lies the real danger of the "energy crisis."

OUR STEEL SCRAP FLOWS ABROAD

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, steel scrap badly needed by our own industries now is moving out of this country and to competitors abroad at the rate of 12 million tons annually.

My authority for this figure is James M. Underwood, chairman of Vulcan Inc., a producer of ingot molds and other steel products at its plants in Latrobe, Pa., and elsewhere.

Mr. Underwood told Jack Markowitz, business editor of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, that the export flow is taking place even though the supply of scrap here is "pinching so tightly" that U.S. firms are compelled to pay \$35 a ton more for it than they did last spring.

I quote from Mr. Markowitz' report:

Steelmakers worldwide, especially in Japan, have tapped the open American scrap market (and) bid up prices frantically on both coasts.

The price last April was \$50 a ton. Today it is \$85 and, according to Mr. Underwood, our plants are lucky to get it. Shortages have become a major operating problem for Vulcan, he says.

Mr. Underwood would like to see Uncle Sam cut scrap exports at least in half during this time of short supply and I could not agree with him more. Why should our scrap market be open and subject to raids by foreign customers while the material is so scarce that it is boosting prices, thus adding to the inflation problem, and threatening jobs here?

It has long been my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we have been far too altruistic in our dealings with other nations. I realize that, in the immediate post-World War II era, we had a responsibility to help others and also that our foreign trade is important to us. But the days of our being the No. 1 "have" Nation are over and this needs to be understood not only in Washington but everywhere in the world where Uncle Sam has come to be looked upon as a patsy.

The steel scrap situation is only one of many in which we have subjugated the interests of our workmen and industries to those of others and are continuing to do so. Foreign trade must be conducted on the principle of the "two-way street" and yet our policies in too many cases refuse to recognize this. What other nation would export the scrap it needed at home? I think the answer is found in the present fuel crisis in which our supposed "friends" and "allies" have shown little willingness to divide up their oil with us, or even to cooperate in international solutions to the problem.

I call, Mr. Speaker, on the administration to take immediate action to curb the movement of steel scrap out of this country.

CONGRESSWOMAN PATRICIA SCHROEDER

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article about our colleague, Congresswoman PATRICIA SCHROEDER, has been written by Judith Viorst and published in the November issue of Redbook magazine.

This is a report on a hard-working, conscientious colleague who has earned the respect of this House. As the article says, Congresswoman SCHROEDER serves because she "thinks that people who care make a difference, and in her own modest way PAT SCHROEDER has—whether it is by sponsoring anti-child-abuse legislation, holding housing and tax hearings, getting money for a children's museum in Denver, or voting to shut off funds for the bombing of Cambodia."

The complete article is as follows:

THE WOMAN WHO HAS A BEAR BY THE TAIL
(By Judith Viorst)

How come this pretty, blue-eyed mommy with the green-velvet ribbon in her hair is annoying the mighty Congressman Edward Hébert, 72-year-old chairman of the powerful House Armed Services Committee?

Why can't the woman stay home where she belongs?

There's important business brewing on that committee, which has authorized this year the spending of approximately \$80 billion on America's defense establishment—on everything, that is, from military bases to aircraft carriers to cost overruns.

Who's this young upstart to ask, "Do we really need to spend?"

This seems to be the sort of muttering that Chairman Hébert (pronounced "A-bear") has been muttering ever since Patricia Schroeder, a first-term, antiwar congresswoman from Denver, Colorado, lobbied her way,

against his stern resistance, onto his committee. For Hébert is used to committee members who share his benevolent view of Pentagon needs. What he is not used to is dissent, especially female dissent, and especially dissent from a parvenu lady representative who seems unaware that newcomers keep their mouths shut.

"I hope," Hébert said to her shortly after they met, "that you aren't going to be a skinny Bella Abzug."

"No," she told him firmly, "I am not. I'm going to be me. I am going to be Pat Schroeder."

Hébert is finding Pat Schroeder trouble enough.

Indeed, she is on his committee to make trouble. She is concerned, she says, about the human, quality-of-life issues—better housing, better health care, a better environment in which to bring up a family. "Defense people say they are protecting women and children," she explains. "As a woman with children, I want to be able to say there are other things we can do to protect us than build bases."

But the Armed Services Committee, Mrs. Schroeder points out, controls about 40 per cent of the national budget, and "I can talk all I want about human issues—they've got the dollars." So when the Pentagon wants a billion of those dollars for another nuclear carrier, she thinks it's important to raise some pesty questions. Like: Why, since we have three nuclear carriers already, do we need another one?

Chairman Hébert is not pleased.

"There are certain people," he once said, sighing, as he looked at her, "who make me shudder every time they open their mouth."

On another occasion, when Mrs. Schroeder was pressing for answers about Cambodian bombing raids, Mr. Hébert was rather more invidious. "I wish," he told her, interrupting her questions, "that you'd support our boys like you support the enemy."

And then there was the day Hébert met Jim, Pat's lawyer husband, on the Capitol Hill subway. "So you're the one," he snorted, "who married that woman." He did not sound congratulatory.

Although this made the rounds as a cute little story, opposing Hébert has not been fun and games. The relationship between the committee and the Pentagon tends to be a cordial and approving one. Of the 43 committee members, only a handful persistently stray from the fold. Hébert has said that "the light is always in the window for those who want to come home." But for those who don't, says Pat Schroeder, there are glares, cold stares, ostracism by most of Hébert's loyal supporters and slurs about the "pink-commie kooks" on the committee.

Indeed, until fairly recently the committee has rarely had to put up with such kooks. The House of Representatives is divided into 21 standing committees, each of which has its realm of expertise—agriculture, for instance, or banking and currency, or foreign affairs, or public works or armed services. All new members of Congress are assigned to one or more of these committees, and most of them traditionally seek out those congenial to their interests. You can spend a lot of time at committee meetings, so you might just as well go where you are likely to feel most at home.

In other words, if you believe that America's ultimate security resides in how the country is humanized rather than how it is fortified, you join a committee that deals with education, or conservation, or equal opportunities, or such. What you do not join is the House Armed Services Committee, which is packed with pro-Pentagon types. You do not join the House Armed Services Committee, whose chairman—even within a system that turns its chairmen into autocrats—is known to be more autocratic than most. You do not join the House Armed

Services Committee, where you are not only consistently unloved but also consistently outvoted.

It doesn't make sense. Except Pat Schroeder believes that, yes, indeed it does.

In fact, she is one of a few members of Congress who in recent years have deliberately joined committees that aren't congenial to them. The reasoning goes like this: If you don't like the way a committee is doing its job—if you think, for instance, that the vision of the House Armed Services Committee is "obscured by the shine of military brass"—don't shake your head in dismay and join something cozier. Get on that committee, take on that chairman, make your opinions heard—though they'll shout you down again and again and again. Be a drop of water and keep dripping on that rock. Someday, somehow, maybe you will reshape it.

Ah, but how? And what exactly does a committee do?

Well, whenever a bill is introduced in the House, it is referred to an appropriate committee—farm bills to Agriculture, labor bills to Education and Labor, military procurement to Armed Services. . . . You get the idea. Ideally the committee members study every aspect of the bill, listen to expert witnesses for and against it, thoroughly and thoughtfully question those witnesses and engage in lively, responsible debate presided over by a strong but fair-minded chairman.

Did I say "ideally"? Let me say it again?

Anyhow, after the debate has been completed and the additions, deletions and compromises have been made, the bill is reported out of committee and sent, for better or worse, to the floor of the House. There, after further adjustments, the bill may be passed and then sent to the Senate for more of the same.

The committee system, it's clear to see, is a good-sized piece of this puzzle we call democracy. Though the U.S. Congress alone has the power to vote a bill into law, it is in large measure within a committee's power to determine the shape of the bill.

But the shape of the 1974 Military Procurement Authorization Bill, reported out of committee last July, wasn't much to Mrs. Schroeder's liking. The major legislation of the House Armed Services Committee, the bill authorized the purchasing of bigger and fiercer—though not necessarily better—billion-dollar military weapons. It authorized spending for weapons Pat Schroeder called "frivolous" and a "boondoggle," as well as a "colossal waste of money." Hébert didn't like that.

Now, Mrs. Schroeder maintains that of course this country must spend money for defense. But she worries about what she terms the committee's "fixation with technology," its belief "that killing an enemy fifteen times over makes us more secure than if we can kill him only five times over." So she tried, through some three months of almost-daily committee meetings, to modify the massive procurement bill.

She modified nothing.

Does this mean that her presence on the committee is useless and futile? She doesn't think so.

For what she did when the bill was reported out of committee was to file seven pages of eloquent "additional views," a scathing critique of committee tactics and practices, which now are a part of our national public record. Calling the House Armed Services Committee the "Pentagon's lobby on the Hill," she observed that it "seemed annoyed at, even frightened of, vigorous and open debate." An unreasonable number of hearings, she noted, were barred to the public, and during one segment of the deliberations 30 witnesses, warmly received, were invited to speak on behalf of the Pentagon's view and only two witnesses, given the shortest of shrifts, were heard against it.

"Some members," she wrote, "gave the impression that doing the hard and tedious work of analysis and criticism of our complicated military program is somehow unseemly, unmilitary—indeed, unpatriotic."

There was plenty more of the same.

Chairman Hébert, said Pat, almost exploded with rage.

"I like you as a person," he growled, his temper just barely controlled, "but you make me very mad." To the Denver Post, her hometown paper, Hébert was less restrained. "Of course, I recognize her expertise after she has been here for six months," he said sarcastically. "She's an authority. . . ." And then from the farther end of the generation gap came this bitter and even poignant cry: "I was in the House of Representatives before she was born!"

Now a few of the other valiant committee dissenters also filed their opposition views, but Hébert seemed to feel a special anger toward Pat. "It's because," she declares with conviction, "Hébert is a sexist. He doesn't believe that anyone with a uterus can make a decision on military affairs."

Indeed, his view of Pat's role on his committee was clearly expressed at the outset of her term. "For the House Armed Services Committee's first lovely den mother," he inscribed to her in his book *Creed of a Congressman*, "with the hope you would better understand your chairman after reading between these covers."

She understands, all right. She understands the generation-gap problem and the sexism problem and the problem of bucking a chairman who insists upon obedience from his ranks. It's bad enough, she says, when they clash in private committee meetings, but when she makes these clashes public, it blows his mind.

"So you're going to be one of those cheap kind," he grumbled on one occasion, "who'll do anything for publicity."

Last summer, however, he tried to do more than grumble. Last summer he attempted to take revenge. There are no goodies, he hoped she'd understand, for those who don't learn that "to get along, you go along."

What happened was that Speaker of the House Carl Albert selected Pat to attend the SALT Disarmament Conference in Geneva, Switzerland. (Discussions were being held on chemical warfare, and since there was a problem of nerve gas stockpiles in her area, Pat Schroeder was a very suitable choice.) As her chairman, Hébert was requested to send a strictly *pro forma* letter of confirmation, a request that only rarely has been denied. But to everyone's astonishment, Hébert instead replied, "She is not my choice."

In discussion that followed, Hébert made it perfectly clear he was punishing Pat for her voting record on his committee and for her "additional views" on his procurement bill. "I wouldn't send you to represent this committee at a dogfight," he told her.

She wasn't intimidated. Furthermore she wasn't even stopped, since the Speaker arranged for a way to side-step Hébert. He asked the State Department to waive the rule that requires a chairman's confirming letter. Pat got to Geneva.

It ought to be noted that Pat wasn't looking for a paid-by-the-Government free trip to Geneva. Or to anywhere else, for that matter. She already had turned down a couple of luxury jaunts, both here and abroad, questioning their propriety or their usefulness. Indeed, she might even sound priggish, unduly self-righteous, on the subject if it were not for her zesty sense of humor.

And what if she does sound a little self-righteous—so what? In her dealings with Hébert and his committee she has taken on an exhausting and frustrating task. "My only tool is words," she sighs, "and words don't mean a lot."

And, "Yes," she admits, "I do get upset. It's hard to keep on going back and facing him. I can think of ten things I'd rather do than attend a committee meeting. But I go."

The David that Pat Schroeder plays to Hébert's Goliath, however, is civilized and courteous and low-key. She doesn't believe in yelling or screaming or threatening people or banging them on the head. "I decide where to give and where to draw the line," she says, "and then I hang tough."

But "tough" seems a funny word to apply to Pat Schroeder as we sit and talk in her office on Capitol Hill. With her Peter Pan collar, her fresh good looks and her quick, hearty laughter, she resembles the mothers I meet at my children's school. There are crayons on her desk in case her children—Jamie, three, and Scott, seven—come over to visit, and samples of their artwork are taped to her wall. At 33 she is one of 16 women now in Congress, and the first one Colorado has ever sent.

How did she get to Washington? And why?

"I'm here," she replies, "because they literally couldn't find anyone else to run."

Well, that isn't quite true. Denver had a prominent Democrat who was willing to take on the incumbent Republican. But a group of young liberals (Pat's husband Jim among them) were seeking a better candidate for the job. The problem was that 1972 looked like a very bad year to beat a Republican, and prospect after prospect turned them down. "What about your wife?" someone finally asked Jim, who laughed and dismissed the idea. But the next time the question came up, Pat and Jim began to discuss it more seriously. In May, 1972, Pat announced she would run.

It seemed at the time a most unlikely candidacy. For though Pat, a Harvard Law School graduate with experience in teaching, in labor law and in civil-service arbitration (and with a pilot's license as well), certainly had impressive qualifications, her husband had the political ambitions. Indeed, Jim had run, and been defeated, for the Colorado state legislature in 1970 and had planned in 1972 to serve as his law partner's campaign manager.

But instead of helping his partner, Floyd Haskell, get into the Senate, he wound up helping his wife, Pat Schroeder, get into the House.

Needless to say, during the campaign many eyebrows were raised by those who believe that a mommy stays home and bakes cookies. Was she maybe one of those wild, Women's Lib types? Pat decided to laugh such objections away.

"Hi!" she would start off a speech. "I'm that nut you've been hearing about, the one who doesn't shave under her arms, the one who leaps over barricades uttering obscenities, the one who keeps her kids in the freezer."

That helped to melt some voters. Still there'd be that person who would march up to Jim and say with great indignation, "Do you realize that your wife is running for Congress?"

"Hey, no kidding—really?" he would reply. "I thought she'd been out of the house an awful lot lately!"

He didn't joke, however, when someone would want to know: "Why are you letting her run instead of you?"

"I thought," was his answer, "we needed a stronger candidate."

And to everyone's surprise—including the Schroeders'—Pat turned out to be a very strong candidate, and 1972 turned out to be a pretty good year for the young and women's votes. Speaking straightforwardly on the issues, radiating decency and good will, Pat won standing ovations at a Nixon-Schroeder endorsement from the potent Teamsters Union, the primary and in November the election.

What had the Schroeders done to their lives?

Pat says she often asks that question when the pressures pile up, when the House stays in session till 10 p.m., when she finds herself working each night and on the weekends, when old friends don't phone her because "they think I'm a superstar now." She asks it when, squeezed for time, as she always is these days, she runs into a store and says, "Get me three dresses—red, green and some other color. I have only ten minutes." She asks it when a hate call condemns her as an opponent of "Sunday football, guns and God" and when, more chillingly, a bomb threat against her comes into the FBI because, on the issue of Watergate: "She's not kind to our President."

What had they done? She and her family now live for most of the year in northern Virginia, instead of Colorado; her husband has had to find another job; the focus these days is on her career, not his. And since she's not at all sure she wants to stay in politics, is the hassle, is the disruption, really worth it?

The answer, from Pat and Jim both, is: "Yes, it is."

From Jim this "yes" has meant a willingness to set aside his own political and career ambitions and work for a law firm that offers him neither big money nor great prospects but flexibility—in other words, time to help his wife. Indeed, it has meant on occasion a willingness to function as a "wife." It was Jim who flew East to find and buy their house, Jim who stayed home with the children till a sitter was hired, Jim who makes plenty of trips to the pediatrician.

I know a lot of men who could never handle all that.

But Jim, Pat Schroeder insists, is not among them. "I always get a big kick out of the expression that comes over his face," she says, "when someone asks him how his ego is taking this. He doesn't even understand what they mean."

In fact, Pat says, Jim's ego is so secure that he seriously considered not working at all. The \$42,500 Pat earns as a member of Congress is more than she and Jim had been making together, and he thought he might like to drop out for a while and experiment with writing or photography. "He has never," says Pat, "been the kind of man who was out to own a Cadillac before he was thirty."

Furthermore, having shared the same courses, the same casebooks, the same teachers at Harvard Law School, they're accustomed to working together, not in competition. Jim has always been, and continues to be, more turned on by politics than Pat is. But his interest, she says, is in the policy, not in the handshaking part, and he's glad to let Pat be the family politician.

Indeed, Pat sometimes kiddingly complains that Jim is like a stage mother, pushing her on to greater and greater roles. She groans when he plans ahead to her next election, or when he says that someday she could make a swell Senator. "I'm not all that sold on what I'm doing here," she says, "and I'm not on a power trip. I sometimes look at Congress and think, What a ridiculous institution!"

But she also thinks that people who care make a difference, and in her own modest way Pat Schroeder has—whether it's by sponsoring anti-child-abuse legislation, holding housing and tax hearings, getting money for a children's museum in Denver or voting to shut off funds for the bombing of Cambodia.

It also matters that Pat continues to duel with Chairman Hébert, who continues to glare at this upstart in his midst. Enthroned in his big committee room with its military flags and carpet of stars, Hébert votes a loud "No! That's the dumbest thing I ever heard!" to Pat's dissenting proposals.

She makes them anyway.

"I believe," she says, "that courage is contagious. Last summer a man who *always* votes with the chairman agreed that, yes, I was right, that this *was* the Pentagon's lobby on the hill. He agreed in private and off the record, of course. But maybe next year he'll be willing to do it publicly."

Furthermore, she adds, there is a certain advantage in being a woman. "How long," she asks, "can committee members allow a female, not even an ex-Marine, to take on the chairman without being embarrassed that they're not fighting him too?"

Pat Schroeder in her own way continues to fight him—firmly, politely, with reason and with facts. To get these facts, which are terribly hard to come by when you're dealing with something as arcane as military budgets, she has chosen to hire an expert of her own, an expert on budgets and weaponry, who can arm her to challenge the Pentagon's point of view.

She also is armed with a healthy dose of humor. At one point, she says, she thought of having some buttons printed that read: "Help—I've got Hébert by the tail."

And maybe if she keeps speaking out, her courage will catch on and the balance of power will shift from Hébert to a Schroeder.

Sometimes the Davids do defeat the Goliaths.

Only time will tell.

ON THE MATTER OF ARTIFICIAL TURF

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Consumer Product Safety Commission announced in the Federal Register that it is denying the National Football League Players Association's petition regarding the use of artificial turf as a football playing surface.

I find this announcement confusing in light of two prior indications that the Commission is still studying the matter. A public meeting of the Commission and representatives of the NFL Players Association has been scheduled for January 4, 1974, for further discussion of the matter. Also, an Associated Press story yesterday indicated the Commission is considering holding public hearings on the subject of artificial turf as a football playing surface.

After reading the announcement in the Federal Register I wrote to Mr. Richard Simpson, Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, urging that the meeting and public hearings go forward.

For the information of my colleagues the Consumer Product Safety Commission's announcement in today's Federal Register and my letter to the Commission Chairman be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The articles follow:

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION
NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE PLAYERS
ASSOCIATION

Denial of Petition Regarding Artificial Turf Covering

Section 10 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (Public Law 92-573, 86 Stat. 1217; 15 U.S.C. 2059) provides that any interested person may petition the Consumer Product

Safety Commission to commence a proceeding for the issuance of a consumer product safety rule. Section 10 also provides that if the Commission denies such petition, it shall publish in the Federal Register its reasons for such denial.

On June 4, 1973, the Commission received a petition from the National Football League Players Association (NFLPA) requesting the Commission to initiate a proceeding under section 7 of the act (86 Stat. 1212; 15 U.S.C. 2056) to promulgate a consumer product safety standard for artificial turf covering used on athletic playing fields or to declare such product to be a banned hazardous product pursuant to section 8 of the act (86 Stat. 1215; 15 U.S.C. 2057).

Additionally, the NFLPA petition requests the Commission to restrain further use of artificial turf covering or prohibit new installations pending promulgation of a consumer product safety standard or a banning order.

On August 7, 1973, the Commission received from the Monsanto Company a request that the Commission deny the NFLPA petition.

The NFLPA alleges that serious injuries sustained by persons playing football on fields covered with artificial turf include knee and ankle injuries, cartilage and ligament tears, body burns, staphylococcus infections, severe fractures and concussions, heat prostration, and blistering.

Having considered the information and data submitted in support of the NFLPA petition, Monsanto Company's comments, and surveillance data reported by the National Electronic Injury Surveillance System, the Commission concludes that the evidence is insufficient to support the proposition that persons playing football on fields covered with artificial turf incur a significantly greater risk of sustaining more frequent or more severe injuries than persons playing football on fields covered with natural turf.

The Commission also finds that since football-related activities, equipment, and apparel are ranked seventh in the Commission's listing of hazardous consumer products, based upon the frequency and severity of injuries reported to hospital emergency rooms, any action taken by the Commission to reduce or eliminate unreasonable risks of injury to consumers associated with playing football should not be limited to the playing surface. Further, artificial turf has consumer uses other than as a football playing surface; consequently, the scope of any proceeding the Commission might undertake to reduce or eliminate any unreasonable risk of injury to consumers should include all known and possible consumer uses of artificial turf coverings.

Therefore, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (Public Law 92-573, 86 Stat. 1217; 15 U.S.C. 2059(d)), notice is hereby given of the Commission's denial of the above-described NFLPA petition.

Dated: December 6, 1973.

SADYE E. DUNN,
Secretary, Consumer Product
Safety Commission.

[FR Doc.73-26414 Filed 12-12-73; 8:45 am]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 13, 1973.

MR. RICHARD O. SIMPSON,
Chairman, Consumer Product Safety
Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMPSON: This morning the Consumer Product Safety Commission announced in the Federal Register denial of the National Football League Players Association's petition regarding artificial turf as a football playing surface.

I find this announcement highly confusing and inconsistent in light of two prior indications that the Commission is still studying the matter. A public meeting of

the Commission and representatives of the NFL Players Association has been scheduled for January 4, 1974 and an Associated Press story yesterday indicated the Commission is considering holding public hearings on the subject of artificial turf as a football playing surface.

I would sincerely hope and strongly urge that the meeting and the hearings go forward, for the following reasons:

(1.) The Consumer Product Safety Commission has ranked football-related activities, equipment and apparel seventh on its list of the 365 most hazardous consumer products. To finally deny the NFL Players Association petition dealing with one of the most controversial of these activities—the use of artificial turf—on the basis of a staff report is inconsistent with the Commission's responsibility to consumers.

(2.) It is my understanding that the Commission has never considered injury data compiled by the NFL teams. The Players Association has been unable to secure this data, but I understand it could be made available to the Commission through the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

(3.) Despite the lack of official injury data, the Commission did have access to a study, financed by the National Football League, which showed substantially more injuries to athletes playing on artificial rather than natural turf.

(4.) The statutes which created the Consumer Product Safety Commission prevents a petitioner whose petition has been denied from going to court. Thus, it would seem that the Commission has a strong responsibility to conduct thorough and complete investigations—including public hearings when advisable—before denying a petition.

(5.) Finally, denial of the NFL Players Association petition affects a great many more consumers than just the professional players. At the present time, there are some 150 installations of artificial turf on football playing fields. Only 13 of those are used by the National Football League. That means that a substantial majority of those installations are used by college and high school athletes and even some "sandlotters". Actually, the NFL Players Association may be able to solve its problems with artificial turf through collective bargaining with the NFL owners. But, the thousands of amateur athletes from grade school through college have no one to protect them from any dangers which may result from the use of artificial turf except the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

For the above listed reasons, I repeat my concern that further study be given to the use of artificial turf as a football playing surface.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. OBEY,
Member of Congress.

THE STATES' SIDE TO NEW FEDERALISM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, recently, a testimonial dinner was given in honor of Howard Phillips, former Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Addressing the dinner audience, Gov. Meldrim Thomson, Jr., of New Hampshire, noted that Phillips, "in a brief 6 months . . . had Congress howling, the

army of bungling, self-perpetuating OEO bureaucrats screaming, and the vast majority of hardworking, taxpaying, freedom-loving Americans singing his huzzahs."

While Howard Phillips had "won the first opening skirmish in the new revolution," Governor Thomson noted that "then the field command was changed. Tragically, there has been no follow-through to this all-important conservative victory."

OEO, which was to be dismantled, now is pursuing virtually all of the programs meant to be eliminated. In many instances, it is doing so against the wishes of State officials.

Governor Thomson believes that our free society can only be maintained as long as power is clearly divided between the national and State governments. He expressed the view that the new federalism, to work, must fulfill the wishes of State officials, not nonelected bureaucrats.

In his talk he declared that:

For 40 years America has dallied in the garden of socialistic ideas. New federalism would set us anew on the path of constitutional government, where free enterprise and human freedom are the warp and woof of our destiny. New federalism would emphasize again the separation of governmental powers, the division of sovereign powers, and the republican form of government—all guaranteed under the federal Constitution.

Thus far, however, the new federalism has won few such battles. Governor Thomson points out that, "except for the brilliant performance of Howard Phillips it is having real trouble converting theory into practice."

Federal bureaucrats, Governor Thomson understands all too well, do not like States. He noted that:

They love regional government. It is a concept foreign to our federal Constitution, where not once does the word region appear. Yet bureaucrats fight for it because salaries are plush, the pastures of wasteful frivolity lush, and the power of the people nonexistent.

Today, approximately 30 percent of the budget of the State of New Hampshire comes from Federal funding of one kind or another. It is, states Governor Thomson, "difficult for a State to stand straight and clean above its dependence on the Federal Government."

The new federalism, if it is to be more than an empty phrase, must, in Governor Thomson's words, "have strong, independent States operating within the framework of constitutional federalism."

I wish to share Governor Thomson's important address with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

THE STATE'S SIDE TO NEW FEDERALISM (By Gov. Meldrim Thomson, Jr.)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, we gather to give testimony to the steadfast and effective adherence to the principles of human liberty by a courageous young man.

When President Nixon announced the goals of new federalism, he launched the new American revolution.

One of the most heavily fortified outer bastions of liberalism was the Office of Economic Opportunity. It lay directly athwart the course of the new revolution.

Last January, the President chose Howard Phillips to lead the assault on the entrenched poverty programs of OEO. Their enflaming fire had cut a wide swath into America's institutions of freedom.

Howie's fight was so successful that in a few short months OEO was infiltrated, dismantled in part, and all of its wretched hypocrisy laid bare.

In a brief six months he had Congress howling, the army of bungling, self-perpetuating OEO bureaucrats screaming, and the vast majority of hard-working, tax-paying, freedom-loving Americans singing his huzzahs from the high hills of hope.

In brilliant fashion Howie won the first opening skirmish in the new revolution. Then the field command was changed. Tragically, there has been no follow-through to this all important conservative victory.

We in New Hampshire can testify to the good works of Howard Phillips during his term as Acting Director of OEO.

Early in my administration last winter Dan Joy came to our office to ask if we would be interested in sponsoring a true test of the voucher plan for financing public education.

I responded with an enthusiastic "yes". I immediately called in our new chairman of the State Board of Education, William P. Bittenbender and obtained his whole-hearted approval.

Since then, we have received a little over \$100,000 from OEO for planning, and the encouragement of such persons as Secretary Weinberger, Presidential Assistant Laird, and Vice President Agnew.

But there are strong educational forces at work to see that nowhere in America can a true voucher plan be tested. Things have changed at OEO since January. And the voucher plan proposed for New Hampshire in January is in trouble in September.

We have met with one Federal bureaucratic delay after another. Now we have in our State an evaluation team from the National Institute of Education. Only this morning Mr. Bittenbender advised me that this team is recommending radical changes to the proposed plan that would dilute and make useless the whole plan. Also, the team wants to delay the experiment originally planned for July until November!

Thus, the liberals fight back. The product of the seeds of hope planted last spring has been nipped by the chilling frost of bureaucratic power!

In another area New Hampshire moved in unison with the President in his fight against the continuance of those OEO programs that were wasteful and harmful to our free institutions.

In New Hampshire we have revised the entire State structure for anti-poverty programs. We will now have more State and local influence on the content and administration of these programs.

The State OEO has been replaced with a Division of Human Resources in the Office of Comprehensive Planning.

The new Division has a much wider scope. It is not limited to OEO programs even though it has absorbed control of all functions of the previous OEO operation.

The new Division provides for an evaluation-oriented staff which will have the authority and resources to scrutinize and assess all human resources programs.

It also will prepare for special revenue sharing programs. The new Division will be able to administer these new programs.

This Division also will provide the information needed by county designating agencies who are responsible for authorizing the community action programs to administer programs.

It will give them the knowledge to determine whether these programs are being run correctly. It also can assist them in any changes at the local level, such as re-

removal of programs from the CAPS to other agencies if they deem it desirable. They will have the expertise to oppose programs they and their citizens do not want.

All of these changes would have been impossible under a Federal OEO leadership which was hostile to democratic ideas. Instead, Howard Phillips and his staff were receptive to changes which would decentralize controls and return these decision-making powers to the people of New Hampshire.

This is the new federalism at work in New Hampshire.

There is nothing really new about the President's new federalism, as I understand it. For forty years America has dallied in the garden of socialistic ideas. New federalism would set us anew on the path of constitutional government, where free enterprise and human freedom are the warp and woof of our destiny.

New federalism would emphasize again the separation of governmental powers, the division of sovereign powers, and the republican form of government—all guaranteed under the Federal Constitution.

Thus far new federalism has sought to return to the States and people powers usurped by a voracious and ruthless central government. Except for the brilliant performance of Howard Phillips it is having real trouble converting theory into practice.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY

There is a State side to new federalism that has been wholly overlooked and neglected.

The entire Federal concept was founded on the fact that 13 original and independent States voluntarily parted with that portion of their sovereignty needed to establish a strong national government, reserving to themselves in the 10th amendment all powers not expressly delegated to the national government.

The two oldest State constitutions, those of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, declared their sovereignty prior to June 22, 1788, when New Hampshire's ratification vote made operative the Federal Constitution.

Our State constitution says, and in New Hampshire we believe, that the people have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign and independent State; and do, and forever hereafter shall, exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction, and right, pertaining thereto, which is not or may not hereafter be, by them expressly delegated to the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Of late years an aggressive Congress and a fawning judiciary have sucked the very power of sovereignty from the States and substituted therefor the corrosive substance of dependence.

Today States are but thin husks of sovereignty—anachronistic leftovers of a once great constitutional concept. They are names and boundaries on maps but little else.

Federal bureaucrats do not like States. They love regional government. It is a concept foreign to our Federal Constitution, where not once does the word region appear. Yet bureaucrats fight for it because salaries are plush, the pastures of wasteful frivolity lush, and the power of the people nonexistent.

Today it is difficult for a State to stand straight and clean above its dependence on Federal Government. About 30 percent of our State budget comes from Federal funding of one kind or another.

Not only do most of these funds have strings attached to them but the regulatory twine manipulates the Federal puppets in an incessant whirling-dervish ecstasy of do's and don'ts.

Early in my administration I decided to get rid of a crime commission that had no evaluation of the effectiveness of its grants

and was more interested in conferences, seminars and rehabilitation of incorrigibles than in basic law enforcement.

Wind of my plan reached the LEAA office in Boston immediately and brought the Federal official to our State House on the run. Under the pretext of meeting me, a pleasure which under the circumstances seemed highly dubious, he suggested that I should leave the commission intact.

I have heard that kind of advice—just short of veiled threats—several times from Federal bureaucrats. I have great difficulty in refraining from instant adverse reaction.

What you and I know but these fellows cannot understand is that new federalism will work only if we have strong, independent States operating within the framework of constitutional federalism.

The meaning of the dual sovereignty under our federalism was made clear by Madison in the 45th paper of *The Federalist* where he wrote as follows:

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the state governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce; with which last the power of taxation will, for the most part, be connected.

"The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the state."

Madison could not conceive of today's mad rush by governors to Washington for Federal handouts.

He would have been appalled as I was at their reaction to President Nixon's impoundment program—one which incidentally had my wholehearted support from the beginning.

The supplicants of federal succor descended on Washington after the impoundment orders with tin cups in hand. The litany of their tins was sweet music to their liberal brethren on the Potomac.

Madison in the 46th paper suggested that states would fight federal encroachments. He said:

"But ambitious encroachments of the federal government, on the authority of the state governments, would not excite the opposition of a single state, or of a few states only. They would be signals of general alarm. Every government would espouse the common cause."

How wrong was Madison these days have thus far proved. Howard Phillips through OEO started the flow of federal power back to the states. But what was a strong stream in March has become a trickle in September.

If President Nixon's new federalism, so essential to the continued life of our republic, is to be effective, the states must reassert their sovereignty. This will be difficult, but not impossible.

Today's office holders must embrace the ideals of yesterday's founding fathers and be willing to make the same sacrifice of property and lives which they mutually pledged to each other.

The struggle is for raw power. Upon the outcome rest the freedom of Americans and the ultimate hope of all mankind.

Hamilton in the 79th paper neatly summed up today's problem of federal largess as follows: "In the general course of human nature, a power over a man's substance amounts to a power over his will."

The founding fathers knew that a government that controlled a man's property was tyrannical no matter by what name it was called; today's conservatives also know this truism of human liberty.

The more distant, complicated and powerful the seat of government from the people

the less they have to say about their own lives.

If we have spent two hundred years merely to concentrate power in an unresponsive and unrepresentative bureaucratic government in Washington then we have swung full circle back to the London of George III.

Never, in the long struggle for human freedom, was the need greater for state sovereignty.

There is no true sovereignty if States are dependent on—

Federal handouts for their economic survival;

Legal aid for the indigent from lawyers not admitted to practice, in some instances with criminal records, and completely unaccountable to either the legislature or governor; and

Family planning that dispenses at taxpayers' expense and against the will of most such persons contraceptives to young, unmarried teenagers.

In New Hampshire we are fighting hard to restore State sovereignty so that our people might once again decide for themselves the things that concern their lives, liberties and properties and might regulate the internal order, improvements and prosperity of their own state.

Thus, when our State library commission recently asked governor and council to join several other states in a court action to strike down the President's impoundment order affecting libraries, I informed our governor's council that I would not do so.

When the legal assistance corporation applied to our Crime Commission for funds to hire counsel for our State prison, I told commission members that such a grant would not have my approval.

The Legal Assistant project in our State has a budget higher than that for the Governor. With this boodle they involve themselves heavily in lobbying and politics, attack through political actions our governmental institutions, and give perfunctory and often useless service to our indigent.

But most of all they are a self-perpetuating and self-directing service entirely unaccountable to our citizens or their elected representatives.

Again, when I found that a family planning unit was fostering promiscuity among our high school students, I moved to block further funding until accountability could be established.

Friends, for years we have railed against the drift toward uncontrollable bureaucratic power in Washington.

We have protested, we have argued, we have lamented, and we have accommodated. And all the while the vertices of constitutional government have fallen away one by one.

Our children cannot pray in school, though our lawmakers mock us by publicly praying, and our courts flaunt their hypocrisy by calling on God to hear our oaths.

Our prisons are kept in constant turmoil by a Federal judiciary that is so hopelessly out of touch with the mores of our day and so contemptuous of the Constitution that they daily drag this great country toward rule by usurpation for the benefit of special minorities.

Not until the short, hopeful, and inspiring career of Howard Phillips did our protests begin to bear fruit.

If nothing else, Howie taught us that the strong citadels of liberalism can be breached; that the great powers held in Washington can be redirected back to the people; and that the new federalism of President Nixon can restore that balance in sovereignty so essential to the survival of our Republic.

He has proved also what Gideon learned more than 2,000 years ago, that faith in God and uncompromising devotion to high principle can bring victory though the members who cross the brook of decision be few.

Tonight we pay tribute to the long list of contributions Howard Phillips has made to the cause of freedom. Tomorrow, we shall salute him for the promise of greater success in his goal to restore the power of self-determination to our people. He has fought the good fight and will return to share one day in the victory.

Friends, never in the history of these United States of America was there greater need for perception, industry and vigilance if we are to preserve in our third century the blessings of liberty thus far achieved under our Constitution.

Howard Phillips has pointed the way. We cannot, we shall not, falter!

**DILLARD BROWN LASSETER,
DEDICATED OFFICIAL**

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Dillard Brown Lasseter, November 2, 1973, many Members of Congress lost a pleasant friend and adviser.

For the past 20 years Mr. Lasseter was associated with the American Trucking Association and was well known to me and numerous Members of the House as a pleasant companion and a man of great intellect and compassion.

It was my privilege to work with him more than 20 years ago when he was administrator of the Farmers Home Corporation. With his guidance and counsel we were able to prepare and see enacted legislation which opened opportunities for farm ownership to thousands of veterans returning from World War II.

Mr. Lasseter was born in Vienna, Ga., and received a masters degree in political science from New York University. After his graduation, he was appointed by President Woodrow Wilson as a language officer in Peking. He served in World War I as a liaison officer to the British Army.

In the early 1940's, Mr. Lasseter was appointed deputy administrator of the National Youth Administration, one of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's creations.

Two years later, Mr. Lasseter was appointed regional director of the War Manpower Commission for the District of Columbia, Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina. As director, he was responsible for the coordination of many war industrial training programs.

President Harry Truman appointed Mr. Lasseter to be administrator of the Farm Security Administration in 1945. A year later, he also was appointed administrator of the Farmers Home Corporation.

The Decatur Daily of Decatur, Ala., of which Mr. Barrett Shelton is publisher, recently printed an editorial concerning Mr. Lasseter's passing. I include the editorial as a part of my remarks at this point:

A CHAMPION OF THE TIMES

In the passing of Dillard Brown Lasseter, 79, in Washington, D.C., Friday, we have lost a champion in our times.

Mr. Lasseter, a native of Vienna, Ga., was well-acquainted with North Alabama through his service in 1945 as administrator of the Farm Security Administration and later as administrator of the Farmers Home Corp. In these agencies, his efforts enabled many veterans returning to this area from World War II to acquire loans for farm ownership.

He was known to all as a gentleman of unusual intellect and compassion for the needs of others.

**SAFE SCHOOLS ARE A NECESSITY
FOR OUR CHILDREN**

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the rising tide of crime upon youngsters on their way to and from school has prompted at least one community to protest and demand increased police protection of the nearby streets.

While I believe that the answer to the problem of school crime goes far deeper than the introduction of security guards in and around the school building, I commend the attached article, appearing in the November 27 edition of the New York Times, to my colleagues as an indication of the severity of the problem and the need to act with expedition on the Safe Schools Act, H.R. 2650.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 27, 1973]
**ATTACKS IN AN EAST FLATBUSH SCHOOL SPUR
DEMAND FOR POLICE PROTECTION**
(By George Goodman Jr.)

About 150 teachers and parents of pupils demonstrated outside Public School 219 in the East Flatbush section of Brooklyn yesterday in an appeal for increased police security.

On Nov. 19, a teen-ager entered the school building at 1060 Clarkson Avenue, walked into a room where a teacher was conducting an after-school play-center program, "held a gun to his head and robbed him," said Steven Kotick, an organizer of the protest.

Mr. Kotick, who is also P.S. 219's chapter representative for the United Federation of Teachers, said that on two other occasions a teacher's aide had been mugged by teen-agers in the vicinity of the school on her way to work during the morning.

In the robbery, the man was not harmed, but Mr. Kotick and others at the school said the woman teacher had been knocked to the ground, beaten and kicked before being robbed.

POLICE ACTION AWAITED

"The demonstration was decided on only after the Police Department and the District 18 Community School Board officials failed to respond to our demands for protection," Mr. Kotick said. "We are waiting to see if they come through on their assurances and will take other action if they don't do something about the situation."

At several meetings yesterday, representatives of the 71st Precinct police command and Harvey Garner, the district superintendent, discussed demands by teachers for security in the neighborhood, where merchants and residents charge that police protection has deteriorated since whites moved away.

A uniformed patrolman will be stationed in the block in which the school is situated between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m., a spokesman for the District 18 School Board said.

The school board spokesman said that the police promised continued patrol of the

school by a police officer on a motor scooter, but that a lack of funds did not permit additional security personnel within the school building, as demanded by the teachers.

"In both cases, with the patrolman and the scooter policeman, their presence will depend on other needs in the area," he said.

The principal of P.S. 219, Judah Frank, said children as well as adults had been robbed in the area. He said none of the adults had been seriously injured, except the teaching aide, Joyce Rosen.

"Kids are harassed coming and going from school and on one occasion a first grader was robbed of his sneakers and his lunch," Mr. Frank said.

A police officer assigned to the area attributed much of the crime in the region to several gangs, "The Jolly Stompers" and "The Tomahawks."

"It is a high-crime area," he said.

Mr. Kotick said that most of the 1,800 pupils at the school were black and most of its teaching staff was white "but there are no racial overtones in any of this."

Mrs. Denise Roker of 232 East 95th Street, a black woman who is a home-owner and a parent of a P.S. 219 pupil, said as did others in the neighborhood, "police do not patrol the community the way they used to when whites lived here."

Along a string of shops and stores in the 1000 block of Clarkson Avenue, others echoed Mrs. Roker's complaint.

"When you see policemen now they're giving out tickets," said William Myers, a customer in the Three Star barber shop.

At the 71st Precinct station house, Sgt. Thomas Mauro said he could not make "an official comment" on the charges, explaining that community relations personnel had left for the day.

ROYBAL'S STATEMENT ON ASSOCIATED UNIVERSITIES FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, there is an important part of the Foreign Assistance Act which deals with population planning and health. In this sensitive area development planning must be the responsibility of each sovereign country. U.S. assistance should be administered in a collaborative style to support the development goals chosen by each country receiving assistance. Also, the U.S. cooperation in development should be carried out to the maximum extent possible through the private sector including those areas, such as educational institutions.

Our committee has considered testimony presented by a group of U.S. universities, titled "Associated Universities for International Education." This group has made arrangements with universities in Latin America to initiate the establishing of permanent population centers by the Latin American universities. Such a program will balance the clinical programs for family planning presently supported by AID with a permanent program focusing on each country's social and cultural aspects in population growth, as well as its resources of food, health, housing, education, and employment. The Latin American universities will develop a program that can be in-

troduced into the governmental and educational processes of each country to provide motivation for responsible parenthood.

The international coordinating university will continue to be located in Washington, D.C.

The universities in Brazil have obtained the written consent of the Brazilian Minister of Education to put this program into operation. The universities in Mexico and Colombia have given assurances of their interest in participating.

I believe AID should proceed with this program of the Associated Universities for International Education.

The Associated Universities' testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations follows:

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT

Congressman Passman, Congressman Shriver, and members of this committee:

My name is Father T. Byron Collins, S.J., Special Assistant to Father Robert J. Henle, S.J., President of Georgetown University, and Federal Relations Officer for the Consortium, Associated Universities for International Education.

With me is Father Harold C. Bradley, S.J., Director of International Programs at Georgetown University and a member of the executive committee of the Board of Directors of the Consortium, Associated Universities for International Education. Also with me is André Hellegers, M.D., Director of Population Affairs at Georgetown University.

It is a pleasure to testify before your Committee on Appropriations on foreign assistance.

We are here to present a request of a consortium of universities in the United States, with a center at Georgetown University. Our concern lies in the field of the International Population Program of AID. We presented to you last year the outline of this program. Our purpose today is to report to you details of our last year's effort and the need for funds for the international Consortium of Universities.

The present program of AID in the field of population is strongly oriented to supporting only clinical programs for family planning in other countries.

We believe that the clinical programs lack balancing social and human motivation programs in many countries.

For a year representatives of Georgetown have met with staff officers of AID to start the international university program.

The international university program associates indigenous universities in a country with universities in other countries to develop a national and local rationale for the country in reference to its population growth and capability to sustain the growth.

At the suggestion of AID population staff, we have a planning request filed with the Agency for universities in Brazil, Mexico and Colombia. The amount of the grant request is about \$50,000. Georgetown University has expended double that amount already in this program.

The amount estimated for the first phase of this Latin American program from AID resources is \$2,000,000. From experience, the universities in Brazil, Mexico and Colombia and the United States will have to add another \$2,000,000 to the AID amount to make the program effective. We need the AID funds to stimulate the sequential private funds in each country.

The object of the program is to have the universities in Brazil, Mexico, Colombia and

the United States to establish a permanent self-sustaining Population Center in each country with an international center in Washington, D.C. at Georgetown University.

We have sufficient interest and assurances from universities in Brazil with the written consent of the Brazilian Minister of Education to start this program. We have like assurances from universities in Mexico and Colombia.

We respectfully request the Committee to encourage AID to develop a balanced population program with expenditures in both social motivation, research and projects as well as a clinical approach with respect for human dignity.

Without this approach the individual population program could be in jeopardy. We note that the present AID population program is barred from Brazil and Mexico. It was recently barred from India.

We enclose complete documentation of the university program for the record.

COMMENTS BY ADMIRAL RICKOVER ON MAN AND HIS WORK

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Admiral H. G. Rickover's appearance before a Senate committee recently, he made some comments about the purpose of life which, I believe, have value for every American. The comments are from the text of his testimony:

COMMENTS OF ADMIRAL RICKOVER

Man's work begins with his job, or profession. Having a vocation is always somewhat of a miracle, like falling in love. . . . But having a vocation means more than punching a timeclock. One must guard against banality, ineptitude, incompetence, and mediocrity.

We as a people seem inclined to accept average or mediocre performance. Mediocrity can destroy us just as surely as perils far more famous. It is important that we remember to distinguish between what it means to fail at a task and what it means to be mediocre. There is all the difference in the world between the life lived with dignity and style which ends up failing, and one which achieves power and glory, yet is dull, unoriginal, unreflective, and mediocre. In a real sense, what matters is not so much whether we make a lot of money, hold a prestigious job, or whether we don't; what matters is that we become people who seek out others with knowledge and enthusiasm—that we become people who can enjoy our own company.

For the person who strives to excel, to shoulder responsibility and to speak out, there is an enemy wherever he turns. The enemy is a man who has a total willingness to delegate his worries about the world to officialdom. He assumes that only the people in authority are in a position to know and act. He believes that if vital information essential to the making of public decisions is withheld, it can only be for a good reason. . . .

The enemy is any man whose only concern about the world is that it stay in one piece during his own lifetime. . . . Nothing to him is less important than the shape of things to come or the needs of the next generation.

To struggle against these enemies, and against apathy and mediocrity, is to find the purpose to life.

EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT SPENDING

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the recent passage of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act by this House has shown a much needed desire to gain control over Government spending. This desire still has to be translated into the actuality of lessening Government expenditures.

Part of the whole problem of excessive Government spending is the Government's great role in the capital market. One of the results has been to increase the cost of borrowing funds for individual Americans and businesses. At the same time the Government's role in this area has led to a further limitation on the funds available for businesses to finance expansion and thereby provide more jobs.

At this point, I include in the RECORD the November, 1973 issue of the Tax Review which deals with "The Governmental Competition for Investment Funds." While I do not necessarily agree with all the recommendations of the article, I do think that they should be discussed. The text follows:

THE GOVERNMENTAL COMPETITION FOR INVESTMENT FUNDS

(By Murray L. Weidenbaum)

We must seriously consider the possibility that the United States has entered a period in which there will be a long-run tendency for the demand for capital to outrun the supply of savings to finance it. Moreover, the situation is likely to be worsened for the typical business firm by the rising extent to which the government itself will become a major competitor for capital funds.

On the supply side, several basic factors will be dampening down the potential for generating savings. In absolute terms, of course, there will be large increases in funds available for investment. Important forces, however, are exercising a depressing effect on the growth rate of savings. Even with the investment credit back on, our tax system does less to encourage private saving and investment than those of most other industrialized nations. Moreover, the social security system—which has been expanded and liberalized recently—discourages private savings.

Finally, consumers—who are the basic source of saving in the economy—will be experiencing some adverse factors in this decade. The changing age distribution of the U.S. population suggests that, if past savings patterns are maintained, the personal saving rate (although not the absolute amount) could decline over the coming decade. Just compare the anticipated trends in the low-saving age groups with the high-saving age brackets, and that does not take much forecasting ability because we are talking about people who are already born and living in the United States.

The prospects are very unfavorable. The number of Americans in the high-spending, low-saving age brackets (20-35) will be rising substantially, from 46 million in 1972 to 60 million in 1982. These are the young people who borrow heavily, particularly to finance and furnish new homes. In striking contrast, the high saving and investment age brackets (40-54) will show a decline in

absolute numbers, from 36 million to 34 million in 1982.

On the demand side, in contrast, there clearly will be rapidly rising requirements for new capital investment, in both the public and private sectors. Estimates in the tens of billions each have been made for such high-priority items as pollution control equipment, housing and community facilities, mass transportation systems, and exploration and development of domestic energy sources.

In the public sector, the Tax Foundation has estimated that new security issues by state and local government will almost double during the current decade, rising from \$18 billion in 1970 to approximately \$35 billion in 1980. These estimates of course exclude the periodic refunding of maturing securities. On this basis, net long-term debt of states and their localities will more than double during the 10-year period, rising from \$122 billion in 1970 to \$260 billion in 1980.

On the Federal side, the amount of external financing essentially will be a matter of fiscal policy. The extent to which the Federal government, like so many business firms, relies on the flow of internal funds to meet much of its financing requirements should not be overlooked. In the government's case, it is not retained earnings, but rather the current accumulations in the social security and other trust funds which are invested in government securities. In the fiscal year 1972, Federal departments and agencies acquired \$8 billion of Federal securities. In the fiscal year 1974, these net purchases are anticipated to total \$16 billion. All in all, the Federal government itself will be holding \$140 billion of its own securities by June 30, 1974.

A number of public and private forecasts show that, by 1976 or 1977 or some other future year, the Federal government may be operating at a surplus—and, hence, that no external financing will be needed. For example, the President's January budget estimated a margin of \$35 billion by which revenues would exceed outlays, on a full-employment basis, in 1978. Do not be misled by these statistical exercises. I have done them myself and find them very useful; but we must recognize them as a form of mental gymnastics. The key to understanding these, as well as any other forecasts, is to look at the underlying assumptions. That is critical in this case. The key assumption, which may not always be apparent to the users of these forecasts, is that no further change will be made in the expenditure programs or revenue structure of the Federal government. This is plainly unrealistic. If there is anything that can be forecast with confidence, it is that over the years the Congress will pass laws increasing spending on existing programs and instituting new spending programs. Likely candidates are not hard to find—ranging from incentives to explore for new energy sources to a national health insurance program to another upturn in the military budget.

PROJECTIONS SHOW FEDERAL OPTIONS

Please do not interpret this as an attack on the projections per se. They are not intended to be forecasts of reality. Rather, they are a useful input into the policy planning process by indicating the amount of discretion that is available to increase outlays and/or cut taxes within the existing budget structure. In the future, as in the past, the public's appetite for new government services and benefits likely will outrun the willingness to pay for this largesse in the form of higher taxes. Thus, on balance, the Federal government is likely to run deficits and be a net demander of investment funds in the years ahead.

In practice, available savings will be allocated among the various categories of bor-

rowers. Hence, no long-term credit crunch should be anticipated, but rather a period of relatively high interest rates for the decade ahead of us. Competition for funds in securities markets will be sharp, thus exerting a strong upward pressure on interest rates. This will be reinforced by the tendency for a higher average rate of inflation than in the past decade—say 4 percent. Although this level will be below the recent peak rates of price increase, it will still be a painfully high average level.

Economic trends, however, do not usually follow a straight line, at least not for any substantial period of time. There will continue to be periodic fluctuations in business activity in general and in financial markets and interest rates in particular. The rate of economic growth—and interest rates—will decline on occasion. But unless fiscal and monetary policy can follow the often unpopular but frequently necessary path of restraint, inflationary pressures will worsen from time to time. This is why so many knowledgeable analysts expect that future administrations in Washington will, from time to time, experiment with various methods of influencing private wage and price decisions, ranging from rigid controls to voluntary guidelines.

I would now like to turn to an undramatic but perhaps equally important change taking place in the public sector, at least important in terms of its impact on securities markets.

We are witnessing the development of a very special kind of financial intermediary, the government-sponsored agencies and the "agency issues" that result. It may be less than one man in a thousand who understands the operations of these Federal credit programs, but I submit that we all are affected by them. Government-sponsored enterprises—such as the Export-Import Bank, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the Federal Land Banks—are strongly influencing and will increasingly determine which private credit needs will be met.

Let me cite just a few pertinent facts. In 1960, these Federal credit programs represented about one-tenth of the total funds advanced in credit markets in the United States. By 1970, they accounted for two-fifths. The trend shows no signs of subsiding. The last few years have seen the establishment of new ones, such as the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and the Student Loan Marketing Association (Sally Mae). Legislation also has been enacted authorizing the government to guarantee private loans for ship construction and rural development, as well as an Environmental Financing Authority.

There are constant demands for setting up still more government-sponsored credit agencies, including an Energy Research and Development Corporation, a Fanny Mae—a Federal National Railway Association—and literally an RFC, an Aerospace Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It does not take too much imagination to foresee that the continuation of present trends will result in more than one-half of the ostensibly private credit markets of this Nation thus becoming "Federalized" by the end of the decade.

Of course, there is always some justification offered for the government setting up these credit activities. Educators are aware of the financial needs of students and will not oppose the formation of a Sally Mae. Utility executives are certainly cognizant of the need to develop energy sources, and some may favor setting up an Energy Corporation. But we all must realize that this form of governmental intervention does nothing to increase the total pool of capital which is available.

CAPITAL MARKETS BEING SOCIALIZED

When the national government enters financial markets, it possesses advantages not available to private borrowers. To a very con-

siderable extent, these governmental attributes are being transferred to the ostensibly private organizations which operate under Federal auspices. In effect, increasing portions of available investment funds are being preempted by government credit agencies and are not available to truly private borrowers. This means an increasing socialization of capital markets, which are such a basic element in the strength and durability of a private enterprise system.

Of course, it is not hard to see the reasons for the growing popularity of the governmental credit mechanisms. Most of them are not included in the budget itself; hence, they seem to be a painless way of achieving national objectives. Moreover, they develop a built-in clientele who receive benefits at the expense of the rest of society. In the fiscal year 1972 alone, the operation of Federal credit programs resulted in commitments for interest subsidies to the beneficiaries of these programs totalling \$7 billion. The subsidies are in the form of interest rates below those that the borrowers would have to pay in truly private credit markets. To compound the problem, these are truly hidden subsidies. You have to dig out the special analyses that accompany the budget in order to get information on them.

What should or can be done about this situation? Let us tackle this question from two viewpoints—first, that of national policy, and second, that of the individual company. From the viewpoint of national policy, a more hardnosed attitude is required toward these various Federally-sponsored credit agencies.

These programs should be carefully examined in the government's own budget process. The costs as well as their benefits need to be analyzed. Fundamentally, limits should be set on the total volume of Federally-assisted credit being extended and on the borrowings of these agencies.

Just because most of these programs are no longer included in the Federal budget, that does not mean that they are without any cost to the nation. The amount of investment funds generated in our economy in a given period of time is limited and giving specific categories of borrowers special preference should be restricted. Every time another Federal credit program is set up outside of the constraints of the budget, some truly private borrower is nudged out of the credit markets.

SEES NEED TO REDUCE GOVERNMENTAL ROLE

The government's role as an allocator of investment funds in our economy needs to be restricted substantially. The formation of a Federal Financing Bank with real authority to limit agency lending and borrowing would be a major advance—but it would have to exercise more than the Treasury's traditional traffic cop function. We also need greater public recognition that the governmental credit device does nothing to expand the volume of capital funds available to the economy. It involves literally robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Now let us examine this question from the viewpoint of the individual corporate borrower. The long-term impact of these trends seems quite clear. During periods of tight money, it becomes more difficult for unassisted corporate borrowers to attract the capital funds that they require. Most of the agency issues, after all, are designed to get more capital to the nonbusiness borrowers, notably home-owners and farmers. By and large, agency issues—whether they bear direct government guarantees or other Federal support—will not be crowded out of the market.

Thus, the burden of tightening monetary policy is increasingly likely to fall more heavily on the business sector. As is now apparent, interest rate movements are becoming sharper during periods of credit

stringency (other factors are also at work, to be sure), as the various classes of borrowers bid against each other for the limited supply of investment funds. Merely marginally profitable investment opportunities suffer during such times.

Clearly, this new type of bond market environment is a real challenge to business firms and to their investment advisers and bankers. Increased attention needs to be devoted to both designing as well as timing public offerings so that they can compete effectively in capital markets which are becoming increasingly influenced by government priorities.

More fundamentally, an economic environment needs to be created that is more conducive to private saving and investment. That will require both changes in the tax laws and greater restraint on government spending. On the tax side, the often naive advocates of closing tax "loopholes" have little understanding of or interest in the reasons for incentive provisions, such as their contribution to economic growth or to private solutions to national problems.

It is ironic that the efforts to increase capital gains taxation are far stronger in the United States than in other industrialized nations, although our tax burden on such gains already is so much higher. In France and West Germany, capital gains are entirely exempt from income taxation. In Italy, they are only subject to a 9 to 15 percent levy by local authorities. Japan only taxes capital gains if trades in a given year exceed 50 transactions or 200,000 shares.

On the expenditure side, the pressures for new government spending programs do not seem to be abating at all. The most recent candidate is the possibility of substantial Federal aid for the exploration and development of new domestic energy sources. But despite all the talk about reordering our priorities, we have not really faced the necessary but unpopular task of selecting those areas of lower priority to which lesser proportions of our resources should be devoted. Yet, we should realize that the process of establishing a new set of expenditure priorities—which in itself is necessary and desirable in a changing world—is not complete until we have eliminated the old. Sensible restraint on the total amount of Federal spending also would help both in containing inflationary pressures, and in reducing the governmental competition for investment funds.

Unless we as a nation act on both the tax and expenditure fronts—to encourage private saving and to dampen down government investment—we must seriously consider the very real possibility that this nation has entered a period in which the demand for capital tends to outrun the supply of savings to finance it, and a high level of interest rates is likely to be the resulting balancing factor.

TRIBUTE TO MOUNT CARMEL AREA HIGH SCHOOL'S FOOTBALL CHAM- PIONS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, December 1, 1973 was a special day for the citizens of Mount Carmel, Pa. That was the day on which the Mount Carmel Area High School football team defeated a fine team from Dunmore, Pa., marking the first time in history that a team in the southern division of the Eastern Conference Class A Football League repeated as conference champion.

The victory represented not only a fine team effort but also a community accomplished. Local citizens decorated their homes for the event and the local radio station, WMIM, broadcast a "Salute to the Tornados" for the entire week preceding the game.

The Tornados showed the true spirit of competition. Trailing by 6 to 0 at the end of the third quarter, the Tornados showed the ability to come back and not give up. They kept driving and the score ended 15 to 6.

Moreover, these athletes showed their excellence not only on the gridiron but in the classroom as well. Fully one-half—11 of the 22 offensive and defensive starters—are honor roll students at the Mount Carmel Area High School.

The citizens of Mount Carmel can be justifiably proud of their fine football team and its accomplishments. I am happy to add my congratulations to them on this important event. It is truly a privilege and honor to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the newspaper accounts of the game and the tributes to this fine football team from the Mount Carmel News-Item, Mount Carmel, Pa., and the Reading Eagle, Reading, Pa.

The articles follow:

[From the Reading (Pa.) Eagle, Dec. 2, 1973]

TORNADOES SWEEP PAST DUNMORE, 15 TO 6:

KNEE TAPE HELPS

(By Sam Procopio)

MOUNT CARMEL.—It was the return of the old, but famous "Mount Carmel sweep," and the running of Ken Diminick, held together at the left knee with a lot of tape, that was instrumental in giving Coach Joe "Jazz" Diminick his 116th triumph in 136 games Saturday—the all-time best winning percentage of .845 for any coach at Mount Carmel or Kulpmont (now part of the Jointure).

When the 5-9, 155 pound two-way back came limping off the field in the second quarter, the concern of Coach Diminick as a father and coach was very visible.

"I can go, dad," Ken assured him at half-time.

Could he really go? He had been on crutches for several days after the Lourdes games two weeks ago! He ran well against Shamokin last weekend, but was heavily taped by Dr. Joseph Greco, team physician.

Dr. Greco noted at the outset of the Dunmore game that the tape was the only thing that was keeping Ken in the contest, adding that he will likely have to see a specialist this week to see if the ligament injury to the knee may need further medical attention.

"He took that (second half) kickoff that nearly put us on the boards . . . He played a helluva ball game," summed up his dad, who rarely lauds his own boys for public quote.

Ken, who scored 11 TDs this season, admitted: "I couldn't run at my top speed."

"If he were 100 per cent," said one Mount Carmel fan, "we would have blown them out of here."

The turning point of the game came . . . "I guess when we found their weak spot on their right side. It was a hit or miss thing," explained the 1946 Kulpmont graduate, who starred at Boston College.

Coach Diminick explained that the "Mount Carmel sweep" used during the days of Gary Diminick and Bobby Veach, four and five years ago, was tried because they appeared to have "us well scouted."

"After we found it was the soft spot, we thought we'd go with it. Of course, Kenny made a good cut (taking advantage of the

tremendous blocking he received at the line)."

In explaining the return of the sweep, Diminick said that "It was one of our pet plays. We got away from it. Since they (Dunmore) hadn't seen it, we felt we had to go with it."

Prior to the opening kickoff, both Diminick and Dunmore Coach John Henzes Jr. felt that the strong wind coming from the northern part of the field would "play a big factor" in the outcome, particularly for field position in the kicking game.

"We hadn't experienced it or anything like it this all year," said Diminick, whose punter, Vince Rawa, did an exceptional job, kicking four for a 32-yard average, while Dunmore's Rick Coyer, who was averaging between 30 and 35 yards, averaged 23 in four kicks.

Henzes said he had nothing special set up to beat Mount Carmel, pointing out "that while we must contain them and they are the best we have played against, we won't deviate from what we made a success."

Torando blasts . . . Bill Joraskie, who got off what was a sensational extra point kick, had not booted one since the fourth game of the season when he kicked four PATs against West Hazleton. Mt. Carmel went for the two pointer more. He kicked a 28-yard field goal against Minersville in the fifth game—his second of the season . . . Ken's 14 points was the most in one game by a Tornado since Vince Rawa did the same trick in the Panther Valley opener. Rawa, who had a shoulder separation that made him a questionable starter Saturday, reinjured the shoulder on his second run of the game, but he did not give up either. While on the sidelines, he was eagerly awaiting for the coach to put him in and did a good job when he went in as a decoy or runner . . .

Although Mount Carmel played with a "no-name" line this year, special attention from outsiders has pointed to Ed Shula, a tackle, and Dave Williams, a center, not to overlook two outstanding linebackers, Lou Cole and Richie Greco. Cole and Kenny Diminick have each received more than 40 college offers. . . . Many signs decorated Mount Carmel. One read: "Even with the energy crisis the Big Red Machine is ready to go." . . .

[From the Mt. Carmel (Pa.) News-Item,
Dec. 2, 1973]

TORNADOES SET RECORD IN DIVISION: MOUNT
CARMEL TITLE SECOND IN ROW

(By Jim George)

MOUNT CARMEL.—Mount Carmel Area High School's Red Tornados used a spectacular fourth period to become the first Southern Division team to ever win back-to-back Eastern Pennsylvania Football Conference championships.

The Tornados whipped the Bucks of Dunmore, 15-6, on the strength of two scoring runs by Kenny Diminick, senior son of Head Coach Joe "Jazz" Diminick. The Tornados had to come from behind for the second game in a row, showing true championship form.

For three periods the Bucks played inspired football while the Tornados appeared listless as linemen missed many blocks.

Then, all of a sudden, Mount Carmel Area players returned to basic football and good blocking to edge ahead 7-6 on a seven-yard touchdown run by Kenny and a placement kick by Bill Joraskie.

A little over two minutes later, the Red and White returned to the same play as Kenny raced 45 yards for another TD. On the two point bonus try, Kenny again used the same off-tackle power play to rack up his thirteenth and fourteenth points of the game and wrap up the twenty-fourth straight win for Mount Carmel Area.

More than 10,000 persons sat in perfect football weather watching the grid spectacular, probably the most colorful and pag-

eantry filled high school football championship game played in Eastern Pennsylvania.

Through the first three periods, each team appeared to perform only in spurts, with neither able to find the right play at the right time. Many times, the Tornadoes would find themselves on a march only to become untracked by a missed block which would result in a yardage loss by a running back.

But, in the long run, the Red Tornadoes showed their mettle by pulling out the win to make the Southern Division history.

Ken Diminick, playing his final high school game, dropped the curtain in spectacular fashion. Used sparingly as a ball carrier most of the season, Ken burst forward in the last two games to establish himself as a top-notch running back, somewhat in the mold of his older brother, Gary, who holds the scoring and rushing records at Mount Carmel Area.

Ken carried 17 times for 106 yards against the Bucks, averaging 6.2 yards per carry. He was by far the leading rusher in the game and if there was an MVP award to be given, Ken would easily have won. On defense, which Ken has admitted he prefers, he accounted for at least seven tackles and intercepted a Dunmore pass in the last minute of action.

But, Ken was not the only star for the Red and White. Vince Rawa, injured nine days earlier, returned to action and was stellar in his blocking and the few times he carried the ball. His punting was a telling factor, also, putting the Bucks in poor field position a number of times.

Other individual performances were of outstanding calibre, but putting them all together produced another title for the Red and White, the fifth championship for Mount Carmel as an Area and community high school.

"THE ADVOCATES" SHOULD CONTINUE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most reliable and consistent forums for dissemination of information to the public has been the Public Broadcasting System which carries "The Advocates" television program. "The Advocates" is the only program presently broadcast which treats issues to public debate. Proponents of opposing viewpoints are given equal time to espouse their theories on subjects ranging from economic policy to capital punishment. I was honored to be asked to appear on the program last week as the advocate of impeachment along with an impressive list of witnesses.

Reprinted below is an article by Terrence O'Flaherty of the San Francisco Chronicle, pointing out the precarious financial position of this worthwhile and informative program. It would be a serious blow to the attempts of those who feel that the public has a "right to know" to eliminate the only television program engaging in public debate on issues of substantial import to the American people.

The article follows:

HONK FOR THE ADVOCATES
(By Terrence O'Flaherty)

For 90 gripping minutes this week the only surviving forum of public debate available to all Americans—"The Advocates"—considered the pros and cons of the proposal

to impeach Richard Nixon. The debate was sobering in its implications, but perhaps even more chilling is the news that the series itself is in grave danger of being canceled.

Representative Jerome Waldie made an impressive advocate of impeachment aided by Representative Paul McCloskey, the deans of two law schools and others who saw the action as the only way to "cleanse our system of the ugliness of its present corruption and to make it clear to future Presidents and present politicians that Americans demand morality, conscience and integrity in their leaders and they do not have such in President Nixon."

The President's approval of the Huston Plan which proposed illegal surveillance and political reprisal against anti-war protesters, blacks and others, was singled out by the proponents as a major justification for impeachment on constitutional terms.

The arguments against impeachment led by William Rusher were based not upon a strong bid for presidential integrity, but upon which might be called "soap box derby" morality which asserted that other Presidents had been equally guilty and upon the argument that "what is going on here is a power struggle and if we abandon the rules by which such struggles are conducted in favor of such politically atomic weapons as impeachment we will regret it until the day America dies."

Your own vote may be registered pro or con to The Advocates; Box 1973; Boston 02134.

No argument put forth for impeachment in this week's debate was as persuasive as Mr. Nixon's determination—long before Watergate—to muzzle the freedom of speech on the Public Broadcasting Service. Although his attempt seemed unbelievable at the time, each week since then has provided the public with additional evidence why such a move would have made sense from the President's standpoint.

The most vital element of a successful democracy is an informed citizenry. In the early days of our nation the information was supplied in the "town meeting" which is now a thing of the past. Today the medium of television could be America's new town meeting hall but, to its shame, TV has only one regularly scheduled vehicle of public debate on major issues. Only one. That is "The Advocates" on PBS.

Where else on television can you hear both sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict or the Alaska Pipeline or labor disputes? It has survived the White House attempts to stifle it along with all public information programming on PBS. Today "The Advocates" is in peril of cancellation because of President Nixon's veto of a two-year funding plan which would eliminate PBS' need to crawl from one year to another.

At present the producers of "The Advocates" are \$400,000 short of funds needed to continue after February. If it is canceled the democratic process in America might as well close its own coffin insofar as public debate on television is concerned.

Let's see now . . . four corporations each making a contribution of \$100,000 each would just about do it. Where are John Mitchell and Maurice Stans now that we really need them?

LAKE ERIE WATER LEVELS STILL "NORMAL"—2 FEET ABOVE AVERAGE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the House Public Works Committee's Subcommittee on Water Resources today held an-

other hearing on the status of the water levels of the Great Lakes. Testimony at the hearings indicates the status is largely unchanged—meaning the Great Lakes remain at or near their historic high water level marks.

Despite an apparent universal recognition of the problems and their scope, little or nothing was volunteered by the Corps of Engineers and the International Joint Commission in the way of solutions to those problems.

The IJC American section chairman, Christian Herter, Jr., informed the subcommittee that water levels would be higher if the SO-901 regulation plan—that attempts to treat the Great Lakes more as a system, instead of on a lake-by-lake basis—had not been instituted. But Mr. Speaker, this is hardly reassuring when we realize that Lakes Michigan, Huron, St. Clair, and my own district's Lake Erie are within less than a foot of their all-time historical highs—ready and waiting for vicious storms like those of November of 1972 to cause more tens of millions of dollars of damage.

Mr. Speaker, I remain extremely upset with the situation and the progress, or better, the very lack of progress toward permanent solutions to these problems. Recognition of the problems and their cause is not enough. We must implement solutions—not just talk about the situations that require them.

Mr. Speaker, in testimony I submitted to the subcommittee, I attempted to make a case for the construction of regulatory controls on the middle lakes, Lakes Superior and Ontario, both regulated, are within several inches of their long-term averages. The unregulated lakes are still in flood stage.

I would like to include for the RECORD some excerpts from that testimony:

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY

Mr. Chairman, we all realize that water levels are largely a result of nature—we cannot stop periodic climate changes from occurring—and we realize that certain amounts of water level fluctuation are inevitable. But Mr. Chairman, a close look at the Great Lakes water levels indicates some interesting things. Using the monthly bulletin of Lake levels for October 1973, prepared by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) of the Department of Commerce, these statistics emerge:

As of the end of October 1973;
Lake Superior—9 inches over the long term average.

Lake Michigan-Huron—20 inches over long term averages.

Lake St. Clair—26 inches over long term average.

Lake Erie—24 inches over long term averages.

Lake Ontario—3 inches over long term averages.

These figures are as revealing as they are disturbing: while most of the lakes are above or close to their historical highs, two of them, Lakes Superior and Ontario, are at levels far closer to long term averages than the other, middle Great Lakes. While Lake Erie water levels in my district are about 24 inches, two full feet, above the long term averages, Lake Ontario is within only 3 inches of its long term average and Lake Superior is only about 9 inches above its long term average. Lake Ontario is unique because it is currently the lake closest to what might be considered its "normal" level. It has reached that level after being more than two feet over its long term average as recently as 6 months ago. Accounting for its seasonal fluctuation, that amounts

to a reduction of over 36 inches of water in half a year for it to reach its present level: something the middle lakes would dearly love to be able to accomplish.

The reasons for Lake Ontario's remarkable recovery and Lake Superior's relative consistent low water levels are apparently their ability to control outflows. Both Lake Ontario and Lake Superior are regulated; equipped with man made controls and devices that allow their outflow to be varied. Lakes Michigan-Huron (treated as a single unit since their connection at the Straits of Mackinac is wide enough and deep enough to permit an unimpeded flow and exchange of waters), St. Clair, and Erie are not regulated—the connecting channels between these bodies of water are not equipped with controls and thus outflow volume is determined only by the depth and width of the channel, the slope of its surface, and the amount of water backed up in the upstream lake.

The monthly levels graphs show that the two regulated lakes have been closer to their long term averages more of the time than the lakes that are not controlled. Mr. Chairman, this is a strong argument for installation of regulation on the other lakes—a deepening of some of their channels to accommodate a larger outflow for periods of high water, and installation of gates and barriers to hold back waters during low water supply periods. The end result would be to reduce the extremes in fluctuations that we have witnessed in the past. Perhaps the reduction would not be a great amount, but shoreline owners all around the Great Lakes can testify that a few inches can mean the difference between losing a 30 year old home and safety. Every inch the levels are lowered means a decrease in the erosion damage to the Great Lakes basin shoreline.

The cost of any regulation of the St. Clair, Detroit, and Niagara Rivers would be great. Major General Ernest Graves of the Army Corps of Engineers testified before this committee in April that "minimal regulation" of all the Great Lakes would cost in the order of \$350 million. But installation of controls at the three additional points would mean that we could now control the entire system of the Great Lakes. For the first time we could treat each lake as a part of the whole of the Great Lakes system.

In view of the possible large project cost, what are the consequences of not installing middle lake controls?

The State of Ohio estimates that the disastrous fall storm of 1972 caused \$22 million of damage and resulted in seven Ohio shoreline counties being declared disaster areas.

An equally devastating storm over the Great Lakes basin in the spring of this year caused more heavy damage. Mayor Daley testified before this committee in April that high waters, wind and wave action of the previous five months had caused \$12 million damage in Chicago alone.

The second highest water levels in history were in a disastrous year that began in the spring of 1951. Damage estimates for that period amounted to \$61 million according to the National Shoreline Study (Great Lakes Region Inventory, August, 1971).

In that same report the Corps of Engineers estimates that a recurrence of storms in the same Great Lakes shoreline region would cause a minimum of \$120 million in property damage. That figure does not include consideration of the development that has occurred on the shoreline since the end of that period of enormous destruction in 1952.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars of private and public money is spent on programs to halt the shoreline erosion that the exceedingly high waters bring. Your committee has heard a great deal of testimony on the need for breakwalls, revetments, coffer dams, and the like—all to prevent the fury of the lakes from reaching or affecting the

shores. Private citizens often spend thousands of dollars apiece in what usually turn out to be useless attempts to save their land and homes. Railroad ties, poured concrete, truckloads of broken cement and sandbags have all proven to be at best only short term deterrents to the wrath of storm driven high water.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the status of the comprehensive Great Lakes Water Levels Study that the Canadian and United States Governments commissioned of the IJC in October of 1964. Almost 10 full years after its initiation, it is still not ready. Hopefully, its contents will hold some of the answers we seek to the high water levels dilemma, but at the rate we are going, its solutions will be outmoded. It is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, that in the face of the suffering and destruction that high water erosion has wrought, we should have to wait this amount of time for a definitive report.

COMMONSENSE IN MEETING ENERGY DEMANDS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in general debate yesterday, I have two amendments to H.R. 11882, the National Energy Emergency Act—formerly H.R. 11450. Pursuant to rule 23, clause 6, I insert these in the RECORD at this point to protect my right to time in the further consideration of amendments to this bill tomorrow:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11882, OFFERED BY MR. WYMAN

Page 59, after line 23, insert the following:
(1) Section 202(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(6) (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law the authority of the Administrator to require emissions controls on automobiles is hereby suspended except for automobiles registered to residents of those areas of the United States as specified by subsection (b) of this section, until January 1, 1977 or the day on which the President declares that shortage of petroleum is at an end, whichever occurs later.

(b) Within 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall designate, subject to the limitations set forth herein, geographic areas of the United States in which there is significant auto emissions related air pollution. The Administrator shall not designate as such area any part of the United States outside the following Air Quality Control Regions as defined by the Administrator as of the date of enactment of this paragraph without justification to and prior approval of the Congress.

- (A) Phoenix-Tucson, intrastate.
- (B) Metropolitan Los Angeles, intrastate.
- (C) San Francisco Bay Area.
- (D) Sacramento Valley area.
- (E) San Diego area.
- (F) San Joaquin Valley area (California).
- (G) Hartford-New Haven (Conn.-Springfield (Mass.)) area.
- (H) District of Columbia, Maryland and Eastern Virginia area.

(I) Metropolitan Baltimore and abutting counties.

(J) New Jersey, downstate New York and Connecticut area.

(K) Metropolitan Philadelphia and abutting counties area.

(L) Metropolitan Chicago and abutting counties (Ill. & Ind.)

(M) Metropolitan Boston and abutting counties area.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'significant air pollution' means the presence of air pollutants from automobile emissions at such levels and for such durations as to cause a demonstrable and severe adverse impact upon public health."

(2) Section 202(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Regulations prescribed under this subsection shall not apply to motor vehicles or motor vehicle engines registered by owners who reside in geographic areas which are not designated by the Administrator under section 202(b)(6) as areas in which there is significant air pollution, for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph, and ending on January 1, 1977, or the day on which the President declares that shortage of petroleum is at an end, whichever occurs later."

(3) Section 203(a)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) for any person to register, on or after 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, a motor vehicle engine for which the regulations prescribed under section 202(a)(1) do not apply under section 202(a)(3) if such person resides in a geographic area designated by the Administrator to be a geographic area in which there is significant air pollution; or"

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11852, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. WYMAN

Page 59, after line 23, insert the following:

(h) (1) Section 202(b)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act is amended by striking out "reduction of at least 90 per centum from emissions of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons allowable under the standards under this section applicable to light duty vehicles and engines manufactured in model year 1970," and inserting in lieu thereof "reduction of at least 90 per centum from the estimate of the average emissions of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons which would have been emitted from light duty motor vehicles and engines manufactured during model year 1970 had such vehicles and engines not been subject to any Federal or State emission standard for carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons. Such estimate of the average of emissions shall be determined by the Administrator under regulations."

NATIVITY SCENE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Court of Appeals recently ruled that the nativity scene must be dropped from the National Pageant of Peace on the Ellipse, or the Government must limit their participation in the event.

This decision has shocked millions of people at a time when our Christmas season is approaching and the feeling of love emanates from us all.

Fortunately, the American Christian Heritage Association has taken the initiative to see that Christ is put back in Christmas. I would like, at this point, to

insert into the RECORD an article explaining the action planned by the American Christian Heritage Association.

The article follows:

**AMERICAN CHRISTIAN HERITAGE ASSOCIATION
RECEIVES PERMIT FOR NATIVITY SCENE**

Recently, the U.S. Court of Appeals, citing "... excessive government entanglement with religion ..." hit at the very heart of our Christian Heritage. It ruled that the Nativity scene must be dropped from the National Pageant of Peace on the Ellipse, or the government must limit its participation in the event. This ruling is contrary to the beliefs of millions of Americans, and not acceptable at this time.

The American Christian Heritage Association has petitioned for and received a permit to erect the Nativity scene near the Ellipse during the annual Pageant of Peace. As a private, non-profit association, we are attempting to eliminate all possible conflicts with the recent ruling. Working within the spirit of the law, under the rights given by the First Amendment to the Constitution, we feel it is appropriate and proper to display the Nativity scene as an expression of our Christian Heritage.

The federal court ruling, in its decision, severely hampers the National Park Service and their participation in the organization and programing of this annual event. We feel that the Park Service has provided the continuity necessary for the success that the Pageant of Peace enjoyed for the past 19 years, and is a necessary ingredient in future programs.

Almost two centuries of rich heritage can be found in this land which stretches from the Atlantic on the East, to the Pacific on the West, however in recent years the foundation on which the United States was built has been chipped away by liberal elements in this country.

The modernist version of Christmas conveniently forgets that this season is celebrated because of the birth of the baby Jesus almost 2000 years ago, and that the founding fathers of this great nation gave their lives to settle this foreign land for their convictions of religious freedom.

By our action, the American Christian Heritage Association is returning to the people of the United States, the opportunity to participate in the Pageant of Peace. We invite individuals and organizations to assist us in sponsoring the Nativity scene by their contributions and their prayers. Also, we invite the people of the United States to visit the Nation's Capital during the Pageant of Peace, and to view the Nativity scene which this year, and for years to come, will remain the central theme of the Christmas Season.

Contributions and inquiries may be sent to the American Christian Heritage Association, P.O. Box 347, Greenbelt, Maryland 20770.

COAL SEVERANCE TAX

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in 1972 West Virginia once again led the Nation in coal production. McDowell County in my congressional district was the leading coal producing county in West Virginia. Yet the tremendous wealth resulting from this coal production is not going to McDowell County or to West Virginians. This unjust situation can only be corrected by fairly taxing coal lands and coal production. The

Sport Fishing Institute has endorsed a national severance tax on coal. I have introduced H.R. 5349 to provide for a severance tax. Following are the remarks of Carl Sullivan, the institute's able executive secretary, concerning the need for a severance tax. His speech clearly outlines the situation in McDowell County, a situation that is repeated throughout the coal fields.

Mr. Sullivan's remarks were delivered July 26, 1973, at the summer meeting of the Natural Resource Council of America.

The remarks follow:

**PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL SEVERANCE TAX ON
COAL**

(Remarks by Carl R. Sullivan)

In May of 1973 the Board of Directors of the Sport Fishing Institute unanimously adopted the following resolution urging the imposition of a National Severance Tax on the production of coal.

"NATIONAL SEVERANCE TAX ON COAL

"Whereas, coal resources are America's most abundant and least costly source of energy yet, despite the national energy crisis, coal is supplying less than twenty percent of our energy demands; and

"Whereas, the President of the United States has urged that the expanded development and utilization of our coal resources should have the highest national priority; and

"Whereas, coal mining operations on America's public and private lands have had catastrophic effect on the environment, with 17,000 miles of formerly productive streams and lakes poisoned by acid mine waters and six to ten million acres of once-useful land laid waste and requiring reclamation; and

"Whereas, despite the many State-imposed coal mining regulations and pending Federal legislation, coal mining pollution problems continue to grow without realistic prospects for meaningful reclamation and without specific funds to support such reclamation;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Board of Directors of the Sport Fishing Institute, assembled in regular Annual Session on May 15, 1973, at Montreal, Quebec, do herewith declare that reclaiming and repairing the land and water areas ravaged by the coal industry is a matter of enormous national urgency; and

"Be it further resolved, that the United States Congress is herewith urged to authorize and the Administration to levy a National Severance Tax on all coal mined in or imported into the United States, with all funds thus collected being committed to the repair of environmental damage caused by past, present, and future coal mining operations."

Virtually everyone is aware of the many serious environmental, economic, and social problems that are associated with the coal mining industry. In order to better document the need for a severance tax let us examine the case history of one coal-field county. We have selected McDowell County in southern West Virginia, which has produced more coal than any other county in the United States.

McDowell County, 538 square miles of beautiful and inaccessible hill country of the state of Virginia became a county in 1858. At that time, it was almost entirely in public ownership. Virtually the entire county was covered with a virgin stand of hardwood timber. The fewer than 300 residents of the area were located in isolated log cabins and were living off the land. Even at that early date, the settlers were aware of the abundance of coal in the county; however, they made little use of it.

In 1863 McDowell County chose to join the other western Virginia counties in forming the new state of West Virginia. There were few changes in the life style of the people, however, until 1888 and the arrival of the

Norfolk and Western Railroad. The "boom-and-bust" story of what has happened to McDowell County in the 85 ensuing years is one of the great tragedies of our time. It is also a prime example of what can happen when an apathetic public elects and tolerates unenlightened, timid and short-sighted governments to protect the public interest in dealings with an aggressive and exploitive natural resource industry. The responsibility for what has happened to McDowell County must be shared by the public and the government as well as by the industry.

In the past 85 years, McDowell County has produced 1,320,533,000 tons of coal. That is a staggering amount which may be easier to visualize as a line of coal-gondola rail cars reaching 10 times around the earth or from here to the moon. Placing a value on 1.3 billion tons of coal is difficult because of inflation, widely fluctuating prices and varying product quality. Our conservative estimate of 5 billion dollars would be much higher in terms of today's dollar value.

With such fantastic wealth flowing almost endlessly from its underground coal reservoir, one could easily imagine McDowell County as the twentieth century "Garden of Eden" with all of the public facilities and opportunities that money could buy and an environment to match. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

In 1971 public welfare costs in McDowell County were \$3,747,104. Computed at \$73.90 per county resident, that's twice the statewide average in West Virginia. It is worthy of note that the total 1971 McDowell County tax collections from all property classes amounted to \$3,525,000 or roughly \$225,000 less than the cost of welfare alone.

In 1970 the McDowell County per capita income was \$2,763 compared to West Virginia's average of \$3,034 and the U.S. average of \$3,933.

The last 15-year average unemployment rate in McDowell County was 14.6% far above the West Virginia and the U.S. average figure.

McDowell County contains five sizable streams having an estimated water area of 554 acres. Fifty-seven percent of these waters are so grossly polluted that they cannot sustain a fish population. The remaining waters are affected to a lesser degree. Per capita hunting and fishing license sales in McDowell County are less than 1/3 of the statewide West Virginia average.

McDowell County's population declined 29% from 1960 to 1970 (71,359 to 50,666). This represents the sharpest decline of any of West Virginia's 55 counties. McDowell County has no commercial airports, no public golf courses, extremely poor roads, and a dearth of cultural opportunities.

(Note: SFI wishes to point out that it is not their purpose to deride McDowell County nor its friendly, energetic, and resourceful people. The County has a variety of fine institutions, a colorful history, and potentially a bright future. It does, however, have great environmental problems which are symptomatic of the entire Appalachian coal fields.)

Unfortunately, McDowell County has more than its share of streams poisoned by mine acid and black with coal washings. There is an abundance of huge, ugly slate dumps, many of which have been burning and sending off acid-forming sulfur fumes for years. Abandoned coal tipples, conveyor systems, and mine buildings are plentiful. Hillsides are permanently marked by countless strip mining scars and broken stands of timber smashed by avalanches of rocks and boulders that now fill the valleys.

How, you may ask, is it possible for an area to create such fabulous wealth and be left so devastated, destitute, and neglected in the process. It is simply because the coal industry has not been required to pay its fair share of the tax load necessary to ameliorate the environmental consequences of its activities. Profits have been huge but they have been

quickly channeled out of the county and out of the state by non-resident corporations which have not been made to accept their responsibility to the land and to those who occupy it now and who will occupy it in future generations. McDowell County and the hundreds of other coal-mining counties of Appalachia can never be restored to their pristine conditions. However, it is not too late to reverse past trends and to correct much of the damage that has been wrought.

In McDowell County, the 25 largest land owners (all of whom have direct coal interests) own 70 percent of the land. Despite the fact that the West Virginia legislature has provided that land must be assessed at its true value, and despite the fact that undeveloped coal lands are sold on the open market for very large sums, the value of the known coal reserves in the ground is not considered in establishing property tax assessment levels. Much acreage in West Virginia is reportedly on the tax rolls at \$1.00 or less per acre and as a consequence the coal industry pays only minimum real estate and property taxes. The industry does pay a state business and occupation tax but then so does every other business or industry and, ironically, the rate charged to the coal industry is less than for most other categories. One hundred forty five million tons of coal were extracted from West Virginia's deep mines in 1968. The value of that coal was 725 million dollars yet the industry paid only 11.6 million in direct taxes. It is interesting to note that West Virginia's taxes on liquor and cigarettes were both roughly 13 million dollars in the same period.

McDowell County's estimated recoverable coal reserves are 1,898,232,000 tons or sufficient to last about 125 years at present rate of extraction. The estimate for all of West Virginia is a staggering 58 billion tons. Coal has historically been in keen competition with oil; however, the growing national energy shortage virtually guarantees that demands for vast quantities of coal will continue for many years.

It is our opinion that a national coal severance tax should be imposed as quickly as possible. Such a tax is the only practical source of funds to repair the environmental devastation resulting from the extraction of coal. A severance tax has been proposed in West Virginia on many occasions. Each time, however, the industry has defeated the move by loudly protesting that such a tax would destroy the competitive position of coal and thus lead to the rapid decline of the industry and mass unemployment. The facts do not support the industry's contention, as is amply demonstrated by the experience of the United Mine Workers.

In 1946 the United Mine Workers, after a long and bitter contract dispute with the coal industry won coal production royalty payments of 5 cents per ton for the Union's Welfare and Retirement Fund. The industry fought the proposal with every weapon available to it. Only after the government had taken over the operation of the mines did the industry agree to the 5 cent royalty as a condition of their return. In reluctantly agreeing to the new terms, the industry forecast a dark future and gradual demise of the coal business.

In its first year (1946) the U. M. W. Welfare and Retirement Fund earned \$1,266,000 from McDowell County production alone. In 1947, when the contract royalty increased to 10 cents per ton, the U. M. W. received \$2,522,000. The 1948 agreement specified 20 cents per ton and the Fund earned over 5 million dollars from McDowell County alone. The royalty payments were increased to 40 cents per ton in 1952 and remained at that figure until 1971, when they were increased to 60 cents. In May of 1974 the royalty will increase to 80 cents a ton, with the Welfare and Retirement Fund earning roughly 12 million dollars a year from the coal produc-

tion in McDowell County, West Virginia, alone.

In the past 27 years, altogether, the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund has earned about 165 million dollars from McDowell County coal production. Imagine the fabulous environmental improvements that could be funded with such a sum. The U.S. Soil Conservation Service estimates that McDowell County has 10,000 acres of unreclaimed strip mines. Based upon a \$3,000-per-acre reclamation cost (as estimated in a 1973 CEQ/Senate Interior Committee report) these 10,000 acres could be reclaimed and reseeded for 30 million dollars. There is no accurate count of the total number of abandoned and active underground mining operations in McDowell County but it most certainly numbers in the thousands. Everyone of these mines has, at a very minimum, one slate dump to despoil the landscape. It is entirely feasible to remove these dumps or to level and cover them with top soil. A spokesman for the U.S. Bureau of Mines says that many of these slate dumps contain up to 35% or more of usable coal that, in many instances, may be economically feasible to recover. A modest severance tax could long ago have eliminated these dumps plus the abandoned rail and conveyor systems, unused coal tipples, and the countless other scars left by the industry. When all the reclamation work was completed, there would have been ample money left over to build public fishing lakes, golf courses, picnic areas, and the other public facilities which, we contend, a portion of the coal wealth should justifiably have provided.

The time for a national severance tax is long overdue but it is not too late. Theoretically, McDowell County could pass its own tax but, as a practical matter, this does not appear to be politically feasible. The same might be said for a state severance tax but, again, the strong local influence of the coal industry makes passage doubtful in the important coal-producing states.

A few states already have coal severance taxes but most are at relatively low rate levels. Furthermore, they occur in states having relatively little coal production. Ohio has a 4 cents per ton tax, in Arkansas the tax is 2 cents per ton, and in Idaho it is 3 cents per ton. Tennessee charges 1.5% of gross income up to a maximum of 10 cents per ton, New Mexico collects one eighth of one percent of gross income, while Utah collects 2% of gross income over \$50,000 per year. Alabama receives 13.5 cents per ton and Montana an average of 27 cents per ton. In 1972 Kentucky, one of the top producing states, made a major advance by levying a severance tax of 30 cents per ton. The major producing states of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Virginia, where the problems are the greatest, collect no severance taxes. The few existing state severance taxes need not complicate a national tax for it would be relatively simple to provide for appropriate deductions. In addition, a national tax would tend to discourage the coal industry from "shopping around" for states and localities with the least severance tax or with the minimum environmental safeguards.

The paradox of McDowell County's wealth-producing/poverty-stricken circumstances is almost beyond belief, yet it is very real. No possible explanation can vindicate it and the conscience of an aroused citizenry should demand that it be corrected.

A national severance tax—with the receipts specifically earmarked for environmental reclamation in coal producing areas—is, in our judgment, the best available answer. Of course, the cost of coal would go up, correspondingly, but so be it. Our energy requirements are such that we must use the coal regardless of price and, in the final analysis, the public will be paying the bill as it always does.

REPORT ON THE SAHELIAN DROUGHT—WEST AFRICA

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 13, 1973

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues a report on my recent trip to West Africa. This report has been prepared by myself and the six black clergymen who made up the delegation responding to the invitation of President Diori Hamani of Niger. I hope that the information that we have brought back with us will help to feed the thousands of people in Western Africa suffering from starvation because of a severe drought. I hope that this report proves to be useful to my many colleagues. The report follows:

REPORT

DECEMBER 10, 1973.

To: The President of the United States; The Congress of the United States; and The American People.

From: The Reverend Walter E. Fauntroy, M.C.; Dr. L. Venchael Booth, President, Progressive National Baptist Convention; Bishop Alfred G. Dunstan, Chairman, Board of Bishops of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church; Mr. Richard Hightower, International Christian Leadership; Bishop Harold R. Perry, Auxiliary Bishop, The Catholic Church; Bishop H. Thomas Primm, Chairman, Board of Bishops—The African Methodist Episcopal Church; Bishop Ruben L. Speaks, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church; and Bishop Smallwood E. Williams, Bibleway Church World Wide.

Subject: The Sahelian Drought—West Africa.

Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these my little ones, ye did it not to me.—St. Matthew 25: 45.

Moved by a common concern for "The Least of These," we have just concluded a visit to the Sahelian Region of Africa where six of the poorest nations in the world are in the grip of a 7-year-long drought that has brought hunger, disease, starvation and death to millions of livestock and tens of thousands of human beings. We made the trip at the invitation of the President of one of the beleaguered nations, President Diori Hamani of Niger.

During the course of our eight day visit (November 28–December 7, 1973), we had the opportunity to discuss the situation with President Diori and numerous members of his Cabinet, Mr. Antoine Dakoure, Minister of Agriculture in Upper Volta and Chairman of the six nation Interstate Committee on the Drought at Ouagadougou, Upper Volta, President Abdelwahab Labidi of the African Development Bank in Abidjan, Ivory Coast, and several of our U.S. Ambassadors.

We are pleased to report, first, that we were well received as American citizens throughout the Sahel, a tribute to the fact that contributions by both private American donor groups and by our U.S. Government to the drought relief effort thus far have been significant and much appreciated. We regret to report, however, that the crisis has deepened for the year 1974 and that we must do substantially much more this year to avert complete disaster and to place these nations in a position to help themselves.

1. THE DEEPENING CRISIS

What we saw in the Sahel were the effects of a seven year lack of adequate rainfall which has caused millions of acres of crops

to fall, livestock to perish by the millions, and people to die by the thousands. The six nations have now exhausted all of their grain reserves and another dry year has caused the failure of 80% of their crops. The result is that a 1½ million ton shortage of grain is expected in the six Sahelian nations this year. Thus, while the 250,000 tons of grain we have pledged for 1974 is encouraging, it falls far short of what is required next year. We call upon our Government, therefore, to convene within the next three months an international conference of the developed nations of the world to plan how they shall meet together the emergency needs of the Sahelian nations for food, health, and medical care this year with particular attention to transportation and storage facilities problems.

II. MEDIUM TO LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

If we are to avoid being faced with a continued crisis next year, the U. S. and the international community must step up immediately the medium to long term development aid required to make these countries self sufficient. It can be done, the people of the Sahel Zone want to do it. Their leaders everywhere told us, "We have the manpower, the rich soil, and the underground water resources; we know where the water is; all we need is the capital to purchase the technology to bring it up and make the dry land bloom."

We saw with our own eyes the kinds of irrigation, dam building, well digging, animal husbandry, and manpower training projects which, if sufficiently expanded, could not only put these nations on their feet but also make them a blessing to the rest of the world. Without a "Marshall Plan" type effort by the Developed Nations of the world, this can never come to pass.

Thus, while the U. S. has made a creditable effort to meet the emergency, we were embarrassed to note that our government has not contributed a cent to the multi-lateral

institution formed to meet the medium to long range development needs of the Sahel, the African Development Fund of the African Development Bank.

We return, therefore, to urge our President and our government to add to its proposal for aid to the I.D.A. and the Asian Development bank, the sum of \$60 million once pledged by President Johnson to the special fund of the African development bank for use in meeting the Sahel Crisis. Our discussions with President Diiori of Niger, Mr. Dakoure of the Interstate Committee, and Mr. Labidi of the African Development Bank, assure us that many of these medium to long range projects are ready for funding, awaiting only the kind of leadership we in this country should give. Our failure to share in the funding of the African Development Bank is a continuing source of embarrassment to our diplomats in Africa that this crisis affords us an opportunity to eliminate.

III. RENEWED AND EXPANDED EFFORT BY PRIVATE GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS IN AMERICA

Throughout our tour, we encountered a note of genuine appreciation for the contributions of Americans to the drought relief effort. The contributions of such groups in the private sector as Africare, the Catholic Relief Service, Church World Services, Care, Rains, The International Red Cross, Push, the United Auto Workers, American Friends Service Committee, and others have not gone unnoticed or unappreciated. The work of our government agencies: The Peace Corps; Aid (Agency for International Development); and in some instances our Air Force, have all created for us a climate of goodwill in Africa.

The deepening nature of the crisis in 1974, however, calls for a redoubling of our efforts in the private sector while we step up our government aid. We announce, third, therefore, that it is our intention to convene with Africare a national conference on the Sahelian drought. We shall ask the leaders of our religious bodies in America, the volun-

tary agencies which are at work in the Sahel, civic, fraternal, social, educational and civil rights groups that have an interest in the problem to come to Washington in the near future for a day or more of analysis of the situation and the selection, from a number of proposals of specific projects to fund in the six Sahelian nations to alleviate the crisis.

IV. "SUBDUE THE EARTH"—TIME FOR MAN TO FIGHT

So God created man in his own image . . . and said unto them. Be fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it.—Genesis 1: 27-28.

In contrast to sentiments expressed by some of our American officials stationed in the Sahel, we were most impressed with the boundless hope that the African people and their leaders have in our ability to win the fight against the desert. They know from their "oral tradition" what we know from our geology, archeology and anthropology: namely, that the Sahelian Zone like the Sahara Desert was once a flourishing forest, and that over thousands of years man has retreated before a growing desert that creeps southward at a rate of thirty miles a year today.

The courage and determination of the Sahelian people are saying to mankind, armed as we are with modern technology, Let us stand and fight. Let us reclaim the vast regions and rich land lost to nature even as we have defied gravity to reach the moon.

The population explosion and the worldwide commodity shortage demand that we as Americans join with them in this historic effort to reclaim the Good Earth.

Signed:

The Reverend Walter E. Fauntroy, Member of Congress; Dr. L. Venchael Booth; Bishop Alfred G. Dunston; Mr. Richard Hightower; Bishop Harold R. Perry; Bishop H. Thomas Primm; Bishop Ruben L. Speaks; and Bishop Smallwood E. Williams.

SENATE—Friday, December 14, 1973

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

PRAYER

The Reverend Monsignor Patrick J. Ryan, major general, U.S. Army (retired), former Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Army, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, You have fulfilled our Founding Fathers' faith in Your divine providence by making and keeping us a land rich in the abundance of Your creation.

Freedom, justice, and universal brotherhood are for us our precious heritage, but, for countless men in our midst and all over the world, they are still only a dream. May we be faithful to share this heritage with the living and transmit it to a people still unborn.

This we ask through our Lord Jesus Christ, Your Son, who lives and reigns with You in the unity of the Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1973.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ABOUREZK thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11575) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. SIKES, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. McFALL, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, and Mr. CEDERBERG were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9142) to restore, support, and maintain modern, efficient rail service in the Northeast region of the United States; to designate a system of essential rail lines in the Northeast region; to provide financial assistance to certain rail carriers; and for other purposes, agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. SKUBITZ, and Mr. SHOUP were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11324) to provide for daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a 2-year trial period, and to require the Federal Communications Commission to permit certain daytime broadcast stations to operate before local sunrise.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill: