

trol Act of 1974; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12212. A bill to prohibit the exportation of grain from the United States whenever the supply of grain is not sufficient to meet domestic needs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 12213. A bill to establish a National Energy Information System, to authorize the Department of the Interior to undertake an inventory of U.S. energy resources on public lands and elsewhere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 12214. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to require the President to set a ceiling price on certain domestic crude petroleum not to exceed prices prevailing on May 15, 1973, adjusted for cost increases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 12215. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention and treatment of, and research in, Huntington's Disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 12216. A bill to amend the act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 12217. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide appropriate ceremonies with respect to the burial of veterans in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 12218. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to repeal the equal

time requirement for candidates for the Office of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12219. A bill to establish a National Energy Information System, to authorize the Department of the Interior to undertake an inventory of U.S. energy resources on public lands and elsewhere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 12220. A bill to establish a national homestead program under which single-family dwellings owned by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may be conveyed at nominal cost to individuals and families who will occupy and rehabilitate them; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 12221. A bill to declare Lake Oswego, Ore., a nonnavigable water of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.J. Res. 872. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the right to life to the unborn, the ill, the aged, or the incapacitated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.J. Res. 873. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Energy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.J. Res. 874. Joint resolution to designate the first week in October of each year as "National Father-Son Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution designating February of each year as "American History Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution to

establish a Joint Committee on Energy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DENT, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. RABICK, Mr. ZION, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. ROE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. PODELL, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. SIKES, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HUBER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. KARTH, Mr. NIX, Mr. VANIK, Mr. FULTON, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, and Mr. LONG of Maryland):

H. Res. 774. Resolution declaring the sense of the House with respect to a prohibition of extension of credit by the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H. Res. 775. Resolution providing for an investigation of the amount of petroleum resources; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 776. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the health effects of the current energy crisis on the poor; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 777. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of the nationalization of the oil industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. Res. 778. Resolution to provide further funds for the expenses of the investigations and study authorized by House Resolution 187; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FAUNTROY (by request) introduced a bill (H.R. 12222) to correct an inequity in the case of certain applications for letters patent of Tsukumo Nobusawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### IMPLEMENTATION OF MPAP CAUSES CONFUSION AT ALL LEVELS

#### HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the mandatory petroleum allocation program went into effect on November 1. At that time its Administrator said that he did not have the staff to handle this program and it would take him 60 to 90 days to set it up. However, this country was expected to live under a program for 2 to 3 months that was not in full operation. Not only were those administering and affected by the program at local and State levels confused and unsure of its provisions and authority, but we in Congress were not much more successful in obtaining answers from those responsible for the program at the Federal level. And, the MPAP has been revised several times since its issuance to make up for the hasty, seemingly thoughtless omissions and mistakes made in the promulgation of the first regulations.

As an example of the lack of information our States are getting on this program, I wish to share with you a copy

of a letter Mr. Pat Moran, fuel allocation officer for the State of Arkansas, wrote to Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton. I am afraid that such problems are not peculiar only to the Arkansas allocation officer.

It is time for us to stop the backbiting over how we got into this situation and who is to blame. We have got to start working together to get some truthful answers to the extent of this crisis and then constructively take measures to alleviate it.

The letter follows:

#### ARKANSAS PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,

Little Rock, Ark., November 19, 1973.

Hon. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,  
Secretary of Interior, Department of the  
Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the past month I have attended approximately three briefings at the invitation of your agency, or the Energy Policy Office, which were supposedly designed to bring appropriate state officials up to date on the workings of the newly formed "middle distillate fuels allocation program" formulated and announced by the Energy Policy Office for implementation by the Department of Interior, effective November 1, 1973.

My knowledge of the "middle distillate allocation program" was, and still is, what I have gleaned from a careful reading and re-reading of the program as it was printed in the Federal Register when it was first an-

nounced. Much of the publicity surrounding the initiation of this program emphasized that the individual state governments were expected to play an important role in carrying out its day to day operation. In an effort to learn in more detail how the State of Arkansas could do its part during the current energy shortage, I have attended these briefing sessions of your department, all to no avail; the speakers are not sure of anything when questioned by the various state officials in attendance.

However, the particular briefing which takes the cake, so to speak, was the one in Dallas, Texas last Friday morning, November 16. This meeting, to which each Governor in this region was asked to send a representative, was addressed by Under Secretary Whitaker in your absence. Secretary Whitaker delivered an absolutely ridiculous speech (although it was mercifully short) in which he sought to convince the audience that President Nixon had seen the present fuel shortage coming for years and that it was the Congress who was at fault for failure to act.

Secretary Morton, most of the people in the Dallas audience last Friday came in an effort to get some answers about the day to day workings and administration of the fuel allocation program being sponsored by your department. What they received was a thinly disguised political speech which no one appreciated. In the current stage of the energy shortage we are surely past playing the asinine game wherein one branch of our government blames another for our troubles (a

point very aptly made by Congressman Milford of Texas at the Dallas meeting.)

Whether it be termed "New Federalism" or otherwise, the States are ready to assume any responsibility given them in the present energy situation. In Arkansas, Governor Bumpers created a State Energy Office one week before the middle distillate program was announced. We have since doubled the force in that office and we will increase personnel again if this is needed in order to insure that no Arkansan has to bear more than his or her share of the energy shortage. Our State Energy Office has printed its own forms because we have yet to receive any forms from the Federal Government. These self-generated forms have been sent to the appropriate people throughout the fuel distribution chain in Arkansas and the completed versions thereof have been filed with your office in Washington. In connection with these make-shift forms our Attorney General recently filed a petition seeking state wide relief from our agricultural diesel fuel shortage and at this writing it appears that our prayer for relief has, in part, been granted.

The point I make, however, is that what relief we have thus far received has been almost wholly a result of a herculean joint effort by our entire Congressional delegation, the Governor's Office, and the State Attorney General. We would have been completely out of diesel fuel to harvest crops 10 days ago if we were depending upon a citizens request to make its way through local, regional, and national levels for review. So, please spare us any more Under Secretary's speeches about how much the present administration is on top of our energy problems. I don't believe we can stand it (literally).

Sincerely yours,

PAT MORAN,  
Fuel Allocation Officer.

**NATION'S GREATEST NEED: REVERSE DOWNWARD TREND OF ETHICS, WRITES ROSCOE DRUMMOND AS HE COMMENDS AMERICAN VIEWPOINT, INC., EFFORTS**

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the noted columnist, Roscoe Drummond, writing another forthright chapter of his "Point of View," in the Wednesday January 16, 1974, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, discussed "The Nation's Greatest Need," namely,

To reverse the downward drift we have been witnessing for a decade of violence and lawless government. Such a reversal would be life-giving.

Mr. Drummond declared that:

Corrupt politics, shabby ethics, and widespread dishonesty are death-dealing to human freedom and to democratic government.

And he expressed enthusiasm for the:

One organization which is setting out to do something about declining ethics in the U.S.—the organization called American Viewpoint, Inc.—and its premise goes to the heart of the matter. It is: "Let's Make America Honest Enough to Stay Free." That theme means what it says—it is crucial to do something about it now. It may sound idealistic. So what? It may sound Utopian. It isn't; it's practical. Healthy ethics is no more Utopian than a healthy democracy. Neglect one and you kill the other.

It was reassuring to read Mr. Drummond's appraisal of American Viewpoint, headed by Ivan Hill, president, University Square, Chapel Hill, N.C. Its sole, nonprofit concern being to help "make honesty a working social principle, rather than a moral issue apart from our daily lives." He wrote:

From first hand experience, I can vouch for American Viewpoint. It is sound and sane.

Mr. President, I have felt so, too, especially since reading its full page advertisement in the Friday, December 14, 1973, issue of the Wall Street Journal making a special appeal to business leaders "with the courage and faith to support a movement to make America more honest".

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Roscoe Drummond's column, "Point of View," under the heading, "The Nation's Greatest Need," from the Wednesday, January 16, 1974, the Christian Science Monitor, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column by Mr. Drummond was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 16, 1974]

#### THE NATION'S GREATEST NEED

The No. 1 problem in the United States is not the energy crisis nor health nor housing nor unemployment—urgent as these matters are.

It's something else.

It's sleazy ethics and pervasive dishonesty in just about everything—in government, in politics, in business, in labor, and to some extent in the media. They all suffer from widespread public distrust.

The truth is that a lack of faith is dangerously eroding the resources of the nation.

Here is one verdict which is blunt and to the point:

"People are fed up, disillusioned by the liars. Sick of the exploiters.

People want faith instead of anxiety. Faith in themselves, faith in their unions, their schools, their government. Faith in each other.

"They are ready to believe in ethics and honesty. But to improve our system, we must improve ourselves. That's the challenge."

But just how important is it to confront this challenge and begin to do something about it? Is it something just nice to do or is it imperative? I submit that corrupt politics, shabby ethics, and widespread dishonesty are death-dealing to human freedom and to democratic government. To reverse the downward drift we have been witnessing for a decade of lawless violence and lawless government will be life-giving.

One organization, which is setting out to do something about declining ethics in the U.S., is called American Viewpoint, Inc., and its premise goes to the heart of the matter. It is: "Let's Make America Honest Enough to Stay Free."

This is not mere rhetoric. History makes it amply clear that the alternative to a decent and workable standard of honor and honesty in any society is not disorder, it is enforced discipline; it is repression; it is the authoritarian state and, in the end, dictatorship.

That is why the theme, "Let's Make America Honest Enough to Stay Free," means what it says. That's why it is crucial to do something about it now. It may sound idealistic. So what? It may sound Utopian. It isn't, it's practical. Healthy ethics is no more Utopian than a healthy democracy. Neglect one and you kill the other.

The danger is plain to see. It is not an overstatement to say that it is as great a challenge to American freedom as World War II. We either face it or run away from it and suffer the consequences.

Much can be done individually to restore higher ethical conduct to all our relations. But collective efforts will be needed. I make this suggestion:

Shouldn't every major civic organization in the U.S.—like the League of Women Voters, the Junior Chambers of Commerce, Rotary, Kiwanis—every labor union, every business organization, every professional group, make it a first priority in 1974 to study codes of ethics to find out how well they work and find ways to make them work better?

I'm not talking about ethics you frame and hang on the wall. I am not talking about ethics with which to measure others, but ethics to measure ourselves and to live by.

The leaders of these and other organizations can do much to stir and stimulate a genuine revival of ethics-at-work in the U.S. and one way to begin would be to consult with American Viewpoints, Inc., whose sole, non-profit concern is to help "make honesty a working social principle, rather than a moral issue apart from our daily lives."

The address is: Ivan Hill, president, University Square, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514. From firsthand experience I can vouch for American Viewpoint. It is sound and sane.

The American people can have any kind of government, any kind of politics, any kind of society they want. But it won't come from wishing; only from doing.

THE LATE DR. MANUEL GIBERGA

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the Members of the death last week of my good friend, Dr. Manuel Giberga.

The former treasurer of the Republican National Heritage Groups Council and, at his death, third vice chairman of the council, Dr. Giberga was known widely for his philanthropic and humanitarian deeds. He also was vice chairman of the President's Advisory Council to the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking Americans.

Manuel Raphael Giberga was born September 3, 1916, in Havana, Cuba. He was graduated from Havana University where he received his B.A. degree in 1939 and his M.A. in 1945 in social, economic, and political history. He completed postgraduate studies at the University of Villanueva in Havana in economics and marketing. He became an economic adviser to the Cuban Labor Department in 1947 and in 1948 worked with the Cuban Treasury Department in sugar fiscal control.

From 1946 to 1966 Dr. Giberga was an international consultant to many South American banking and business firms. He held a seat on the New York coffee and sugar exchanges. Through 1968 he was president of Tinguaro sugar mill in Louisiana. He was Director of Tax Division Sugar Production in the Cuban Treasury Department and special economic consultant to the Prime Minister of Cuba, Dr. Carlos Prío, 1952-55.

One of the recent highlights of Manuel Giberga's career was his indefatigable efforts in bringing to fruition the return to the United States from Spain of 25,000 Cuban refugees. He was a war hero, a patriot, a civic leader.

Dr. Giberga was the author of a number of books and articles in the field of economics.

Mr. Speaker, Manuel is survived by his wife, Lillian, of Washington, D.C., and eight daughters. I take this time to alert many Members of Congress of his death since it may not have been called to their attention while Congress was adjourned.

POWER OF THE PURSE

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed and disturbed by the continued thwarting by the executive branch of not only the will and the express direction of the Congress but also of the indifference and disregard of the interests by the executive branch of our citizens in rural communities.

Specifically at this time I refer to the impoundment of moneys appropriated to construct needed water and sewer facilities in rural areas.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial on this subject appearing in the New York Times on December 17, 1973:

POWER OF THE PURSE

Congress in its collective wisdom decided last year and again this year to appropriate funds for the construction of needed water and sewer systems in rural areas. The executive branch decided that the program was unnecessary and impounded the money.

Far from being "redundant"—to use the Administration's word—the program in dispute is distinct from the Government's existing program, which has to do with sewage treatment systems, not sewers themselves. But even if the Administration's explanation were sound, it would be no answer to the real question involved.

The question is this: Which branch of government is constitutionally charged with making laws and appropriating the necessary money and which branch is charged with executing those laws and spending that money? Even in this instance, where Congress has explicitly directed the expenditure within a fixed period, the Administration takes the view that its judgment must prevail.

Its action should quicken the pace of Congressional efforts to curb a growing usurpation of legislative function by the executive branch. Both houses have already passed bills giving Congress the power to override such impoundments and force the release of appropriated funds. Tacitly acknowledging that these attempts might be vetoed, the House of Representatives embodied an anti-impoundment section in a much-needed bill to enhance budgetary responsibility in Congress.

Combining these two purposes would not only make it harder for President Nixon to veto a curb on his own Administration's as-

sumption of the power of the purse; it would increase the possibility of overriding such a veto if it did come. The Senate would do well to follow the lead of the House.

TRIBUTE TO THE GARDENA VALLEY COUNCIL OF THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the outstanding community work being done by the Knights of Columbus Council No. 4038 of Gardena, Calif.

Over 100 years ago, Walt Whitman seemingly prophesied our good fortune when he wrote:

A great city is that which has the greatest men and women.

Gardena is such a city.

The Gardena Valley Council of the Knights of Columbus was founded by 105 charter members in 1955. Through their hard work and dedication this organization has now more than doubled its enrollment. In fact, it has received the Century Club Award for acquiring 100 new members in a single year.

In addition to the work the Knights of Columbus do for their parishes—St. Anthony, Maria Regina, St. Catherine, St. Frances Cabrini, and St. Philomena—their achievements and activities have greatly benefited all the citizens of the community. Almost \$1 million has been raised in the past for various charitable organizations, including Boys Town of the West. Members of the Knights also take part in alcoholic and narcotic prevention and treatment programs, Boy Scout activities, senior citizen programs, and visit patients in area hospitals on Sundays. The Gardena Valley Council was instrumental in starting the Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award and the Community Field Day for the citizens of Gardena.

One of the major activities of the council is the Annual Sports Award night honoring outstanding athletes chosen by the local high schools and colleges. The 16th annual presentation will be held on January 25, and I am honored to have been invited to help present this year's awards to Don Rowell of Harbor Junior College, Wayne Johnson of Compton Junior College, Mike Gilbert of El Camino College, Kevin Cole of Gardena High School, and Pat Donahue of Serra High School. I am sure that the parents, schools and communities of these fine young men are very proud of their achievements.

We in the South Bay area are fortunate to have such a dedicated organization as the Gardena Valley Knights of Columbus willing to unselfishly serve the interests of our community. It is indeed fitting that Council No. 4038 has twice received the Star Council Award for being the most outstanding Knights

of Columbus council in the State of California. The Gardena organization is the only one to have ever received this award for two consecutive years—1972 and 1973.

Under the leadership of Grand Knight Oscar Santos, Deputy Grand Knight Alred H. Lecesne, Financial Secretary James Pierceall, Treasurer Fred Purifoy, and Junior Past Grand Knight Fred Hand, we can be assured that this distinguished council will continue to live up to the motto of the Knights of Columbus, "All this and much more are these men they call the Knights of Columbus."

REPORT TO THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FROM CONGRESSWOMAN CARDISS COLLINS

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last fall I sent a questionnaire to all of the residents of the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois. The questions and findings of that survey are as follows:

SURVEY

1. Amnesty: Favor amnesty for draft evaders if they perform several years of public service work upon their return? Yes, 54.5%; No, 38.1%; No opinion, 7.4%.
2. Bilingual: Favor more federal funding to aid bilingual education? Yes, 50.2%; No, 35.5%; No opinion, 14.3%.
3. Cost of living: Feel that the costs of food and rent have become excessive? Yes, 84.5%; No, 9.0%; No opinion, 6.5%.
4. Day care: Feel that more federally funded day care centers are needed? Yes, 60.2%; No, 28.9%; No opinion, 10.9%.
5. Economy: Favor continued wage and price controls to fight inflation? Yes, 53.0%; No, 33.3%; No opinion, 13.7%.
6. Environment: Think that sufficient progress is being made to clean our air and water? Yes, 28.3%; No, 67.8%; No opinion, 8.9%.
7. Headstart: Feel that federal funds to give pre-schoolers a "headstart" should be increased? Yes, 56.3%; No, 32.3%; No opinion, 11.3%.
8. Health insurance: Feel that a national health insurance program to serve the medically poor is needed? Yes, 69.7%; No, 21.5%; No opinion, 8.8%.
9. Housing: Feel that the President should lift the moratorium on federally subsidized low-income housing? Yes, 51.0%; No, 31.6%; No opinion, 17.3%.
10. Impoundment: Feel that the President has the right to refuse to spend funds appropriated by Congress? Yes, 32.9%; No, 55.4%; No opinion, 11.7%.
11. Military: Feel that the military budget is excessive? Yes, 60.9%; No, 27.1%; No opinion, 12.0%.
12. News: Guarantee reporters the right to confidential news sources? Yes, 61.3%; No, 25.1%; No opinion, 13.6%.
13. OEO: Agree that federal funding of community action programs should be continued? Yes, 54.1%; No, 30.5%; No opinion, 15.4%.
14. Postal Service: Feel that the postal service has improved during the last two years? Yes, 19.6%; No, 69.5%; No opinion, 10.9%.

## DÉTENTE FOR ENEMIES: BUT WHAT ABOUT FRIENDS?

## HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger to achieve détente with Communist countries are well known. Not so well known are the efforts by the same individuals to achieve a cold war with a country which desires to be our friend—Rhodesia. While Secretary of State Kissinger maintains that we should not put pressure on the Soviets to change internal policies, we should and must put pressure on Rhodesia to change their internal policies. It would seem that there is a certain amount of hypocrisy in this position.

Smith Hempstone, in the Washington Star-News on December 21, 1973, has written that the United States—

Should be encouraging conciliation rather than confrontation, compromise rather than conflict.

At this point, I include in the Record excerpts of Mr. Hempstone's column entitled "Embargo Debates Called Ill Informed."

The excerpts follow:

## EMBARGO DEBATES CALLED ILL INFORMED

(By Smith Hempstone)

"There are really only three questions worth asking, and nobody is asking them:

"—Is the government of that white-ruled Central African state so odious as to merit isolating Rhodesia from the rest of the civilized world?

"—Are [trade] sanctions likely to moderate the racial policies of Rhodesia, or lead to the collapse of Premier Ian Smith's regime?

"—If sanctions were to lead to the collapse of the Smith regime, what would be the consequences?

"One does not have to be particularly perspicacious to see that the Smith regime was not made in Heaven. Africans are discriminated against over a broad spectrum of matters. But when it comes to oppressiveness, the Rhodesians are amateurs when compared to all those Communist regimes (and some non-Communist ones) with which we trade and maintain diplomatic relations.

"As to the likelihood of sanctions having a beneficial influence on the policies of the Rhodesian government or resulting in its collapse, one can only say that neither has happened in the eight years since Rhodesia declared its independence from Britain. . . .

"It is difficult to see how the sudden collapse of white rule would benefit black Rhodesians or the United States. A terrorist movement, aimed primarily against black Rhodesians seeking accommodation with the white minority, already is under way and the dissolution of authority could only lead to an orgy of reprisals between rival tribal power groups.

"To the extent that conditions in Rhodesia warrant the consideration of worthy members of the U.S. Senate—and one would really think there would be matters of more urgency commanding their attention—it would seem that that venerable body should be encouraging conciliation rather than confrontation, compromise rather than conflict.

"Rhodesian chrome is not and never has been the real issue. The Senate has been getting the wrong answers on Rhodesia for the simplest of all reasons: It has refused to ask itself the right questions."

## THE POLITICS OF FAMINE AND THE SAHEL

## HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years drought has ravaged the Sahel in north Africa. The effect on both the peoples and the economies of the region has been devastating, but neither the United States nor the United Nations has made a substantive commitment of economic and humanitarian assistance. It seems that we can sell wheat to the Soviet Union and force our own consumers to pay higher prices for bread, but we cannot provide grain to starving Africans.

Jeffrey L. Hodes has written an incisive article on how most of the world is shutting its eyes to the Sahel tragedy. I am sharing this article, which appears in the February issue in *Encore* magazine, with my colleagues in the Congress in the hope that our collective conscience will be moved to insist upon greater U.S. commitment to relieve the suffering of the starving people of the Sahel.

The article follows:

## THE POLITICS OF FAMINE

(By Jeffrey L. Hodes)

The drought and devastation of the Sahel is now entering its third year. The famine that has besieged this region of North Africa is a blot on the conscience of the international community. The technocrats use code words like "developing countries" and "lack of infra-structure" to belittle African estimates of the tragedy.

Each news dispatch coming out of Dakar, Senegal; Niamey, Niger; and Ouagadougou, Upper Volta; documenting the desolation and death that has overcome a quarter of the 25 million nomads of this sun-scorched bowl, offers a distressing example of the low premium placed on life in Black Africa by the West. Much of the human suffering could have been avoided if it wasn't for the indifference, bureaucratic hassles and inertia of the emergency relief operations of the United Nations and the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID).

The drought was officially "recognized" in August, 1972, but the last shipments of emergency grain did not arrive in Mauritania, Senegal, Chad, Mali, Niger and Upper Volta until October, 1973. For five months the UN did not even heed the SOS of its own "early warning system," and its record from that point on is something of a cruel joke.

The Sahel has also dramatized what little regard the U.S. government has for Black Africa. Faced with massive starvation last summer, the Sahelian governments pleaded with the U.S. Air Force for at least 20 planes for an emergency airlift. The State Department allocated three C-103 cargo planes for 105 days.

The U.S. countered famine and flooding in Bangladesh with \$318 million in assistance. "No less can be done to assist the 25 million people of the Sahel," says Rep. Charles Diggs, chairman of the House subcommittee on Africa. But, unfortunately, drought does not have the visual immediacy of a flood or earthquake. Its physical properties are more elusive and difficult to establish. And the Sahel does not have much strategic, political or economic value for the U.S. government, the criteria for most bilateral assistance.

The Sahel exists in a time capsule today, as it tries to shake loose the shackles of colonial servitude, while leaping across cen-

turies of economic development. The six nations carved out of the heartland of once semi-arid French West Africa are still scarred by the worst kind of economic balkanization, perpetrated by artificial national boundaries imposed by a colonial power.

The Sahel is a flat, harsh region stretching across the continent from the sands and barren mountains of the Sahara, to where the desert gives way to the grasslands and trees of the savannas in central Africa. The desert is encroaching upon the region at the rate of 30 miles per year. It has already partially consumed Mauritania, is threatening the southern half of Niger, and has long since covered Chad as it advances southward, edging into Senegal and Upper Volta.

The six Sahelian states cover an area equivalent to 60 percent of the U.S. There the similarity with America ends. The Sahelian people are among mankind's poorest. Upper Volta is often referred to as the world's poorest nation. Its five million people have an annual per capita income of \$50 and a life expectancy of 32 years. Only 10 percent of the population is literate.

Life in Mali, Chad and Niger is little better. The average 10-year-old in Niger has a life expectancy 14 years shorter than a 10-year-old in India. In Chad, during "normal" years, it isn't unusual for six out of every 10 babies to die before they reach five years of age.

Mauritania and Senegal are only slightly better off. In sparsely-populated Mauritania, the GNP is a princely \$140 per capita. In Senegal, children lacking protein suffer from *kwashiorkor*—bloated bellies—and pregnant women lacking vitamin A suffer from *keratomalacia*—blindness.

*Amame* is what the Sahel nomads call water. It is the basis of existence in the Sahel. Yet the region's rains are scanty and erratic. The annual rainfall is from 16 to 120 inches in west Africa. In the Sahel, the average rainfall is between 4 and 16 inches.

The precipitation usually lasts from late May through the summer into late September. But the sun quickly sucks up the rain, reducing the impact of the precipitation. Thus, the intensity of the summer rains—the monsoons—usually determines the success or failure of the agricultural output.

This delicate ecological balance supports a largely pastoral economy, where nine out of every 10 workers engage in "subsistence farming," raising cattle or growing either peanuts, sorghum, or millet, primarily for self-consumption.

The magnitude of 1972's short-lived rainfall, combined with the hardships and declining water levels of the lengthy dry 1969-1971 seasons, precipitated the catastrophic drought and famine which overwhelmed the Sahel, and after seven disastrous years of declining rainfall, finally brought the region to international attention. "If you bring this region back to where it was before the drought," one aid expert commented, "it will not be good enough."

Last fall's harvest was as poor as the previous year's, necessitating a continued emergency relief operation of the same magnitude—if not larger—than 1972's. And beyond this remains the necessity of coming to grips with the spreading desert and restoring the ecological balance of the environment. "There is no doubt that the present crisis will happen again," a UN report declared, "possibly each time more severe, because of the growing degradation of the rangelands."

The rain that did fall last summer was late in coming, inadequate and short-lived. By early October the crops were withering in the ground. A multi-nation survey mission assessed the fall harvest and concluded that the crop was sufficient to sustain the Sahel only through the winter months. This spring will probably see a repeat of last year's famine.

Mass starvation was averted in 1973 because of the eventual arrival of 625,000

metric tons of grain. At least that amount will again be needed. Meanwhile, disease claims a large number of the already emaciated nomads, especially children. This winter many will succumb to respiratory ailments.

The actual cost in human life to date is as yet unknown. Statistics are hard to come by in such a desperately poor region. The Sahelians say that six million faced starvation last summer. The UN denied it. The League of Red Cross Societies said it was twice as many. "I cannot play the numbers game," says Carl Rowan, who was in the Sahel last summer, "but I know what I am seeing: flies feasting on the sore-pocked face of a child pot-bellied and deformed by hunger; children crying incessantly."

Life in capital cities like Bamako, Mali, and Niamey, Niger, is becoming a nightmare. With the social disintegration of the nomadic tribes, herdsman are leaving their families and are being forced to live on the dole near refugee camps.

Indeed, the effects of the drought were devastating. All six Sahelian nations share a common dependence on livestock and agriculture for their livelihood. With insufficient rainfall, crop production was ravaged and food production was halved. Before the drought, there were about 60 million animals, including several million head of cattle. Millions perished. Estimates are that from 40 to 80 percent of the livestock were decimated in some regions.

The UN Food & Agricultural Organization's early warning system reported an "acute emergency situation" in the Sahel in September, 1972. Yet, nothing significant was done to mobilize the international community until the spring of 1973. And a major appeal was not made until May—two months after the six Sahelian governments declared a state of emergency at a heads-of-state meeting in Ouagadougou, Upper Volta.

In the U.S. there is evidence that AID officials wired the State Department from Africa as early as August, 1972, of the imminent disaster. And Sahelian embassies in Washington insist that they appealed to AID for emergency food provisions in September and October of that year.

Yet AID didn't respond until the winter months. AID and the Agriculture Department's Food for Peace program are the major sources for the UN's World Food Programme reserves. Some government bureaucrats have implied that the global grain deficit was one reason why AID couldn't move faster and more generously. This simply isn't true; the problem was financial and political, not agricultural. The delay on grain shipments to the Sahel was caused by the priority given to the shipment of \$200 million in wheat to the Soviet Union, which completely tied up U.S. ports on the Gulf of Mexico.

The size of the U.S. commitment has also appalled the Black community. Of 625,000 metric tons of grain donated internationally, the U.S. contributed only 156,000 m.t., and this fall—after the worst of the drought had passed—committed another 100,000 m.t. In addition, the donor nations gave over \$40 million in cash and service-in-kind. The U.S. share was only \$4.4 million. As a matter of fact, until the Black community mobilized public opinion last spring, there was little recognition of the problem at all in Washington. The spectre of Jesse Jackson collecting cans of dry milk and appealing to cereal manufacturers jogged the State Department's indifference.

The prodding continued with the formation of Afro-Americans Against the Famine, and RAINS, a Black coalition for "Relief for Africans in Need of the Sahel," headed by former Ambassador Elliott Skinner and Congressman Diggs. Diggs asked for an emergency \$30 million in aid for the Sahel. Five months later he compromised with the Senate at \$25 million.

Black Africa has never received much U.S. aid. In fiscal 1973 the U.S. allocated only \$173 million for economic aid, and \$134 million in food commodities. The six Sahel countries received \$11.9 million in food commodities and nothing for economic development.

What can be done about the Sahel? Can future famine be averted?

Ministers of the Sahelian states will meet again this fall. They have estimated that rehabilitation projects—reforestation, irrigation, transit, etc.—would cost \$850 million. Because of the tremendous loss of tax-producing cattle, the governments are all near bankruptcy, and will need subventions and deferment of their present outstanding loans.

But discord between donor nations such as the U.S. with the Sahelians and the UN over the shape of rehabilitation projects offers scant hope that a concerted effort will be launched. The AID technocrats reject remedies and innovations that haven't been engineered by Americans. The World Bank and the UN espouse well-digging and deepening of the existing system of wells. AID says wells contribute to the water shortage.

There is also a major dam project on the Senegal River, that, if built, would help irrigate Mali, Mauritania and Senegal. It has a \$1.1 billion price tag on it. Either out of political disinterest or lack of faith in Sahelian research, the U.S. is asking for still more feasibility studies. Indeed, even though the Sahel governments have proposed 123 immediate projects, the U.S. government thinks what is needed now is a major study to determine the parameters of the problem! The real question now is not how many wells will be dug, or how many head of cattle will be replaced, but what is going to be done and who is going to do it.

The Sahelian drought is not a politically-charged situation such as Biafra or Bangladesh. A drought is not as easily identifiable as a civil war or an earthquake. But unless this drought is given the same priority, the 1972-73 tragedy in the Sahel could arise again.

#### LEAVE THE CLOCKS ALONE

### HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I comment the within editorial from the Columbus, Ga., press to the attention of the membership. If, however, there is to be further legislation on the national time zones Georgia properly belongs in the Central Time Zone. The fact that it is not is exactly the reason that daylight savings time is so onerous to most Georgians.

#### LEAVE THE CLOCKS ALONE

If you'll pardon the pun, a number of state legislators seem to have time on their hands.

Rep. Norwood Pearce of Columbus, among others, wants to return Georgia to its rightful place, in the Central time zone.

Georgia has been a fish out of water, so to speak, for more than 30 years. He and a few other chosen representatives want to right this long-time wrong.

... END "FAST TIME"?

Meanwhile, a couple of Rome, Ga., lawmakers want to take Georgia off Daylight Saving Time. Georgia and the rest of the nation has been on "fast time" since Jan. 6 in what is supposed to be an energy-conservation move.

Here's our position: Leave the clocks alone. We're sick and tired of all this nonsense

about setting our clocks forward or backward or sideways. In fact, one of the positive aspects of year-round Saving Time is that we won't have to go through the confusing ritual of changing a half dozen or so timepieces in our house twice a year. We have a reprieve until October 1975.

... "HE'S STILL 'DADDY'"

As for reverting to Central time, we feel much like the young man who discovers his natural father is not the one he's been calling "Daddy" for 20 years. The guy who's been putting bread on his table may not be his natural father but he's the only father the young man has ever known.

We implore Rep. Pearce and other legislators campaigning to turn our clocks back to forget it and concentrate on the multitude of far more pressing problems.

#### CHARLES M. TEAGUE: A FRIEND OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

### HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn during the days between sessions America lost one of its most respected legislators and a true friend of the Nation's farmers, Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE of California.

As a freshman Member of the House I did not know CHARLES TEAGUE as well as many of his friends and colleagues here, but my service with him on the House Agriculture Committee afforded me the opportunity to observe how much he knew about American agriculture.

I know that those who served with him on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee share my high regard for his abilities, his wit, and his dedication to improving the lives of America's farmers and veterans. His passing is a sad event for us all.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the January 2 edition of the Washington Post reporting on the death of Representative CHARLES M. TEAGUE:

REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES M. TEAGUE DIES

(By Jean R. Halley)

Rep. Charles M. Teague (R-Calif.), a member of Congress since 1954, died yesterday in Santa Paula at 64.

Aides said he suffered a heart attack while staying at the home of his son, Alan, who is mayor of Santa Paula.

The congressman, who was the ranking Republican on the House Agricultural Committee and the senior Republican member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, had gone home for the holidays.

Santa Paula, where he was born and reared, is in the 13th District, which he represented in Congress.

The unexpected death of the quiet but highly respected congressman brought immediate statements from top-ranking Republicans.

President Nixon said:

"The death of Charles Teague represents a significant loss to the United States Congress, to his home state of California and to the nation he served so long and so well. He will be remembered most especially for his interest in American agriculture and for his many years of devoted service on the House Agriculture Committee. Mrs. Nixon and I were deeply saddened to hear of his passing

and we extend our sincere sympathy to his family."

Vice President Gerald R. Ford said: "I am very much saddened by the death of my dear friend and former colleague, Charles Teague. American agriculture owes a great deal to him for his dedication to the best interests of the American farmer. His district, state and the nation have lost an outstanding legislator."

"Congressman Teague typified the best in American politics today," said Rep. Robert H. Michel of Illinois. "He was a dedicated, hard-working legislator whose prime interest was in what is best for the country. As ranking Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, he also was the leading advocate of American agriculture in Congress. He will be sorely missed." Michel is chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee.

Rep. Teague has served on the Agricultural Committee for most of his tenure in Congress. While he was not noted for introducing major legislation, his efforts to maintain free as opposed to subsidized agriculture were considered very effective.

He also took a strong stand on aiding conservation and environmental programs and for a number of years was the ranking member on the Agricultural Committee's Conservation and Credit Subcommittee.

He was one of those responsible for bringing about an Interior Department ban on new oil drilling platforms in the Santa Barbara Channel in 1971. There had been heavily damaging oil gushing from a drilling platform there several years earlier.

Rep. Teague was a natural choice to serve on the Agricultural Committee. His family was among the founders of the Sunkist cooperative in California, and his father was a pioneer in that state's farm credit program.

Rep. Teague went to Stanford University, where he received his bachelor's degree in 1931 and his law degree three years later.

His practice of law was interrupted during World War II, when he served as a major in the Army Air Corps. He resumed the practice after the war and became involved in community affairs, serving as president of the Ventura County Community Chest, the Ventura Rotary Club and the Ojai Valley School Board of Trustees.

He was president of the Ventura County Republican Assembly when he decided to run for Congress in 1954. He was re-elected to the nine succeeding Congresses and had planned to run again this year.

Rep. Teague had a gentle sense of humor. He once noted that there seemed to be a conflict in the labels applied to him in letters from some of his constituents.

"When the conservatives consider me a liberal and the liberals figure me for a conservative, I must be in trouble," he lamented.

On another occasion, he dowsned one of his own bills on the floor of the House. A great pet lover, he had introduced a bill to eliminate tariffs on the importation of wild animals.

He was so proud of the bill that he had asked that it be referred to as the Teague Bill. But by the time it got through the Senate, it had come out as a bill to limit beef imports from Australia and New Zealand. The changes brought this speech from Rep. Teague:

"I was proud to have been the father of such a clean, beautiful little fellow . . . He was prepared to do great things for boa constrictors and gorillas and their owners.

"But, in the course of events, my little baby was sent to the Senate pediatric hospital . . . All that remained of him was the identification number on his poor little wrist.

"Mr. Speaker, I must disclaim fatherhood of (H.R.) 1839 as he is before us today. I am willing to contribute to his support, but he is not mine—my blood no longer flows in his veins.

"I repeat, Mr. Speaker, 'This child ain't mine.'"

Rep. Teague also found humor in another situation. For some time, he and Rep. Olin E. Teague (D-Texas) shared seats on the Veterans Affairs Committee.

The resulting confusion from pronouncements frequently credited to the wrong Teague were usually followed by retractions, which in turn were followed by a good laugh.

There was no confusion in the work both did toward helping veterans.

Among other things, Rep. Charles Teague had worked hard to improve housing rights for veterans.

Rep. Teague's first wife, Marjorie, died in 1970. He remarried that year but was separated from his second wife, Courtney, at the time of his death.

In addition to his son, Rep. Teague also is survived by two daughters, Norma Potter, of Washington, and Judith Kenyon, of Santa Rosa, Calif., and eight grandchildren.

## RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE: FORESTRY IN GERMANY

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently discussed the problems of forestry with German forest expert Mr. Jost Wilke, forestry counselor for the Republic of Germany, in a televised interview for my constituents. I include the text of that interview:

#### TELEVISION INTERVIEW

Congressman RARICK: Public attention is being focused on the nation's forests today probably more than at any time in the recent past. One of the primary reasons for all this attention after years of neglect, is that our country is running out of timber to satisfy our increased demands. In order to fully understand the forestry situation in this country, it's helpful to gain a perspective by studying the way other countries' forests are managed.

I've been to Germany on several occasions and I've always been highly impressed by their beautiful, well managed and highly productive forests. We in this country can learn a great deal from foresters in the Federal Republic of Germany. With me on the show today is the Forestry Counsel for the Embassy of Germany in the United States, Mr. Jost Wilke. Mr. Wilke, it's indeed a pleasure to have you with us on our show today. And as I understand it, forestry is an important part of the economy of Germany. Would you give us some idea of the scope of forestry in your country?

Mr. WILKE. First, Congressman Rarick, let me thank you for your kind invitation. It's of course a pleasure to be with you and to discuss some problems of forestry in which you are interested. You are absolutely right; forestry plays an important role in the economy of my country. This is due to historical reasons. Four or even five hundred years ago we were already forced to manage forestry in an intensive way. Today forests cover nearly 30 percent of all the acreage of my country; the agricultural part is 55 percent, towns, industrial areas, roads and traffic installations such as ports, harbors, airports, etc. cover another 10 percent. Only very small areas are waste lands, idle, or uncultivated rurals.

Mr. RARICK. Well, we in the U.S. Congress just recently passed a Forest Incentive Pro-

gram whereby we are hoping to encourage our private land owners to plant their idle acreages in trees. Germany, as I understand it, has been active in forest incentive for many years. How do your forest incentive and conservation programs work together?

Mr. WILKE. Let me first mention, Congressman Rarick, Germany is usually considered, even by Germans, as a typical country with a high percentage of state-owned or public-owned forests. This is not absolutely true, because more than 44 percent of all forests are privately owned. There's one big difference between the United States and Germany, that is, we do not have any industry-owned forests. So we have nearly 900,000 small private woodlot owners. And in these years where the importance of agricultural production is decreasing, farmers give up marginal lands close to forests and in the mountainous areas. All these, or mostly all of these areas are reforested and cultivated. And the government gives these people a subsidy up to one-third of their own cost to reforest or to build up a forest stand on those places. We of course try to get the farmers or the private wood owners to produce mixed stands which are more stable, which offer more recreational possibilities for the people in future years, and which are better habitats for the wildlife.

Mr. RARICK. I see. In other words, in Germany, you have the multiple use of your forests also.

Mr. WILKE. Yes. We do not call it "multiple use", but is exactly the same system.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Wilke, I noticed during my trips to Germany that the people seem to make great use of your forests for recreational purposes. What specific programs does your government encourage, as far as using the forests in recreation?

Mr. WILKE. That is right. Germans are impassioned, dedicated hikers. Not all the forests are state-owned. We have another typical form of forestry proprietorship, namely villages, small towns, counties and even schools or churches own forests. They all try to provide the necessary trails for hiking and also for bicycling, not to forget horseback riding in the forests and playgrounds for children. But it is not allowed, or let me put it this way, not everybody is allowed, for instance, to hunt or fish in the forests. There is a quite different system. And the reason for this is probably that we are, compared to the United States, densely overpopulated. I know a little about your state, lovely Louisiana, called "sportsmen's paradise". And that is really true. We couldn't afford to have such a liberal system of hunting because thousands of people would be in a very small space; so hunting is strictly regulated and is related to an area system. Only a small number of people is allowed to hunt on a given area. The hunt has to be of a minimum size, and there are leasing contracts for those hunting rights with a minimum of nine years for those areas where small game is given and twelve years where stags, wild boar, etc. are present.

Mr. RARICK. In our country there has developed a division of opinion between various groups of forest managers, who favor the concept of a managed forest with increased production, and environmentalists, who support a wilderness forest where nature would take its course. What has been the experience in your country between the managed forest and the wilderness concept?

Mr. WILKE. First, Congressman Rarick, I would like to mention that in Germany there are less than one or two percent virgin forests. That means that the abundance of German forests is all man-made, in a certain way. And during a long experience of not only decades, but hundreds of years, we came to the conclusion, and that is the official opinion as well as my own, that the

best way to produce and to provide a variety of recreational purposes is a rather well, and high-yield managed forest. If you take several parts of the forests out of this intensive management and try to bring it back to a kind of wilderness, the wilderness is not optimal, neither in the ecological nor in the recreational sense, because in our opinion very, very few people would be able to feel happy in an absolute wilderness, that means no roads, no trails, no restaurants, no accessibility. This is not the ideal which most of our outdoor-loving people would like to have. And in these times where it is and becomes increasingly more difficult to get the necessary raw material out of forestry production, we couldn't afford to exclude and to put aside wilderness area.

Mr. RARICK. In other words, in Germany, you don't have the battle we have between the environmentalists and the timber management folks?

Mr. WILKE. That is true—not to the same extent as over here. But, of course, we do have environmentalist groups who try to attack our intensive way of forestry, especially clear-cutting. But even clear-cutting is an efficient way to renew a forest. And there are a few examples, for instance, if there has been a forest fire or if a stand is highly infected with disease, fungus disease or insect disease, or in the case of an avalanche in mountainous areas and a stand is destroyed or is broken by ice or snow or the like, there is no other way than clear-cutting to a limited extent. It is always the size of a clear-cut area that counts, not the measure itself.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Wilke, training of forest professionals, as I understand it, began in Germany in the early part of the last century. Your country today is considered as one of the leading advocates of management training. Just how extensive is your training of young foresters?

Mr. WILKE. We have three different careers in the forest service. We can forget the third one because it is running out. In the future we will have two different careers, an academic, strictly academic career with university curriculum for the supervisory level, for the management level, for the ministries and so on. Ministries is the European expression for departments. After graduation from high school you have to do one year of a kind of apprenticeship, where you work in a forest as lumberman, as forest road builder, etc. And then you usually have to serve in the military (we still have the draft system, as you know) for at least a year and a quarter. After that you have to study for a minimum of four years. If you plan to get your doctor's degree, it will require another one or two years. This is not the end of it. You then have to pass a rather difficult examination, at the end of your university curriculum, and join the state forest system which is comparable to your forest service, even if you do not intend to join the state forest service in the future but rather the private forest system. This education in the state forest service, however, is mandatory and at the end of three more years you have to pass a very sophisticated examination in order to prove that you are able to combine your theoretical knowledge with the practical needs a forestry manager is required to have.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Wilke, let me ask you one more question. In the United States we are losing more timber as a result of insect damage than we lose to forest fires. Do you have the same problem with DDT usage in Germany?

Mr. WILKE. Germany banned the use of DDT nearly two years ago. But there's one big exception, and that is forestry. Foresters cannot afford, in my opinion at least, to completely drop the use of DDT, and DDT has not proven, if carefully considered, to be dangerous to forests. We obey very strictly the regulations and directions for use, and

unless we have sufficient other, non-poisonous chemicals to replace DDT or use methods like biologically fighting insects, which is absolutely possible with sophisticated methods. . . .

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Wilke, our time has expired, and I wish we could proceed further. Our guest today has been Mr. Jost Wilke, Forestry Counselor for the Republic of Germany in the United States. Thank you so much.

Mr. WILKE. Thank you.

## DÉTENTE: A TRADE GIVEAWAY?

### HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, there is a misconception in the executive branch as well as among members of the news media that the only reason the Members of Congress are opposed to the President's trade bill is because of the restrictive immigration policies of the Soviet Union. This is but one of many important reasons in my view. Many of us are also concerned about giving away the technology of the United States to our potential enemies. This case was put in an excellent manner in an article that appeared in *Business Week* of January 12, 1974. Those who feel this trade is innocent and devoid of peril should read this article which follows:

#### DÉTENTE: A TRADE GIVEAWAY?

The steadily increasing number of high-technology deals between U.S. companies and the Soviet Union is stirring up a serious policy dispute in Washington. In the past year or so, export restrictions on these transactions have been liberalized as détente has become the essence of U.S.-Soviet relations. But Defense Dept. and other officials now complain that the Soviets are acquiring—or are trying to acquire—U.S. technological knowhow that has important military applications under what are supposed to be commercial agreements. The areas involved in the recent sales range from computers and communications to shipbuilding and aircraft.

The latest affair to disturb the Pentagon critics: Soviet overtures to five U.S. aerospace giants—McDonnell Douglas, Boeing, Lockheed, General Electric, and United Aircraft's Pratt & Whitney Div. The Russians have sounded out the companies on the purchase of DC-10, 747, and L-1011 aircraft and engines.

Next month, McDonnell Douglas marketing executives are scheduled to fly to Moscow for talks with Kremlin trade and aviation officials about the possible sale of the DC-10. Negotiations are still in the "feeler" stage and the Russians insist that their interest in wide-bodied jets has no military connotations. But the Pentagon is upset, not so much about potential aircraft sales, but over the package of U.S. aerospace technology that might be part of the deal.

#### TECHNOLOGY GRAB?

What the Soviets really want to buy, apprehensive Pentagon spokesmen claim, is not planes but the knowledge that would allow them to build their own production facilities—complete with all the systems and quality control that are the hallmark of U.S. defense plants.

The Soviets already can produce big jets for commercial or military transport. But their manufacturing techniques, according to U.S. experts, are still too backward to permit them to produce them economically and

efficiently enough for competition in world markets. Their possession of plants embodying U.S. technology would permit this. Moreover, it would enhance their production of military cargo planes, a type of aircraft that has been accorded considerably higher priority by both the U.S. and the Soviet Union as a result of the recent Mideast war.

The link between civilian and military production technologies is impossible to separate, Pentagon sources emphasize. Aircraft engines, computers, integrated circuitry, telecommunications equipment, navigation systems, and avionics are very similar in both military and civilian aircraft. Less obvious, perhaps, are the similarity in production instruments, tooling, and other manufacturing equipment.

But beyond the new potential in aircraft sales, Pentagon officials are agitated by the general relaxation of export controls. The U.S., for example, now is supplying the Soviets' Kama River truck complex with manufacturing equipment that was embargoed two years ago. The Pentagon, which never did wholly approve of U.S. participation in that project, notes that the technology and equipment required to mass-produce heavy-duty civilian vehicles is virtually the same as that needed for Army trucks.

#### CLOSING THE GAPS

Malcolm R. Currie, Director of Defense Research and Engineering at the Pentagon, has launched a campaign warning U.S. industry about the dangers of selling the Russians production technology that is unique to U.S. companies. Currie, an applied physicist, who was a research vice-president for Beckman Instruments, Inc., before joining the Pentagon last spring, says he is "very concerned about exports in high technology areas which have both civilian and military application."

The Soviets have become increasingly aware, Currie claims, that their great deficiency is not in scientific knowledge but in production technology. Says he: "They apparently feel that they can neither close pivotal gaps in their military capability, nor gaps in their general economic growth—domestically and worldwide—until they acquire a manufacturing technology comparable to ours. The processing knowhow, the whole flow of work and equipment in manufacturing plants—that's the technology they're after."

Arguing that "U.S. national policy on technology exports needs to be clarified," Currie is lobbying hard both in the defense industry and other government circles. He has the wholehearted support of Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger and of Deputy Defense Secretary William P. Clements Jr., both of whom continuously remind listeners of Soviet strides in military research and technology in recent years.

But while these Pentagon officials have a voice in government export licensing clearances, they know they do not exercise control. That control rests with the National Security Council, which gets recommendations on sensitive export licensing clearances from the State Dept., White House Council on International Economic Policy, and the Commerce Dept.'s Bureau of East-West Trade, which was created to promote U.S. sales to Russia and other Warsaw Pact nations.

Defense industry sources say they never make a move in dealing with the Soviets without first checking with the government. "No U.S. company," says a Boeing spokesman, "would ever make any firm commitment to the Soviets without first receiving concrete government authority for it. And the Russians know that this is the case."

Did the Soviets ask Boeing, for one, for information on how to improve plant manufacturing techniques for wide-bodied jet aircraft? "Yes, they brought it up," says the Boeing official. "We just listened."

The key question in all this, according to

the director of a Senate committee staff that deals with East-West trade, is "just who is the U.S. government?" There is, he says, "no national policy, and we've all got the feeling, like Currie, that this all needs a very hard look. The list of things that can't be exported to the Soviets is not sufficiently discrete. It's got more exemptions than restrictions. We're moving toward becoming wholly unrestrained in our technology exports. You can't blame the companies; it's not their job to worry about national security."

#### WHAT IS SECURITY?

Steven Lazarus, director of the Bureau of East-West trade, acknowledges that there have been conflicts between his agency and the Pentagon on questions of technology export clearance. He agrees that a potential adversary's "possession of technological know-how is often of greater strategic significance than finished items produced from that technology." Consequently, says Lazarus, "it has been necessary to exercise a more restrictive control over transfers of technical data than commodities."

He also acknowledges "what I call the 'dread of cumulative effect'—while no one sale or negotiation between a U.S. company and the Soviets may pose a threat to security, the increasing volume and frequency of sales and talks could be harmful." Still, he insists, the bureau is as sensitive to national security as it is to East-West commerce, and he sees "no evidence that security has been compromised."

The debate, however, clearly involves different definitions of security. The Pentagon, for example, feels that security considerations were downrated in one deal which the National Security Council has just cleared—a bid by a team of American computer companies to install in the Soviet Union an air traffic control system comparable to the system used by the Federal Aviation Administration.

IBM heads the team, which also includes Sperry Rand Corp.'s Univac Div., Texas Instruments, and Raytheon. The team is competing with Thomson-CSF of France for the Soviet award, which U.S. sources say could amount to \$100-million or more, depending on the extent of the system the Soviets decide to buy.

In the government debate over clearing the system bid by the American team, the Defense Dept. argued that it would provide the Soviets with the technology they need to build the computerized military air traffic control system they now lack.

To aggravate the Pentagon's fears, the White House Council on International Economic Policy is winding up a study of computer exports to the Soviet Union which, according to one high source, "will ease our stance, make it less restrictive." Pentagon experts who participated in the study reportedly argued for a tougher computer export policy, but lost the debate.

The national security debate is complicated by considerations of commercial advantage. "The companies don't have any precedent," says a White House source. "They head détente, and they deal, but they wonder. Individual companies are dealing with ministers of state who trained on the wheat deal. They really know how to do that; they're good at it."

"I would urge our companies and our government to be wary of some of the commercial gain and balance-of-payments advantages," says the Pentagon's Currie, trying to put the damper on strategic exports to the Soviet Union. "In my personal opinion, the market may be significantly less than advertised, the difficulties of doing business may be extensive, and the ability to pay may be questionable." What the Russians want from us, is the whole damn plant," says one aerospace industry source who shares the

Pentagon's concern. "As an industry, we've never done that, and we had better be very, very careful."

#### WHO IS DEALING WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Company and area of cooperation  
 Bechtel—Construction methods, planning.  
 Boeing—Civil aviation, air transport technology.  
 Brown & Root—Oil and gas development.  
 Control Data—Computers, peripheral equipment, systems design, software.  
 Dresser Industries—Oil and gas exploration.  
 General Dynamics—Shipbuilding, aircraft construction, telecommunications, computers.  
 General Electric—Power and electrical engineering, atomic power plants.  
 Hewlett-Packard—Medical electronics, measuring equipment, minicomputers.  
 IIT—Communications technology, electronic components.  
 Joy Mfg.—Coal mining equipment.  
 Litton Industries—(Not available).  
 Monsanto—(Not available).  
 Occidental Petroleum—Oil and gas drilling, refining, agricultural chemicals.  
 Singer—Computers, electronic instruments, textile equipment.  
 Stanford Research Institute—General science and technology.  
 Tenneco—(Not available).  
 Texas Eastern Transmission—(Not available).

#### JOHN P. BURCH

#### HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 31, 1974, in Castagnola's Plush Horse Restaurant in Redondo Beach, John P. Burch, Redondo Beach bank executive and South Bay civic leader, will be honored at a combined retirement-recognition banquet sponsored by the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce.

Burch, vice president and manager of the South Bay office of the Crocker National Bank, was named Redondo Beach's "man of the year" in 1964. He is a charter member and past president of the Riviera Village Rotary Club and has served as president of the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce, Redondo Beach Coordinating Council, Riviera Village Merchants and Professional Association, and Redondo Beach Sister City Committee.

He has served as a director or officer of the Palos Verdes Navy League, Community Chest, South Bay YMCA, Southwest Optimist Club, Palos Verdes Chamber of Commerce, Redondo Beach Round Table, Palos Verdes Breakfast Club, American Red Cross and the Sales and Marketing Executives Association of Los Angeles. He received the salesman's distinguished award from the latter group in 1970.

Burch was born on August 6, 1909, in Iola, Allen County, Kans. He attended San Jose (Calif.) High School and was graduated from Los Angeles Manual Arts High School. He also graduated from the Pacific Coast Banking School at the University of Washington and the American Institute of Banking.

On his retirement date, January 31, 1974, Burch will have served the same bank for 46 years, 7 months—24 years as a branch manager. He is one of the most admired men in our community and one of our most able leaders.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is with special pleasure that I call attention to the honor which is being paid to Mr. Burch on January 31. It is a tribute which reflects the regard and respect of everyone who is privileged to know him.

#### ARMADO DE LEON—A JOB WELL DONE

#### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in November of 1973, the job opportunities for Mexican-Americans in the city of Phoenix were significantly increased, thanks to the efforts of a Phoenix city councilman, Armando De Leon. A long-time champion of the Chicano cause, Councilman De Leon pushed for the reduction of height requirements in city employment. His arduous campaign was rewarded when Phoenix announced lower height regulations for all personnel, including those of the fire and police departments. This change was vitally necessary. By creating opportunities for a greater number of Mexican-Americans, the city has moved toward a hiring practice which will involve more people of all minorities.

This broadening of city employment policies to include more minorities is but one of many accomplishments of Armando De Leon. As a past member of the Human Relations Commission, the Housing Code Advisory Committee, and the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Mr. De Leon has had an influential voice in local affairs. His effectiveness in aiding minority groups was increased with his election to the Phoenix City Council 4 years ago. Using his legal background, he was able to benefit another minority group when he represented the National Indian Reservation.

This Phoenix councilman has been a strong advocate for greater Mexican-American rights. In his capacity as legal counselor for the National Council of La Raza, Armando has been working to improve the quality of life for the 7 million people of Mexican descent.

His experience working with Spanish-speaking people expanded while he was a special legal liaison officer for the Department of Defense in Spain. There he worked with city officials in Madrid and key personnel in the Spanish Foreign Office. Since then, Mr. De Leon has continued his international work through Mexican attorney associates. During his practice he has helped many clients with legal problems in Mexico. To improve relations with Mexican lawyers, Mr. De Leon and several Arizona lawyers planned and directed seminars on Mexican law in both Arizona and Mexico. During sessions of the International

American Bar Association in Venezuela and Ecuador, he had further opportunities to work with other lawyers in Latin America.

Mr. De Leon's international and community activities deserve special commendation. All of these activities have led toward an increase in opportunities for members of several minority groups, especially those of Mexican Americans. Armando De Leon's latest achievement, that of opening more Phoenix city jobs to Chicanos, is another measure of his contribution to improving city life for these people.

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Ukrainian citizens throughout the world today in marking January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day. On January 22, 1918, in the city of Kiev, the Eastern European nation of Ukraine issued its proclamation of independence from the Soviet Union. I would like now to submit a short statement prepared by the United American Ukrainian Organizations Committee of New York for the attention of my colleagues. It carefully and concisely considers the history of Ukraine:

January 22, 1974, will mark the 56th Anniversary of the proclamation of Ukraine's Independence, and the 55th Anniversary of the Act of Union, both of which took place in Kiev on January 22, 1918, and January 22, 1919, respectively. By these acts a Ukrainian independent state was officially established on all the ethnographical Ukrainian territories.

The young Ukrainian democratic republic was short-lived as Communist Russia attacked it almost immediately, despite the fact that the new Soviet Russian government had officially recognized Ukraine as an independent and sovereign state. The same recognition to Ukraine was granted by the Central Powers, and a number of the countries of the Entente, including Great Britain and France.

After almost four years of continuous invasions and fighting, Ukraine, alone and unaided, succumbed to the numerically superior military forces of Communist Russia, which eventually destroyed the Ukrainian National Republic, created a Communist puppet government in Ukraine known as the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic," and incorporated it in 1922 into the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" (USSR).

The whole history of Soviet Russian-dominated Ukraine is a ghastly record in inhumanity, outright persecution and genocide, Russification and violation of human rights. Under Stalin Ukraine was marked for physical extinction; under Khrushchev, and now under Brezhnev-Kosygin outright terror has been replaced by the subtle process of destroying the Ukrainian national consciousness and identity through Russification, mass arrests and illegal trials and by other oppressive methods.

In the course of its rule over captive Ukraine, Communist Russia destroyed millions of Ukrainians through man-made fam-

ines, and forced deportations; it abolished the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church; it subordinated all aspects of Ukrainian life to the rigid control of Moscow, including Ukrainian economy, education, the press, the arts and literature, trade unions, and so forth.

For the past several years the Kremlin has engaged in a series of arrests, trials and convictions of hundreds of young Ukrainian intellectuals—poets, writers, literary critics, playwrights, professors, students and others—charging them with "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation." Yet, in the United Nations, Ukraine is a full-fledged member, and the Kremlin makes much of this fact in its massive propaganda drives throughout the world.

The fact is that today Ukraine, with its 48 million people, is more than ever a colony of Communist Russia; it is a land of inhuman persecution and economic exploitation.

Many a Western statesman may be lulled into a sense of false security by the spurious *detente*; but there is no *detente* in the relentless persecution of the Ukrainian people by Communist Russia.

Only outside Ukraine can Ukrainians and their descendants scattered throughout the world speak of the freedom and independence of Ukraine.

Wherever the basic rights of humanity are abused, men of good will must protest. That is why I bring Ukrainian Independence Day to public attention. By appropriately marking this day, we add our voices to those who protest Russia's treatment of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people.

#### UKRAINE ANNIVERSARY

### HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join with the many thousands of Americans throughout this Nation in commemorating the 55th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic, January 22, 1918, was a day which marked the culmination of century-old dreams of national independence from the Soviet Union. On that occasion, in the city of Kiev, the Ukrainian National Republic was born.

The Ukrainian people proved themselves to be dedicated and heroic patriots who were able to realize their cherished goals of individual freedom and national liberation from the autocracy of Soviet Russia. Today the 47 million ethnic Ukrainians form the largest of the captive nations subject to the control of an unrelenting Communist regime in Moscow. They still hold within their hearts the memories of a glorious history of continual struggle for self-determination.

We Americans must be reminded of our struggles for those same rights which are inalienable to people all over the free world. We share this dream with the people of the Ukraine. Let us pledge to work faithfully for the ideals of the men and women who fought so hard and won a free Ukraine.

#### SOLZHENITSYN AND OPERATION KEELHAUL

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have tried repeatedly to obtain information from our Government concerning Operation Keelhaul. This operation resulted in forcible repatriation of millions of anti-Communist Russians. Execution or imprisonment at the hands of the Soviet Government awaited those who were repatriated.

Why is so little known about this event? Even though over 25 years have passed, the Defense and State Department files on Operation Keelhaul are still classified. In his book, "The Gulag Archipelago", however, Alexander Solzhenitsyn writes about the tragic fate of those who were repatriated. I find it ironic that American citizens will learn about this event in Solzhenitsyn's book rather than from our own Government.

The following article on "The Gulag Archipelago" and Operation Keelhaul appeared in the January 16 edition of the Washington Star-News:

#### REMEMBERING "KEELHAUL"

Russian Nobel Prize-winner Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn's new book smuggled out to the West, "The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-1956," is a stinging indictment of the tyranny which is the foundation of the Soviet Union.

But Solzhenitsyn hurls at least one dart that ought to prick the conscience of the West when he recalls how Roosevelt and Churchill condemned literally millions of anti-Communist Russians and Eastern Europeans to execution or imprisonment by agreeing at Yalta to their forcible repatriation.

Not one American in 100,000 has heard of Operation Keelhaul, for the very good reason that the Defense and State Department files on it are still classified top secret. Nor are more aware of its infamous successor, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency's Operation Carrot.

Yet it has been estimated that between 6 million and 7 million members of the anti-Communist Russian Liberation Army (who fought on the side of the Germans), POWs and civilians—including women and children—were forcibly repatriated under "Keelhaul" and "Carrot" to the Soviet Union between 1945 and 1947. Some were White Russians who had fled from the Soviet Union a quarter of a century before.

Solzhenitsyn asserts that not a single former POW—let alone members of the Russian Liberation Army, many of whom were executed—returned to his country a free man. Without exception, they were shipped directly from Hitler's concentration camps to no less horrible slave-labor camps of Siberia. There, according to Solzhenitsyn, most of them perished.

In 1945, there were, according to Berlin's figures, nearly 700,000 Russians serving with the German armed forces, most of them on the Eastern Front, since the Russians were interested in the liberation of their country, not in fighting the Western democracies. Their commander was Lt. Gen. Andrei A. Vlasov, a brilliant Soviet officer and one of the heroes of the battle of Moscow, where he was captured in 1942.

In April of 1945, the 45-year-old Vlasov led his three divisions through Bavaria toward

Prague, with the notion of holding Bohemia against the Soviets with the assistance of anti-Communist Czechs until a surrender to the Americans could be arranged. It was also hoped that 30,000 anti-Communist Cossacks retreating from Yugoslavia could effect a juncture in the Bohemian basin with Vlasov's men.

At Pilsen, Vlasov reached the American lines. According to his biographer, Sven Steenberg, Vlasov received no guarantees from the Americans, although his troops laid down their arms and considered themselves to be interned under U.S. protection.

With Russian troops advancing from the East, Vlasov was informed that permission for his troops to pass through the American lines had been refused. This left him no alternative other than to order his unarmed men to save themselves as best they could. Some 10,000 were captured or executed by the Russians. Half of those who slipped through the American lines were forcibly repatriated to the Soviet Union. Vlasov himself was taken from an American escort by Soviet troops, spirited to Moscow and executed.

The British behaved no more honorably. Despite guarantees to the contrary, more than 30,000 Cossacks, including women, and children, led by the 76-year-old Gen. P. N. Krasnov, who had left the Soviet Union in 1920, were disarmed and forcibly turned over to the Red Army. Many committed suicide rather than be repatriated. Krasnov and 36 other generals were executed.

A certain amount of what happened can be laid to the confusion of the moment. But forcible repatriation of anti-Soviet Russians under UNRRA's auspices continued into 1947, more than a year after the fighting had ended. This "indelible stain on the honor of the West" (as the American historian George Fischer has termed it) can only have been a consequence of the desire to please Stalin at any price.

Solzhenitsyn perhaps is being charitable when he attributes this crime against humanity to the "systematic shortsightedness and stupidity" of Roosevelt and Churchill. Perhaps they—and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who enforced Operation Keelhaul with no apparent pangs of conscience—understood but simply did not care.

#### CHARLES M. TEAGUE, 1909-74

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the death of my friend and colleague, Charles M. Teague. Congressman Teague died New Year's Day in Santa Paula, Calif., at the age of 64. Widely respected by his friends, he was also admired by his adversaries for his diligence, forthrightness, sense of humor, and integrity.

Charles Teague leaves an inspiring record of service—he was the senior Republican member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, in addition to being the ranking Republican on the Agriculture Committee. As a member of the Veterans' Committee, I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to work closely with Mr. Teague.

Congressman Teague will be remembered for his good judgment, conscientiousness, honesty, and dedication to pursuing what he believed was best for his country. Having come from a family

active in California agriculture, Congressman Teague provided the Agriculture Committee with a great deal of valuable insight during his tenure in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged to have known Mr. Teague and to have had the opportunity to work with him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family, and to the people of the 13th District of California. We all have lost a good friend.

In addition, I would like to share an article with my colleagues concerning Congressman Teague which appeared January 2 in the Washington Post. The article affords us additional insight into some of the highlights of Mr. Teague's career.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 2, 1974]

#### REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES M. TEAGUE DIES

(By Jean R. Halley)

Rep. Charles M. Teague (R-Calif.), a member of Congress since 1954, died yesterday in Santa Paula at 64.

Aides said he suffered a heart attack while staying at the home of his son, Alan, who is mayor of Santa Paula.

The congressman, who was the ranking Republican on the House Agricultural Committee and the senior Republican member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, had gone home for the holidays.

Santa Paula, where he was born and reared, is in the 13th District, which he represented in Congress.

The unexpected death of the quiet but highly respected congressman brought immediate statements from top-ranking Republicans.

President Nixon said:

"The death of Charles Teague represents a significant loss to the United States Congress, to his home state of California and to the nation he served so long and so well. He will be remembered most especially for his interest in American agriculture and for his many years of devoted service on the House Agriculture Committee. Mrs. Nixon and I were deeply saddened to hear of his passing and we extend our sincere sympathy to his family."

Vice President Gerald R. Ford said: "I am very much saddened by the death of my dear friend and former colleague, Charles Teague. American agriculture owes a great deal to him for his dedication to the best interests of the American farmer. His district, state and the nation have lost an outstanding legislator."

"Congressman Teague typified the best in American politics today," said Rep. Robert H. Michel of Illinois. "He was a dedicated, hardworking legislator whose prime interest was in what is best for the country. As ranking Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, he also was the leading advocate of American agriculture in Congress. He will be sorely missed." Michel is chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee.

Rep. Teague has served on the Agricultural Committee for most of his tenure in Congress. While he was not noted for introducing major legislation, his efforts to maintain free as opposed to subsidized agriculture were considered very effective.

He also took a strong stand on aiding conservation and environmental programs and for a number of years was the ranking member on the Agricultural Committee's Conservation and Credit Subcommittee.

He was one of those responsible for bringing about an Interior Department ban on new oil drilling platforms in the Santa Barbara Channel in 1971. There had been heavily damaging oil gushing from a drilling platform there several years earlier.

Rep. Teague was a natural choice to serve on the Agricultural Committee. His family was among the founders of the Sunkist cooperative in California, and his father was a pioneer in that state's farm credit program.

Rep. Teague went to Stanford University, where he received his bachelor's degree in 1931 and his law degree three years later.

His practice of law was interrupted during World War II, when he served as a major in the Army Air Corps. He resumed the practice after the war and became involved in community affairs, serving as president of the Ventura County Community Chest, the Ventura Rotary Club and the Ojai Valley School Board of Trustees.

He was president of the Ventura County Republican Assembly when he decided to run for Congress in 1954. He was re-elected to the nine succeeding Congresses and had planned to run again this year.

Rep. Teague had a gentle sense of humor. He once noted that there seemed to be a conflict in the labels applied to him in letters from some of his constituents.

"When the conservatives consider me a liberal and the liberals figure me for a conservative, I must be in trouble," he lamented.

On another occasion, he disowned one of his own bills on the floor of the House. A great pet lover, he had introduced a bill to eliminate tariffs on the importation of wild animals.

He was so proud of the bill that he had asked that it be referred to as the Teague Bill. But by the time it got through the Senate, it had come out as a bill to limit beef imports from Australia and New Zealand. The changes brought this speech from Rep. Teague:

"I was proud to have been the father of such a clean, beautiful little fellow . . . He was prepared to do great things for boa constrictors and gorillas and their owners.

"But, in the course of events, my little baby was sent to the Senate pediatric hospital . . . All that remained of him was the identification number on his poor little wrist.

"Mr. Speaker, I must disclaim fatherhood of (H.R.) 1839 as he is before us today. I am willing to contribute to his support, but he is not mine—my blood no longer flows in his veins.

"I repeat, Mr. Speaker, 'This child ain't mine.'"

Rep. Teague also found humor in another situation. For some time, he and Rep. Olin E. Teague (D-Texas) shared seats on the Veterans Affairs Committee.

The resulting confusion from pronouncements frequently credited to the wrong Teague were usually followed by retractions, which in turn were followed by a good laugh. There was no confusion in the work both did toward helping veterans.

Among other things, Rep. Charles Teague had worked hard to improve housing rights for veterans.

Rep. Teague's first wife, Marjorie, died in 1970. He remarried that year, but was separated from his second wife, Courtney, at the time of his death.

In addition to his son, Rep. Teague also is survived by two daughters, Norma Potter, of Washington, and Judith Kenyon, of Santa Rosa, Calif., and eight grandchildren.

#### UKRAINE ANNIVERSARIES

### HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join those who today are remembering the 56th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukraine's independence and the 55th anniversary of the

Ukraine's Act of Union. The people of the Ukraine did not have much opportunity to enjoy their freedom before they were incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1922. However, the desire for freedom despite Russian occupation has claimed more than 11 million victims. We have achieved some success with support of human rights for Jews in Russia. Can we not extend our scope to include concern and support for other captive peoples?

H.R. 8053—POSTCARD VOTER  
REGISTRATION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the postcard voter registration bill will be considered by the House soon. This is vital legislation. There are too many people in the United States who do not take part in elections because registration is too difficult. H.R. 8053 would supplement the existing registration machinery of the States.

In a letter, Peter Fosco, general president of the Laborers' International Union of North America, states:

We believe one of the most critical problems facing political leaders is the sharp rise in public cynicism toward government. A survey conducted last November by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research showed that 66 percent of the public said they felt they could trust their government only "some of the time."

This is a shocking statistic and, in a democracy, government cannot act effectively if citizens lack confidence in their public leaders. It therefore rests with Congress to help restore the people's faith in their political system. A good first step would be to increase voter participation in the democratic process.

H.R. 8053 would supplement the existing registration machinery and add a new tool to registering voters. . . .

Minnesota used their new postcard registration and election day registration law in last fall's election. The following excerpts are from a letter from Arlen Erdahl, Minnesota secretary of state, whose office administered the new law. He says:

As you well know, our Minnesota experience with the 1973 law is so far limited to local and municipal elections. About 700 municipalities had elections in November and December, and I feel the experience with the new law was quite satisfactory. . . .

On the whole I felt the new postcard and universal registration law worked quite well. . . .

Voter registration is now an easy process in Minnesota and should not restrict any eligible person from voting. . . .

This letter, from a secretary of state who has had experience with postcard registration, is a positive and powerful argument against the prognosis of secretaries of state who were polled last summer and stated the postcard registration would not work in their States.

The Federal law would not supplant existing registration machinery, it would

supplement it. In a letter dated January 16, 1974, Leonard LaShomb, executive vice president of the Minnesota AFL-CIO, says:

Labor is in full support of this legislation (H.R. 8053) as we feel it will supplement the post card registration we now have in Minnesota.

I agree.

We must make it easier to vote in the United States. I am convinced that the difficult registration procedures limit the turnout on election day. Among the world's democracies the United States has the worst record of voter participation in elections. This country is the only Western democracy that puts the burden of registering on the citizen instead of on the Government. We must remedy this situation.

FOURTH AFRICAN AMERICAN  
DIALOG CONFERENCE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the fourth annual African American Dialog Conference was held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from December 3 through 7 of 1973. This conference is sponsored by the African American Institute, which is based in New York City. The participants in this very important conference consisted of representatives from both the United States and majority-ruled African countries.

The purpose of the dialog between participants centered around the importance of assistance from the United States to majority-ruled African countries in the areas of trade, economic development, and foreign investment.

It was a very important occasion for me, for not only was I a participant in the dialogs, but a chairman of the conference as well.

There were several significant speeches given by various representatives who participated in the conference. One very significant speech was tendered by Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, leader of the Zulu nation, which focused on the evils of the apartheid policy in South Africa. I deem it a privilege to share this magnificent speech with all my colleagues:

COMMENTS ON SOUTHERN AFRICAN ISSUES  
IN AFRICAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS, ADDIS  
ABABA, ETHIOPIA—DECEMBER 6, 1973—M.  
GATSHA BUTHELEZI

I consider it my first duty to thank the Directing Committee for the African-American Dialogues for extending the privilege to me to participate in this fourth Conference of their Dialogues series.

It is always beneficial to one to participate in any Dialogue where one learns from a divergence of opinions. This I think is the whole purpose of any dialogue. One does not come to a dialogue with the purpose of acquiring proselytes or to sell any particular line of thought. More is gained by an exchange of views in any dialogue.

For those of us who live in South Africa, it is a great privilege to come out to Black Africa, something that is not very easy and something which should be happening more

often if we had our way. I consider it absolutely essential for Africa and America and the whole world for that matter, to appreciate the fact that although we live under a peculiar regime, such as the one in our country, that we have no option but to live in our country. This means that we just have to make the best of the situation in which we find ourselves. This might even mean living there and suffering the handicaps under which we live just as over 3 million Jews did in Germany before the last world war. We do not accept being chatels in the land of our birth. We have not even resigned ourselves to the state of powerlessness and voicelessness to which we have been reduced by the powerful in our land. The methods we use are dictated largely by the strength of the forces arrayed against us. Even our politics, might look to an outsider as lacking the vigor and force it should have. It must be remembered that even in that situation politics is the art of the possible.

The rest of the world and even Africa sometimes fail to take cognizance of the fact that we are faced in South Africa with an indigenous white population. Most white South Africans are descendants of settlers who settled in South Africa more than three hundred years ago. They have become indigenous to South Africa as white and black Americans have become to the United States.

This makes no task more difficult because this white minority is powerful and probably has the most powerful army in Africa, the total amounts set aside by white South Africa for Defense for 1973/74 amount to R481,164,000. This figure represents 3.3% of the estimated gross national product as compared to 2.5% in the previous financial year. This is merely to mention one aspect of their power.

When the present regime formulated its Apartheid policy, there was no consultation with Blacks. This was not something peculiar to this Regime as is no other regime has ever done so since our conquest. Before the Nationalist Regime ascended to power, the United Party ruled in South Africa. They had a policy of segregation under which Africans had a Native Representative Council in Pretoria. For quite a long time great African patriots such as the Late Chief A. J. Lutuli, the late Dr. Z. K. Mathews to mention just two well-known names because members of the Native Representative Council. When they did participate they did not by so doing embrace the segregationist policies of the then-government of the Land. National Liberation Movements such as the now banned African National Congress decided to embark on a policy of non-collaboration. In other words, they asked their members not to continue to participate in these bodies set up under the segregationist policies. They then followed a more militant line I need not go through the history of these bodies as it is well known to all of you.

I mention this background to emphasize that Separate Development as Apartheid is now euphemistically known in South Africa, has been imposed on Blacks. No options are open to us, the number of banning orders under which various people have been placed is evidence of this. Homelands have been imposed on us but are now a fact. That does not mean that we are resigned to having a stake only in these impoverished underdeveloped old reserves which have now been romanticized with the news name of "Homelands". We do not want to opt out of the economy of our country. At the same time it must be realized that our people live in these undeveloped areas and we are concerned about them as much as those of our people who are regarded as sojourners in the metropolitan areas of South Africa.

Africans are the only racial group in South Africa that carry passes. We are in other words, debarred from seeking employment as freely as other racial groups do. Only through

labour bureaux can Africans get registered as employment seekers. White South African has now irresponsibly made us responsible for millions of our people under the policies they pursue. In my case 4¼ million Zulus have been pushed on to my lap. We have no industries worth speaking about in the Homelands. Even the Prime Minister has more than once said to me that the former—High Commission Territories which are now independent countries in Southern Africa, and the Homelands, have nothing to sell but their labour. This hurts but it remains a true description of the extent to which we are kept both economically and politically powerless.

We appreciate the volume of sympathy to us that is directed from outside. This moral support means quite much for people like us stewing powerlessly in the Apartheid pot. We appreciate the motives even behind the various attempts to weakening the South African Regime economically. I, for instance, applaud the pressures that have been brought on American Corporations by people like Congressman Charles Diggs. I wish particularly to congratulate Mr. Diggs on his bill. At the same time it must be appreciated that those of us who are responsible for so many millions of people, however irresponsibly this has come about, have to provide for their existence from day to day.

We appreciate that the pressures by Americans. We also understand that the pressure for sanctions and withdrawal of investments are an ideological stand aimed at the Racist Regime in South Africa. However, by virtue of the fact that we are right in the situation, our approach has of necessity to be more pragmatic than doctrinaire. According to a leading Industrial Consultant, Dr. Lawrence McCrystal, given the current economic growth, there would be 728,000 unemployed Africans by the year 1975. Between 1973-77, 107,800 additional African workers will enter the labour force annually, 23,500 Coloured and Indian making a total of 131,300. The cost of training one worker is \$1500 and it costs \$3,865 to create jobs per worker. The total cost of placing a worker is \$5,365. So that the annual cost of providing one job per annum will be: For Africans: \$578,347,000. For Coloureds and Indians: \$126,077,500 making a total of \$704,424,500.

We came from Natal and 60,000 African workers mainly Zulus, went on strike this year as 70 per cent of African wages are uneconomic. Our workers are not members of Trade Unions. But we in Kwa Zulu publicly encourage our people in South Africa to establish Trade Unions and more than five have been founded. At a Summit meeting of Homelands' Leaders held at Umata on the 8th of November, all Homelands' Leaders except the Chief Minister of Bophutatswana, Chief Mangope supported the stepping up of a campaign for the establishment of more and more trade unions amongst Africans. There is nothing in law forbidding Black Trade Unions. Under the Industrial Conciliation Act the definition of a worker excludes Africans, that is what has hampered the emergence of Black Trade Unions.

The South African Government has up to now refused to give us more land than was promised under the 1936 Native Land and Trust Act under the Hertzog Regime. In other words, no more land is being released by the South African Government to consolidate Homelands as countries. This was one of the main issues we discussed at our Summit Conference at Umata and we intend approaching the Republican Government on these issues. Whilst people like myself have strong reservations about the philosophy of Apartheid, we feel that the Regime in South Africa must carry out their policy to its logical conclusions. This means providing countries within South Africa for the various African ethnic groups such as they have promised. We are at the same time aware of the fact that ethnic grouping is being used

by the Racist Regime to divide us. That is why we have now committed ourselves to the idea of a Federal Union.

We think first of a Federal Union of Black States and we have said that we are not going to agree to any Federal formula which pushes us out into the cold by allowing whites to hoard the economy of South Africa for themselves.

We have said that if whites are so concerned about "being swamped" as they put it, we can work out a federal formula which will ensure that the economy of the Country benefits all the peoples of Southern Africa.

We do not pretend that this is the only formula for the solution of that complex situation. But it must be realized that whatever efforts are made towards resolving the problems of South Africa, from outside, have a highly appreciated but limited value.

In the final analysis, it is the Black people themselves within South Africa who will ultimately throw off the yoke of this racist oppression. This is not just wishful thinking on our part, but this has been the common pattern of liberation throughout the history of Man.

Whilst we try all the formulae at our disposal for our liberation, it must be remembered that our people have to live from day to day. At the same time we have to prepare our people for the time when we shall take full participation in decisionmaking in South Africa. This means uplifting ourselves as much as possible in the meantime. We feel that this is the aspect of assistance which the rest of Africa and the world seem to ignore. We would appreciate any assistance for this vital preparation for our future

#### MURDER BY HANDGUN—THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 262

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to the article reprinted below from the January 18 Washington Post. It is, I think, obvious that this murder would not have occurred had Mr. Titlow's assailant been unable to obtain a gun. Once again, I must urge my colleagues to take prompt action to prevent these tragedies through stringent gun control laws.

There are two things that we must not forget. First, no matter what the intentions and capabilities of a person, it is much more difficult to kill someone without a gun. Great Britain, for example, had fewer than a hundred murders in all of last year.

Second, only Congress can do anything to stop this slaughter. The States cannot do it because their jurisdiction is too limited. The Executive and Judicial branches of the Federal Government cannot do it because it is not within their authority.

Only Congress can take effective action, and, as I have said before, if Congress refuses to act, the responsibility for this continuing tragedy must rest with us.

The article follows:

#### WOMAN SOUGHT IN K STREET SLAYING

(By Judith Lacey Mann)

Shortly before he was shot to death, Tuesday, Willard Titlow, 40, told colleagues at

Congressional Quarterly, that he was worried about a secretary in his office who, for several weeks, had been following him when he left for lunch or at the end of the day.

Police said yesterday that the secretary, Paula J. Frendak, 27, has been charged on a warrant with homicide in the fatal shooting of Titlow, whose body was found shortly after lunch just inside the rear door of an office building at 1735 K Street NW, where Congressional Quarterly rents office space on the third floor.

Titlow, who sold the research service of the private government research organization, had been shot twice in the head, according to the D.C. medical examiner's office.

Police described Miss Frendak as being 5 feet, 8 inches tall, weighing 165 pounds. They said she is armed and considered dangerous to herself as well as others.

Colleagues and friends of Titlow's said Miss Frendak, a secretary in the sales section of Congressional Quarterly, sat directly across from Titlow's desk and took letters from him as well as other sales personnel, but that he had no personal relationship with her.

Judy Godsey, a secretary in the same office, described Titlow as "very outgoing, the type of person you could get to know very well and very fast. He was always kidding around." With Miss Frendak, however, "he was very businesslike. He didn't joke around with her like he does with everyone else," said Miss Godsey.

On one occasion when he accidentally touched Miss Frendak, she became annoyed, said Miss Godsey. "He was at the Christmas party and put his hand on her arm and said 'excuse me' as he was passing by, and she said, 'get your hand off,'" Miss Godsey recalled.

Miss Frendak joined the Congressional Quarterly on Dec. 3, according to managing editor Wayne Kelly. At first, said Miss Godsey, "her work used to be pretty good. They were very impressed the first couple of weeks. Then, it started going downhill."

About this same time, according to Kelly, Miss Frendak began following Titlow when he left the office for lunch or in the evenings to go home.

"Mostly it was just joining him (as he walked), although she did follow him at a distance some times," said Kelly.

"This happened frequently enough to disturb him and to disturb the supervisor here in the department.

"Willard had told a couple of friends at the office that he was concerned about her following him and that he was going to speak to her about it. We don't know whether he ever did that," Kelly said.

Kelly said Miss Frendak was going to be "let go" this Friday "because of her behavior and our concern about it and because her general secretarial work was not satisfactory." She had not been told that she was going to be fired at the time of the shooting, Kelly said.

Police, in the lookout issued for Miss Frendak here and in her native New York state, said she was wearing an orange dress with white piping around the neck and cuffs, a knit sweater, dark blue suede coat, dark boots and a large pocketbook.

Miss Godsey said Miss Frendak had been wearing that same outfit "for about two weeks." She said Miss Frendak also began wearing a purple and white knit cap, into which she tucked her long dark hair, every day since Christmas.

Miss Godsey also said that Miss Frendak had a large pocketbook and "carried it all the time. If she poured a cup of coffee, she had it with her. The purse was never out of her sight. Not for one minute."

Miss Frendak, who was born in Skaneateles, N.Y., was graduated from the Syracuse University in December, 1967, according to resumes she provided her employers. She worked briefly as a clerk for a radio station

in Charlottesville, Va., before coming to the Washington area.

Most of the next five years she lived at 1417 N St. NW, and held various secretarial and clerical positions. Several of her employers described her as quiet and introverted.

In 1969, she was enrolled in the philosophy department at Howard University, according to her resumes.

Miss Friendak worked on Tuesday, according to Kelly, and followed Titlow when he and a friend left the building for lunch. She did not follow them into the restaurant but was in the lobby of the building when they returned. Titlow went to his office, then left shortly before 2:30 to go out on business.

"When he got up to leave, she jumped up and followed him," said Kelly. "She said something about having an appointment, and never came back."

Titlow was born and raised in the Washington area, attended Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School and Montgomery Junior College. He served in the Army for two years, then received a degree in journalism and public relations from the University of Maryland. He had been with Congressional Quarterly about a year and a half.

He was separated from his wife Patricia, who is living in Sydney, Australia, and was living with his mother, Isabel W. Titlow, at 8802 Grant St., in Bethesda. He is also survived by a brother, Richard, who also lives in Bethesda.

#### THE 1973 CONGRESS

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

#### THE 1973 CONGRESS

1973 was a good year for the U.S. Congress. The major concern of the Congress in 1973 was to reverse the long-standing flow of power toward the Presidency. When the Congress assembled in January of 1973, a defiant mood was apparent and its leaders were determined to reassert its constitutional powers. During the year the Congress suffered some losses and made some gains, but, on balance, it ended the year in a stronger position.

In foreign policy it scored two major successes: a first time ever cutoff of funds for a military operation in progress, by voting to end funds for bombing in Indo-China on August 15; and a 60-day limit on the length of time American troops could be committed to combat without Congressional support.

With the help of the federal courts, the Congress is apparently winning the struggle over the control of spending. The lower federal courts have consistently held that the President must carry out the laws enacted by the Congress, and that he does not have the power to impound money that the Congress has appropriated. The House has passed, and the Congress will undoubtedly give final approval next year to a bill to limit the President's power to impound appropriated funds and to give Congress better control over the federal budget.

Of course the Congress often failed, too, by not overriding vetoes and by adjourning with a long list of important and unfinished business. Campaign spending failed, and, in the closing days of the session, no agreement could be reached on emergency energy legislation. Other legislation facing members in the new session will be pensions, trade, tax

revision, health insurance, housing, minimum wage, no-fault insurance and land use.

It is easy to put the Congress down for failure to complete actions on these tough issues, but that indictment may be overdrawn, especially if it is recalled that the issues raise terribly difficult problems and that the Congress will act on many of them in 1974.

The 1973 Congress did not achieve landmark legislation on most issues of domestic policy. No major housing, education or tax legislation was enacted, although a farm bill became law which replaced the existing system of rigid farm price supports with a "target price" plan, and major transportation measures were passed, including a highway bill and a railway bill to keep the trains running in the Northeast and Midwest.

Although the list of legislative accomplishments was not long, the Congress showed initiative with legislation to open the highway trust fund to mass transit, home rule for the District of Columbia, a comprehensive manpower program with public service employment, federal aid for emergency medical care and the creation of health maintenance organizations. Congressional reform made a breakthrough, too, with more open meetings of Congressional committees, a further dent in the seniority system, and the installation of an electronic voting system in the House which cut in half the time of a recorded vote.

This Congress also dealt reasonably well with the extraordinary problems of the Presidency. Despite some mistakes, the Senate Watergate Committee performed an important task of public education on the men and events of Watergate. A careful and responsible job was done on the confirmation of a new Vice President, and a beginning was made on a purposeful and professional inquiry into impeachment.

The energy crisis dominated the final days of the Congress. After passing significant energy legislation authorizing construction of the Alaska pipeline, providing for mandatory fuel allocations, approving a 55 mile-per-hour speed limit and daylight savings time, the House and the Senate were unable to agree on the provisions of an emergency energy bill. Three days before Christmas, with the two chambers bogged down over a windfall profits section aimed at the oil industry, and with nearly half the members already gone, the Congress adjourned and let the bill go over to 1974.

Whatever its faults, the first session of the 93rd Congress, which convened on January 3, 1973, and adjourned December 22, 1973, ran 354 days and was hard working. As the seventh longest Congress in history, it considered 17,528 bills, enacted about 200 laws, and took more recorded votes than any Congress in history. During the session the House cast 541 recorded votes, and the Senate 594. (The old records were 329 for the House and 532 for the Senate.)

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, commemorates the 56th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. Normally, Mr. FLOOD would conduct a special order recognizing this historic occasion. Due to the fact that this is the first week of the second session and a heavy legislative schedule awaits us, the special order will be held next Thursday, January 30.

#### HOLY FAMILY COLLEGE CELEBRATES 20TH YEAR

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 20th anniversary of Holy Family College in Philadelphia. This coed liberal arts college is planning to commemorate its founding by providing a series of complementary lectures to the public dealing with some of the problems facing families today.

Besides providing an outstanding scholastic curriculum, Holy Family College, through its various clubs and activities, has raised money and entertained many needy families and charitable organizations during its 20 years of existence.

Holy Family College is not an institution which hides behind its academic walls. In addition to the many charitable works performed by the faculty, staff, and students, the college makes its facilities available to many segments of the community.

I have used its meeting rooms and classrooms many times for seminars for the public on the vital issues of our day.

At this time I enter into the RECORD an article in a local newspaper, the Northeast Times, commemorating the 20th anniversary of Holy Family College.

The article follows:

#### HOLY FAMILY COLLEGE CELEBRATES 20TH YEAR

Nestled in the quiet setting of Torresdale, Holy Family College is preparing to celebrate its 20th anniversary. Originally chartered in 1954 as a liberal arts college for women, Holy Family is now a coed institution, with programs in elementary and secondary education, medical technology, nursing and business administration as well as the traditional liberal arts curricula.

Founded by the Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth, the college is located on a spacious and attractive tract of land bounded by Grant and Frankford Aves. The buildings of Nazareth Academy and Nazareth Grade School adjoin the College property.

Sister M. Lillian is the current president of the college; other administrative officers include Sister M. Immaculata, Academic Dean, Sister M. Praxede, Treasurer, Sister M. Patrice, Dean of Students, and Sister Mary Louise, the Registrar. Sister M. Kathryn directs the services of an adequate and comfortably furnished library.

Recent additions to the original campus have been made to provide for possible expansion in the future. The former Evans property, on the southeast corner of Frankford and Grant Aves., was purchased three years ago and at the present time it provides departmental office space for the faculty of the popular Department of Nursing. Some 20 acres, north of Stevenson Lane and including the former Green property, were purchased more recently from the Orleans Construction Co.

The Green family residence now houses the Mathematics Center, a community-oriented facility under the direction of Wanda Wleckowski of the Department of Education. This facility provides specialized tutorial assistance in the field of mathematics to local school children. At the same time, prospective teachers, students of the college, are trained in the important techniques of special instruction.

According to the Academic Dean, Sister M. Immaculata, establishment of the Mathematics Center was a natural follow-up to the previously established Reading Center. Opened in September 1968 the effectiveness of the Reading Center, which is directed by Sister M. de Lourdes, has been commended by representatives of the Pennsylvania Department of Education as well as by educators generally. The Center has even served as a model for similar installations at other institutions of higher learning. Substantial numbers of students, registering from public and private secondary and elementary schools in the area, have been assisted since the opening of this Reading Center.

Sister M. Patrice, Dean of Students, reports that the typical student at Holy Family is friendly, serious in purpose and, more than likely, holding a part-time job. Most of the students are residents of Philadelphia, many from the Northeast community. And, paralleling a national trend, more than half of the students attend on a part-time basis, pursuing various occupations in conjunction with their academic studies.

The pioneer class, which was graduated in 1958, numbered 19. During the intervening years enrollments have slowly but steadily increased and more than 1,150 baccalaureate degrees have been conferred by the college to date. Courses in business law, family law, real estate, ethnicity and pluralism, personnel management, and the psychology of the socially maladjusted-emotionally disturbed child are courses currently being offered in response to the needs and interests of the present student body.

A variety of courses, for personal enrichment as well as for professional and academic credit, are offered to all interested candidates. Day, evening and Saturday classes are scheduled throughout the year and a growing number of more mature adults as well as younger individuals in the community register each year. Holy Family remains the only fully accredited four year college in the immediate area.

#### LECTURES FOR PUBLIC

One of the distinctive features of the college has been an emphasis on family spirit and the importance of inculcating values in all aspects of family life. Appropriately, the family has been chosen as the dominant and particular theme for the entire College community during this 20th anniversary year. Seminar and course themes, the Logos lectures and student sponsored activities will focus on this theme during the year. Moreover, a coordinating council, comprised of students, faculty and alumni of the college, has announced a commemorative lecture series to begin on Jan. 15. These lectures, open to the public without charge, will deal with some of the practical problems which confront families today: communication, morality, finances, mental and physical health, law, and preparation for the later years.

To encourage attendance at the lectures, students of the college have volunteered to provide supervision and recreational activities for the younger members of the family while parents attend the lectures. Further information concerning the lectures is available from the college.

The campus spirit at Holy Family reflects an enthusiasm generated by diverse interests and activities. For example, in addition to the scholastic interests, departmental clubs and other campus organizations pursue a variety of activities, science exhibits and demonstrations, glee club and dramatic performances, athletic events and charitable efforts form an integral part of the collegiate year. Among the beneficiaries, the Riverview Home for the Aged, the Philadelphia State Hospital, local orphanages and several needy families of the

city have been entertained or otherwise assisted by campus groups.

Of the 49 full-time faculty members, 26 are religious. The full-time faculty is supplemented by a staff of part-time lecturers, 22 laymen and another 5 religious.

GEN. EDWARD I. CREED

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress, Maj. Gen. Edward I. Creed, Commander of the U.S. Army Reserve Command, Columbus, Ohio, one of the largest in the Nation, is leaving his command.

General Creed entered the Army on March 18, 1941, and was commissioned from Officer Candidate School at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md., in January 1942. His first assignment was to the Ordnance School at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. In December 1942 he was assigned as section chief of the Ordnance Training Center at Santa Anita, Calif. He was transferred to the Alaskan Defense Command at Fort Richardson, Alaska, in April 1943 where he participated in the Attu and Kiska campaigns in the Aleutian Islands.

In August 1945 he was assigned as Assistant Chief of Staff, G2, with the 6th U.S. Army and participated in the Hollandia, Admiralty Island, Leyte, and Luzon operations. He was awarded the Bronze Star for Valor for his participation in the landings at Luzon in the Philippines; and the Bronze Arrowhead for participating in the amphibious landings on Attu, Kiska in the Aleutians and Leyte and Luzon in the Philippines. His many other decorations include the Purple Heart Medal; Asiatic Pacific Ribbon with five battle stars; American Defense Ribbon; Philippine Liberation Ribbon with three battle stars; six Overseas Bars; World War II Victory Medal; Army of Occupation Ribbon and Armed Forces Reserve Ribbon.

Following his return to civilian life, he entered the U.S. Army Reserve. His Reserve assignments have included assignment as commanding officer, 302d Ordnance Group, Cleveland, Ohio; chief of staff, 83d Infantry Division; deputy commander, 83d ARCOM. He assumed command of the 83d ARCOM in March 1970.

During General Creed's tenure of duty with the 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command, he has taken an active role in community service relations, mutual support programs, and military affiliated organizations. He consistently and tirelessly devoted his time and attention to the problems at hand and to the one goal of a better Reserve force. His inspiring example, exceptional capabilities and loyalty have earned him the esteem and admiration of subordinates and superiors alike. It is with fond memories and sad regrets that we bid goodby to General Creed as a group commander.

NIXON PURSUES DÉTENTE WHILE  
KREMLIN PURSUES MILITARY  
SUPERIORITY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration, despite all indications to the contrary, seems to believe that U.S.-Soviet détente will bring about a friendlier and less militant Soviet Union. An article by Evans and Novak in the December 31 edition of the Washington Post, however, exposes the danger of this misconception.

At the same time that Nixon is talking about the supposed benefits of détente, the Soviet Union is pushing to achieve clear military superiority. The Soviets are now spending twice as much as the United States on military research and development, while the United States is spending twice as much as the Soviets on military pay. As Evans and Novak warn:

If continued, those trends will enable the Soviet Union to pursue a highly bellicose foreign policy within 3 years.

The following is the complete text of the Evans and Novak article:

#### THE KREMLIN'S FUTURE POWER

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The muscular Soviet military posture during the Mideast war and disturbing trends in comparative U.S.-Soviet defense spending leads senior uniformed officers in the Pentagon to this alarming forecast: a Kremlin with clear military superiority will begin maximum world pressure as early as 1977.

U.S. intelligence analysis shows Moscow spending twice as much as Washington on military research and development and Washington spending twice as much as Moscow on military pay. If continued, those trends will enable the Soviet Union to pursue a highly bellicose foreign policy within three years. By this analysis, Soviet saber rattling during the Yom Kippur war is but a foretaste of what lies ahead.

Going beyond the usual Pentagon rationale for higher defense spending, this assessment represents deep-seated concern for the future by troubled senior officers. In particular, they believe the architect of détente, Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, overlooks the danger of declining United States strength in comparison with that of the Russians.

That decline is pointed up in the U.S. intelligence consensus regarding U.S.-Soviet defense spending. Research and development now accounts for 25 per cent of the Soviet defense budget, compared with 12 per cent for the United States.

Converting rubles into dollars, R & D figures for 1970 (the last available year) show \$16 billion spent by Soviets against \$7.4 billion by Americans, with the gap even wider today. Moscow's crash program in naval expansion is most dramatic. Ship construction now comprises 15 per cent of Soviet defense spending compared with 4 per cent for the United States.

In contrast, inexorable salary demands of the all-volunteer U.S. armed services mean that manpower alone costs the United States an outlandish 57 per cent of the defense budget, compared with 25 per cent for the Soviets. That ratio will get worse before it improves.

These deadly statistics convince high U.S. officers the all-volunteer concept must be

replaced by a revived draft. The chairmen of the armed services committees in Congress, Sen. John F. Stennis of Mississippi and Rep. F. Edward Hébert of Louisiana, tend to agree. But they have privately informed the Pentagon that Congress would not adopt a new draft law earlier than 1977. And 1977, ominously, is the year U.S. officers see the Soviets achieving clear-cut conventional superiority.

The question remains: What will the Kremlin do with that superiority? The Pentagon has noted with interest a newsletter published by The Economist of London, describing bilateral meetings early in 1973 between Soviet officials and their Warsaw Pact allies. According to the newsletter:

"Essentially, the East Europeans were told that the Soviet Union aims in the next 12 to 15 years to devote all its resources (A) to pursuing detente with the west and (B) to building up its own strength, militarily and economically. At the end of this period—roughly in the middle or late 1980s—the total strength of the Soviet and East European bloc would have increased to such an extent that it would be able to gain the upper hand in its relationship with the West."

High U.S. officers confirm this account's accuracy but predict the "upper hand" stage will be closer to 1977 than 1987—a view shaped by recent events in the Eastern Mediterranean.

With the Soviets concentrating 93 vessels there against 60 for the United States, the Pentagon believes a clash would have resulted in American disaster. What, then, would the United States have done had there not been a diplomatic settlement? Replies one top officer: "We would have had to throw in our cards." In other words, an ignominious withdrawal of U.S. forces.

Kremlinologists outside the Pentagon always accuse the U.S. military of accepting the worst possible hypothesis of Soviet intentions, neglecting Moscow's desperate need for Western computer technology and fear of U.S.-China entente. Nevertheless, these experts now believe the Pentagon's fears should be taken more into account by Dr. Kissinger.

This view is held by a distinguished Kremlin-watcher, Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski of Columbia University. Moscow, he said, during a Dec. 7 seminar at the Brookings Institution, continues to "seek a warfare capability to become assured of victory and to have an edge in crisis situations." Hence, the United States must increase defense spending to retain vanishing parity.

More important was this recommendation: As chief proponent of detente, Kissinger should participate more actively in drafting the defense budget. To that suggestion from the Columbia professor, the brass in the Pentagon whispers amen.

GILMAN REPORTS POW-MIA STATUS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from a trip to Laos taken on behalf of those American men still missing as a result of our military involvement in Southeast Asia.

Today I reported to the National Security and Scientific Developments Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs

Committee the findings of my trip to Laos.

I respectfully request permission to include this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues will have opportunity to give this matter appropriate consideration:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., January 22, 1974.

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,

Chairman, National Security Policy Subcommittee, House Foreign Affairs Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ZABLOCKI: I welcome this opportunity to formally report to the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments the findings of my recent visit to Southeast Asia on behalf of those Americans still unaccounted for following our military involvement in that part of the world.

With recent reports that efforts at accounting for our missing men are at a standstill and with the growing frustration on the part of the families of these men, I felt compelled to visit Laos myself for an on-the-spot assessment of our situation there.

Prior to taking this trip, I sponsored legislation, H.J. Res. 716, calling for a Congressional field investigation into the status of our missing men. In October, 1973, I helped arrange a similar trip for a delegation of families of our missing men. Because of our legislative responsibilities, I was unable to accompany the families at the time of their trip. I was pleased, therefore, to have had this opportunity, during our recess, to take a first hand look in Southeast Asia at the conditions surrounding the search for missing American servicemen. Additionally, the State Department urged my visit, lending further impetus to my own interest.

Before reporting on the actual events of my investigation, permit me to take this opportunity to review the provisions of the agreement we signed almost a year ago today.

The Joint Communiqué signed in Paris on June 13, 1973, details the specific provisions relating to POW-MIA matters agreed to in Article 8 of the original treaty signed in January, 1973.

Section 8(e) states:

"In conformity with Article 8(b) of the Agreement, the parties shall help each other to get information about those military personnel and foreign civilians of the parties missing in action, to determine the location and take care of the graves of the dead so as to facilitate the exhumation and repatriation of the remains, and to take any such other measures as may be required to get information about those still considered missing in action."

To this date the North Vietnamese have failed to comply with these search agreements, and since fighting and military occupation particularly in the areas of Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos has not fully subsided, members of the Four Party Joint Military Team have been unable to adequately investigate known crash sites.

During my visit to Laos I met and conferred with officials of the Pathet Lao, officers of the Hmong Guerrilla Army which opposed the Pathet Lao in Laos, officials of the North Vietnamese government, and members of the Joint Casualty Resolution Center.

In Vientiane I conferred with Pathet Lao Col. Soth Phetrasy, Co-chairman of the Joint Commission for Implementation of the Peace Agreement.

In reply to my appeal to expedite the search for our MIAs and to provide information concerning POWs in Laos, Col. Phetrasy stated that while his government would be

willing to assist, any full scale search would have to await the formation of a coalition government in Laos so that the safety of the search teams would be guaranteed. He further indicated that he knew of no American prisoners being held in Laos with the exception of Emmet Kay, a civilian pilot.

I then conferred with Vu Thien, First Consul of the North Vietnamese Embassy in Vientiane who cited the failure of the South Vietnamese to abide by the conditions of the agreement concerning the release of political prisoners as the major stumbling block to our thwarted search efforts.

I then flew to Long Thien, the Laotian field headquarters for rescue of American pilots downed in North Vietnam. There I met with Major General Vang Pao, Commanding General of Military Region II, the region encompassing the embattled Plain of Jars area. General Vang Pao is commander of the Hmong guerrilla army which opposed the Pathet Lao in Laos.

General Vang Pao informed me that he had received reliable information that "8 to 10 young American pilots were being held by the North Vietnamese" for purposes of extracting technical information. He was unable to supply me with the names or conditions of these men, other than the information that they were younger pilots who had been flying in Southeast Asia.

Since learning of this information from General Vang Pao, and having been assured of his credence as a source, I have been acutely troubled as to how best to utilize this information. I hesitate to raise the hopes of the families of our missing men since we have no further substantiation of these reports at this time. Moreover, if these facts are corroborated the prospects of a repatriation are not encouraging. Recognizing, however, that these families have a right to this information, I have contacted Mr. Frank Sleverts of the State Department and Dr. Roger Shields of the Defense Department to further pursue and fully investigate this information. Both of these gentlemen have assured me that such an investigation is taking place.

Following my meeting with General Vang Pao, I traveled to the Nakhon Phanom Royal Thai Air Force Base in Thailand where officers of our rescue and search team reported on the current status of our search efforts.

I met our rescue crews who informed me that during their most recent investigation of a crash site in Viet Nam, their unarmed investigative team was fired upon in a premeditated ambush by the North Vietnamese. This abominable attack resulted in the death of an American military officer, Captain Reese, despite the fact that a two week notice of intention to investigate had been given to the North Vietnamese. Because the safety of the search teams cannot be guaranteed, the search effort has temporarily come to a halt.

Brigadier General J. R. Ulatoski, Commander of the Joint Casualty Resolution Center at Nakhon Phanom briefed me on the current results of their search efforts and provided me with the following information:

Search Status Report

Crash sites.....	1,077
Ground sites.....	434
Grave sites.....	49
<b>Total Sites.....</b>	<b>1,560</b>
<b>By country</b>	
South Vietnam:	
Crash .....	249
Ground .....	351
Grave .....	36
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>636</b>

Search Status Report—Continued  
By county—Continued

North Vietnam:	
Crash	348
Grave	11
Total	359
Laos:	
Crash	262
Ground	46
Grave	1
Total	309
Cambodia:	
Crash	20
Ground	37
Grave	1
Total	58
Over water	198
Missing	1,156
Bodies not recovered	1,226
Total	2,382

These figures represent what our best sources feel is the most recent and definitive information concerning our MIAs. While we must certainly be realistic in our expectations, I feel that the information I received during this visit warrants an intensified Congressional investigation. Particularly in light of the information I received from General Vang Pao, our responsibility to the families of these missing men is apparent. We must renew our commitment to these unfortunate families, fully pursuing our investigative efforts to provide definitive information for those individuals who are so vitally concerned.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments to continue its fine work on behalf of our missing men.

There are three provisions of the January Peace Treaty that the North Vietnamese have not fully complied with:

- 1) We have not received assistance in the exhumation of remains.
- 2) Our efforts at search and recovery have been hampered by the refusal of the North Vietnamese to accompany our joint search teams.
- 3) If the information I received is accurate, all of our prisoners of war have not been returned.

I respectfully suggest that we concentrate Congressional efforts in two areas:

- 1) We should refuse to assist or aid the North Vietnamese government in any manner until they fully comply with the provisions of the peace treaty.
- 2) We must focus the attention of all humanitarian nations on this issue, appealing to the North Vietnamese government on behalf of these men who are still unaccounted for.

Congress has a major responsibility in these endeavors. While we must be reasonable in our assessment of the situation, we cannot give up the search for remains, for grave sites, or for prisoners of war until we have satisfied ourselves that we have done everything within our power to fully resolve this issue. We can do no less for those who gave so much.

I am highly appreciative of the generous cooperation rendered by our officials in assisting me with the arrangements for this trip, including Frank Sieverts, Special Assistant for POW/MIA Matters at the Department of State, Charles S. Whitehouse, U.S. Ambassador to Laos and Col. Thomas Henry, Military Attache for the Joint Casualty Resolution Center to Laos.

COLLEGES TEST SCORES DOWN  
10TH YEAR IN A ROW

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, a story appeared in the Washington Star-News of January 2, 1974, that the college entrance examination scores, as determined by the SAT—scholastic aptitude test—have declined for 10 years in a row. In my view, this reflects several things.

No. 1, Federal aid to education has had a largely negative impact on education. No. 2, our schools lack the discipline that is necessary for a good teaching and learning atmosphere. No. 3, our schools are neglecting the basic drills necessary to learning to read, write, and do simple arithmetic. Federal aid programs, in some cases, have enabled our educators to spend the taxpayers' time and money on all sorts of projects unrelated to education under the guise of improving the quality of education. Our children are neither the smartest nor the dumbest generation we have ever had, but they are neglected in the sense that we have not given them the basic education they deserve. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

COLLEGE TEST SCORES DOWN 10TH YEAR IN  
ROW

Are today's college-bound students dumber than those of a decade ago? Has Women's Lib raised the career sights of teen-aged girls? What about the spiraling costs of college tuition? How will kids cope?

Some surprising answers appear in a profile of a million high school seniors, members of the class of 1972-73. They took the College Entrance Examination Board's Scholastic Aptitude Test (S.A.T.), the achievement test, and filled in the board's descriptive questionnaire.

The board reported that the mean (average) S.A.T. score declined for the 10th year in a row. The mean verbal score of 443 (scores range from 200 to 800) compared with 478 in 1963; the mean mathematical score dropped from 502 to 481. The decline is seen in some quarters as an indictment of the schools.

But other factors are involved, cautioned Dr. T. Anne Cleary, chief of the board's program services division. "The S.A.T. measures skills developed over a youngster's lifetime—both in and out of the school setting," she said, adding that most high-scoring juniors don't retake the test. Because their averages aren't figured in with the seniors', this also tends to drive the mean down.

Another major consideration is that only about a third of the nation's seniors take the S.A.T. (many colleges don't require it), so the test may not be representative.

The girls who took the test averaged higher than the boys, but most of the girls said they only wanted to complete the bachelor's degree, while the boys planned graduate work. More than twice as many girls as boys said they only would complete a two-year degree program.

There also was evidence of sex stereotyping in projected careers. Nearly half the girls chose education, nursing and social studies. Their male counterparts chose biological sci-

ences (premedicine), business and engineering.

Well over half the students said they planned to live in dormitories, while 23 percent said they would stay at home. Only 5 percent of the males, and 4 percent of females, planned to live in a fraternity or sorority house.

More than 80 percent of the students said they would seek financial aid. Over half wanted assistance in finding a part-time job. The numbers were proportionately larger among minority students.

The students also were asked to estimate how much their parents would be able to contribute toward their education. On the average, black students estimated \$511, those of Oriental descent \$1,233, and white students, \$1,580. About 27 percent of the students (the highest proportion) estimated their parents earned more than \$18,000 a year. These students also had the highest mean grade on the S.A.T.

Few students would admit a need for advice about personal problems, but nearly 70 percent said they wanted college counseling about jobs and educational opportunities. This figure indicates to the board that the career plans reported may be quite tentative.

ARTHUR BOSWORTH MCGINLEY RE-  
TIRES AFTER 68 YEARS AS NEWS-  
PAPER JOURNALIST

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1974, Arthur Bosworth McGinley, sports editor of the Hartford Times for more than half a century, and a newspaper journalist for 68 years, announced his retirement, effective immediately.

Art began working for the Hartford Times on September 20, 1920. As sports editor of the Times, Mr. McGinley was intimately associated with hundreds of professional athletes, from Babe Ruth to Mickey Mantle.

In 1940, Mr. McGinley was assigned the task of writing two columns a day. The first was his sports column and the second was a personal column which dealt with the people with whom he was acquainted and with whom he corresponded.

His close friendship with the playwright, Eugene O'Neill, was well known. O'Neill's play, "Ah Wilderness," is a biography of the McGinley family.

Art also serves as Hartford area chairman of the Arthritis Foundation, and he has held this position since 1962. He is quite familiar with this crippling disease, having suffered its agonizing discomfort for 39 years.

To describe Art McGinley as the friend of thousands would be an understatement. His warm wit and understanding nature have earned him a legion of admirers throughout his many years as a journalist.

I would like at this point to share with my colleagues the editorial and article about Mr. McGinley which appeared in the Hartford Times.

I join with thousands of Art's friends in wishing him health and happiness in retirement.

The items follow:

#### AN ERA ENDS—MCGINLEY RETIRES

Arthur Bosworth McGinley, sports editor of The Hartford Times for more than half a century and a journalist for 68 years, is retiring, effective with his final columns today and Wednesday.

McGinley, 84, in his characteristic good humor, said, "It's about time."

His career in journalism began in 1905 as a 15-year-old part-time reporter for his father's newspaper, The New London Day. For 15 years, McGinley worked for almost a dozen newspapers including the Day, the Boston Post, Hartford Post, Hartford Courant and Providence Journal.

On Sept. 20, 1920, McGinley walked into the editorial offices of The Hartford Times, and he has been a fixture here ever since.

As sports editor of the Times, and as a sports writer before then, McGinley met and befriended almost every major league athlete from Babe Ruth and Ty Cobb to Mickey Mantle. He became a landmark at spring training sessions in Florida for more than 30 years.

McGinley estimates that he has addressed more than 5,000 banquets, luncheons and Bar Mitzvahs, telling his audiences the hundreds of humorous, ironic and tragic events of his time.

And in his 68 years on the newspaper beat, McGinley still considers two stories he covered while still in New London as the biggest.

One was the visit of the supersubmarine Deutschland which pulled into New London harbor in 1916 on a peace mission. Within a year, the Deutschland was prowling the Atlantic trying to sink American boats.

And there was the trial of an army colonel, accused of homosexuality, at Ft. Terry on Plum Island, across Long Island Sound from New London. The colonel was found guilty and banished from the armed forces.

Of course, there were other events and other personalities—he remembers when Babe Ruth began his baseball career on the old Providence Group, interviewing President William Howard Taft and industrialist Andrew Carnegie.

In 1940, McGinley was assigned the task of writing two columns a day—one for the sports page and one as a personal column of the people he knew and met and talked with or wrote letters to.

He wrote those columns six days a week for 25 years, before easing back to his recent pace of three sports columns and three "Good Afternoon" columns a week.

McGinley has received honors from almost every one of the lodges, churches and other organizations where he has spoken during his career.

McGinley was named sports editor of The Times in 1922 and retained that title until 1969 when he became sports editor emeritus—at the age of 80.

He was a close friend and confidant of playwright Eugene O'Neill, whose play "Ah, Wilderness" is a biography of the McGinley family.

McGinley and O'Neill were remembered by many in New London as two of the town's most notorious drinkers, until in 1929 when McGinley went on the wagon and never stepped off. His pal O'Neill took the same step a few months after McGinley, and except for a few tumbles, remained a teetotaler as his star as one of America's foremost dramatists ascended.

McGinley's friendship with O'Neill more recently led to an impassioned plea before New London officials to have a street named

after the playwright in his home town and a trans-Atlantic telephone call from actor Sir Laurence Olivier who wanted McGinley's help in portraying O'Neill's father.

To the 100-year-old Crocodile Club, McGinley is still president, a post he has held in the organization for more than 15 years. (The club celebrates a monumental land grab in 1875 when Bristol added Lake Compounce to its acreage through the efforts of a well-fed General Assembly.)

McGinley also serves as the Hartford area chairman of the Arthritis Foundation, a position he has held since 1962. He knows firsthand the pain of arthritis, as he has learned to live with the crippling disease since Christmas Day 1938.

His column in today's paper will be his last, McGinley said. "Once I walk out of the office," he said, "I don't think I'll be back."

His plans for the future?  
"I don't know," McGinley said. "But I don't think I'll run for governor."

#### IT WAS GOOD TO WORK BESIDE ART MCGINLEY

Today's issue of The Hartford Times carries Art McGinley's last column. This is Art's retirement day, after his 68 years as newspaperman. It is fair to say that every newspaperman who knows him, as colleague or competitor or reader, is proud of him.

The story of his retirement, beginning on Page One, tells the public facts about him. They're well known—his friendship with Eugene O'Neill when they were youthful brawlers in the saloons of New London, his popularity as a toastmaster and after-dinner speaker, the affection in which thousands of sports figures hold him.

To those who worked with him, there are other facts, not so well known but equally revealing of his character.

Art McGinley is the softest touch in the newspaper business. He is the panhandler's favorite target. He must have given away thousands of dollars, a half-dollar or dollar at a time, to men who walked shakily and with false confidence into The Times newsroom, unable to face the day without a shot of liquor and hoping Art would be at his desk.

Art's public couldn't see the pain that went into his writing. His hands have been badly crippled by arthritis for 39 years. Typing two daily signed columns, as he did for 25 years, was physically agonizing. He did it without a word of complaint.

It's understandable that he is a popular speaker. Mention a name—any name—and Art knows a pertinent anecdote. The stories stream from him like water from a spring. They're full of accurate, colorful detail, and most of them are funny.

For that matter, almost everything has something funny about it in Art's eyes. He thinks it's funny that he, one of whose brothers was an Episcopalian bishop, another a Travelers vice president, another a doctor, should have been a notorious pubcrawler and a sports columnist in the gaudy days when journalism was considered only a little short of shady.

Many of the foibles of human nature he has seen were published, well disguised, in occasional columns under the pen-name of Hetty Hobron, The Times' correspondent in the mythical village of Perkins Pastures. Embellished by Art's imagination and his recall of vaudeville routines, those items created a place with its own New England character, its own scandals and mythology.

Art is never too busy to answer a question from a young reporter to whom Babe Ruth, Jack Dempsey, Joe Louis, are only legendary names in the record books. He can remember in exact detail what happened in some obscure—but uproariously funny—

prizefight in Foot Guard Hall a half-century ago. And he can salt the story with sidelights about the private lives of everybody from the referee to the loser's trainer.

It would be inadequate to describe Art McGinley as the friend of thousands. He has more friends than Santa Claus. Those friends who worked with him feel privileged by the experience.

#### MAJOR ISSUES OF CONCERN TO 11TH DISTRICT OF INDIANA

### HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess, I visited with a number of businessmen, union leaders, workers, homemakers, students, and senior citizens to ascertain their views on issues and major concerns. At the same time, I circulated a questionnaire among them in which I asked their views on such national issues as the energy crisis, President Nixon, the news media coverage of the President, and voting habits, as well as the major problems close to home in the 11th District. About 650 questionnaires were tabulated.

I found that the No. 1 issue among the people of the 11th District is the cost of living. The dollar simply does not buy as much today as it did last year and people are feeling the pinch in their pocketbooks. Running a close second is the energy crisis. There is much confusion and considerable skepticism over the seriousness of the so-called "energy crisis." People cannot understand the conflict in information given by the Federal Energy Office and the major oil companies which leads to an understandable but dangerous cynicism on the part of consumers. The third issue of greatest importance on the questionnaire is forced busing of school children for the purpose of achieving racial balance. It is obvious that this issue is very much on people's minds as I visited in the community, and I hope that during this session of Congress we can move legislation presently bottle-necked in the Judiciary Committee.

On the energy crisis, people believe there is a real energy crisis, but also feel that the major oil companies are being unjustly enriched as a result, so I want to make sure that the final energy bill contains a specific provision that prohibits any "windfall profits." I also want to commend the American people for their determination to save fuel by turning down their thermostats and conserving gasoline.

On the matter of President Nixon, the survey indicates that most respondents feel he should be strongly supported—222; or be left alone—122; and 102 suggest he should resign, while only 69 feel he should be impeached.

One of the most gratifying things I found was that the overwhelming majority of people feel that voting in an election is more important now than ever

before. I have contended for a long time that the American people are justly proud of our system of Government and this certainly helps prove the point. As Abraham Lincoln said:

Our democracy is the last best hope of earth.

Believing it will be of interest to my colleagues, I am including as part of my remarks, a copy of the questionnaire and the responses on each issue.

#### HUDDUT QUESTIONNAIRE—JANUARY 1974

One of the responsibilities of a Congressman is to represent his fellow citizens by expressing their viewpoints to the Congress. You are the people—please give me the benefit of your thoughts.

#### MAJOR PROBLEMS

How would you rank the following problems? (greatest problem=1, 2nd greatest problem=2, etc.) Busing, 121; Cost of Living, 290; and Energy Crisis, 239.

#### ENERGY CRISIS

1. Do you believe we are facing a real crisis? Yes, 319; no, 180.
2. Do you believe the oil companies are being unjustly enriched? Yes, 346; no, 138.
3. Have you turned your thermostat down? Yes, 331; no, 91.
4. Do you believe the energy crisis has been cooked up by the Administration to take people's minds off of Watergate? Yes, 115; no, 374.
5. Have you taken any steps to conserve gasoline? Yes, 312; no, 84.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON

1. Based on what you have read and heard about recent events, do you believe the President should (check one or more). Be strongly supported, 222; Be left alone, 122; Resign, 102; Be impeached, 69; and Other, 40.
2. Based on what you have read and heard about recent events do you believe the President's ability to lead our country has been damaged (check one or more). Quite a lot, 219; Somewhat, 179; Not much, 236; none at all, 58.
3. Which of the following statements best reflects your views of the Watergate investigation being carried on by Congress? (check one or more). Congress is doing what the constitution requires it to do, 135; It's an honest effort to clean up government, 121; It is politically motivated to make the Republican Party look bad to effect the 1974 elections, 169; and It is an effort to undo the results of the 1972 election and to "get" the President, 122.
5. Which of the following statements best reflects your view of the news media coverage of the President? (check one or more). The news media is doing a fair and impartial job of reporting, 100; Some individuals and organizations in the media are biased, but most are being fair, 116; Most of the media is slanting the news against the President in an effort to make him look as bad as possible, 158; The media will not stop until the President resigns or is impeached, 82; and Other, 34.

#### GENERAL

To what extent has your interest in voting been influenced by the recent events? I consider voting more important now than ever before, 300; I expect to do as I always have, 130; and Events of the past year have turned me off, I'm not going to vote, 16.

#### OPTIONAL

I am registered, 366; not registered 20; as a Republican, 272; Democrat, 59; Independent, 44.

## SAVE FUEL BY CUTTING NOISIEST FLIGHTS FIRST

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation's airlines cut back flights due to fuel shortages, the first flights stopped should be those during normal sleeping hours when the noise impact is greatest.

I have written to the Federal Energy Office, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Air Transport Association—the airline industry trade group—calling on them to take immediate steps to protect citizens against the excessive noise of nighttime jet flights over residential areas.

Such a move would not only mean a considerable fuel savings—possibly as much as 3.4 million gallons a day—but it would also give relief to millions of Americans who cannot get a decent night's sleep because of airport noise.

Airline cutbacks already have been announced because of the energy shortage, and several carriers have grounded some of their fuel gulping jumbo jetliners.

Thousands of people who live near airports are finding life increasingly unbearable because jet traffic has increased to a point of constant bombardment of noise. Thousands of my constituents live under the flight paths of La Guardia Airport, one of the Nation's busiest, and they know the true impact of noise pollution.

With the support of 32 of my colleagues, I have introduced H.R. 1073, the Airport Noise Curfew Commission Act. This antinoise legislation could result in establishing curfews on overnight aircraft operations.

Studies amply demonstrate the psychological and physical traumatic effects on people resulting from excessive jet noise. Experts say the noise impact is 10 times more disturbing during the normal sleeping hours. Since flight cutbacks are inevitable because of the fuel shortage, I urge the administration, the industry and the Congress to support this proposal.

The Federal Energy Office has estimated that U.S. commercial airlines will need 817,000 barrels of fuel per day during the first 3 months of 1974. Federal Aviation Administration figures indicate that up to 10 percent of airline traffic is scheduled between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. Thus, flight cutbacks during these hours could save as much as 80,000 barrels—or 3,360,000 gallons—of fuel per day.

Millions of people would benefit from flight cutbacks during sleeping hours, while I believe the airlines would suffer only minor inconvenience. Not many passengers would be affected because so few choose to fly during those hours. Any inconvenience must be weighed against the public's right to domestic tranquillity and a good night's sleep.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the text of my letter to Mr. William Simon, Director, Federal Energy Office; Mr. Robert D. Timm, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; and Mr. Stuart G. Tipton, Chairman of the Board, Air Transport Association.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1974.

DEAR SIR: The problem of excessive noise pollution from airline jet traffic has been of great concern to me for several years. Thousands of people who live near airports are finding life increasingly unbearable because jet traffic has increased to a point of constant bombardment of noise.

As the nation's airlines cut back flights due to fuel shortages, I urge that first priority be given to stopping those flights during the normal sleeping hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m., when the noise impact is the greatest.

Such a move would not only mean a considerable fuel savings—possibly as much as 3.4 million gallons a day—but it would also give long-needed relief to millions of Americans who cannot get a decent night's sleep because of airport noise.

The Federal Energy Office estimates that United States commercial airlines will need 817,000 barrels of fuel per day during the first three months of 1974. Federal Aviation Administration figures indicate that up to 10 per cent of airline traffic is scheduled between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. Thus, flight cutbacks during these hours could have as much as 80,000 barrels—or 3,360,000 gallons—of fuel per day. This is a substantial savings which would help alleviate the fuel shortage.

Studies amply demonstrate the psychological and physical traumatic effects on people resulting from excessive jet noise. Experts say the noise impact is 10 times more disturbing during the normal sleeping hours. Since considerable flight cutbacks are being made because of the fuel shortage, I urge you to support my proposal.

Millions of people living near the nation's airports would benefit from such flight cutbacks, while the airlines would suffer only minor inconvenience. Not many passengers would be affected because so few choose to fly during those hours. Any inconvenience must be weighed against the public's right to domestic tranquillity and a good night's sleep.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

## COMMENDING MARYLAND JUSTICE

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, at the time of former Vice President Spiro Agnew's resignation, I deplored the deal he received, and remarked how this even reinforced the conviction of many poor and minority Americans that there is a double standard of justice in America whereby they are sent to jail for crimes much less serious than those of the wealthy and powerful who are allowed to go scot free.

I find it very reassuring, then, that a three-judge panel in Maryland has recommended that Vice President Agnew be disbarred.

An editorial in the Cleveland Plain

Dealer of January 18 expresses a view identical to mine. I am happy to share it with my colleagues:

**MARYLAND JUSTICE**

Even before Spiro T. Agnew resigned in disgrace from the vice presidency of the United States, Maryland politicians and businessmen had a rather unsavory reputation for rumored governmental manipulation.

But so far the handling of the Agnew disbarment case in Maryland seems to be proceeding in a way that may earn the state some prestige for evenhanded justice.

The Maryland State Bar Association moved forthrightly for disbarment of the former vice president, rather than seeking some milder penalty for his admission of income tax evasion. Now a three-judge panel has made the same recommendation to the Maryland Court of Appeals, which will make the final decision.

The sight of the former vice president coping a plea to avoid more serious charges was shocking, especially because of the perhaps naive belief Americans have that men grow morally, spiritually and intellectually in the fulfillment of the nation's highest offices.

Though it was Maryland politics that led Agnew astray, it is heartening to see the Maryland judicial system responding to the Agnew case in a way that suggests that his wealthy and powerful friends this time cannot intervene to mitigate his circumstances.

**EXPORT-IMPORT BANK**

**HON. LES ASPIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) and my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) in sponsoring a sense of the House resolution which instructs the Export-Import Bank not to approve any credits to the Soviet Union until the Senate has considered the Trade Reform Act of 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I am not only concerned about the Eximbank ignoring Congress will on the Mills-Jackson-Vanik but also with the price consumers will pay for gas imported to the United States.

At present, the U.S. companies involved in the North Star deal say that Russian gas will cost \$1.25 per thousand cubic feet—Mcf. But, this calculation assumes that the Russians will charge nothing for the actual gas produced as part of the North Star project in western Siberia. The Russians will have to pay only for pipeline transportation and liquification.

Mr. Speaker, this present price estimate is a total fraud and hoax. The big companies, in cahoots with the Russians, are planning massive gouging of the American consumer. The price of \$1.25 per Mcf is already outrageously high but now we learn the price could easily increase another \$0.50.

As some of my colleagues may know, the current wellhead price in the United States averages a little more than \$0.23

per Mcf and pipeline charges make the wholesale price of natural gas in New York City \$0.54. Therefore, the Russian gas deal will result in as much as 700-percent increase in price compared to current wellhead prices.

At least five Government officials have confirmed that the current price estimate of \$1.25 does not include a charge for the actual gas. With a worldwide energy crisis, it is at best doubtful that the Russians will give their gas away free.

In fact, the Russians hope to take natural gas prices to the price of crude oil on the world market which would increase the price tremendously. Assuming \$11.50 per barrel crude oil prices, an equivalent price for natural gas per Mcf would be \$2.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the Russian gas deal will make last year's fleecing on the wheat deal look like a Sunday school picnic.

Before the Government makes any loans, we must know exactly how much Russian gas will cost. At present, part of the problem is that at least five Federal agencies are involved in the Russian deal—the White House, State Department, Department of Commerce, Federal Power Commission, Export-Import Bank. Somebody in the bureaucracy better figure it out and figure out fast just exactly what this gas will cost.

In view of the probable acceptance by the Senate of the Jackson-Mills-Vanik amendment, I believe that the Bank should be instructed not to approve any credits for the Soviet gas deal.

**MASSACHUSETTS SENATE RESOLUTION SUPPORTS SIDS BILL**

**HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives passed, by voice vote, legislation designed to provide Federal assistance in the fight against one of the most tragic diseases known to man—the sudden infant death syndrome, the mysterious disease that takes the lives of over 10,000 babies each year. This legislation, H.R. 11386, authorizes \$2 million for each of the next 3 fiscal years for the purpose of research into the disease, and for a variety of information and counseling services. While this bill does not go as far as I would like—or as far as the preferable Senate passed legislation—it is an important first step toward eradicating this tragic affliction.

As I noted in my statement yesterday in support of H.R. 11386, the Massachusetts Legislature acted in 1973 to assist families struck by the sudden infant death syndrome. In addition, two Massachusetts State senators, Majority Leader Joseph J. C. DiCarlo and John J. Conte, have introduced in the Massachusetts Senate a resolution urging favorable ac-

tion on the sudden infant death syndrome legislation now before this Congress. Specifically, the resolution urges swift and favorable action on the Senate-passed bill, S. 1745, and on legislation similar to that passed by the House yesterday and which I introduced last year, H.R. 10490.

This resolution is indicative of the kind of support which sudden infant death syndrome legislation is receiving at the State level across the Nation. Now that the House has passed H.R. 11386, I hope that a conference committee will be quickly appointed and that rapid and affirmative action will be taken on this legislation so that final congressional approval can be speedily accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to include in the RECORD the text of the resolution introduced by Massachusetts State Senators DiCarlo and Conte:

**RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITIES RELATIVE TO THE SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME**

Whereas, Sudden infant death syndrome is the largest killer of infants between the age of one month and one year, and there is to date no known cause, preventive measures or cure for this affliction; and

Whereas, The commonwealth has in nineteen hundred and seventy-three enacted several statutes which aid in the detection and research relative to sudden infant death syndrome, but federal financial assistance is necessary to effectively eliminate sudden infant death syndrome; and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States is presently considering two proposals, S. 1745 and H.R. 10490, which provide funds for research activities and study of this syndrome; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts senate hereby respectfully and urgently memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation to identify and prevent sudden infant death syndrome; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the senate to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to each member thereof from the commonwealth.

**THE U.S. ECONOMY IN 1974**

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

**THE U.S. ECONOMY IN 1974**

1974 shapes up as a year of economic problems. The 1974 economic outlook was not rosy even without the fuel crisis. With it, a bleak economic picture emerges.

There will be little or no growth, rising unemployment, continuing price increases, a drop in corporate profits, and shortages. On the brighter side the nation's foreign trade will improve, moving from deficit to surplus, the dollar will strengthen in the international money markets, and the second half of the year should see some improvement.

It also needs to be said that economic

forecasts, including the ones above, are never an exact science, and, because of the new factor of the energy crisis, are less reliable than usual. Scarcely have economic forecasters faced such a complex set of problems, with the nation confronting in 1974 recession, inflation, and shortages all at the same time.

The impact on the economy of the energy crisis has drawn an extraordinary range of predictions. The pessimists foresee a depression and 10% unemployment, but even the more optimistic talk of at least 6% unemployment and a period of no economic growth. It is generally agreed that the energy crisis will plague us with bottlenecks, resultant areas of inflation, and will imperil any success at moderating prices.

#### INFLATION

The 1973 record on inflation was dreary, with consumer prices rising 9% (the worst record in over 20 years), and 1974 does not look much better. Something over 7% is a reasonable guess for the 1974 inflation rate. Even the President's top advisers are saying that the rate of inflation "could be very high" in 1974. The economists have a word for it—"stagflation"—i.e., little or no economic growth accompanied by rapid inflation. Over the entire year the economy will be substantially flat. But even to achieve this level, we will have to manage the fuel shortage well, letting consumers absorb more of it and industry and commerce less.

#### EMPLOYMENT

With declining productivity and rapidly advancing prices, the fairly restrained labor scene of 1973 is not likely to be repeated in 1974. If, in addition, the energy shortage requires cutbacks in jobs and production, labor militancy could rise sharply.

The 5.5% general wage and salary guidelines will become history. Unemployment will certainly rise from the November 4.7% level. The President's economists say it will rise to about 6%, but many economists believe it will go even higher, with energy shortage-induced unemployment spreading unevenly across the economy, hitting certain industries, like petrochemicals, especially hard.

#### SHORTAGES

1974 may well be the year of shortages. The energy crisis, combined with high demand and short supplies of primary materials (like metals, paper, petroleum), will give the entire economy a condition of shortage. A major concern is whether the shortages will result in a snowballing effect. We simply do not have much experience in dealing with, let alone forecasting shortages.

#### PROFITS

1973 was a good year for corporate profits, but profits for 1974 will be lower, accompanying the stagnation expected for 1974.

#### GOVERNMENT POLICY

The President's goal of a balanced budget by next June 30 is all but unreachable now, and the long-range forecast for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, is for a very large deficit. The economic downturn in the first half of 1974 will reduce tax revenues, and spending will rise to cover more unemployment benefits, higher fuel prices and other things. The Administration has hinted at a more stimulative fiscal policy to keep the economy moving. A gradual downward drift in interest rates is also expected.

At a time when prices are rising at the fastest rate for peacetime in the modern era, the government is slowly dismantling wage and price controls. For several months now it has been clear that the President is phasing them out, as one economic sector after another is being released from them. The complex controls simply have not restrained prices, and they have caused disruption and

dislocation in the market. Many people have been confused by them, none satisfied, and apparently most everyone would be happy to see them go. Even so, some power may be retained to restrain wage and price increases in basic industries.

### WHAT WOULD LINCOLN HAVE THOUGHT TODAY?

#### HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, last October a longtime friend visited me while in Washington. I thought at the time he was so impressed in his business that brought him to our Nation's capital that he would miss some sights and history that would please and impress him.

But this busy man took time—and the time he set aside from business so impressed him that he recalled his visit in his New Year's greetings.

His letter is worth reading by those who visit our Capital, those who live here and those who don't.

I insert the letter of John C. Cohan, of Salinas, Calif., at this point in the Record. I wish that all businessmen who visit Washington would set aside more time to see and savor the history here:

NEW YEAR 1974.

DEAR BURT: Thoughtful speculation filled my mind as I stood at the foot of the awe-inspiring Lincoln Monument in Washington, D.C., last October. "What would he have thought about the state of the nation today?"

A New Year dawned for Mr. Lincoln a century ago as the Republic agonized with its conscience over the dignity of man.

Startling changes have been wrought! Government investigations are the order of the day. The misdeeds of the few earn the scorn of the knowledgeable millions in the white-hot glare of publicity. Character assassins are on the loose. Now entire professions and industries are being castigated. Indictment by inference is the national past-time.

Will a government of, by and for investigations serve to inspire greater achievement, or will we ENSLAVE the spirit responsible for our progress?

Dignity—Honor—Respect—must be sustained, regardless of the effort it takes. Can we return to the days of esteem for the commendable—understanding of the evil—and dispose of wanton, indiscriminate criticism? Can we turn the tide of destruction by innuendo?

In a few hours a New Year will begin. It looms large and challenging. As we receive this God-given opportunity to begin anew—let's make a promise to the future . . . "Never judge a man until you have walked in his moccasins for a moon."

It's so easy to tear down . . . so hard to build. "And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity." (James III:6)

As 1974 begins, let's renew our respect for our fellow man; let's say a good word; hold a good thought; build together. Yes, let's say a prayer for friendship!

I value you—and I respect you as an honorable human being.

Warm good wishes for a prosperous and productive New Year.

Cordially yours,

JOHN C. COHAN.

Mr. Cohan died January 1, 1974, so his thoughts are even more meaningful now.

### DISTRACTIONS MUST GO

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 21, 1974]

#### CONGRESS RECONVENES: DISTRACTIONS MUST GO

All observers agreed that the first session of the 93rd Congress dissipated much of its momentum in the distraction of the Watergate affair. As the second session opens today a major question is whether Congress can finally make headway on its neglected agenda.

Watergate and the impeachment resolutions in the House Judiciary Committee continue to tick like timebombs, even though most members of Congress returning from their holiday recess reported they had detected no powerful sentiment for impeachment of the President at the grass roots. Their comments suggest that the public at large is being more fair-minded toward Mr. Nixon than many of his critics in Washington. Meanwhile, the energy crisis has emerged as an issue with potential for the kind of political hay-tossing that traditionally has pre-occupied the Congress.

Congress recessed before Christmas after a fruitless attempt to enact emergency legislation to help the Administration deal with fuel shortages. Since then charges have begun to fly that the energy shortage was deliberately aggravated if not largely contrived by oil companies to justify price increases and gain a relaxation of environmental restraints on their activities.

Election-year politics thrive on issues that can be put before voters in oversimplified terms of heroes and villains. A congressman or senator seeking re-election this year might relish being a St. George doing battle with an "oil lobby" dragon. Thus it is with some trepidation we can note the remark of Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield that Congress is returning with a "punitive" attitude toward the oil industry, even before hearings into the charges of an oil-price conspiracy had begun.

There is always the hope, of course, that Congress will try to move into the election season with a list of solid accomplishments from among the unfinished business of 1973—such as the trade bill, pension reform, a mass transit program and the kind of energy legislation which President Nixon said Saturday should be at the top of its 1974 agenda. It would not be punitive for Congress to insist, as Mr. Nixon has urged, that any "windfall" profits accruing to the oil industry from the fuel shortage be channeled into development of new sources of energy.

The \$300 billion budget which President Nixon is preparing is probably more austere than that figure would suggest. Much of it consists of spending authorized by previous legislation, with only limited room for new spending programs. It is almost a certainty that the President will be faced again with using vetoes and impoundment to keep federal outlays within the limits of a deficit deemed adequate to help offset an anticipated period of recession.

The genuine problems in America which this session of Congress could address are legion. We might anticipate that by the end of the year good legislation will have started us toward the solution of some of them. Just how many depends on how well Congress avoids the muddy detours of election-year politics along the way.

1973 ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of December 1973, I mailed out more than 200,000 questionnaires to households of the Sixth Congressional District of Florida. This 1973 annual questionnaire contained 11 questions on subjects which I believe to be of central importance to the American people and to the deliberations of the 93d Congress.

More than 57,000 responses have been received to date. Each of these questionnaires was individually hand-tabulated by volunteers working out of my district office in order to obtain a completely accurate breakdown of the responses.

I would like to share with my colleagues the responses of my constituents to these questions, for I feel they are an excellent sampling of some of the more controversial issues before the Congress. The questions and tabulation of answers are as follows:

1973 ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. In our effort to eliminate dependence on foreign nations for oil should the use of nuclear energy be expanded? Yes 49,751 (86.9%). No 3,700 (6.4%). No opinion 3,811 (6.7%).

2. Would you support drilling for oil on the Outer Continental Shelf (in the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean)? Yes 41,854 (74.6%). No 11,932 (21.3%). No Opinion 2,332 (4.1%).

3. Should the United States continue to support Israel through the sale of military equipment? Yes 27,694 (48.1%). No 24,813 (43.1%). No Opinion 5,093 (8.8%).

4. Do you believe that a woman and her doctor should have the legal right to make a decision regarding abortion? Yes 45,875 (79.9%). No 8,460 (14.7%). No Opinion 3,094 (5.4%).

5. Would you allow abortion to save the mother's life? Yes 53,277 (94.8%). No 1,703 (3.0%). No Opinion 1,246 (2.2%).

6. Do you believe that government-imposed wage and price controls should be continued? Yes 37,121 (65.1%). No 15,997 (28.1%). No Opinion 3,870 (6.8%).

7. Do you believe that the United States should give Russia and China the same beneficial trade status that non-communist countries are given? Yes 22,427 (38.9%). No 29,811 (51.7%). No Opinion 5,445 (9.4%).

8. Would you support an attempt to discontinue the independent status of the U.S. Postal Service and return it to congressional control? Yes 30,906 (55.2%). No 18,850 (33.7%). No Opinion 6,193 (11.1%).

9. Do you believe sufficient proof of wrongdoing by President Nixon has been presented to warrant impeachment? Yes 20,319 (35.3%). No 33,991 (59.0%). No Opinion 3,269 (5.7%).

10. Do you favor proposals to finance Presidential and Congressional election campaigns from tax money? Yes 23,657 (42%). No 29,877 (52.9%). No Opinion 2,858 (5.1%).

11. Would you favor my proposal for election reform which would substantially reduce the amount of money that can be contributed to a candidate and spent by a candidate in an election campaign? Yes 52,817 (93.1%). No 2,552 (4.5%). No Opinion 1,390 (2.4%).

The figures represent total responses for the questionnaires received. Each questionnaire was individually counted by volunteers working out of the district office.

for the duration of the cold snap because there is no heat or electricity.

We all know the Executive branch of the Government is now totally incapable of rising to an emergency—if, indeed, we ever have such a branch anymore. Everyone is looking to Congress for help! The problem isn't local, State nor County. We need leadership now more than ever. Nobody believes one single thing he hears from Washington. Now is the time for Congress to take its rightful place and tell us what's going on and how we can help!

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. KNIGHT.

THOUGHTS ON THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the 2d session of the 93d Congress and deal with the crucial energy legislation before us, we should remember the importance of that legislation. Mr. Robert P. Knight of White Bear Lake, Minn., has written me on the energy crisis, expressing well the confusion over the situation that is shared by millions of Americans. One of the key points in his letter to me is that the American people, in this time of crisis, are looking to Congress for answers. Mr. Speaker this is a challenge to all of us in Congress. And it is a challenge I believe we are capable of meeting. I place on the RECORD the thoughts and experiences of Mr. Robert P. Knight:

WHITE BEAR LAKE, MINN.,  
January 10, 1974.

Congressman JOSEPH KARTH,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KARTH: Please let me describe a morning in the life of one of your loyal constituents and see if you can appreciate how confused all of us are.

I got up long before dawn "to conserve precious electricity, now in very short supply."

I had breakfast in a cold house; cold for two reasons—1 Our (?) President has told me it's my patriotic duty to save oil.—2 He has let Standard Oil increase fuel prices to where I couldn't afford to heat my house even though there were no shortage.

While dressing I listened to Johnny Cash sing about how if I just cooperate with Standard Oil we can "work out everything together" as his Grandpa always said.

Next I stopped at a station for gasoline, paying 51.9¢ per gallon for a product which a month ago was only 39.9¢. Only this time the filling station operator, while offering absolutely no service, told me how lucky I was to find him open.

Along 35-W I saw highway signs for such essentials as Cutty Sark, Old Gold, and Finns Camera Shop, each illuminated with enough electricity to supply my house with both heat and light for a year.

The parking lot of the K-Mart was lit up like the Super Bowl at half-time. Inside, every light was on, although the store didn't open for two hours.

On the car radio news I was told there was a distinct possibility some schools will close

THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us have had extensive constituent contact during the past few weeks; during my travels through Maryland in Prince Georges and Anne Arundel Counties. I have been constantly deluged with questions concerning the energy crisis.

There is a great deal of skepticism concerning the reality of this crisis and much concern over the skyrocketing cost of fuel resources including gasoline, home heating oil, and potential increases in electric rates. Energy consumption statistics from the month of December have amply displayed the willingness of the American people to band together and conserve scarce fuel resources. Their actions have significantly reduced the possibility of gas rationing and of a major shortage of fuel oil during the current cold months.

It is incumbent upon the Congress to protect the consumer, who has borne the burden of reduced driving and lowered thermostats, from being exploited by those who would attempt to profiteer from our current troubles. People are asking why gasoline prices have shot up at a time when preliminary inventory reports show reserves equal to or greater than, last year. They are asking why there are recurring reports of tankers being unable to unload their cargo due to filled storage tanks. And they are asking why oil industry profits seem to be increasing at record rates during this crisis period. These are legitimate questions.

Until we have answers to these, and reliable data on refinery capacity, production, and national consumption, we will be frustrated in our attempts to draft responsive and effective energy legislation.

I am indeed pleased that various committees of the House of Representatives and of the other body, as well as the Federal Energy Office, are vigorously investigating these areas of concern. With prompt and responsible action by the legislative branch, and continued cooperation of the American public, I am confident that we can overcome this crisis.

COUNCILMAN AL DEFILIPPO

**HON. CHARLES H. WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to honor Councilman Al Defilippo of the city of Gardena, Calif., who has worked untiringly for the benefit and welfare of all citizens in that fine city.

Councilman Defilippo, a native of Thompson, Conn., moved to California in 1951 and has lived in Gardena since September of 1957. He has been a driving, active force in the city and in the Gardena Valley Knights of Columbus, of which he has been a member almost since his city residency began.

In the summer of 1962 he was youth cochairman and staged a baseball clinic cosponsored by the city and the Los Angeles Angels for more than 700 local youngsters and their parents. That same year, he founded the first Labor Day Weekend Field Day for residents in an effort to help relieve traffic and cut traffic deaths. This event proved so successful that the field day has been repeated yearly and has been expanded to include the July 4 holiday weekend. Councilman Defilippo's efforts along these lines have been recognized and commended by many local levels of government in Los Angeles County.

He also helped found and was cochairman of the annual Knights of Columbus golf tournament which each year donates its proceeds to the Gardena Valley Training Center for Mentally Retarded Children and was coordinator for the Gardena Honors Supervisor Kenneth Hahn testimonial, later hailed as Gardena's largest and greatest success.

As a member of the North Gardena Kiwanis Club, Councilman Defilippo helped form Operation Help, to assist victims of the disastrous northern California floods of 1965. Also, for the same Kiwanis Club, he originated the Most Outstanding Radio Station in California Award.

Although the list of his accomplishments is nearly endless, we must not forget his appointment as United Nations Week chairman, his charitable work for St. Anthony of Padua Parish Guild Association, the Italian Sons and Daughters of America, the Gardena Teen Post, Gardena WMCA, Serra High School Booster Club, and the Gardena Rotary Club.

Councilman Defilippo is also a former Recreation and Parks Commissioner for Gardena and a Commissioner for the Los Angeles County Public Libraries. He has served as an officer with the Gardena Youth Counseling Service, Italian Catholic Federation, the Young Men's Institute, the Gardena Chamber of Commerce, and the Gardena Community Center Committee.

Since his election to the City Council, Mr. Defilippo has become a member of the following: Independent Cities of Los Angeles County, Intercity Highway Committee, Southwest Area Planning Committee, West Basin Water District, and

the South Bay Corridor Committee. He was also a driving force in getting paramedic service for his city.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join with the citizens of the city of Gardena in saluting a fine man, Councilman Al Defilippo.

**THE SUPREME COURT ABORTION DECISION: 1-YEAR LATER****HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, marks a year since the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its historic decisions on abortion.

It is my belief that the landmark decisions in the cases of Roe against Wade and Doe against Bolton furthered the cause of freedom and dignity for American women. Rather than upholding the patchwork series of State abortion laws that were, for the most part, harshly repressive, the Supreme Court simply said that the decision concerning abortion should be left up to the individual and her conscience.

One year later, we would do well to remember the words of the Supreme Court in its historic decision and to once again commend the members of the court for their courage amidst chaos and for their reason amidst emotionalism.

On this first anniversary of the Supreme Court decision on abortion, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an excerpt from the majority decision of the court in Roe against Wade written by Mr. Justice Blackmun. Mr. Blackmun's words, providing the central rationale for the court's decision in the case, are well worth a rereading by the Members of this body.

The excerpt follows:

ROE AGAINST WADE—EXCERPTS

X

In view of all this, we do not agree that, by adopting one theory of life, Texas may override the rights of the pregnant woman that are at stake. We repeat, however, that the State does have an important and legitimate interest in preserving and protecting the health of the pregnant woman, whether she be a resident of the State or a nonresident who seeks medical consultation and treatment there, and that it has still another important and legitimate interest in protecting the potentiality of human life. These interests are separate and distinct. Each grows in substantiality as the woman approaches term and, at a point during pregnancy, each becomes "compelling."

With respect to the State's important and legitimate interest in the health of the mother, the "compelling" point, in the light of present medical knowledge, is at approximately the end of the first trimester. This is so because of the now established medical fact, referred to above at p. 34, that until the end of the first trimester mortality in abortion is less than mortality in normal childbirth. It follows that, from and after this point, a State may regulate the abortion procedure to the extent that the regulation reasonably relates to the preservation and protection of maternal health. Examples of permissible state regulation in this area are requirements as to the qualifications of the

person who is to perform the abortion; as to the licensure of that person; as to the facility in which the procedure is to be performed, that is, whether it must be a hospital or may be a clinic or some other place of less-than-hospital status; as to the licensing of the facility; and the like.

This means, on the other hand, that, for the period of pregnancy prior to this "compelling" point, the attending physician, in consultation with his patient, is free to determine, without regulation by the State, that in his medical judgment the patient's pregnancy should be terminated. If that decision is reached, the judgment may be effectuated by an abortion free of interference by the State.

With respect to the State's important and legitimate interest in potential life, the "compelling" point is at viability. This is so because the fetus then presumably has the capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb. State regulation protective of fetal life after viability thus has both logical and biological justifications. If the State is interested in protecting fetal life after viability, it may go so far as to proscribe abortion during that period except when it is necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother.

Measured against these standards, Art. 1196 of the Texas Penal Code, in restricting legal abortions to those "procured or attempted by medical advice for the purpose of saving the life of the mother," sweeps too broadly. The statute makes no distinction between abortions performed early in pregnancy and those performed later, and it limits to a single reason, "saving" the mother's life, the legal justification for the procedure. The statute, therefore, cannot survive the constitutional attack made upon it here.

This conclusion makes it unnecessary for us to consider the additional challenge to the Texas statute asserted on grounds of vagueness. See *United States v. Vuitch*, 402 U.S. 62, 67-72 (1971).

XI

To summarize and to repeat:

1. A state criminal abortion statute of the current Texas type, that excepts from criminality only a *life saving* procedure on behalf of the mother, without regard to pregnancy stage and without recognition of the other interests involved, is violative of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

(a) For the stage prior to approximately the end of the first trimester, the abortion decision and its effectuation must be left to the medical judgment of the pregnant woman's attending physician.

(b) For the stage subsequent to approximately the end of the first trimester, the State, in promoting its interest in the health of the mother, may, if it chooses, regulate the abortion procedure in ways that are reasonably related to maternal health.

(c) For the stage subsequent to viability the State, in promoting its interest in the potentiality of human life, may, if it chooses, regulate, and even proscribe, abortion except where it is necessary, in appropriate medical judgment, for the preservation of the life or health of the mother.

2. The State may define the term "physician," as it has been employed in the preceding numbered paragraphs of this Part XI of this opinion, to mean only a physician currently licensed by the State, and may proscribe any abortion by a person who is not a physician as so defined.

In *Doe v. Bolton*, post, procedural requirements contained in one of the modern abortion statutes are considered. That opinion and this one, of course, are to be read together.

This holding, we feel, is consistent with the relative weights of the respective interests involved, with the lessons and example of medical and legal history, with the

lenity of the common law, and with the demands of the profound problems of the present day. The decision leaves the State free to place increasing restrictions on abortion as the period of pregnancy lengthens, so long as those restrictions are tailored to the recognized state interests. The decision vindicates the right of the physician to administer medical treatment according to his professional judgment up to the points where important state interests provide compelling justifications for intervention. Up to those points the abortion decision in all its aspects is inherently, and primarily, a medical decision, and basic responsibility for it must rest with the physician. If an individual practitioner abuses the privilege of exercising proper medical judgment, the usual remedies, judicial and intra-professional, are available.

#### LAURA X RECEIVES MADEMOISELLE AWARD

#### HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the Berkeley Gazette of Monday, January 14, 1974, carried an article by Pauline Metzla which announced the awarding of the annual "MLLE" awards by Mademoiselle magazine.

Ms. Laura X of Berkeley was among those chosen to receive the award. I am aware of the fine work Laura X has done and therefore call attention to the article:

#### AWARDS GIVEN

Laura X of Berkeley, organizer and founder of the unique Women's History Library, is among 11 young women from the nation chosen to receive "MLLE" awards for 1974 from Mademoiselle magazine in recognition of their "outstanding achievements."

The annual awards will be presented Jan. 23 in New York City by Editor-in-Chief Edith Raymond Locke.

Laura X of Berkeley founded the Women's History Library in her home and has collected some 2,000 topical files of information relating to women. Also included in the library are documentaries on women's lives, women's films, tape recordings, and art. The staff answers about 50 telephone inquiries each day from feminists, libraries, writers and day care centers.

Last year she earned a commendation from the American Library Association, and Laura's ambition is to put her entire collection "in every house and every institution." Initially financed by Laura X herself, the library now is supported by contributions from women throughout the country.

Other award winners are:

Kathy Kahn of San Francisco, author of "Hillbilly Women," offering 19 self-portraits of Appalachian women; Kathryn Burkhart, who wrote "Women In Prison" after four years of research; Sharon Curtin, author of "Nobody Ever Died of Old Age," which demands that society regard old people as "human beings with a future as well as a past."

Lisa Connolly of Santa Monica and Karol Hope of Venice, are cofounders of MOMMA, organization for the nation's 7 million mothers who are divorced, separated or never have been married. "What we are is a place for people to come to break their isolation, to find out you aren't the only woman experiencing what it means to be a single mother," they explained.

Mary Emmons of Chicago, and Marty Beth Shea of San Francisco are cofounders of the

Funding Sources Clearing House, Inc., a computerized data service which matches grant-seekers to grant-givers. With more than 500,000 grant-supported organizations and institutions in the United States and close to 75,000 government grant-making agencies, the service helps grant-seekers cut through red tape.

Anne Grant of New York is coordinator of the National Organization for Women's NOW National Task Force on Education. She is saluted for producing a multimedia documentary entitled "Our North American Foremothers."

Claudia Weill of New York, co-owner of Cyclops Films, carried her camera to the People's Republic of China. Many of her films are concerned with women's experience.

Bette Midler, a native of Hawaii, is a singer whose first album, "The Divine Miss M", Atlantic, released in November, already has sold over 100,000 copies.

Carol Ruckdeschel of Georgia, an ecologist, puts her knowledge and concern for preserving animals to work for the state.

The Boston Women's Health Book Collective gets a special group award for its publication—"Our Bodies, Ourselves, a Book By and For Women," Simon and Schuster. It was compiled and written by 12 women and sold 400,000 copies as of Dec. 1, with monthly reprint order of 50,000.

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

#### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House in support of the Ukrainian people and their hopes of freedom. As we recognize Ukrainian Independence Day by our remarks and as we review the history of Soviet domination of the Ukraine, our own freedom becomes more appreciated and our personal liberties less taken for granted.

The uncivilized and horrendous aspects of Soviet oppression of the Ukrainian people over the years include cultural, religious and spiritual genocide by premeditated actions. Those acts cannot be forgiven and the hopes of the Ukrainian people cannot be ignored. That is why we in the United States must respond to those hopes by reaffirming our faith in the basic rights of human beings everywhere in the world.

It is particularly appropriate for these remarks in support of the Ukrainian people to be made at a time when the tensions of the world seems to be at a low point. The U.S. military role in Southeast Asia has ended and peace talks in the Middle East have produced an optimistic atmosphere for the first time in many years. Détente with Russia is the publicized reason for much of the apparent successes of our world diplomacy.

These remarks in the House of Representatives should reawaken the conscience of America and warn us against a false sense of security. Oppression exists in different corners of the world. People are not allowed basic human rights everywhere but many, like the Ukrainians find their way of life dic-

tated in an atmosphere of tyranny and economic exploitation. Let the plight of 48 million people in the Ukraine be a reminder to us that freedom carries with it the responsibility to be vigilant against those who deprive others of their freedom.

#### THE AMAZING TREASURY NON-RESPONSE TO THE WASTE OIL CRISIS

#### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today's energy mess reveals the stark inadequacies of the administration's past policies toward petroleum resources. Far from working to solve these problems in any coherent manner, the administration continues to waddle along with reorganization plans.

A revealing facet of the administration's energy nonpolicy came to light recently in a comment by the Treasury Department to my legislation to encourage the recycling of waste oil. Each year, we generate over 1 billion gallons of waste oil from our automobiles and industry. Less than one-tenth of this oil is effectively reused. The remainder—over 900 million gallons a year—is discarded in ways which seriously degrade our environment. What is more, in our time of acute energy shortage, this mindless waste is unconscionable.

Many actions can be taken to reinvigorate our oil recycling effort. One change—a simple change—would be to eliminate the tax discrimination to re-refined oil that presently exists in the "off highway" market. This is essentially what my legislation does.

For the interest of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the letter I recently sent to Mr. Frederic Hickman, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Hickman's rationale for not supporting this simple tax change manifests the shallow commitment and the shortsighted reasoning that have come to typify the administration's energy policy.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C. December 14, 1973.

MR. FREDERIC W. HICKMAN,  
Assistant Secretary, Department of Treasury,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HICKMAN: Thank you for supplying your comments to the Ways and Means Committee concerning three bills I have introduced, H.R. 6194, H.R. 9859, and H.R. 5902.

Although your criticisms have been most helpful in developing this legislation, I am surprised at your Department's opposition to H.R. 5902, the National Oil Recycling Act. Briefly, this legislation improves the competitive position of re-refined oil in the critical off-highway market by eliminating the rebate of special subsidy now offered to off-highway users of new oil. Quoting from your letter to Chairman Mills, I would like to respond to your comments.

"The changes in the tax on lubricating oil proposed by H.R. 5902 assume that the recycling of used oil can be stimulated by re-

peal of the provision enacted in 1965 which granted a rebate of the tax when new lubricating oil is used in other than a highway motor vehicle."

As you know, re-refining petroleum is a marginal industry populated by small, localized firms. Under present law, these re-refiners have a very small tax advantage over new oil in the highway market, but they suffer a tax disadvantage to new oil in the off-highway market. Because of the relative importance of the off-highway market to their economic viability, the re-refiners are being adversely affected by the present tax structure. Indeed, prior to 1965 there were 150 re-refiners in operation. Today there are only about 40. Although many factors are involved in this decline—such as the discriminatory labeling requirements of the FTC—the adverse impact on the industry of the 1965 Excise Tax Reduction Act is undoubtedly significant. In concluding their study of the matter in early 1972, the Defense Supply Agency concluded that the excise tax and the labeling requirements are the two principal government imposed deterrents to oil recycling.

"For many years, the reclaimed oil industry benefited from the fact that new lubricating oil was taxed even though the tax on new lubricating oil was not imposed to aid reclaimers. When the tax on new oil was made rebateable for off-highway use beginning in 1966, the reclaimers lost part of this tax advantage. While removal of the rebate provision would restore this advantage, we do not believe that the tax should be revised for this purpose."

This policy analysis is short-sighted and misleading. In discussing the relative tax advantages of new and reclaimed oil no mention is made of the tremendous subsidies to production of crude oil under present law. Through the depletion allowance we encourage lower crude oil prices through the stimulation of supply. Recent economic studies by Professor Edward Erickson estimate that crude oil prices would be 24% higher if depletion were eliminated. Because re-refined products compete directly with new petroleum products, through the depletion allowance we are in fact encouraging resource depletion and discouraging resource recovery.

I find your opposition to altering present law most discouraging. You acknowledge that a change such as I have proposed would be an advantage to the re-refining industry, but you state, "we do not believe the tax should be revised for this purpose." The fact is that waste oil disposal has become a monumental environmental hazard. With the serious decline in the re-refining industry, there is no alternative but to dispose of this oil in environmentally unacceptable ways.

Section 101(b) (6) of the National Environmental Policy Act, Public Law 91-190 states: "In order to carry out the policy set forth in this Act. It is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs and resources to the end that the nation may . . . enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources." (emphasis added)

Section 103 of the Act further states: "All agencies of the Federal government shall review their present . . . Administrative regulations and current policies and procedures for the purpose of determining whether there are any deficiencies or inconsistencies therein which prohibit full compliance with . . . this Act . . ."

In view of the NEPA law, your reluctance to support a change in the present tax treatment of re-refined oil is, to say the least, confusing. Your reliance on the operation of the marketplace to encourage recycling fails to

take into account, as I have pointed out, the impact of current tax subsidies which encourage petroleum depletion to the detriment of recycling.

Finally, you point to the need for a coherent energy policy. "What is needed is a coordinated and overall effort, rather than fragmented measures that may distort competitive relationships and prove counter productive in the long run."

I agree that a national energy policy must be organized and implemented. We must avoid falling into the pitfalls such as the depletion allowance which distort competitive relationships and have proven to be counter productive in the long run. At the same time, the goal of energy self-sufficiency has been set. If we are to meet this goal we must eliminate energy waste and encourage the maximum utilization of our domestic resources. For this reason, notwithstanding your specific objections to this legislation, I hope you will work closely with our committee to develop a sound fiscal policy to meet the demands of our energy shortages.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,  
Member of Congress.

#### THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE INDEPENDENCE

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1974, marks the 56th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukraine's independence, and the 55th anniversary of the Act of Union, both of which took place in Kiev on January 22, 1918, and 1919, respectively. By these acts a Ukrainian independent state was officially established on all ethnographical Ukrainian territories.

After several years of continuous invasion and fighting, Ukraine, unaided, succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia. The whole history of Soviet Russian dominated Ukraine is a ghastly record of inhumanity, outright persecution and genocide, Russification and violation of human rights.

For the past several years the Kremlin has engaged in a series of arrests, trials and convictions of hundreds of Ukrainian intellectuals, poets, writers, literary critics, playwrights, professors, students and others, charging them with anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation. Yet, in the United Nations Ukraine is a full-fledged member, and the Kremlin makes much of this fact in its massive propaganda drives throughout the world. The fact is that today Ukraine is a land of inhuman persecution and economic exploitation. Only outside of Ukraine can Ukrainians and their descendants throughout the world speak of freedom and independence.

On behalf of Americans of Ukrainian descent, I wish to call this date to the attention of my colleagues and urge them to lend their support of the Ukrainian people in their undaunted struggle for human rights and freedom, which are the basic tenets of our modern society.

#### THE HEALTH CARE CRISIS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the availability of health care is of vital concern to all Americans, simply because access to quality health care may literally mean the difference between life and death.

We hear a lot today about the "health crisis" in America, and how the United States ranks far behind other nations. Recent statistics show that the United States ranks 14th among industrial nations in infant mortality; 22d in life expectancy of males and 7th among females; and infant mortality among non-white infants is almost double the rate for whites—35.9 versus 19.7 per 1,000 births.

There is no doubt that there are major problems with the Nation's health care system, which exist despite the fact that we have the best educated and the most highly skilled doctors in the world, as well as the most advanced and sophisticated medical technology.

The health care crisis appears to be a result of our inability thus far to translate these achievements into realities of better health care at prices all our citizens can afford.

In the last 4 years alone, total health care expenditures have risen nearly 40 percent—from \$60 billion a year to more than \$83 billion.

The average American now spends 35 percent more on his health care—an increase from \$292 to \$394 per year.

Clearly, medical care is being priced out of the reach of millions. Fifteen years ago in the automobile industry, the average worker paid 5.6 cents an hour for health insurance. The cost today is 40 cents an hour.

In fact, private health insurance still covers only 26.4 percent of the private health costs. And 30 million people under the age of 65 have no health insurance at all—that is nearly 1 out of every 7 persons.

Persons in the lowest income brackets have it particularly hard. They are four times more likely to have an activity-limiting chronic condition as those earning \$10,000 per year or more. The poor average 50 percent more disability days per year than the nonpoor.

For the elderly, the problem is even more severe. In fiscal year 1972, the Nation spent \$71.9 billion for personal health care; 27 percent of this was for health care for the elderly. The average medical bill for an aged person reached nearly \$1,000 in fiscal year 1972—almost three times as great as the bill for a person in the intermediate age group.

For an aged person, his bill for physician's services was nearly four times that for a youth, and double that for the intermediate age group.

Personal health care expenditures increased by an average of 9.4 percent in 1972 for all persons. But for the elderly, living on fixed incomes, the rise in expenditures increased by 11.6 percent.

Despite medicare's large outlays, its

portion of the health bill for the aged dropped in recent years from 46 percent in 1969 to 42 percent in 1971 and 1972. The most significant drop in medicare payments has been for extended care facilities, as a result of tightened controls on the use of such facilities. In 1969, medicare spent \$367 for extended care—nearly 18 percent of the nursing home bill for those aged 65 and over. By 1972, the medicare outlay dropped to \$216 million, and its share of the bill likewise dropped, to only 7 percent.

Medicare's share of expenditures for physicians' services for the aged has also dropped. In 1969, medicare's contribution was 61 percent; in 1972, it was 56 percent. Part of the reduction is the result of tighter regulations for reimbursement of charges for physicians' services. Another factor is the decrease in the proportion of claims for which physicians have accepted assignment.

When a physician accepts assignment, he or she accepts medicare's determination of a reasonable charge, and the patient is billed only for the unmet part of the annual \$50 deductible plus 20 percent of the remaining amount. If the doctor does not accept assignment, he or she can charge more than medicare's "reasonable charge" and the patient must make up the difference. In fiscal year 1969, the net assignment rate, exclusive of hospital based physicians, was 61 percent. In 1971, it dropped slightly to 60 percent, but by 1972, the net assignment rate was only 56.4 percent.

One reason for these skyrocketing costs is that private carriers pay only the cost of hospital care, a situation which forces doctors and patients alike to resort to the expensive and inefficient use of hospital facilities. Unnecessary hospital stays drive up the total cost of health care.

Just as important as rising costs is the shortage of trained health personnel. We have health personnel shortages of nearly half a million, including 50,000 doctors, 20,000 dentists, and 150,000 nurses. By 1980, the shortages are expected to climb to 725,000.

Today, the number of doctors providing family care is only about 1 for 2,000 people, as compared to 3 doctors for 2,000 people in the 1930's.

Not only is there a nationwide shortage, but because of poor distribution, many rural and inner city areas suffer from an even more acute lack of available medical personnel.

The health crisis has been intensified by the failure of our health delivery system to encourage preventive care. Hopefully the recent passage of legislation to encourage the establishment of health maintenance organizations will help to alleviate this problem.

It is imperative that Congress now develop a system of national health insurance to help the individual consumer meet skyrocketing health care costs.

All the proposals before Congress vary considerably in scope and operational procedure, but they all have one common element—they would rely in some way on the Federal Government to contribute to medical insurance coverage for most, if not all American citizens.

I have cosponsored the Kennedy-Grif-

fiths bill, which would provide for a health insurance system funded through a federally administered trust fund financed by payroll taxes and general Treasury funds.

I favor the Kennedy-Griffiths bill because it does not provide simply a system of national health insurance. It would also extend assistance to expand the number of trained health personnel, and expand health facilities. Further, it would provide incentives to reorganize the health delivery system to make it more efficient, and more evenly distribute health resources across the country.

#### A NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO COMBAT THE FAMILY HEARTACHE AND CRIPPLING TOLL OF HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE

**HON. ROBERT A. ROE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, in response to the heart-rendering plea of members of my Eighth Congressional District, I am introducing legislation in the House today to amend the Public Health Services Act to be considered by our colleagues in order to establish a special comprehensive program to combat Huntington's Disease by providing Federal assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention and treatment of, and research in this most serious illness affecting many of the families of our Nation.

A national commitment in the fundamental health of our people is needed now. America's unprecedented strides in technology and science have achieved undreamed of horizons throughout the world over the past two decades. If we can harness these disciplines and concentrate America's technical expertise and scientific knowledge to alleviate the suffering of our people and achieve the finest health care through Federal assistance and grants-in-aid, then let us make that investment in the substantive health care needs of our people.

Considerable attention has been directed toward the hereditary nature of this disease which has been found in all races and nationalities. Both sexes are affected and the disease may be transmitted by either sex. The incidence in different families is subject to considerable variation. In some families, practically all of the offspring have the disease. In others, only one or two members may be affected. This chronic progressive degenerative disorder of the nervous system in which mental deterioration accompanies involuntary choreic movements of the body generally makes its first appearance in the very prime of life, between the ages of 30 and 50. It already affects great numbers of Americans and will begin to afflict an even greater number as our young adult population expands.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the citizens of my congressional district and the State of New Jersey, and particularly the Garden State Chapter for the Com-

mittee to Combat Huntington's Disease for their forthright action in organizing and seeking a greater health care commitment to eliminate this debilitating genetic disease and I am pleased to join with them in a concentrated resolve to place the discovery of the cause of and cures and treatments for this dread disease in the highest national priority. I respectfully request favorable consideration of my bill which reads as follows:

H.R. 12215

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention and treatment of, and research in, Huntington's disease

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Huntington's Disease Control Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares—

(1) that Huntington's disease is a chronic, progressive, degenerative disorder of the nervous system. It is described in medical journals as a hereditary disease of the basal ganglia and cerebral cortex characterized by the onset in adult life of choreiform movements and mental deterioration. The age of onset of the symptoms may be at any time from infancy but in the vast majority of cases it is first discerned between the ages of 30 and 50 years;

(2) that this debilitating inheritable disease which makes its first appearance in the very prime of life already affects great numbers of Americans and will begin to afflict an even greater number as our young adult population expands;

(3) that the exact cause of Huntington's disease is still unknown. Although severity of the choreiform movements may be reduced by the administration of certain medication or treatment that has been developed, there is no known treatment that will influence the course of the disease;

(4) that efforts to prevent Huntington's disease must be directed toward increased research in the cause and treatment of the disease, and the education, screening, and counseling of carriers of the trait;

(5) that programs to prevent Huntington's disease must be based entirely upon the voluntary cooperation of the individuals involved; and

(6) that the attainment of better methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of Huntington's disease deserves the highest priority.

(b) In order to preserve and protect the health and welfare of all citizens, it is the purpose of this Act to establish a national program for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and research in Huntington's disease.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "titles I to X" and inserting in lieu thereof "titles I to XI".

(b) The Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, is amended by renumbering title XI (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) as title XII, and by renumbering sections 1101 through 1114 (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act), and references thereto, as sections 1201 through 1214, respectively.

"TITLE XI—HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE PROGRAM

"PROGRAMS RELATING TO HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE

"SEC. 1101. (a) (1) The Secretary may make grants to public and nonprofit private entities, and may enter into contracts with

public and private entities, for projects for the establishment and operation, primarily through other existing health programs, of Huntington's disease screening, treatment, and counseling programs.

"(2) The Secretary may make grants to public and non-profit private entities, and may enter into contracts with public and private entities and individuals, for projects for research in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of Huntington's disease including projects for the development of effective tests which will identify those who have the disease or carry the trait.

"(3) The Secretary shall carry out a program to develop information and educational materials relating to Huntington's disease and to disseminate such information and materials to persons providing health care and to the public generally. The Secretary may carry out such program through grants to public and nonprofit private entities or contracts with public and private entities and individuals.

"(b) (1) for the purpose of making payments pursuant to grants and contracts under subsection (a) (1), there are authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the next two fiscal years.

"(2) For the purpose of making payments pursuant to grants and contracts under subsection (a) (2), there are authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the next two fiscal years.

"(3) For the purpose of carrying out subsection (a) (3), there are authorized to be appropriated \$25,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the next two fiscal years.

#### "VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION"

"SEC. 1102. The participation by any individual in any program or portion thereof under this title shall be wholly voluntary and shall not be a prerequisite to eligibility for or receipt of any other service or assistance from, or to participation in, any other program.

#### "APPLICATIONS; ADMINISTRATION OF GRANT AND CONTRACT PROGRAMS"

"SEC. 1103. (a) A grant under this title may be made upon application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, containing and accompanied by such information, as the Secretary deems necessary. Each applicant shall—

"(1) provide that the programs and activities for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

"(2) provide for strict confidentiality of all test results, medical records, and other information regarding screening, counseling, or treatment of any person treated, except for (A) such information as the patient (or his guardian) consents to be released; or (B) statistical data compiled without reference to the identity of any such patient;

"(3) provide for appropriate community representation in the development and operation of any program funded by a grant under this title;

"(4) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

"(5) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(b) In making any grant or contract under this title, the Secretary shall (1) take into account the number of persons to be served by the program supported by such grant or contract and the extent to which rapid and effective use will be made of funds under the grant or contract; and (2) give priority to programs operating in areas which

the Secretary determines have the greatest number of persons in need of the services provided under such programs.

"(c) The Secretary may make a grant under section 1111(a) (1) for a screening, treatment, and counseling program when he determines that the screening provided by such program will be done through an effective Huntington's Disease screening test.

#### "PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FACILITIES"

"SEC. 1104. The Secretary shall establish a program within the Public Health Service to provide for voluntary Huntington's Disease screening, counseling, and treatment. Such program shall utilize effective Huntington's Disease screening tests and shall be made available through facilities of the Public Health Service to any person requesting screening, counseling, or treatment, and shall include appropriate publicity of the availability and voluntary nature of such programs.

#### "REPORTS"

"SEC. 1105. (a) The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before April 1 of each year a comprehensive report on the administration of this title.

"(b) The report required by this section shall contain such recommendations for additional legislation as the Secretary deems necessary."

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to present this vitally important health amendment on behalf of our people.

### SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

#### HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 21, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently the House passed H.R. 11386, to provide assistance for information and education programs concerning sudden infant death syndrome. This is landmark legislation giving statutory recognition to a medical problem requiring additional research and counseling activities.

The Guild for Infant Survival was founded in 1964 to fight sudden infant death syndrome or "crib death." The guild has concentrated its efforts on counseling individuals and groups, providing information on sudden infant death syndrome, and cooperating with public and private research efforts in the field where possible. I commend the efforts of the guild over the years to bring this mysterious cause of infant death to the attention of private citizens, medical authorities, and the public in general.

H.R. 11386 would authorize \$6 million over a 3-year period for grants and contracts. The Senate bill, S. 1745, would authorize \$36 million—\$24 million for research and \$12 million for counseling and other purposes. It is obvious that there is a need for organized research into the causes of sudden infant death syndrome, and I would hope that the House and Senate can reach an agreement on final legislation that would provide adequate funding for both research and counseling.

### JANUARY 21 STATEMENT ON NEED FOR OIL EXCESS PROFITS TAX

#### HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, as Congress reconvenes today, I am convinced it is imperative that we make the first order of business the passage of legislation imposing an excess profits tax on the oil industry.

We have heard considerable discussion in the last few months about the causes and dimensions of the energy shortage. But after visiting at home I can tell you that my constituents are tremendously skeptical about the existence of a shortage or our Government's ability to handle a real energy crisis. I am sure most of us received the same message.

And I believe the American people are making a valid point. For instance, who believes that Congress or the administration has sufficient information to make energy decisions that inspire public confidence? Yet, we should pass no additional legislation unless and until Congress first enacts an excess oil profits tax. Notwithstanding our failure to grasp all the problems, we may any day now be asked to vote on another energy bill.

While many in Congress may lament the loss of this energy legislation, I think it is extremely important for us to take the most controversial problem first—the question of the excess profits tax—before we begin reconsideration of a full blown energy bill. I say this because I believe that there is no public support for any congressional action which might further inconvenience the American people or might promote oil companies' interest in working closely with each other, unless the public is assured that companies do not stand to reap windfall profits growing out of the uncertainties of the energy situation.

The American people are willing to make any sacrifice in a real and just cause. But, despite the praiseworthy success of the voluntary program of lowering highway speeds and home thermostats, there is no assurance that the public will continue to tolerate long-term cutbacks and inconveniences. If people cannot reconcile fuel shortages with the sizable jump in precrisis oil profits or the high postcrisis level of oil inventories, if people become convinced that the higher prices they are now paying only mean even higher profits, there will be no support whatever for any Government programs, either from Congress or the administration. And quite frankly, most of the people I have met do not believe there is an energy crisis—but they do believe that someone is getting rich from actions taken in the name of a so-called crisis.

Part of the credibility problem stems from price controls. Why not? After all, price controls simply mean Government and business sitting down to decide how much to charge the public. If a price control is a ceiling, it is also going to

be a floor. Is there not great reason for the public to believe that our price control policy is a complete failure?

More to the point, there is a significant energy credibility problem because people do not believe that an administration, whose campaign managers are alleged to have accepted \$6 million in contributions from people in the oil industry, can be totally impartial in the setting of oil and gasoline prices.

For these reasons, I say it is imperative that Congress takes the initiative in putting public fears to rest. The first step must be to pass an excess profits tax whose purpose is to take the profit out of profiteering. Properly designed legislation will not drive energy producing firms out of business.

Because the oil industry is allowed to write off at once almost all of its oil exploration investments as "intangible drilling expenses," an excess profits tax on the oil industry will actually encourage investment in additional recovery and drilling new wells.

And hand in glove with Congress enacting this tax is the gathering of adequate information to give the American people a clear picture of reserves, storage, and other critical information necessary for intelligent decisionmaking at all levels of Government.

These are the protective steps we must take to assure the public that the Government does work in their behalf. The first step is the excess profits tax, and I am in the process of preparing and introducing such legislation.

### OIL BLACKMAIL: A TWO-EDGED SWORD

**HON. BILL GUNTER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent statement on counter measures which can be employed against those nations engaged in oil blackmail was written recently by Mr. Arthur H. Courshon, chairman of the board of Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association of Miami Beach.

Mr. Courshon suggests that an embargo can be a two-edged sword. I commend his statement for the consideration of the many readers of the RECORD.

**HAS THE FREE WORLD LOST CONTROL OF ITS DESTINY TO THE BLACKMAIL OF AN OIL EMBARGO?**

(By Arthur H. Courshon)

A group of small Arab nations, who through accidents of history and geology control a major part of the world's oil reserves, are denying access to this resource, vital to the economic and military security of nations of the free world.

The Arabs accomplished through collective action what they could not have accomplished singly. Without firing a shot, they now threaten the economies and the freedoms of England, countries of Western Europe, Japan, and to an extent, the United States.

Profiting from their lesson in collective action, they could realize further mutual objectives were they so inclined. Tyranny always begins with a first step. What's next? Disruption of free world productive and economic stability; repeated denials for whatever purpose of access to basic world energy sources?

Their lesson should be our lesson. I strongly urge that we, as Americans, assume the lead in creating an effective, collective counter-embargo and thus show the Arabs they are swinging a two-edged sword.

The Arab nations cannot survive without food, industrial products, transportation equipment, medicine, industrial services and other commodities available to them only from the free world.

The United States historically has taken the lead in protecting the integrity of sovereign nations against blackmail by military force. We should now take the lead against oil blackmail.

No one nation can succeed with such a course through unilateral action. The United States is not the only source, in many commodities not even the major source, of Arab supply. But the free world—England, Canada, Australia, Western Europe, Japan, Latin America and others—could succeed quickly through mutual solidarity in a collective counter-embargo.

Would a collective counter-embargo work? Examine the Arabs' alternatives as they push for their own objectives contrary to the peace and order of the rest of us. Without free world goods, they could look only to the Communist world for food and industrial products. Those nations, principally the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, produce only marginally for their own people. Moreover, the Arab countries have shown clearly that while they may accept Communist arms they fear and reject both dependency on and domination by the Communist powers.

The possible costs of inaction are high and are becoming more visible daily. The costs to the oil embargo victims could include economic disruption, weakened currencies, unemployment, severely lowered standards of living, reduced productivity, limited sources of fuel for defense purpose and further alienation of friendly nations as each moves for its own, rather than for mutual, interests.

Collective action now can prevent these problems. Through collective counter-embargo the nations of the free world can regain control over their own destinies.

Of all the free nations, the U.S. may be the most independent of outside energy sources and, in time, probably could survive alone if we had to. But as a world leader and as a bulwark of international moral force, we should take the initiative toward collective action against coercion and blackmail.

What's required? Only the will, the capacity to act in unison with other free nations whose products keep the Arab people alive. The Arabs can't eat or drink oil . . . or money! If suddenly no ships, no planes, no wheat, no spare parts, no industrial products reached the 8 nations that created the oil embargo, we would see an immediate change in attitude on their part.

We do not have to wait for political leaders to take the initiative. We can write our congressmen, our senators, our President. We can encourage our friends, business associates, suppliers and customers throughout the free world to insist that their leaders set aside fruitless rivalries and unite in this common, critical purpose.

We can urge that the U.N., though we recognize the difficulties of resolution in that body, certify oil and other major resources

as world treasures open to the world marketplace in fair trade; resources not to be used to wage a war that, while absent of bullets, may be as catastrophic as arms to peace and tranquility.

Rather than supinely retreat and divided suffer losses we previously fought wars and spent fortunes to prevent, let us join together and fight fire with fire, collective embargo with collective embargo.

On October 17, 1973 at Kuwait eight nations created a joint policy aimed at bending the free world to their will. They were Saudi Arabia, Libya, Algeria, Kuwait, Abou Duran, Iraq, Sudan, Yemen.

Against that line up, the free world through collective counter-embargo could quickly regain control of its destiny, deal fairly with everyone and protect our mutual national interests. With courage and a strong will, it can be done.

### WALDIE WALKS, TALKS IN MIDDLE CALIFORNIA

**HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess, our colleague from California (Mr. WALDIE), made a 20-day walk to take the pulse of the people of California.

What he found in the opening days of that journey was quite interesting. The Los Angeles Times had a reporter along with Representative WALDIE, and he filed this story:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 7, 1974]  
**WALDIE WALK UNCOVERS FEARS OF HARD TIMES**  
(By Bill Boyarsky)

PUMPKIN CENTER, CALIF.—Fear of hard times has emerged along old Highway 99, the historic route of the Okies and Arkies of the Depression, a road that has known pain and suffering.

Worried about their future, a dozen normally reticent men and women—Democrats of conservative Southern stock—were anxious to tell their troubles to a stranger Thursday.

The stranger turned out to be a liberal, anti-Nixon Democrat, Rep. Jerome R. Waldie of Antioch, a candidate for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination. Still, those interviewed were anxious to talk, seemingly pleased he had happened by.

Waldie, an advocate of President Nixon's impeachment, walked all day through the Kern County farmlands, talking to residents of a Democratic area that overwhelmingly supported the President in the 1972 election.

Starting from Pumpkin Center, a small community outside Bakersfield, Waldie began a 20-day walk to the Capitol in Sacramento to boost his uphill gubernatorial campaign.

The encounters were a surprise to reporters who had visited the same county in past elections and had found residents hesitant to share their feelings with outsiders. When they did talk in 1970 and '72, they spoke of law and order and their fears of radicals.

On Thursday, the dozen or so who spoke with Waldie generally discussed the energy crisis and their fears for their economic futures.

They appeared glad to stop their work and give him thoughts about the economy and politics—a contrast to earlier days when

barnstorming liberal politicians received a chillier reception from the people on the street.

"I think it's wonderful," an elderly woman told Waldie outside the mobile home in which she lives on Highway 99. She said she thought it was a good thing that he was going out to talk to the people.

His filling station about to fold, Don Hallford, proprietor of Don's Mobil Service, told Waldie he believed he was a victim of a conspiracy by large oil companies trying to freeze independents like himself out of business.

"This shortage was created by the oil companies," he said.

"I think the fuel shortage is for the birds," said Ruth Buck, whose Pumpkin Center restaurant is patronized by farmers having trouble getting fuel to run their equipment.

"I have always been a Nixon fan until the oil shortage. But I read in the paper that he had too much oil in his campaign and it tied his hands," she said.

The people were not well informed in the academic sense of the word. They gleaned their information the way most people do, from bits of news on television and radio, from a glance at a newspaper story.

But everyone to whom Waldie spoke seemed united in a common belief—that the oil companies and other powerful forces out of their control were threatening their hard won economic security.

Mrs. Darlene Lemons, who operates a gift shop in Pumpkin Center and who has always voted Democratic, said, "I've got five children and two grandchildren and my husband Bill is a truck driver. We have a lot of mouths to feed and things have been very slow here for the past few months and I know we need a change."

Truck driving is important in this country, where the long-haul rigs take the produce to market and where the drivers and owners are worried about the fuel shortage and the 55-m.p.h. speed limit.

This is also middle America, one of the most politically important areas in the state because it is a bellwether of other blue-collar working-class white districts. When these conservative Democrats, who had prospered under the New Deal, abandoned their party for Republican Gov. Reagan and President Nixon, it was a sign the Democrats were in deep trouble in the late 1960s.

The story Don Thompson, a filling station operator, told Waldie had a Depression sound to it.

Gulf Oil, he said, was canceling the lease of his service station in Pumpkin Center because there was not enough gas. He, his wife and their small daughter had just moved into a home he had purchased a mile from his station. Now he will have to look for a new job.

"It's the little guy who suffers," he said.

Waldie received a hostile reception once, when he waved to two workers across the road. "Are you a Democrat?" he shouted. "No," one of them replied.

"You have time to repent," said Waldie.

"I go to church, I don't need to repent," the worker replied.

Waldie said he hopes to use the walk as a means for building enthusiasm for his candidacy, which he concedes is running behind some of the other Democratic candidates for governor.

As a theme for this first day, he quickly picked up the complaints of those he talked to and referred to them in a half-hour television interview in Bakersfield.

Speaking of the Gulf Station operator faced with loss of his business, Waldie said, "He's tossed out on his ear and the profits of the oil companies, including Gulf, are the highest in years. . . . I don't see any sacrifice from the big oil companies."

## FREE ENTERPRISE—NOT RATIONING OR HIGHER TAXES—BEST WAY TO SOLVE ENERGY CRISIS

### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, there have been proposals that gas rationing and/or higher taxes on gasoline will aid us to solve the energy shortage. A basic understanding of our free enterprise system and how it operates show the fallacy of this approach. An excellent article which discusses this entire question appeared in the Wall Street Journal. This article, written by two Texas University professors, is entitled "The Common Sense Way to More Oil."

The article follows:

THE COMMON SENSE WAY TO MORE OIL

(By W. Philip Gramm and Richard R. Davison)

In the great debate about how to stretch the nation's crucially short available supplies of petroleum products to meet current and expected demand, many people in influential positions are trying to straddle the issue. They are proposing rationing or high federal fuel taxes as a short-term policy and free markets as a long-term policy.

On the surface this blend of controls and freedom seems to make sense. The exact magnitude of today's petroleum shortage is unknown but the quantity of excess demand has been estimated in the range of 10% to 20%. Until the forces of the marketplace can once again achieve equilibrium, it is proposed that high fuel taxes would serve to trim some of the excessive demand and rationing would make sure that everyone gets his fair share of the available supplies of gasoline and fuel oil.

In fact, almost nothing could be quite as disastrous for everyone concerned. Rationing and taxing will cause output to fall and the shortage will get worse. The explanation is simple. If these programs are introduced as temporary measures, it's true they will serve to hold down the price of oil of domestic producers, but at the same time they will also serve to introduce the expectation of higher prices after controls end. The producer, therefore, will have an incentive to restrict current supply and to maintain his capacity to produce under more profitable conditions.

We need only look back to last summer when beef prices were frozen to see what will happen. Since oil can be held indefinitely, while cattle quickly pass their prime market period and eventually die of old age, we can expect even more production holdovers in oil than we experienced in cattle.

Not only will rationing and taxing petroleum not eliminate the shortage, but under such programs the effective price of petroleum to the consumer will be higher than the price that would exist in a free market. There, as prices rise the quantity supplied would expand from both domestic production and increased importation; and the shortage would be partly eliminated by decreases in the quantity demanded and partly by increases in the quantity supplied. The taxing system, on the other hand, would produce no supply response and we would have to rely solely on decreases in the quantity demanded as the effective price rose—thus a higher price to the consumer than under a free market system.

Rationing, with a "white" market in coupons, though lowering the transaction costs

that were incurred in the black market trading of World War II, will still produce a higher effective price to the consumer than the free market solution. The market price of ration tickets will be bid up to the point at which the ceiling price of gasoline, plus the price of the ration ticket are equal to the price at which the 10% to 20% of excess demand is choked off. But again there will be no stimulation of oil output, with the consequence that the effective price will rise above the level the free market would have produced.

#### THE ICEBERG IMAGE

What, then, could we expect of free market pricing by itself? Where would the additional supplies of oil come from if prices rise? Like an iceberg, 90% below the surface of the ocean, about 90% of the known oil in the U.S. is unrecoverable at present prices, existing in fields that are now considered largely depleted. But, as an iceberg floats higher when the sea becomes denser, so more oil reserve become available when the price rises.

To put this in perspective, in 1969, before the energy shortage developed and when there was little prospect of higher oil prices, cumulative production in the U.S. was 84 billion barrels, and recoverable reserves were about 31 billion barrels. (The Alaskan North Slope strike has increased this to about 39 billion barrels.) Yet there remained in these same reservoirs, in fairly well-defined locations and volumes, 285 billion barrels not recoverable at existing prices. The technology exists to recover much of this oil. Even now, over a fourth of the oil produced in this country comes from fields subject to artificial water floods, but even after successful water flood, about 50% of the original oil remains in place.

There are a large number of so-called "tertiary" recovery techniques that include steam and fire drives, dissolving the oil with miscible gases or liquids and methods employing detergents that literally wash the oil from the rock. The high temperature methods are particularly effective with highly viscous oils. There are estimates that up to 50 billion barrels of low gravity, viscous oil are recoverable by these methods. On the other hand, miscible fluid recovery techniques with higher gravity oils are capable of recovering as much as 90% of the oil in place.

While in time, more and more of this hidden part of the iceberg will become available as improved technology brings down the cost and risk, a few dollars per barrel price increase would likely have the effect of tripling U.S. oil reserves. Just how fast this additional oil would become available as the price rises is impossible to answer with precision. However, between 1947 and 1972 the record indicates that every 1% increase in prices of refined petroleum products was on average associated with a 4% increase in the production of gasoline. This fact bears out what the bureaucrats have been saying: Oil men are greedy. If you raise the rewards for production, they produce more to get it. If real prices fall, as they have under price ceilings, production falls off.

In a free market, all marginal or stripper wells that could produce profitably would soon be in operation. There are over 350,000 stripper wells in the U.S., producing 10 barrels per day or less and tens of thousands more shut down which could be made operational on short notice. Production from these wells could probably increase stripper production by 20% to 25%. Though some of these wells would require renovation, most could be on stream in six months to a year and could produce about 250,000 barrels per day. The even larger inputs from secondary and tertiary production and increased exploration would be felt more slowly. Within a 24-month time frame, new production ap-

proaching one million barrels per day might be expected and this source would gush forth in ever increasing quantities until stopped by declining prices.

The free market oil price is constant dollars would be below \$8 per barrel. At \$8, a vast amount of energy from other sources would cut deeply into the conventional oil market. Not only would coal and nuclear energy replace oil and gas for power generation, but gas from coal would supplement natural gas supplies; and methyl alcohol from coal could undersell gasoline. The U.S. has some of the best coal deposits in the world—at least 200 billion tons (equivalent to roughly 900 billion barrels of oil and significantly in excess of world crude reserves). There are also huge reserves of shale and tar sands that could make a significant contribution at these prices, and even solar energy could make inroads into the space heating market in many localities.

#### A RETURN TO NORMALCY

Gaseous and liquid fuels from coal have a longer lag time than increased petroleum production, but the potential contribution is such that it places an absolute upper limit on ultimate fuel prices. For instance, methyl alcohol, produced from coal, can compete with gasoline at oil prices well below \$8 per barrel. Furthermore, methyl alcohol is over 100 octane, lead-free, much cleaner burning than gasoline, and, as a by-product, it could save billions in pollution abatement. With these many energy alternatives, given the opportunity, the free market system would provide adequate fuel for rapid economic expansion.

One of the loudest objections raised against a free market solution to the energy crisis is that the petroleum industry will make excessive profits if prices are allowed to rise. Since the crisis was, in large part, engendered by various government regulations that disrupted the workings of competitive markets and by price ceilings that caused the real price of petroleum and natural gas to fall and lowered the return on investment, rising profit margins represent not so much a windfall gain as a return to normalcy. These profits are necessary if we are to revitalize the exploration and production process in the energy industry.

U.S. production of crude oil and natural gas liquids this year has been running close to 11 million barrels a day, while the latest figure for imports is about 6 million barrels a day. Imports, not covered by price controls, are selling for about \$8 a barrel on average, although in extreme cases they have sold for twice that amount. Recently, new and stripper well production was freed from controls and is now selling for over \$6.75 a barrel. Last week in a commendable move the price ceiling on "old oil" from existing wells was raised \$1 a barrel, but this still leaves two thirds of America's oil selling for \$5.25 or less and the other third ranging up to nearly \$8 a barrel. The stated objective of these pricing policies is to encourage the finding of new oil and the maintenance of production from marginal wells, but under such a system there is a clear incentive to cut the production of non-strippers and wait for prices to rise when ceilings are removed. Such incentives explain why many wells have been capped under the present pricing system.

Without question, the government has held the price of oil and gas artificially low for many years. As a result, the return on invested capital in the petroleum industry has fallen from 9.4% in 1963 to 7.4% in 1972. Falling prices also have caused a drastic decline in drilling and hence curbed the growth of oil reserves. Twenty years ago, when crude production was only 60% of present production, there were about half again as many drilling rigs operating in the U.S. as there are now. But 20 years ago it cost less than half as much to find a dollar's worth of re-

serves as it did in 1972. Just from 1967 to 1972 the cost to drillers for oil field machinery, pipe and labor increased about 30% while the price of finished petroleum products rose less than 9%. This has caused a steady decline in the discovery ratio. At present, not including Alaska, we are depleting reserves about 20 times as fast as we are finding new oil.

In order to reverse this trend the oil companies must spend billions, but this they cannot do if their return on investment is less than the going interest rate. Under a free enterprise system the only way that the cash flow and incentives necessary for research and exploration can be provided is from profits. These profits cannot arise under the present system of controlled prices. The proposal that the government subsidize the oil industry for purposes of exploration and research will create a quasi-governmental cartel modeled on that paragon of efficiency—the U.S. Postal Service. It seems far better (and cheaper), therefore, to allow the oil companies to finance this exploration themselves through free competitive capital markets.

#### TREASURY CONTRADICTIONS

The new proposal to institute a progressive "windfall profits" tax on crude oil that sells for over \$4.25 a barrel will only lessen the profitability of marginal production, and short term output will increase by a smaller amount than it would in the absence of such a tax. By extracting \$3 billion a year from oil company revenues, such a tax will make it more difficult to plow back the \$200 billion necessary to maintain current production over the next 15 years or to get external financing for such a massive investment. Moreover, the Treasury's estimate that such a tax will not affect prices to consumers is based on the assumption that over the five year life span of the tax the quantity of oil supplied will be perfectly fixed, i.e. that no marginal production is possible. This flies in the face not only of every private estimate of the price responsiveness of crude oil supply but of previous estimates put out by the Treasury itself.

Somewhere along the line people have forgotten how the profit system works, that it is to each producer's self interest to expand output and thereby expand profits. As each producer does this, excess profits are competed away. Excess profits vanish when their work is done and output has increased.

It is plain common sense that if government regulation and price controls have helped to cause the energy crisis, they are not likely to solve it. When government intervention does not solve a problem, the bureaucrat never thinks to end controls. He cries for more controls. Those who have no knowledge of free enterprise stampede to give him more power. In such cases, our problem is not an "energy crisis" but a "leadership crisis."

#### REPRESENTATIVE RONCALLO COVERS THIRD DISTRICT ON FOOT

#### HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, nearly all of us are looking for novel and effective ways of "feeling the pulse" of our districts. On January 7, my good friend and New York colleague, ANGELO RONCALLO, took an approach which certainly

deserves our applause. Starting at his home in Massapequa, he walked 21 miles to his district office in Cold Spring Harbor, talking with constituents along the way.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include a Newsday account of his hike in the RECORD at this point:

#### ONE (HEAVY) STEP FOR MANKIND

(By Jack Altshul)

Roncallo for President! He's my candidate for 1976. I don't care about his voting record in the House as a freshman representative of the Third Congressional District. It doesn't matter that he's a Republican or an intimate of Joe Margiotta, the Nassau GOP boss. Angelo Roncallo made it in my book Monday when he walked his district, all 300 pounds of him, in freezing temperatures, from Massapequa to Cold Spring Harbor—a distance of 21 miles. I get the huffs and puffs walking my dog.

If it was a publicity stunt, more power to the congressman who expects to run for reelection in November. The least he ought to get out of it is a cabinet post. The President's yes men never came up with an idea to match it or to humanize him. That gambol through economy class on the way to San Clemente was a feeble exercise compared with the Roncallo trek over frozen tundra. And unlike the congressman, the President never bothered to inquire of the passengers what they thought of his administration.

Roncallo wasn't at all bashful. He serves a predominantly Republican district, and he asked all the people en route what they thought of the President. They gave it to him bluntly. They thought the aroma exuding from the White House smelled worse and polluted the environment more than the seepage from a damaged cesspool.

And Roncallo, a party loyalist in every other respect, did not hesitate to reveal the sentiment he encountered. He was honest enough to comment: "The President couldn't win in my district today. If he were running again, I'd tell him not to."

He also learned that the people who sent him to Congress don't believe there is an energy crisis. They think it is a ploy by the oil companies to get higher prices. They think the companies will use the crisis to tap the oil in the Atlantic, meanwhile charging all the traffic can bear. If that's what the people think, Roncallo says, he's going to pursue his own investigation when he gets back to Washington to determine whether the crisis is real or a hoax. In that respect, I don't know whether Roncallo is promising anything more than any other candidate.

Be that as it may, my admiration for the former Nassau County controller continues unabated. It takes some doing for a man of such imposing avoirdupois to consummate an eight-hour walk. The congressman started off from his home in Massapequa at 7 AM and by the time he got to his office in Cold Spring Harbor late in the afternoon, he was only one of three who survived the marathon. The rest, including newsmen, dropped by the wayside. The other survivors were Roncallo's wife, Priscille, who now qualifies as the most athletic wife in Congress, and John Deppert, a member of the Nassau Community College track team.

The way I look at it, Roncallo won more than just my vote Monday. Consider what he did for the unloved, overweight population of America, which is no longer a silent majority and which has been protesting discrimination in executive job opportunity almost as loudly as women, recently. Certainly the congressman from Massapequa has gained considerable weight among a constituency that reaches far beyond the borders of the Township of Oyster Bay. An awful lot of

lightweights had to take to cars to complete the frosty congressional junket.

He could very well be the forerunner of a new trend in politics. It would emphasize a kind of give-the-people-what-they-want government. There must be a lot of voters who don't read diet books and who would want to be represented by someone who asks them what they want. Now I don't know whether Angelo Roncallo can give them all that. I don't know whether he can figure out the oil crisis which thus far has baffled not only those assigned to the problem in the White House, but also supposed experts in the field.

I don't know that my hero can beat inflation, divert munitions money for medical research, or solve the urban and suburban problems. All I know is a man who goes out asking is more apt to get solutions than this guy who hides in three White Houses and talks only to people who tell him what he wants to hear.

I'm casting my vote for Angelo Roncallo who asks his questions walking.

### OUR MISSING IN ACTION

#### HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, we still have American citizens missing in action in Southeast Asia. Almost a year has passed since many of our POW's came home, and yet we still have no complete accounting of our missing.

Recently my constituent, Mrs. L. F. Bates, wrote a letter regarding our MIA's to her local newspaper. The Chicago Heights Star answered her letter with an editorial. Since both the letter and editorial express my feelings so eloquently, I am placing them in the RECORD for all to consider:

#### MISSING IN ACTION

To the Editor:

I am writing out of my deep concern that newspapers of this area have given so little attention to the plight of the more than 1,200 Americans who were captured or reported missing in the Viet Nam war and who have not yet been accounted for. Surely this subject is one that merits both your editorial comment and continued news coverage.

Because several hundred of our former prisoners of war (POWs) and missing in action (MIAs) were returned to us, many Americans hold the mistaken impression that the POW-MIA problem no longer exists. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Here are some of the hard facts:

Few of our "missing" were included among those men who were returned.

More than 50 of those who were known to be prisoners of war also were not returned.

Sixty of our men that the other side claimed had "died in captivity" are still buried in alien soil. Not one body has yet been sent home to the man's family.

Our search and inspection teams which were supposed to be allowed entry into all areas of Southeast Asia where our men were last seen alive have so far been permitted to examine only a handful of such sites—all in South Viet Nam.

As the parent of one of those few "missing" who was returned home, I realize how very lucky we were, and can feel the desper-

ation of those families who are trying to get an accounting of those still missing.

I hope that you will find enough of interest in this letter to prompt an editorial on the subject, and further and continued news coverage on the progress or lack of progress our government is making in its efforts to account for these missing men.

I feel sure that my fellow Americans would share this deep concern of the National League of Families, if only they knew the facts.

Mrs. L. F. BATES.

PARK FOREST SOUTH.

#### LEST WE FORGET

A letter from a reader, which is reprinted elsewhere in this issue, calls attention to a tragic aftermath of the Viet Nam conflict—the fate of more than 1,200 American servicemen who were captured by the enemy or were reported missing in action and have not yet been accounted for.

When the United States signed the Paris Peace Conference agreement last January, 1,925 members of the U.S. armed forces and 52 U.S. civilians were being held as prisoners of war (POW) or were missing in action (MIA). Now, nearly a year later, two-thirds of these men are still missing, and there has been no word of any kind from Hanoi as to their whereabouts.

The question that continues to plague the families of these men—and indeed should be of concern to every American—is: Is it possible that some or all of these men are still alive and in Communist hands?

In the opinion of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, the answer is: "Yes, it is possible."

The league then goes on to point out:

Some of the missing men are known to have been alive and in Communist hands at one time.

Some of the missing were photographed in captivity, and the U.S. government has copies of the photographs.

In some instances, the enemy issued propaganda releases, including photographs of the official U.S. armed forces ID cards of certain men, stating that the men had been taken prisoner. The U.S. government also has this information in its files.

In still other instances, the enemy made radio broadcasts announcing the capture of U.S. servicemen. The U.S. monitored the broadcasts.

When the peace agreement was signed, however, and the North Vietnamese handed U.S. officials a list of Americans who were to be repatriated (together with a list of 60 men who "had died in captivity"), more than 50 men previously identified as POW's did not appear on either list. The Communists have since provided no information about these men.

Similarly, many Americans who had been listed as "missing in action," but who were never classified as POW's, disappeared in the combat zone under circumstances that point strongly to the possibility that they were taken prisoner. Yet, when the Communists listed the Americans who were to be repatriated, the lists included only 47 men (out of a total of 1,334 missing) slated for repatriation. Ten other men previously identified as missing were included on the list of those who died in captivity. This means that a total of 57 MIAs, or less than four per cent of all of the missing, were accounted for.

What happened to the others? What indeed? Only Hanoi knows. The U.S. government should step up efforts to get definitive answers. It owes it to these men and to their families. In a sense, it is a "war debt" that is long overdue in settling.

### CANAL ZONE DUTY IS NICE

#### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 10 the Wall Street Journal published an article entitled "The Good Life—in the Canal Zone, Duty is Nice for U.S. Military, But Criticism Mounts." Mr. Richard J. Levine, the Wall Street Journal's Pentagon correspondent presents a devastating case against the continuation of the so-called southern command. It is the smallest and most rank heavy of the Pentagon 7 unified commands and one that I think should be reexamined, and possibly abolished.

I commend Mr. Levine's article for my colleagues. The article follows:

THE GOOD LIFE: IN CANAL ZONE DUTY IS NICE FOR U.S. MILITARY, BUT CRITICISM MOUNTS

(By Richard J. Levine)

QUARRY HEIGHTS, CANAL ZONE.—Tall palm trees shade the stately old quarters of the generals and colonels clustered on this military post overlooking the Panama Canal. In the early-morning heat, Panamanian workers tend the neat lawns and lush flower beds. Two tennis courts await the day's first players.

The military people stationed here will devote much of their day to paperwork. The pace is hardly arduous, and there will be plenty of time to enjoy the serenity of the zone and its recreational delights, such as golf, fishing and boating. An army colonel says: "There's nothing like it in the world. A party every night and never a wait on the golf course."

This idyllic setting is home for the headquarters of the U.S. Southern Command—the smallest and most rank-heavy of the Defense Department's seven commands that comprise more than one service. Though it numbers only 10,500 military people and can muster little firepower, the command has no fewer than 10 generals—including the four-star commander, William B. Rosson—plus two admirals and four separate headquarters.

#### THE DIFFERING VIEWPOINTS

To its champions, the Southern Command is essential to the defense of the canal, the U.S. military-aid program in Latin America and the maintenance of close ties with military-oriented Latin governments. It is "performing a vital military mission," Gen. Rosson says.

But to its detractors in Washington, the Southern Command is a costly anachronism that symbolizes misuse of military manpower—mismanagement that in their view is unnecessarily driving up defense costs and producing a military establishment with too many high-ranking officers, too many headquarters, too many soft desk jobs and too few combat units.

"The grade structure has become so top-heavy with high-ranking officers that it's shaped not like a pyramid but like a balloon," Democratic Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota complains. "Colonels drawing well over \$20,000 a year are used to carry around charts and hold pointers during Pentagon briefings on why the Defense Department needs additional manpower."

The Southern Command's critics, who are mainly in Congress and the State Department, contend that it lacks a major military mission and should be merged into other commands, reducing the number of brass

hats. "I can't see any reason for the Southern Command," says a military analyst with long experience at the Pentagon and the National Security Council. "They have nothing to command except a few soldiers."

#### A NAVY WITHOUT WARSHIPS

The fighting forces assigned here are slim. The Army has a 2,800-man infantry brigade. The Air Force has only 31 planes, and its four combat jets are borrowed from another outfit. The Navy, to its embarrassment, doesn't have a single warship here. Its "fleet" consists of two 45-foot fishing boats used by the brass, and Navy briefing officers are reduced to discussing the annual visit of a single landing ship for training exercises.

"The only reason the Navy is here is that this place is surrounded by water," says one of the few senior officers here who side with the critics. "They have no mission—not one. That headquarters is the sleepiest place I've ever seen."

What the Southern Command does best, critics insist, is provide pleasant pre-retirement jobs for the brass. "It's a make-work proposition," a congressional staffer says. "What better way to end a career than on Quarry Heights?" Gene La Rocque, a retired rear admiral turned Pentagon critic, goes further: "A tour in the Southern Command is most aptly described as a two-year vacation."

Indeed, some military men here complain of a lack of real work. At a dinner party, an ensign assigned to Navy headquarters says with a sigh: "We're just a skeleton force; it makes you feel so useless."

#### THE PRESSURE FOR ECONOMY

In the future, military chiefs may have growing trouble in protecting the Southern Command from economizers. The mounting cost of defense manpower, which now accounts for 56% of the Pentagon's \$79 billion spending budget, is increasing congressional pressure for eliminating various headquarters and reducing the number of high-ranking officers.

"Combat jobs tend to be undermanned while support jobs, particularly for headquarters staffs, tend to be overmanned," the Senate Armed Services Committee recently lectured the Pentagon. "The Department of Defense and each of the services should make substantial reductions in their headquarters staffs. . . ."

To bolster this view, lawmakers cite the fact that there are 44 more three- and four-star generals and admirals in uniform today than at the height of World War II in 1945. There are also more colonels and Navy captains today (15,847) than in 1945 (14,989).

The congressional message appears to be getting through to the Pentagon loud and clear. Defense Secretary James Schlesinger has ordered a major review aimed at "finding opportunities for eliminating and reducing headquarters staffs." Pentagon officials say moves could come shortly to eliminate up to 60,000 military and civilian jobs. The ultimate goal is an annual saving of some \$300 million in the military-support structure.

As military pay has climbed in recent years, Congress has become increasingly critical of the traditional perquisites of rank: the chauffeured cars, the big houses, the elaborate recreational facilities.

Perhaps nowhere are these accouterments of American military life so abundant as in the Canal Zone—a strip 10 miles wide and 50 miles long in which most of the Southern Command's men and their 14,000 dependents work and live. Small and out of the military mainstream, the command has gained a reputation in the armed forces as a "hidden paradise."

Crammed into the zone are seven golf courses, six riding clubs, four beaches, 14

swimming pools, 14 movie theaters, four yacht clubs, five bowling alleys, nine craft shops, two roller-skating rinks, six gymnasiums and countless tennis courts, many of them lighted for night play.

Adding to the allure of an assignment here for the brass are the big, frame residences built by the French before the turn of the century. They have 40-foot living rooms with high ceilings and polished hardwood floors, four or five bedrooms, maid's rooms, modern kitchens and walk-in closets so large that many a suburban boulder in the U.S. would label them bedrooms. One officer estimates that it costs the government several thousand dollars a year to maintain a big home on Quarry Heights.

Gen. Rosson readily concedes the life here is "attractive." But he insists that the Southern Command is carrying out an essential mission "in an area of prime importance to the national interests of the U.S." Still, the mission, like the command itself, is controversial.

While the command officially lists the primary mission as defense of the Panama Canal, staff officers concede that "it is difficult to define" any traditional military threat against the canal.

When pressed, military men reluctantly cite the Panamanians themselves. But State Department analysts contend that the Panamanians fully recognize that the canal is important to their economy. Despite the anti-American riots here in 1964 and occasional threats of violence voiced by the Panamanian government, a U.S. diplomat says: "The Panamanians' emotional thrust isn't against the canal. The problem is the nature of our presence."

#### BEYOND THE TREATY

Panama vigorously objects to the Southern Command with its 13 military posts strung out through the zone. The government of strong man Omar Torrijos argues that this deployment goes far beyond the protection of the canal as permitted under a 1903 treaty.

"We believe that the Southern Command was never allowed by the treaty," a Panamanian diplomat says. "The defense of the canal is something else from the maintenance of an enormous military establishment. You have the constant feeling of the military boot being put on you."

Elimination of the Southern Command is one of Panama's aims in the decade-long negotiations with the U.S. on a new canal treaty. The negotiations resumed last November, with the U.S. delegation led by Ellsworth Bunker, the former ambassador to South Vietnam. Panama's basic objective is to regain sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Diplomatic problems aside, the Southern Command's critics insist that the elaborate headquarters setup here isn't needed to support the zone's only sizable fighting force, the 193rd Infantry Brigade, or any reinforcements that might be brought in if serious trouble did erupt.

But Gen. Rosson and other officers here emphasized the Southern Command's non-combat missions; these include running military assistance to Latin America and directing disaster relief and search-and-rescue operations in this region, which is subject to earthquakes and hurricanes. "I wouldn't argue (with the view) that we are somewhat heavy in general and flag officers," Gen. Rosson says. "But the nature of the command is such as to place uncommon requirements on us for senior personnel in selected positions."

By this reasoning, a disproportionate num-

ber of high-ranking officers must be assigned here as a way of flattering status-conscious Latin officials with whom they deal. But some U.S. officials believe that the trend has gone too far. They note that eight Southern Command officers wear more stars than Brig Gen. Torrijos, who heads the Panamanian government. "There are indications that Torrijos doesn't appreciate it," a Western diplomat stationed in Panama says.

Moreover, some U.S. analysts feel that the shrinking arms-aid program could be run just as effectively from Washington as from the Canal Zone. Why, they ask, does it require 290 military men and 96 civilians to run a weapons-aid program that has declined to less than \$5 million a year from \$60 million in 1966?

The Southern Command says this field force is needed to spur weapons sales throughout Latin America. But a U.S. Foreign Service officer says, "It doesn't take all those people to tell the Latins what they want to have. The American aircraft industry is out selling."

The Southern Command is responsible for training Latin American military men at four schools in the zone. Since the first courses were established in 1943, some 45,000 students have graduated, many of whom now occupy seats of power. Among the alumni are Gen. Torrijos; Gen. Juan Velasco Alvarado, president of Peru; and Brig. Gen. Guillermo Rodrigue Lara, president of Ecuador.

The school system, forging strong ties between U.S. officers and many Latin leaders, has helped the American military perform what it has called its "representational role" in Latin America. But State Department officials want this job left to the professional diplomats. And congressional critics can't understand why, after three decades, the schools haven't worked themselves out of a job. "The military doesn't see any end to this (training)," a Senate staff member complains.

The command takes great pride in its humanitarian missions. In the past six years, it has provided assistance in 80 disasters; after the December 1972 earthquake in Nicaragua, Southern Command pilots flew in one million pounds of badly needed supplies. Yet Brig. Gen. John Desmond, command operations officer, worries that "a lot of people lose sight of what we're doing down here."

His concern is shared by ambitious career officers here, who fear that a stigma is attached to a Canal Zone assignment. "As you progress in your career, assignment to this command hampers you," a young Air Force officer says. "Why? Because this command has declined in importance. There's a general lack of interest in Latin America in the U.S."

Gen. Rosson, a widely respected officer, is attempting to change the zone's image as an easygoing pre-retirement center by reaching out for officers on the way up. But stories poking fun at the command still circulate—about a former army commander here, known as "tire guage," who ran around the zone measuring the air pressure of tires on military vehicles and about a former Navy commander who once demanded that a logistics officer rush over to his quarters to fix his washing machine.

In 1970, a special defense panel composed of leading private citizens recommended that the Southern Command be abolished and that its functions be assigned to an enlarged Atlantic Command. Then-Defense Secretary Melvin Laird agreed. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff managed to persuade President Nixon to leave the Southern Command intact.

Now, as the Pentagon searches for savings in headquarters staffs, one blunt officer here suggests that the Southern Command is "the ripest fruit on the tree."

## THE PANAMA CANAL CRISIS

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that Dr. Kissinger is to meet with representatives of the rebel Panamanian government in negotiating a giveaway of U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal has drawn sharp retort from Mr. Phillips Harman, the grandson-in-law of the founder of the Republic of Panama.

I ask that Mr. Harman's wire to Dr. Kissinger, a letter to Maj. Gen. Franklin M. Davis, Jr., and correspondence to me, along with a pertinent news clipping follow:

LOS ANGELES,  
January 8, 1974.

HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER,  
Secretary of State,  
Department of State,  
Washington, D.C.:

The Los Angeles Times today stated that you might go to Panama this month to sign a new treaty. Do take into serious consideration that the gagged and suppressed people of Panama will not acknowledge a treaty signed by you and Juan Tack, the de facto foreign minister, as this treaty by their law would be invalid. Article 2 of Panama's national Constitution clearly states the public power emanates solely and exclusively from the people and that it is exercised through legislative, executive and judicial agencies. Consequently any act by an organization, institution or group other than those authorized under the national Constitution to exercise the public power is illegal and a flagrant violation of the basic principles underlying the democratic system.

PHILLIP HARMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
January 12, 1974.

MAJ. GEN. FRANKLIN M. DAVIS, JR.  
Commandant,  
U.S. Army War College,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL DAVIS: Being the grandson-in-law of the founder of the Republic of Panama, a former Honorary Panamanian Consul, and one who knows Panama well, I have for the past four years been exposing the leftist and illegal regime of Omar Torrijos, Juan Tack, and the Communist Party of Panama in their objectives of bringing Panama into the Marxist-Leninist camp and to gain control over the sovereignty of the U.S. Canal Zone through their worldwide anti-U.S. propaganda. I am sure that the DIA in the Zone and the CIA in Panama briefed you concerning Torrijos, Tack, and others in Panama.

I recently read that you were in Panama last month and that you had sent a letter of appreciation to Omar Torrijos for his presentation to the students of the war college during their visit to Panama. Concerning Omar Torrijos rank as an officer, it still is Lt. Col. as his rank as Brig. General has no validity as this is self-proclaimed. To become a Brig. General in Panama, this has to be approved by a constitutional president and a constitutional National Assembly. As Panama today has a de facto government, the illegality of Torrijos' self-proclaimed rank as Brig. General is made clear in the official statement made by the National Bar Association on Oct. 13, 1968, just two days after the gunpoint grab of the nation by Lt. Col. Torrijos and a few other leftist officers:

"When we Panamanians believed that our country had reached a stage in which the military would no longer interfere in those affairs which our nation's Constitution and laws reserve to the people, who are the only sovereign power that may impose its will and determine its own rule, such men have suspended individual rights and guarantees and silenced, by dint of their bayonets, all public media, abolished the agencies of the State, and set up a military junta."

"These events must be evaluated in the light of Article 2 of the nation's Constitution which clearly provides that the public power emanates solely and exclusively from the people and that it is exercised through legislative, executive and judicial agencies. Consequently, any act by an organization, institution or group other than those authorized under the national Constitution to exercise the public power is illegal and a flagrant violation of the basic principles underlying the democratic system."

When the constitutional government of 1968 is restored by the suppressed people of Panama, and they are diligently trying to do so, Lt. Col. Omar Torrijos will be stripped of his Lt. Col. rank and tried for treason, murder, fraud, theft, and narcotics violations.

As you know, the Russians have long wanted to control all the main waterways in their maritime strategy of dominating the major canals of the world of which the most important is the Panama Canal. That is why they organized the Communist Party of Panama in 1930 with 2 primary objectives:

1. To gain control over the Republic of Panama from within with the help of the armed forces.
2. To gain control over the sovereignty of the U.S. Canal Zone through worldwide and anti-U.S. propaganda, treaty negotiations, or by force.

They accomplished their first objective on Oct. 11th, 1968, when they overthrew the anti-Communist President, Dr. Arnulfo Arias, a good friend of the United States and the free world. As for their second objective, the anti-U.S. propaganda was initiated immediately with the help of Major Manuel "Barba roja" Pifreiro, Castro's chief of intelligence and propaganda for overseas organizations, who arrived in Panama on January 18th, 1969. The treaty negotiations are being used by Tack and Torrijos solely for propaganda purposes as they know that the U.S. Senate would never ratify a treaty with their non-constitutional regime. Concerning the use of force, as you know Torrijos has publicly said many times that this will happen.

I cannot forget my meeting with Secretary Dulles when he came to Panama with President Eisenhower in July, 1956. On July 22nd, in the patio of the El Panama Hotel, I told him in detail the danger that faced the U.S. if steps were not immediately taken to counteract the subversive strategy of the Panamanian Communist Party in their primary objective of converting many of the officers and enlisted men into the Communist fold. I further told the Secretary that when the Communists felt they had control of the National Guard, they would then grab the nation. I explained to him that Ted Shannon, the CIA agent in Panama, and the intelligence agencies in the Zone, were aware of what the Communists were trying to do but I felt that more counter action and more intelligence should be formulated as I knew the strength of those who controlled the Communist Party in Panama. All of this unfortunately became history on Oct. 11th, 1968, when Panama fell to the Reds.

We should not forget what Secretary Dulles said publicly on June 30th, 1954, after the Guatemalan people with the help of the CIA, toppled their leftist head of government, Jacobo Arbenz, that could be applied to Panama today:

"Guatemala is a small country. But its

power, standing alone, is not a measure of the threat. It was not the power of the Arbenz government that concerned us but the power behind it."

Ever sincerely,

PHILLIP HARMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
January 14, 1974.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing a copy of a telegram that I sent to Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger concerning the news media report that he is about to sign a treaty with Panama.

Being the grandson-in-law of the founder of the Republic of Panama, a former Honorary Panamanian Consul, and one who knows Panama well, I have for the past four years been exposing the pro-Soviet and illegal regime in Panama who wants to bring Panama into the Marxist-Leninist camp and to gain control over the vital and strategic \$5 billion dollar U.S. Canal Zone as the Kremlin's maritime strategy is to dominate all the main waterways of the world.

As Panama has a de facto government with no legality to sign a treaty with Secretary Kissinger, the suppressed people of Panama will never recognize a treaty signed by the pro-Soviet foreign minister, Juan Tack, as by their national Constitution only a constitutional foreign minister can sign a treaty with a foreign government.

If ever I can be of assistance or offer advice do let me know and also I would appreciate hearing from you concerning your comments about these de facto treaty negotiations that have no legality or validity.

With warmest regards.

Ever sincerely,

PHILLIP HARMAN.

[From the Washington Star-News,  
Jan. 17, 1974]

KISSINGER PLANS TRIP TO PANAMA  
(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger is planning a short visit to Panama early next month to show U.S. interest in diplomatic efforts to settle the Canal Zone question once and for all, according to informed sources.

Now on a peacemaking mission to the Middle East, Kissinger already is booked to meet with the Latin American foreign ministers in Mexico City Feb. 20 through 22. The trip to Panama comes as a surprise because it is described by informed sources as a one-country journey and because Kissinger is known to be planning a more extensive swing through Latin America in the spring.

The decision to go to Panama, according to insiders, emphasizes the new U.S. concern with reaching early agreement with the Panamanians on the future of the canal, the U.S.-controlled zone and the military bases agreement. There is also interest in possible future expansion of the canal facilities by addition of a third set of locks or excavation of a sea-level waterway.

It is believed that Kissinger will meet in Panama City with Demetrios Lakas, the figurehead president, Foreign Minister Juan Tack and Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, commander of the paramilitary Guardia Nacional and Panama's strongman.

Reports from Washington and Panama indicate Tack and Ellsworth Bunker, the roving U.S. ambassador who is in charge of canal treaty negotiations, now have agreed on a set of eight principles for accelerating the talks.

Kissinger's personal presence in Panama will tend to reinforce the idea that Panama and the United States have haggled long enough over the canal issues. Negotiations have been going on since 1967.

The United States has long recognized that Panama should and will recover control of

the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone and eventually will be given control of the canal itself.

The White House, meanwhile, announced yesterday that a Kissinger aide in the National Security Council, William Jordan, will be nominated to be ambassador to Panama. Jordan, a former newspaperman, has been the NSC's resident expert on Latin America and liaison between the State Department's bureau of inter-American affairs and the White House. He succeeds Ambassador Robert Sayre.

## NATION EYES KANSAS FOR FOOD

### HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, since the pioneers crossed the prairies and settled in Kansas in the 19th century, our fine State has had an outstanding record in food production.

In recent years, Kansas, known to many who have traveled across the vast expanse of farmland as the "Wheat State," has taken on an even greater role in food production for our Nation, as well as for the world.

Not only does Kansas supply more wheat than any other State, but it also ranks high in the production of other feed grains and livestock.

I am proud of the record my State has achieved in this regard, and as the Nation eyes Kansas for food, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues, the following article from the Kansas City Star:

NATION EYES KANSAS FOR FOOD  
(By Ray Morgan)

**TOPEKA.**—Increasing emphasis on food production in the face of rising prices and the energy crisis has moved Kansas into center stage on the international economic scene with agricultural crops totaling \$4 billion last year. Deposits of oil, gas and coal also make the economic future look brighter.

Statistics just released by the Kansas Department of Agriculture show that the \$4-billion food production figure puts the state in fifth place behind California, Iowa, Texas and Illinois in farm production.

Figures by the Kansas Geological Survey show that the state still has an estimated 11.2 billion barrels of oil in place, 12 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in estimated reserves and an estimated 895 million tons of coal in the ground.

At the same time the rising prices on oil and natural gas resulting from the energy crunch are producing still higher returns for owners of the thousands of acres of leases.

The statistics also show that while crops are making new records in production and livestock is increasing dramatically on Kansas ranges, the prices also are at record levels to produce the high income, a combination seldom seen in the state.

"We think Kansas will continue to grow in importance economically as a result of our increasing farm production in this time of food shortages," Roy Freeland, secretary of the Kansas Department of Agriculture, said.

Dr. William Hambleton, director of the Kansas Geological Survey, which has its headquarters at the University of Kansas campus at Lawrence, sees increasing income for Kansas oil and gas producers from higher

prices and new efforts at exploration for the first time in recent years.

"I must point out that any effort at attempting to pinpoint what we call reserves in oil, gas and coal is at best only the shakiest kind of an estimate," Dr. Hambleton said. "What we quote are statistics which we feel are accurate to a degree on the basis of current activity."

"This is not to say that there may not be other deposits which have yet to be discovered and which might raise these estimates. On the other hand any effort at trying to estimate reserves must not be taken at absolute value and some that we estimate at reserves may not be producible."

#### TOPS IN WHEAT

Dr. Hambleton pointed out that in some instances in recent years only about 40 per cent of reservoir pools have been estimated to be producible at the old prices. He said the new prices could make it economical to recover greater amounts of this oil and gas.

Right now Kansas is the leading producer of wheat in the nation. The state ranks far ahead of its nearest competitor state by more than 100 million bushels with a crop estimate at 384,000,000 bushels last year, Freeland said.

"One of the more interesting things is that the wheat production on Kansas land during the last year will average by all standards a tremendous 37 bushels to the acre," Freeland said. "This means that for each year in the 1970s we have averaged better than 30 bushels to the acre in Kansas."

"You can get some idea of the increased crop yield when you compare this with an average yield of just over 12 bushels to the acre in the 1930s and only about 17 bushels to the acre in the 1950s."

The estimated cash value of the wheat produced in 1973 in Kansas at prices that ranged up to more than \$5 a bushel at the peak compared to a price of \$2.43 a bushel average in December, 1972, and an average of \$4.66 a bushel in mid-December '73, has been estimated at \$1.4 billion by agricultural statisticians.

On the basis of actual cash statistics for the first 10 months of 1973, the last period for which actual figures are available, Kansas farmers were running nearly \$1 billion ahead in receipts of cash for their crops when compared with the same period in 1972.

The total for the 10-month period the last year was \$3.3 billion. It was \$2.2 billion in the same period in 1972, according to Freeland.

Cash income in the other leading agricultural states for the first 10 months of 1973: California, \$5.2 billion; Iowa \$5.2 billion; Texas, \$4.7 billion and Illinois, \$3.9 billion.

The imposing position of Kansas in the wheat picture is shown by the fact that the state exceeded by more than 130 million bushels its nearest rival in the field, North Dakota, which had a production of 252 million bushels, and more than twice that of the third producer, Oklahoma, with 158 million bushels.

In the field of sorghum grain production increasingly vital because of its relation to livestock feed—Kansas moved up to second in the nation with 227 million bushels. The state set a record production for soybeans with 26.6 million bushels in the year and came in ninth in corn production with 151 million bushels.

The state's economic gain from the crops is obvious when the prices are compared with 1972. Corn at \$2.36 a bushel was 81 cents a bushel higher than a year ago; sorghum grains \$3.65 a bushel were up by \$1, and soybeans, at \$5.65 a bushel were \$1.60 a bushel higher.

Agricultural department officials said beef prices in December were \$1.40 a hundred weight above a year ago.

## UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January is a day which has special meaning for more than 2 million of our fellow citizens. For those in America who are of Ukrainian descent, this day recalls the moment in 1918 when a group of patriots in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, proclaimed the independence of their native land from Russia. The Ukrainian people now, as in the past, are determined to be free, and to guide their own destiny in their sovereign state.

In this spirit, in the year 1917, when the revolution broke out in Russia, Ukrainian leaders called a Ukrainian National Congress in March 1917, which elected a Ukrainian National Council—Ukrainian National Rada. The Ukrainian National Council was recognized as the Ukrainian Government by a majority of the people of Ukraine—by the Congress of Ukrainian Armed Forces, by the Congress of the Ukrainian Peasant Party, and by the Congress of the Ukrainian Labor Party. On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Council proclaimed Ukraine as an independent state.

Russia immediately sent her armies into Ukraine and the Ukrainian Government faced a bloody war with Russia, completely unarmed and unprepared. At this time, the Ukrainian Government was recognized by approximately 35 foreign powers, England, and France being the first to grant recognition.

On February 9, 1918, a peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed between the Ukrainian Government and the Central Powers. On September 10, 1918, in Kiev, the Russian Government under Lenin's leadership recognized Ukraine as a sovereign state and signed an armistice. Under this document, Russia agreed to withdraw her armies from Ukrainian territory and further agreed to respect the right of Ukrainian sovereignty. As in the past, Russia did not respect the Kiev agreement. The war continued. After 3 years of fighting and subversive activities, Russia conquered the Ukrainian armies and occupied the territory of the Ukrainian state, and forcibly incorporated Ukraine into the Soviet Union.

During the past 56 years millions of innocent people in Ukraine, for the "offense" of not accepting the Communist way of life, have been persecuted and imprisoned by the agents of the Government of the U.S.S.R. In 1932-33, Ukrainian farmers were ordered by Stalin into collective farming. When they protested, Russia retaliated by confiscating most of the grain and imposing a famine which took the lives of 7 million Ukrainians.

Arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals, writers, literary critics, professors, students, scientists, and representatives of every strata of society have been made in recent years for "anti-Soviet agita-

tion and propaganda," and the arrests, torture, and internment continue.

In reality this "propaganda" consists of petitions, appeals, and letters submitted from concentration camps by prominent political prisoners and prominent Ukrainians at home to the Communist Party and government officials of Ukraine and U.S.S.R., bringing to their attention the questions of terror, Russification, and violations of constitutional and human rights. Since there is no free press in Ukraine, the above-mentioned arrests and persecutions were published in the self-sponsored—samvydav—magazine, the Ukrainian Herald.

Many millions of Ukrainians are today under the harsh yoke of Communist rule. But the oppressions and the persecutions that these valiant people have endured has only strengthened their passionate desire for national independence.

It was for these pressing reasons that I introduced House Resolution 33, to establish in the House of Representatives a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, and House Resolution 31, which resolves:

That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year—the anniversary of the proclamation which declared Ukraine to be a free and independent republic—as Ukrainian Independence Day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies.

I have also introduced House Concurrent Resolution 46, which resolves:

That it is the sense of Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

My distinguished colleagues, it is indeed appropriate for us here in the Congress to remember, on the 56th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian Republic, the millions of people still in the Ukraine, and their national compatriots in my own 11th District of Illinois, throughout our Nation, and all over the world who continue to cherish the hope of eventual independence and a free Ukraine. These dauntless people desire only that which is the right of all peoples—a nation of their own.

Let us, therefore, reaffirm our belief in freedom for all peoples and our hope that the valiant Ukrainians shall one day again enjoy the blessings of liberty in their own homeland for which they have courageously struggled for so long.

#### INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINIANS

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, today the Ukrainians in the State of Arizona, as well as the world over, are celebrating the 56th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of Ukraine. I join them in recognizing this memorable event.

In 1917, as the tsarist regime crumbled and Russia was torn by internal forces; the non-Russian areas of the empire were afire with a struggle not only to attain social freedom but national independence as well.

Nowhere was the drive for independence more alive than in Ukraine. Amid the complex events of that year the Ukrainian masses created a movement that led to the Ukrain'ka Narodnia Respublika-Ukrainian National Republic.

However, as the new nation was hard at work establishing itself, its freedoms and its independence were snatched away. In 1922, the Bolsheviks, disregarding national boundaries and identities, seized Ukraine, clamping despotism over this nation of beauty, vast resources, and 50 million people. The result was, and is, that Ukraine is the largest non-Russian captive nation both in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe.

In the last 50 years repression has been a way of life in Ukraine. Yet, hope and the will to be free has not been taken from the people. The belief in the Ukrainian will and national spirit remains alive.

I commend all Ukrainians on this 56th anniversary of their national independence for their national spirit and strength, and I look forward to a day when Ukraine will again freely stand among the nations of the world.

#### THE MALEK MEMOS

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the revelation of the Malek Memos, on the one hand, merely corroborates what I, and many others, said throughout the summer of 1972: That cutbacks in the Cleveland summer recreational program and in such projects as the Neighborhood Youth Corps were politically motivated by a reelection conscious White House which felt it could easily afford "benign neglect" of the "black vote."

But the memos reveal more than this. They reveal more than callousness to the needs of minority and poor Americans throughout the country. They reveal a total bankruptcy not only of a philosophy of public service. But they further reveal a moral obtuseness of staggering dimensions.

The Washington Post of January 21 published an excellent editorial addressing precisely this point. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### EVERYBODY'S DONE IT?

A constant theme underlying the Nixon administration's justifications of almost all of the things it has been criticized for is, "Everybody's done it." At first blush, that would seem to be an appropriate response to the disclosure that Frederick V. Malek, then a member of the White House staff sent a memorandum to H. R. Haldeman on March 17, 1972, outlining a program designed to assure that the powers of the federal government to dole out grants and other benefices were marshalled most effectively to assist in the President's reelection effort.

Although officials of past administrations are naturally inclined to see operations during their own government days in a rosy light—especially when compared with those of a succeeding administration of the opposite party—there can be no doubt that from time immemorial everybody in the federal government was aware that an election year was an election year. And the process of rewarding or punishing certain members of the Congress, for example, with the award or withholding of post offices, Corps of Engineering projects or military bases is a time-honored, if not particularly honorable, one. It cannot be argued that the impact of that process on presidential politics has been minimal in the past. Nevertheless, the Malek memorandum is an instructive example of the Nixon administration's proclivity for taking something "everybody's done" and carrying it beyond recognizable—or tolerable—limits.

In his memorandum to Mr. Haldeman, Mr. Malek said that the program he was outlining was designed to "improve Executive Branch responsiveness to the voting public." The memorandum went on to outline the bureaucratic machinery which he had put into place to insure that there was both systematic initiative in the departments and centralized White House direction on "politically sensitive" operating matters. The first accomplishments he cited were (more or less) unexceptional. He noted that some 35 White House requests to the Department of Commerce had resulted in "expediting the normal grant reviewing process and securing the release of information."

Mr. Malek's program went farther. He cited, for example, some \$1.4 billion of Department of Commerce funds which could be "redirected" over two fiscal years for the benefit of the President's reelection campaign. He reported that "during the recently completed budget cycle [White House aide William] Gifford worked closely with the budget examiners to ensure the budget was as supportive as possible for the President's reelection." He suggested in a later memorandum that the Committee for the Reelection of the President would identify "the most advantageous projects."

Mr. Malek also sought to keep the project secret and to give it what has come to be known as deniability by ordering that no communications to or from the White House with respect to the effort be put in writing. When it came to listing the drawbacks of the plan, Mr. Malek wrote, "The most significant drawback of the program is, of course, the risk of adverse publicity."

Mr. Malek apparently was not concerned that delegating some of the departmental programming functions to the Committee for the Reelection of the President might have an adverse effect on the programs themselves—not to mention what it does to the concept of responsible government by duly elected or appointed officials. In practice, it worked like this: Cleveland requested \$354,000 for a recreational program. Only \$164,000 was granted. The reason: "The program is designed to impact inner city residents, and thus does not fall within our political guidelines." So the expenditure of public funds was to be conducted not in terms of the design of a program in pursuance of a congressional mandate, but in pursuit of the reelection of a President.

To the extent that this is a departure from traditional pork barrel practices, a case can be made that the difference is only one of degree. And yet it strikes us that, in an important sense, it is something more than that—something more in keeping with a fundamental tendency we have observed in President Nixon's general approach to government and politics. Time after time, as the Watergate saga has unfolded, we have encountered evidence of excesses on the part of the President and/or his associates which,

by their nature, have had the effect of transforming a difference in degree into a genuine difference in kind.

Thus, past Presidents have selectively tape recorded their official conversations. It remained for Mr. Nixon to pioneer—disastrously—with indiscriminate, continuous, voice-activated recording devices in his various offices. Thus, former administrations have leaned heavily on the business community or farmers for campaign contributions. But the Nixon way, one surmises, was to be a lot more explicit in making the connection between a particular corporate—or dairy farmer—contribution and a specific governmental favor. Thus almost all Presidents have reacted violently to news leaks—with telephone tapping used as a security enforcement process on occasions. But only Mr. Nixon, as far as we know, felt the need to establish his own, private parapolice unit to engage in illegal burglaries and electronic surveillance to plug the leaks. Other Presidents have raged at press criticism. None that we have heard about has been quite so blatant about it as to threaten Internal Revenue Service audits or antitrust actions, or to launch a calculated, sustained, nationwide campaign of vilification, for the express purpose of intimidation or discrediting the news media. Past Presidents have taken tax deductions for their official papers; but Lyndon Johnson did not scramble to beat the deadline when Congress was about to close this loophole—and Richard Nixon did. When it comes to political campaigning, for another example, it is the difference, you might say, between a Donald Segretti and a Dick Tuck.

In short, everybody *hasn't* done things the way Mr. Nixon has done them. And the Malek operation is only the latest illustration of why the indiscriminate use of this argument—even leaving aside its essential lameness in terms of morality or legal standing—is at best a weak defense.

#### RANGEL CALLS FOR FULL ACCOUNTING OF ISRAELI POW'S IN SYRIA

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have today called upon President Nixon to push for a full accounting of Israeli prisoners of war being held by Syria as a necessary part of any troop disengagement agreement negotiated by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

In my letter to the President, I have urged the President to use his good offices to insist that the International Red Cross be immediately permitted to visit the Israeli prisoners in Syria. This is vitally important because a report issued by the New York Jewish Labor Committee indicates that at least 42 Israeli POW's have been killed and many more tortured in Syria.

The refusal of Syria to fully account for Israeli POW's is a threat to peace in the Middle East. If Secretary Kissinger's efforts are to be the successful beginning of the process we all hope will lead to a lasting peace in the Middle East, the full and accurate truth regarding the fate of Israeli prisoners of war in Syria must be made known.

I place the full text of my letter to President Nixon in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1974.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As one who was deeply concerned with and moved by the plight of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam, I know that the present news about Israeli prisoners of war held by Syria horrifies you as it does millions of citizens throughout the world.

The New York Jewish Labor Committee reports that at least forty-two Israeli prisoners have been killed and many more tortured. What has been reported, as well as what remains unknown threatens the possibility of achieving peace in the Middle East.

I urge you to use your good offices to insist that the International Red Cross be permitted to visit the Israeli prisoners in Syria. The full and accurate truth in this matter must be made known.

At the start of this new year, let us resolve to act decisively and compassionately in the quest for world peace.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,  
Member of Congress.

#### CARNEGIE HERO FUND HONORS JOHN R. TARRANT

### HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of today's troubling headlines, it is heartening to learn about an individual act of courage and selflessness. Such an act of extreme valor was performed by John R. Tarrant of Gardena, Calif., in March of 1972 when he rescued two neighbors from a perilous house trailer fire. For his heroism, he has recently been awarded a medal from the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission.

An electric heater started the blaze in the four-room aluminum trailer which Mary K. Jacob shared with Vaughn C. Dean. Catching onto an oil heater, the configuration raged in the living room and prevented Miss Jacob and Mr. Dean from making a safe exit. Both of them, after vainly trying to open windows, rapidly lost consciousness. Several neighbors then became aware of the disaster but retreated from the heat and smoke. Yet one neighbor fatefully ran to the trailer of John R. Tarrant who lived nearby.

Mr. Tarrant, pausing only long enough to put on trousers and shoes, rushed outside to give aid to his friends. Although he was physically sound—and a former Marine—he was greatly afraid of fire. Yet fear was overcome by friendship as he rushed into the burning trailer. Since he knew the layout of the trailer and the placement of the furniture, he quickly decided that the living room door was the only feasible exit. Yet, about 10 seconds after Tarrant had entered the trailer, the persons outside saw the living room filling with tongues of flame.

Weakened with smoke inhalation and the intense heat, Tarrant was further disoriented because of his failure to rouse Mr. Dean. Yet he managed to pull Miss Jacob over Mr. Dean and tried to put her over his shoulder. Twice she slipped from his grasp. When he finally had a hold on her, he panicked with the thought that he would not be able to get through the living room. But persons outside had managed to remove furniture and clear the opening to the bedroom door. Tarrant then dragged Miss Jacob 3 feet out the door.

After taking several deep breaths, Tarrant returned to get Dean who by then was partially revived. Tarrant emerged with Dean less than 1 minute after having entered the trailer. About 10 seconds later an explosion of flames filled the bedroom, and firemen arrived 3 minutes later.

The fire was brought under control in 2 minutes, but the trailer had been gutted. Miss Jacob, with first and second degree burns over 10 percent of her body, was hospitalized for 2 weeks while Dean required treatment for second-degree burns only.

These two people may well not be alive today were it not for the heroic efforts of John R. Tarrant. He is a very special person; for, as Laurence Sterne wrote, "The best hearts are ever the bravest."

#### RURAL HOUSING THREATENED

### HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Home Administration Bulletin No. 4816(440) dated December 13, 1973 allocated fiscal year 1974 funds among the various housing programs. Both the allocation between "existing" and "new" dwellings and the very high reserves are without precedent. As a Member of Congress representing a congressional district which has much to gain or much to lose from the allocation of these funds for housing, I would like an explanation for the allocations and assurance that they will not result in slowing down the rural housing program or constitute a form of impoundment.

There has been a significant change in the Farmers Home Administration housing program and for a good summary of these changes and the problems these changes pose, I recommend the following article by Kenneth Harney. The article which appeared in the January 12 Washington Post and is entitled "Housing Policy Seen on New Tack" follows:

EVEN SUBSIDIES POSSIBLE: HOUSING POLICY SEEN ON NEW TACK  
(By Kenneth Harney)

The U.S. housing industry—in a depressed mood for months over high interest rates, a credit crunch, environmental restrictions and energy—is puzzled over some contradictory signals coming from the Nixon administration.

On the one hand there are indications that the White House finally is listening to builders' warnings that a serious slump in

housing could speed the country towards a recession. In meetings with representatives of the National Association of Home Builders and other trade groups, White House budget and domestic policy leaders have begun putting out the word: We're concerned. We don't want to see you belly up.

On the other hand, builders have just been hit with a budget axe in an area they thought would be one of 1974's few bright spots: rural housing.

Without the usual public announcement that accompanies a significant policy change the Farmers Home Administration informed its 1,750 field offices before Christmas that most of the \$1.1 billion Congress appropriated for low and moderate income single family housing this year won't be spent on construction of new units. \$350 million of it, said an internal memorandum issued by the agency, is being placed in "reserve." Another \$400 million is being set aside for rehabilitation and purchase of existing rural housing units one year or older. The remaining \$350 million is for new housing. What upsets builders is that the Farmers Home Administration traditionally has spent the bulk of its available loan funds for construction of new units—and almost no one believes it can spend anywhere near \$400 million on rehab and existing housing by the fiscal year-end deadline, June 30.

The combination of the \$350 million "reserves" and the \$400 million that can't all be spent amounts to a "1974-style impoundment of a big chunk of the subsidy appropriations," says the head of one rural housing group in Washington.

"It's much subtler than the 1973 moratorium," he added. "They give you a dead end rather than a stop sign. Maybe they've gotten a new lawyer."

Even James R. Neville, who was an Assistant Administration at Farmers Home from 1971 until his retirement Dec. 31, concedes that it will be difficult to spend all the subsidy money because "there simply isn't a rehab industry out there," and because the field offices aren't geared up for such a big switch.

What's going on here? Does the Nixon administration spokesman you can get hold of, say housing is high on the agenda. But housing on the administration's terms, not necessarily on the home builders'.

One of the White House Office of Management and budget's housing specialists, Ronald Landis, says for example that "no one should have been surprised" by FHA's new emphasis in existing housing and rehabilitation.

"Anyone who read the President's September (1973) housing message to Congress would have known that he said the policy henceforth would be to reach and serve more lower income families through better use of existing units."

"Look," said a high official at the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), "we spent eight months last year (during the moratorium on subsidized programs) showing why the old construction-oriented programs were bad, and indicating where we should put our money from now on."

The Administration, he said, is really worried about the plight of home builders, especially during the first two quarters of 1974, when the annual housing starts rate may drop to 1.3 million units, 40 per cent below 1972's high rate.

"But we're not going to throw out our principles in trying to bail them out. They're going to have to do without gravy trains like (Section) 236."

The Section 236 program, which subsidized the mortgage interest rates paid by developers of lower-income apartment projects, was one of HUD's two largest programs between 1969-1972, accounting for as high as 200,000 new units a year. It was criticized as in-

ordinately expensive and inefficient by HUD's housing policy review team last year because it allegedly provided windfall profits and tax shelters to everyone from architects to builders to the investors who bought syndicated shares in projects. The program's basic design was so poor, according to the HUD review team, that one out of five Section 236 projects will go into foreclosure before 1980.)

The Nixon administration's intended replacement program for Section 236—one of the ideas being worked on—is known as Section 23 leasing.

HUD's FHA chief, Sheldon Lubar, has his office pushing for funding of some 130,000 units of Section 23 in the next six months, and up to 300,000 units from July, 1974 to June 1975. Under the program housing units in a variety of building are leased by lower income families who pay one quarter of their monthly income to the building's owner. Through payments from a local housing authority to the building owner, the federal government provides the difference between the going market rent and the subsidized tenant's 25 per cent. Normally, no more than 20 percent of the units in a building can be covered by Section 23 contracts, thereby avoiding the concentration of low-income tenants in vertical ghettos that characterize many federal projects.

Because the leasing program permits families to choose their own housing and this resembles President Nixon's long-range preference for a housing allowance, it is likely to be the largest (if not the only) subsidized housing vehicle for the foreseeable future.

Some builders say they aren't enthusiastic about a program that can only fill up 20 per cent of a projects units. Also the U.S. pays only when a family actually moves in. But Lubar answers that the days of "the government getting ripped off" (paying developers for empty space in subsidized units) are over.

Other ideas being worked on within the Administration to boost housing market activity also follow the policy guidelines offered by the President last September:

A major new emphasis on rehabilitating existing housing units in urban and suburban areas including possible below market rate loans.

Stimulating home buying by pumping new mortgage funds into the market through some form of temporary or "emergency" mechanism.

Pushing HUD-FHA mobile home insurance volume from the present 21,000 units per year level to more than 80,000.

A dark horse possibility, according to some officials, might be limited resumption of a subsidized home-ownership program, the old Section 235. Although oriented towards new construction, it got a relatively good review in HUD's 1973 housing policy report. With an estimated \$212 million in contract authority funds still impounded by the administration. Section 235's resumption could put between 150,000-170,000 new single family units on the market—and give some home builders what they really want.

(The writer, Kenneth Harney is managing editor of Housing and Development Reporter, an information service published by the Bureau of National Affairs Inc.)

## A DECADE OF ASSASSINATIONS

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, a great number of Americans are not convinced that President John F. Kennedy was

killed by a lone assassin. There has been lingering doubt among black Americans that the killer of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., acted without the collusion of others. The succession of assassinations and assassination attempts over the last 10 years has left all of us skeptical, I believe, whether each one of these crimes would have been solely the work of a single individual.

Over last Thanksgiving weekend a private group, the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, sponsored a conference on the subject at Georgetown University. I was represented at the conference by a member of my staff whose subsequent report I found revealing and disturbing.

A similar report appeared in the January 3, 1974, issue of Rolling Stone magazine, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those parts of it dealing with the responsibilities of Congress in the whole sad affair:

[From Rolling Stone, Jan. 3, 1974]

ASSASSINATION—MURDER IN THE CATHEDRAL

(By Robert Blair Ralsin)

"That was a golden time for us back in the Sixties," said Sylvia Meagher, reminiscing over the early days when the critics of the Warren Commission Report were doing their homework, trading their arcane information with one another and writing their books on their conspiracy. "Then we started fighting among ourselves. . . ." Her voice trailed off, the violins came up there in the bar of the Colonial Inn in Georgetown and she pondered her drink (tomato juice, no vodka, on the rocks).

"Right," said Josiah (Ting) Thompson, stirring his whiskey sour. "In fact, all the critics have fought with one another so bitterly that many are still not speaking to this very day. I think that Sylvia and I are among the few who are still on friendly terms."

Thompson, a Haverford College philosophy professor, wrote *Six Seconds in Dallas*, a seminal work which demonstrated that one lone rifleman on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository couldn't possibly have fired the bullets that killed President John F. Kennedy on November 22nd, 1963. No one has ever refuted that book, and it's one of the reasons why an overwhelming majority of Americans believe that President Kennedy was done in by a conspiracy.

Meagher is the UN official and independent researcher who indexed the Warren Commission's 26 volumes and then wrote *Accessories after the Fact*, an opus which gave the authorities reasons enough to reopen several investigations into JFK's murder, reasons, however, which they found themselves able to resist.

The two of them were relaxing over drinks after a full day's meeting at Georgetown University to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the President's death. But they would soon have to revise their views on the bickering critics, for if anything came out of the two-day meeting there in the frescoed auditorium of old Gaston Hall, it was this: The conference marked a real change for the buffs. Critics who hadn't spoken to each other for years now started talking: Popkin to Weisberg, Weisberg to Polcoff, Polcoff to Sprague. And, later that evening, at a party given by Bernard Fensterwald, the director of the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, everyone talked to everyone.

It was a time of renewal and reconciliation for all the old critics and, more importantly, a time when it was clear that many other new, respectable researchers had joined the club. "I'm encouraged," said Jerry Polcoff, referring specifically to the climate newly established here in Georgetown, and adding,

vis-a-vis a new national climate moderated by the winds of Watergate, "people don't call me a lunatic any more." Pollicoff, who is a media analyst in New York, had been working on the JFK assassination for years, but finally, out of sheer frustration, put all his materials in cartons and sealed them up and said the hell with it.

The years from November, 1963, to November, 1973, were an exhausting decade for the critics. They worked, they produced findings which were hard to ignore and yet public officials did ignore them, gave them so little of a hearing that the critics began to feel that maybe they were lunatics.

Norman Mailer, who keynoted the conference and hung around for the entire two days, focused right on the mark when he compared the obsessed critic to a jealous lover, who in his affliction careens between the two extremes of hating his unfaithful wife for her unspeakable conduct and hating himself for his unspeakable imaginings. "What has made this history unendurable," said Mailer, "were two opposed hypotheses: 1) that it was just an accident, which leads to a philosophy of the absurd, and 2) any one of the grand conspiracy themes. And anything in between."

But now it was obvious from what was happening here at the conference (and from the daily news reports about all the malfeasance and the misfeasance in government not so very far away from Georgetown) that the times are indeed changing.

Here at Georgetown, new critics came forward with evidence to create new doubts, old critics presented items which could trigger new tries for the truth.

Dr. Cyril Wecht, the coroner of Pittsburgh and one of the leading pathologists in the U.S., spent hours on the podium explaining why he does not believe that any single human being could have handled the shooting of JFK.

Wecht is a man whose looks and vigor reminded me of no one so much as Vince Lombardi. He has had the almost singular benefit of access to many medical and pathological reports on the JFK assassination which are still technically secret and he doesn't buy the Warren Commission's keystone theory of the single bullet, based on the evidence he has now. What more does he need? Among other things: a spectrographic analysis of the bullet fragments removed from both Kennedy and Governor Connolly. The FBI, he says, has the evidence, but the FBI won't cough it up. (Harold Weisberg, author of *Frame Up*, told the conference that he has had a tip-off on that spectrographic analysis: It, too, will destroy the single-bullet theory.)

Dr. Robert Foreman, a chinless anthropologist from Toledo, Ohio, presented his study of a simulated JFK "skeleton." According to all reports, the bullet that entered JFK's upper deck exited just below his Adam's apple, without striking any of the President's bones. Dr. Foreman showed on a series of elaborate photographic charts that such a shot, fired from the sixth floor of the book depository, couldn't have hit JFK at the angle it did and still have continued on to hit Governor Connolly.

Pete Noyes, a corpulent TV news producer from L.A. who is the model for the Edward Asner character on *The Mary Tyler Moore Show*, has been working for at least six years on the Mafia connections to the JFK assassination. Here, at last, after several publishers canceled their contracts to publish his conclusions, Noyes proudly presented his just-published account, *Legacy Of Doubt* (a Pinnacle paperback). Noyes doesn't solve the conspiracy in the book. But he names names, he tells how he knows what he knows and he points out the directions that authorities must take—if they really want to do their jobs.

Peter Dale Scott, a tall, ascetic and schol-

arly professor of medieval literature at the University of California at Berkeley, and the author of a book on the Vietnam War, *The War Conspiracy*, pointed out to the audience that there are ways we can all learn from Watergate some significant things about the methodology of a cover-up. "The physical evidence presented by Dr. Wecht is good" he said, "but that won't tell us who the real suspects are. Examining the cover-ups in the Dallas affair will help us find our suspects."

George O'Toole, a former CIA computer specialist who looks like Santa Claus with a black beard, showed the audience how he has used a new "truth machine" called the Psychological Stress Evaluator (PSE) to evaluate previously recorded statements about the assassination by former Chief Justice Earl Warren; James E. Humes, the chief autopsy surgeon at Bethesda Naval Hospital who burned his original notes on the autopsy; Howard Brennan, the man who told the Warren Commission he had seen Oswald shooting at President Kennedy from the window of the book depository, and several other Dallas officials who were involved in the initial investigation of the shooting. All these men showed great stress, said O'Toole (pointing to slide projections of their voice patterns as recorded by the PSE) which might mean they were not telling the truth. The PSE, he said, was 94% accurate in the hands of an expert. O'Toole said he has been working for a year on these analyses; sometime next year he will turn over his findings to the Justice Department and to members of Congress.

Congress. That may be where all these new investigations will wind up. Unofficially, this conference at Georgetown (which was sponsored by the private Committee to Investigate Assassinations) issued no white paper or set of conclusions. But almost every speaker implied that only a subcommittee of Congress could get to the bottom of things—because only Congress or the courts had the power to subpoena witnesses under oath or levy penalties on those who wouldn't talk. The Watergate committee is, of course, something of a model.

What chances that a congressional committee will take over from the lonely critics? Slim now, I think, but growing, as the consciousness of a wider public grows that there are some answers out there and that this nation needs them. While the so-called "straight press" has largely ignored the critics for years now, the Washington Post reported this Georgetown conference as soberly as it has reported anything on the Watergate scandal. And three staff members of Congressmen Morris Udall's office looked in on the discussions at Gaston Hall so they could report to Udall, a brother of Stewart, JFK's Secretary of the Interior and himself a key figure among the so-called "Kennedy Democrats" in Congress.

During the Sixties, before the Garrison charges against Clay Shaw in New Orleans, before the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Senator Robert F. Kennedy, before, in sum, the information overload short-circuited the critical faculties of those who liked their thinking neat and tidy, there was a measured receptivity among many to this, that or another theory on the conspiracy to kill JFK. But what good are theories that multiply as the years pass and lead nowhere? Did any of the conspiracy theories about the death of JFK, for instance, save the life of his brother?

Curious, strange, remarkable thing: It was only the amateurs, the philosophy pros and the private citizens who had the theories, who tried to map new avenues of investigation. But they had no resources to travel. What about the FBI and the CIA and the whole so-called intelligence community? Wasn't there a single agent who had theories of his own? Any of them asking questions? And if so, why weren't any of them given

some kind of go-ahead to run down some answers?

Some conspiracy buffs said the reason was obvious: because the intelligence community itself was complicit in either the assassination or the coverup. But the events of the past year or two (the Pentagon Papers, the Watergate business and all the other inside stories about the way the secret government has worked) suggest another, less sinister answer: that the intelligence community was neither intelligent nor a community—i.e., that the patterns of secrecy within government precluded open exchanges of information, frequently not even among themselves, never with the public at large.

That kind of operational secrecy is changing (not nearly fast enough, but it is changing). The conference's media panel (of which I was a member) agreed that the press is putting on unprecedented pressures to blast open the secret government. A craggy character like Sherman Skolnick, the paraplegic from Chicago who successfully agitated for the conviction of Judge Otto Kerner, with that most subversive of all tools, information, could well be emulated by other information commandos.

Radical youth may take this kind of lead and run with it. Norman Mailer prophesies that a growing movement on the nation's campuses—gathering political intelligence—could become as big as the peace movement. That may help the assassination critics get an official reopening of the investigations into the assassinations of two Kennedys and a King.

Then again, no amount of agitation may win a public constituency large enough to demand that Congress do something very special (and without the public demand, Congress usually does nothing).

The reason: Assassinations are more ghastly than burglaries and assorted other political dirty tricks, and if many think that impeaching a President is obscene, what are they to think about dredging up thoughts of having his brains blown out? They don't want to think about it. And the very people who should think about it most—the Kennedy clan (and that includes the Salingers and the Schlesingers and the Mankiewicz who refuse to even read my book on the Robert Kennedy assassination)—want to think about it least.

On this ground, apparently, the Washington, D.C. appeals courts have so far been denying the Committee to Investigate Assassinations access to key records the committee and its members need. "*Requiescat in pace*," wrote Judge John Anthony Danaher in a recent opinion denying Harold Weisberg a look at the FBI's spectrographic analysis.

The Judge has a point. During the Georgetown conference, the experts spent a full afternoon on bullets, brains and ballistics and when they turned off the lights to show the audience their ghoulish slides and the afternoon rays shone in the high stained glass windows of Gaston Hall, I jotted in my notebook, "Murder in the Cathedral." It was too much for me and for many of the several hundred spectators who were there, unused to such a cool, scientific treatment of such a hot, emotional subject. Some became visibly uneasy, almost ill. I went for a walk.

And then that night at the Fensterwald party, Robert Grodin, a young filmmaker from New Jersey who is working with a group intending to do a documentary on the assassination of JFK, showed up with another generation of the film shot by Abraham Zapruder in Dallas. Grodin and an optic technician had spent exhaustive hours enlarging the central detail, i.e., the President and Mrs. Kennedy, of each frame of the Zapruder film and here, toward the end of the party, Grodin ran the enlarged version several times. It is clear from this film (which eliminates to a large extent the shaky effect of a hand-held camera) that the shot

which took the top off President Kennedy's head came not from the direction of the book depository but from the grassy knoll.

The realization drove some of us to tears and then to whiskied inebriation. Later, about 3 AM at another gathering back in Georgetown, I almost got into a fistfight with an asshole who was claiming that Senator Robert Kennedy was also killed in a crossfire.

But irrationality is the easy way out. No matter how much it hurts, we have to consider any and all evidence which may be germane to the issue. Of course, we could withdraw from the issue entirely. But, as Mailer said at this conference, that would make us less interesting as human beings. And being mired in secrecy would make our society a frightful place.

#### THE RULE OF LAW

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the December 1973 issue of the American Bar Association Journal strongly supports the principle of independence of prosecution. Citing the chain of events surrounding the Watergate Special Prosecutor, the article reaffirmed the ABA's position that the Special Prosecutor must be wholly independent of the executive branch of Government:

#### THE RULE OF LAW

The deep attachment of the American people to the principle of the rule of law and not of men could not have been exemplified better than by the outpouring of public disapproval that greeted President Nixon's action in late October when he declined to follow the adverse Watergate tapes decision of the court of appeals and then dismissed the special prosecutor for refusing to temper his investigation and to accept the president's alternative to turning over the tapes.

The public outrage, which political reporters have said was not expected by the president, demonstrated that the people have an ingrained trust in and respect for our system of justice as administered by fearless and independent judges and lawyers, and that they feel that the established judicial means for the settlement of disputes are to be preferred over methods grounded on political power and position. These events serve to point out again the awesome yet integral role the legal profession plays in our nation's life, and they should be the occasion for a reaffirmation of our determination to fulfill that role.

It is elementary that the investigation and prosecution of wrongdoing must be independent, free of conflicts of interest, and not subject to the influence of those who might fall under suspicion and investigation. This problem was present from the beginning in the investigation and prosecution of the events that comprise what has been called "Watergate," but it became more acute as higher officials were implicated last April. Robert W. Meserve, then president of the American Bar Association, told a National Press Club luncheon on April 30 that an "independent special prosecutor, having no connection with the government or any of the parties in the case, should be appointed to direct the grand jury inquiry and any criminal prosecution that might result." After referring to the Code of Professional Responsibility and the Standards Relating to the Prosecution and the Defense Functions, Mr. Meserve added that the "appointment

of a special prosecutor of recognized professional stature and integrity would do much to clear the air and reassure the country that the facts will be brought out and those involved dealt with fully and fairly."

The special prosecutor's office as established was a part of the Justice Department, a circumstance that did not remove the inherent anomaly of investigatee having ultimate dismissal power over investigator. But the Senate was satisfied with the assurance of the new attorney general, Elliot L. Richardson, that the prosecutor would have an unusual degree of independence and could not be removed except for "extraordinary improprieties," which would be determined by the attorney general. These assurances were expressed in "guidelines" that became the foundation of the special prosecution force.

This compact between the executive branch and the people was abrogated by the president in late October when he directed Archibald Cox, who had been appointed special prosecutor, "to make no further attempts by judicial process to obtain tapes, notes, or memoranda of presidential conversations," discharged Mr. Cox when he refused to accept this interference in his prosecutorial function, and abolished the independent status of the prosecution force. Mr. Richardson did not find Mr. Cox guilty of "extraordinary improprieties." Indeed, he declined to discharge the special prosecutor and himself resigned. Neither President Nixon nor anyone for him has charged Mr. Cox with "extraordinary improprieties."

In a statement issued October 22, Chesterfield Smith, president of the Association, declared that President Nixon's actions were an "intolerable assault upon the courts, our first line of defense against tyranny and arbitrary power. . . . I express my hope and confidence that the judicial and legislative forces of this nation will act swiftly and decisively to challenge, repeal, and correct this damaging incursion . . . upon the system of justice and therefore upon the basic liberties of the citizens of this country." A few days later the Association's Board of Governors endorsed Mr. Smith's statement and went on record favoring the re-establishment of the office of the special prosecutor by appointment of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. (For the text of the resolution and the statement, see the article on page 1389 of this issue.)

The principle of independence of prosecution is one that needs to be remembered and preserved. No better successor for Mr. Cox could have been selected than Leon Jaworski, the former president of the American Bar Association, whose appointment was announced on November 1. But the question is not one of men but of independence of the prosecutorial function. In the unusual circumstances of this situation, that principle requires a prosecutor not beholden in any way to the executive branch of government.

### HON. DOLPH BRISCOE, GOVERNOR OF TEXAS, ADDRESSES THE TEXAS AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION STAFF

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be in attendance at a staff conference of Texas Agricultural Experiment employees on Wednesday, January 9, 1974, at College Station, Tex. The Governor of Texas, the Honorable Dolph Briscoe, delivered the main address, and

I am pleased to include the text of Governor Briscoe's remarks:

#### REMARKS BY GOV. DOLPH BRISCOE

Thank you for a kind and generous introduction.

I know of no other place where I feel more at home than I do with you. For a great number of years I have worked closely with you and I know personally the great contribution the men and women of the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station have made to the progress of Texas. Working with your partners—the Texas Agricultural Extension Service—the many lasting benefits of research have been carried to the people of this State, and as a result of these efforts, all Texans have enjoyed a more abundant life.

President Williams, I would like to thank you, Dean H. O. Kunkel, Directors Miller and Hutchinson and the many dedicated members of this university staff both here and in the field for our favorable position in agriculture. Of course, many of you hold joint teaching appointments and I express appreciation also to those dedicated teachers who are training the young men and women who will lead agriculture and home economics in the future.

Dr. Williams, in my opinion the land grant university concept of teaching, research and extension is one of America's great achievements. I hope that the high priorities given to agriculture and rural life in the past will be accelerated in the future. You are assured of my continued support for your efforts.

You are aware that one of the goals of my administration is to make Texas Number One in Agriculture, not only in volume of sales but in profits to the farmers and ranchers of this State. If we achieve this goal then we all must accelerate our efforts. I believe no one could be engaged in a more exciting career than in today's dynamic agriculture.

Agriculture is really the great hope of our country. Not only does it feed and clothe our people but agriculture has become the one tool with which we can compete most efficiently in foreign markets.

Dean Kunkel, in his annual report message, said "an agronomist can no longer be concerned only with producing the seed, but he has to be part of the team concerned with the disposal of the straw." Yes, the agronomist has to be a team member. You are developing a team approach and I congratulate you on the strides you are making. The fourteen designated research and extension centers, one of which is located in my home town of Uvalde, provide truly effective multidisciplinary task forces, dedicating their efforts toward solution to the problems of the areas in which they are located. The conduct of research by the station is organized into projects which outline objectives. This provides for necessary coordination to insure that the most important priority problems are being investigated and prevents costly and unnecessary duplication. The Research and Extension Centers and dynamic area development programs such as B.E.T., B.I.G., P.E.P., South Plains, El Paso, Rolling Plains and the new one just recently organized at Uvalde can continue to make Texas agriculture a leading economic and social base for a more prosperous Texas. After all, the principle measure of research success is the impact that research has had on the economy and well being of the people of the State.

No one would deny that Texas agriculture and its associated supplying, processing and distributing industries have been transformed dramatically in recent years. And agricultural research has been the basis for every change—the new varieties of cotton, rice, vegetables and grain sorghums, the modern fertilization practices, the new equipment and processes, the new management and cultural practices, the new livestock rations and feeding systems. As only one measure of value of agricultural research

In Texas, cash farm income increased almost 50 percent between 1962 and 1972. This increase was more than \$1.1 billion.

Projects in rural economic development, cooperatives, financial institutions serving agriculture, foundation seed programs, insect and disease programs, poultry diagnostic services, water, livestock and crop programs and hundreds of other projects make the future exciting indeed.

We must see to it that the rural areas of Texas do not dry up and that they do not die; but that they offer to each Texan the opportunity to make that decision as to where he or she wants to live, to where they want to make a decent living, to where they want to have educational opportunities for their children. Rural Texas must provide medical services for families, library opportunities, and a way of life that is attractive to our citizens.

This we can do and I think nothing less will do.

We must work toward the attraction of job opportunities and economic development—the attraction of existing industry to rural areas—the orderly development and protection of our natural resources—the improvement of government services and facilities—more emphasis on vocational career-oriented education—a partnership between the business community, the agricultural community and our educational system. We must be sure that we are training the young people of today for the career opportunities and the job opportunities that will exist in the world in which they will live.

Our aim then must be to increase jobs, to increase economic activity.

Certainly agriculture alone, in the rural areas of this state, cannot do it. But today because of very fortunate circumstances that exist throughout this world, I believe that we are in a position to achieve within a very few years what I think to be a most important goal for all of Texas and that is to make Texas number one in agricultural production and profit in the United States.

With your help—the help and the leadership of those assembled in this room—we can make known to those engaged in agriculture throughout the state the potential for additional productivity that exists in practically every field of agricultural endeavor in Texas today.

Your distinctive service, and the support of the other state agencies working toward this goal, certainly makes our goal of becoming number one in agriculture an obtainable objective.

I am convinced that as we look to the future, Texas agriculture will become more important in many, many ways; one of which will be the worldwide demand for agricultural products.

In terms of world trade, agriculture is a major contributor to America's balance of payments and Texas plays a major role in this worldwide market. Our State is the leader in the export of beef breeding cattle, cotton and rice. In fact, during fiscal 1973, Texas' agriculture exports totaled \$835 million—or about 21 percent of the State's total farm cash receipts.

Foreign trade is important to the Texas agricultural economy, and it will have an even greater impact—and greater potential—in the future.

America has at last faced the realization that the days of importing low cost petroleum from the Arab nations is past. If we are to continue importing oil to meet our energy demands of the future, the cost will likely continue its upward spiral.

To offset these growing deficits we must be in the position to export those products which the United States can produce more efficiently and more economically than any other country in the world.

These products, of course, are the crops and livestock of our farmers and ranchers.

I think this gives us a great outlook, a great potential, of making Texas number one in agriculture in the United States.

I congratulate each of you on your profession and achievements. It was men and women of research and education who looked into test tubes and under the microscopes and built American agriculture into a success story unsurpassed anywhere else in the world.

We do not know what new worlds, what new frontiers of science, what new techniques, are as yet undiscovered. Some forecasts of developments before the year 2000 are: reliable weather forecasts and regional weather control, translation of language by computers, production of primitive artificial life, blanket immunization against infectious disease, and the economic production of synthetic protein foods.

Expected in the succeeding quarter century—when children born this year will be only in their fifties are: direct links between the brain and the computer, chemicals to stimulate the growth of new organs and other drugs to increase intelligence, education by direct recording on the brain, and production of a fifth of the world's food from ocean farming.

The future will be exciting. I am confident that the men and women of the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station will, as ever, be in the forefront in service to their fellow man.

AMBASSADOR JOSEPH JOHN JOVA

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, now that Ambassador Joseph John Jova, of Hispanic, Cuban, and Puerto Rican ancestry, has been named and confirmed as Ambassador of the United States to Mexico, my distinguished colleagues may wish to read an editorial and news report featured in the Times of the Americas, Washington, D.C.

Among the many admirers of Ambassador Jova, his wife, Pamela, and his gifted children is my longtime friend, Father Joseph F. Thorning, known affectionately as El Padre of the Americas.

For many years, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning has been observing the performance of Ambassador Jova and his devoted wife as envoys to the Republic of Honduras and as our representative with ambassadorial rank to the Organization of American States.

The articles I recommend follow:

AMBASSADOR WITH CREDENTIALS

President Nixon's nomination of Joseph John Jova as ambassador designate to Mexico, reported on page one of this issue, is reassuring proof that capable, career diplomats do often get proper recognition. Simply put, Ambassador Jova is both "a good man" and "a nice guy." His language ability, diplomatic skills, and long experience will be put to good use at Mexico as they have been at Washington where he now serves as this country's OAS ambassador.

The OAS ambassadorship is not as routine an assignment as it might seem to an outsider. Since the United States cannot avoid being the dominating force in the OAS, it is often scolded by those Latin countries who say it does too little, and just as frequently by those who say it does too much. Mr. Jova

has moved through this trelliswork of roses and thorns with consummate skill, winning the respect of his colleagues and the warm admiration of his many friends. Mexico's relations with the United States are of great importance, and it is hard to imagine a man better qualified for the job than Mr. Jova and, though he will be missed in Washington, we wish him well in his new post.

CAREER DIPLOMAT JOVA NAMED TO MEXICO POST

WASHINGTON.—The White House last week announced the designation of three career diplomats to western hemisphere ambassadorial posts. The most significant assignment was that of present United States OAS Ambassador, Joseph John Jova, to replace retiring Robert H. McBride at Mexico.

Prior to having served as U.S. Ambassador to Honduras (1965-1969), and deputy chief of the mission in Chile (1961-1965), Jova had extensive experience in Europe and at headquarters in Washington. A graduate of Dartmouth, and a Navy lieutenant in World War II (1942-1946), Jova is highly regarded in Latin circles.

Ambassador-designate Francis E. Meloy, Jr., after Yale, also served as a World II Navy lieutenant (1942-1946). He now moves from Santo Domingo to Guatemala. Meloy joined the foreign service late in 1946 and spent most of his career before the Dominican Republic in Europe and on special tasks.

Going to Port-au-Prince is Hayward Isham, a third Ivy-leaguer also from Yale. He had army service (1945-1946), and his past assignments have included Moscow, Berlin, and Hong Kong.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
MUST PROOFREAD MORE CAREFULLY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret to report that a most grievous typographical error occurred in the Government Printing Office regarding my remarks in the Extension of Remarks of January 21, 1974, page 191, which I inserted calling the attention of the Members of the House to my strong objections to the proposal by the Select Committee on Committees to restructure the House Committee system.

I am most disturbed by the Government Printing Office error, due to the obvious lack of efficient proofreading in that Office and which resulted in, to say the least, a deplorable misleading statement in my Extension of Remarks of that date.

I will point out that my prepared Extension of Remarks on this matter were sent to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk and the Government Printing Office from my congressional office, letter-perfect, so the error is at this time inexplicable to me.

I refer the Government Printing Office, and the Members of the House, to page 191, column three, the fourth full paragraph, where the GPO dropped the letter "s" in a key word, "busy," in the first sentence of that paragraph which results in an embarrassing interpretation of the meaning of my remarks.

The sentence referred to should read, as my letter-perfect letter and remarks were sent to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk and to GPO, "It is undeniable that conflicts exist, and that this can be and often is inconvenient to busy Members."

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that the Government Printing Office prepare an explanation for the Members of the House of this breakdown in its vital service and that the inaccurate spelling I have referred to be corrected immediately in the permanent history of the Extension of Remarks.

I also am writing the Government Printing Office requesting an explanation.

In addition, while I am pointing out proofreading errors, Mr. Speaker, there are three more instances of misspelling in my Extension of Remarks of the same date and those are located in the following paragraphs and sentences:

First. Page 191, third column, second full paragraph, first sentence, the word "Merchant" is inaccurately spelled "Mechant."

Second. Page 191, third column, second full paragraph, third sentence, the word "Endangered" is inaccurately spelled "Endangerd."

Third. Page 192, first column, fourth full paragraph, second sentence, the word "attempts" is inaccurately spelled "atempts."

C. H. HOLGATE

### HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, last December marked the passing of one of South Dakota's most distinguished educators. Although his teaching and administrative career was centered in the Aberdeen area, his influence was felt throughout the State and was a large force in developing the strong educational system which is the pride of South Dakota. He was Clare H. "Cy" Holgate.

While his skill as a leader in education made him known throughout the State, his leadership was for many years a force throughout the city of Aberdeen and its various civic groups and organizations. In all of his many activities he gained the respect and esteem of his associates, and as part of their tribute to his work one of the city's junior high schools bears his name.

During memorial services for Cy Holgate, Dr. Donald E. Messer, president of Dakota Wesleyan University in Mitchell, S. Dak., made these comments:

Truly, the gloom of the world is but a shadow—behind it, yet within reach, is joy. We affirm this truth in two ways. First, our memories of Cy Holgate are a source of joy. His life and work sustain us in a time of trouble and stimulate us to greater heights of service to others. As the eulogists have noted, the profound impact of his life shaped the educational history of Aberdeen and transformed the lives of countless people. Two years ago, it was my good pleasure to present on behalf of his alma mater, Dakota

Wesleyan University's Distinguished Award for Outstanding Service to College and State. These tributes are but a portion of the chorus of thanksgiving that Cy deserved and earned by his faithful commitment to the cause of education.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Messer spoke for all South Dakotans who knew and respected Cy Holgate.

#### CALLING FOR AMNESTY DEBATE

### HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time the American people are confronted by enormous problems—the energy crisis and inflation are two which will affect the direction of our Nation for generations to come.

While we are looking forward and attempting to make the future better, we must also take stock on the impact of our past. Many of us would like to forget the Vietnam war because it was a period of great division for our country. But we should not forget the thousands of men who acted on the dictates of their conscience now exiled in other countries or languishing in American jails. There are over a hundred thousand men in the above categories alone. Hundreds of thousands more were court-martialed or received dishonorable discharges for actions related to controversial Vietnam war policy.

It is incumbent upon us to fully debate what is to be done with the lives of these Americans. The following sermon by the Rev. Richard S. Lippert, pastor of St. Matthew Lutheran Church, North Hollywood, Calif., can help to point the way for such an important debate.

The sermon follows:

#### A SERMON PREACHED ON AMNESTY

I have agonized this past week trying to decide whether or not I should talk to you about this subject. I must admit that at this very moment I am feeling nervous, as I have been all week. I agonize because this is a touchy, emotionally charged issue that has only now begun to be talked about. And I agonize because this, as well as any subject that is controversial, always has the possibility of dividing rather than bringing together. I realize that and I understand that. It has never been easy for any religious community to come to grips with controversy. One needs only to look back into our own Judeic-Christian heritage, back to the days in early Israel in the time of the prophets when they had their running controversies with the Kings; back to Judaism in Jesus' day and their running feud and controversy with the Roman Government; and back into the entire history of our own Christian Church. In all of these instances, one finds that the time was pregnant with controversies with which Judaism and the Church were, on many occasions, unable to handle.

So I must tell you that I agonize and at this moment—at this very moment I have a pit in my stomach—and I am nervous—and my hands are literally shaking. And I must tell you, too, that any time I talk about this or any related subject, I am flooded with memories and I still hurt terribly inside. So before I embark on what I have to say, there are two things which constitute a preamble to my remarks and my feelings.

The first is this: I will own my feelings, I will own what I say, I will own my words, I will own my thoughts. I cannot and I will not demand that you accept what I have to say, or for that matter, reject what I have to say. I am telling you what I feel, what I believe, what I must deal with from the very depths of my own soul and experience. And as I understand the will of God and my subsequent responsibility as a Christian, I speak to you this morning. I sincerely believe that as I understand the will of God and as I believe that His spirit works in me, I am moved to say what I have to say. If you can relate to that, okay. And if you don't relate to what I have to say, that's okay, too. All I can give you is the depth of my feelings and my understanding. I do not lay that on you for you will have to come to your own understandings, your own conclusions and deal with your own feelings.

Secondly, I want to give you some of my background so that you can get a better picture of me and, hopefully, garner more credibility about my remarks. Perhaps most of you by now know that I came to this Parish from the Military. I was a Navy Chaplain for three and one-half years and during that time I spent three years with the United States Marine Corps.

Now first, in 1968, at the very height of our involvement in Southeast Asia, I went to Vietnam and served for a year. Upon arriving there, I served about two weeks with the First Reconnaissance Battalion, a highly trained and very skilled counter-insurgent force. But I didn't stay there long. I was transferred to the field with a regular infantry battalion because their Chaplain had been badly injured. So I remained for eight months with the Second Battalion of the Fifth Marine Regiment, First Marine Division. During that particular time of eight months, my battalion suffered among the highest casualties of killed and wounded of any battalion in the I Corps area of operation. I Corps ran from the DMZ South to Quang Nai City.

Second, I spent a whole year away from my family. For those of you who, either in the service, or for some other reason have had to spend long periods of time away from your family will understand what I am talking about. I spent a whole year away from my wife, away from my child, during the most formidable year of his life. And because of that, I missed out on an awfully large chunk of his life. I can never have that time back.

Third, I contracted illnesses the likes of which I hope I never have to go through again. I had falciprum malaria which has a much higher fatality rate than the normal vivax type of World War II. I had shigella dysentery so bad I was withered up like a prune. I had practically every kind of internal and external parasite—hookworm, roundworm and ringworm so bad that my skin broke open and began to pus. I was in so many fire fights and in so many shellings that it's like one big, bad nightmare. And I still pick small pieces of shrapnel out of the back of my neck and the back of my head. I have my medals, nine of them in all, to show where I've been. I say all of this not because I boast or am proud. On the contrary! I tell you this only to hopefully make my remarks more creditable. Also to talk or to think about any of this only brings on anxiety and sadness and a strong desire to withdraw. However, I have committed myself to this task and I choose to carry on. I must tell you also that I do so hesitantly, especially against the background of convulsion which is now going on in Washington, because I am sensitive to that also.

The issue or question simply put is this. What is to become of the thousands upon

thousands of young men languishing in our jails right now; and what is to become of the thousands upon thousands of our young men across the world who have had to flee this country because of something they believed in, because they refused to participate in something which they felt was immoral and wrong? The war is now over between North Vietnam and us but it is not over for the majority of our sons who refused to fight, who refused to be caught up in something which they believed was wrong, and immoral, and indecent. So I ask—when will this war end?

Some people have suggested that what we need to do is to apply what the law says. They should be tried, convicted and put into prison. Others have advocated that these young people should be pardoned by the President. That is, what they have done should be recognized as a crime because they broke a law and it should be so recorded; but that the offenders should be relieved of any consequence of the offenses for which they have been convicted. Now others have suggested that what they need is amnesty. Now amnesty comes from a Greek word which means literally to not remember, or to overlook, or to not recognize. The proposition is that the whole matter of desertion, the refusal to fight, or the refusal to be drafted should be forgotten, that there would be no recognition of a crime having been committed and therefore no reason for pardon.

Now, I gave you all of that background on myself, on my feelings, on where I had been and what I have done because I wanted you to know exactly what I felt and what I went through. And I want you especially to know that during that year in Vietnam I died a hundred times, believe me I suffered! I suffered terribly and because I suffered I say to you this morning that I am completely and totally for complete and total amnesty! I say that as a human being and as one who recognized the basic tenets of my faith as being reconciliation, and peace, and love. Because I recognize these things I must, and I am moved, to ask our government to remove the penalties immediately from those who have suffered long enough in prisons, or have gone underground, or who are now in exile. I take very seriously my responsibility as a citizen of the United States and I take very seriously my responsibility as a Christian, and I am well aware of the arguments that might be raised against my position.

First, that I am neglecting my Christian responsibility to the State as set forth in the Thirteenth Chapter of Romans which states: "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except from God and those that exist have been instituted by God." Now I accept that and I believe that, but I also must balance that with a statement in St. Matthew where Jesus in the Sixth Chapter said you cannot serve two masters. Now I understand that to mean, within the context of Church and State, that if the demands of the State and if the demands of your faith have come into conflict, you must choose between the two. I have that conflict and I have chosen between the two! I choose the demands of my conscience and my understanding of my faith as opposed to the demands made on me by the State. I cannot and I will not give complete, absolute, unconditional and unquestioned allegiance to the State. Nazi Germany is not that far behind for me to forget the ovens at Dachau and Auschwitz.

Another comment that people are making in regard to amnesty is that if we do give amnesty it is going to be destructive for our country and for those who served. Now I ask this question: who is to say who did the most for their country, whether it was he who answered his call to duty and went overseas, or whether it was he who answered his call to duty and refused to go? I'm not trying to say that all of those who refused

to fight, who refused to be drafted and who refused to go to Vietnam were doing so for moral reasons because I know that isn't true. There are thieves and interlopers and hustlers and con-artists and murderers who at this very moment are in jail, who are across the sea, who deserted and refused to go to Southeast Asia.

But their number is small. That same line of reasoning could be applied also to those who served in the Armed Forces because I know that there are thieves and interlopers and hustlers and con-artists and murderers who went to Vietnam and came back and answered their "call to duty" to serve in the armed forces. There are bad people in both places who did their thing for bad reasons, just as there are good and honest men in both places who did their thing for what they believed were good reasons. Who therefore is to say who did the most for freedom and conscience? To me it really is amazing that most Americans continue to believe that these young men who refused to fight or be drafted still must be punished when over 70% of the American people now believe that the war was wrong from its inception to its conclusion. Doesn't it seem rather ironic then that even though we feel the war was wrong, and in many quarters immoral, we still demand our pound of flesh from our sons?

Third, it is argued that amnesty will contribute to a general breakdown of law and order. This is inaccurate. For the past one hundred and ninety-seven years of our country, we have had thirty-five instances of amnesty or pardon beginning with the whiskey rebellion in 1785 in the State of Pennsylvania. And mind you, these people in 1785 fought against their own and not a foreign government and received amnesty from President Washington. In all of these instances when amnesty or pardon was given, the general breakdown of law and order never occurred! Either to know or to hope that you will be forgiven, or that your act will be forgotten after a war, did not make it any easier to go to jail or flee your country during the war. Further, to speak of law and order, that one must obey the letter of the law or be punished, is rather hard to take when hypocrisy, double-talk, lying, deceit, and the breakdown of law and order emanates from the very highest positions in our land. What kind of a country is this when those who govern feel they can break laws with impunity while imposing laws and rules and judgments and regulations of their own liking on others? What kind of hypocrisy is that? President Nixon talks a lot about law and order, and though he gets pardon and amnesty mixed up, I think the following quote by Mr. Nixon valuable in terms of what I've been talking about. "Now amnesty means forgiveness. We cannot provide forgiveness for them. Those who served paid their price; those who deserted must pay their price and the price is not a junket in the Peace Corps or something like that as some have suggested. The price is criminal penalty for disobeying the laws of the United States. If they want to return to the United States, they must pay the penalty." In light of what is going on right now in Washington, I can only shake my head in disbelief.

Fourth, some argue that to grant amnesty is unfair to those who died and suffered in Southeast Asia because it robs them of their sacrificial meaning. I came back with my life, but I want you to know that I suffered there and that this line of reasoning, that it robs those who suffered and died of their sacrificial meaning, is absurd, illogical and irrational. Is putting these young men in prison and keeping them there because they believed in the rightness of their cause going to bring back the lives of any of those young men who were killed in Southeast Asia? Is putting into prison those who have fled the country because they refused to be drafted and participate in a war that they thought

was immoral going to bring back or change any of the suffering that went on with the thousands and thousands of young men who served there? Is it going to change anything? What will the pound of flesh bring? What will our retribution bring? If we throw them in prison and keep them there, is that really going to make the death and suffering of so many Americans any more meaningful?

Today I speak to you as a veteran of the Southeast Asia War, as a Christian and as an American who tries and falls far short, but who tries to understand myself and my world in terms of forgiveness, restoration, reconciliation and healing. We teach our children from the time they are able to walk that they should forgive, learn to live with people, to seek peace and not to demand our pound of flesh. Now if this is so, how can I as a Christian and an American refuse to be reconciled to our exiled and imprisoned sons—how can I do that? We have taught them to honor their conscience, to listen to the voice of God in them, to forgive, to heal and to reconcile. What gross hypocrisy if we honor that inside the Church but not in the market place of the world. Is it no wonder then that so many of our youth regard the Church and our country with contempt and cynicism? Unless some of you accuse me of lack of allegiance to my country and an appreciation of what and who we are, I want to go on record right here that I very dearly love my country—and because I do, I say these words this morning. Just because I disagree with some of its policies does not mean I love her any less. And contrary to the intentionality of a well known bumper sticker, I do love my country and I will not leave!

In closing, I am going to quote a short, but eloquent thought that can best sum up exactly what I feel about amnesty. It was uttered during what I believe to be the most critical period of American history: "With malice towards none, with charity for all, let us strive to bind up the nation's wounds. To do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." The man who said that did so on a bloodsoaked battlefield one hundred ten years ago and his name was Abraham Lincoln.

Finally then, I urge from my perspective and my feelings and experience as a Christian and an American: not malice, but forgiveness; not revenge, but charity; not more brokenness, but unity; not peace only in Viet Nam but here with our sons as well.

If what I have said here today has any relevancy, then I am forced to ask this question: Is the King God; or is God the King?

PASSENGER TRAIN JOURNAL  
PRAISES "COAST STARLIGHT"

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the present energy crisis has provided further reasons for improving intercity passenger service by rail. Already the gasoline shortage has produced a sharp increase in train ridership. One of the most encouraging developments has been the steady increase in ridership on the long-haul trains, traditionally those trains with the highest deficits and which rail management for years dismissed as a lost cause. Contrary to traditional wisdom, the long-haul trains have been between Seattle and San Francisco, via the "Coast Daylight" and the "Coast Starlight." In November of last year, the

latest month for which figures are available, these trains carried a daily average of 750 people. In August of 1973, the ridership in terms of passenger miles was nearly double that of the preceding year. I was pleased to note that an excellent magazine, *Passenger Train Journal*, which is devoted to reporting on modern passenger service, featured the "Coast Starlight" in its monthly feature, *Trains of Note*. *Passenger Train Journal* comments that—

The "Coast Starlight" has provided the most positive proof that long distance rail travel can be a growing institution.

I am happy that this success story has taken place on a rail route serving my own district in Seattle and I would like to include the article from *Passenger Train Journal* in the *RECORD* at this point:

#### THE "COAST STARLIGHT"

In the West, the long-distance passenger train is dead. These words summed up the Southern Pacific funded, "The Future of Rail Passenger Service in the West," which became the cited reference for those who sought the end of passenger service on rails. However, seven years later finds the passenger train traversing the length of the west coast alive and thriving on the run between Seattle, Washington and Los Angeles, California.

Because the *Coast Starlight* has provided the most positive proof that long distance rail travel can be a growing institution and has done so on the tracks of a railroad that was most dedicated to the passenger trains' demise, PTJ has chosen this train to begin a new series, *Trains of Note*.

When Transportation Secretary Volpe announced the final basic system routes in January of 1971, the end point designation of Seattle and San Diego set the stage for the establishment of service that has never been available as a through train of any time prior to Amtrak's May 1, 1971 beginning. Before Amtrak, various ways were available at one time or the other for the traveler to go from Southern California to Seattle. From November, 1924 to October, 1949, Espee provided a through train from Los Angeles to Portland, but only some sleepers went on through to Seattle. The *West Coast*, as it was called from June, 1927, operated via the San Joaquin Valley and Sacramento to Portland. The train was discontinued north of Sacramento just after the inception of the *Shasta Daylight* although it continued to operate south of Sacramento until 1960. From October 3, 1949, one was required to make a train transfer at Martinez, California to complete the fastest Seattle-Los Angeles trip. Then, in 1965, even first class passengers had to change in Portland with the termination of through sleepers between Oakland and Seattle. Finally, in 1969, SP altered the schedules of the *Coast Daylight* and *Cascade* to provide better through transit time, but requiring an additional transfer (three altogether) and a bus ride across the San Francisco Bay Bridge, if one chose this routing. However, this schedule adjustment broke the key connection with the *Super Chief* in Los Angeles and was probably counter-productive on balance.

So, Amtrak's through train put four distinct segments together to provide the no-change-of-train service. Los Angeles-Santa Clara, *Coast Daylight*; Santa Clara-Oakland, a freight-only section that had not been a regular passenger train since October 2, 1960; Oakland-Portland, *Cascade*; and Portland-Seattle, pool train service of the Burlington Northern/Union Pacific.

The operation never did actually fulfill the role of a through train between the DOT-designated end-points. Service between L.A. and San Diego was maintained with a

through coach and sleeper from Seattle that was switched to a *San Diegan* at Los Angeles. However, the expensive switching operation in Los Angeles and relative light usage moved Amtrak to terminate these cars in early 1972.

The name *Coast Starlight* came into being on November 14, 1971 upon issuance to Amtrak's first home-grown system timetable. From this time, the *Coast Starlight* generally referred to the tri-weekly operation north of Oakland, while the daily operation south of Oakland was called the *Coast Daylight*. Now that the entire route is operated daily, it does not make much sense to continue the dual nomenclature. So while Amtrak continues the double name, PTJ prefers to call the train *Coast Starlight* no matter where it may be between Seattle and Los Angeles. The *Coast Daylight* was a Los Angeles-San Francisco train, the likes of which, in the traditional sense, left the rails some time ago.

The resumption of the through train had little impact on ridership initially. By that time, SP had generally convinced most people that passenger trains were indeed gone. Amtrak was an unknown entity. However, as Amtrak's marketing program began to take effect in spring 1972, the train caught on, even with young people. By the end of 1972, demand built to the point that Amtrak decided to operate the Oakland-Seattle segment daily during the Christmas vacation period. Unlike most long-distance trains that carry their lightest loads during the winter and early spring months, the *Starlight* increased its average daily loads in each consecutive month in 1973 from January to June.

Almost without saying, the train was made daily over its entire route for the 1973 summer season, and in spite of 16 car consists every day, sellouts were more the rule than exception. This demand convinced Amtrak to retain full daily operation on a year round basis. At the present rate, the *Starlight* is carrying more passengers annually than the highly touted *Super Chief* and is earning enough to cover operating costs much of the time.

Why the *Starlight* is such a hit is not entirely clear. Beyond the attributes of train travel, there is little, competitively, to place it above other modes. From the speed viewpoint, even buses are faster between most city-pairs. The fare level is generally bus competitive, but between San Francisco/Oakland and Los Angeles, the train coach fare is \$1 higher than the popular, cheap air service that has made this corridor the most highly traveled air route in the world.

But, whatever attracts several hundred passengers to the *Coast Starlight* each day, they are there, voting with their travel dollars that the long-haul passenger train is far from dead. Since Amtrak's fastest growing train is as far from the Northeast Corridor as possible, it has probably done more to reverse traditional thinking toward rail passenger service in the United States than any other post-Amtrak event.

### MAJOR BREAKTHROUGH IN FUSION RESEARCH

#### HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, each Sunday the Raleigh News and Observer honors an outstanding North Carolinian as its "Tar Heel of the Week," and on Sunday, January 20, this honor was accorded to Dr. Willard H. Bennett, head of the plasma research

laboratories at North Carolina State University in Raleigh.

This feature story written by Mr. Brad Stuart was especially timely because Dr. Bennett recently made a major breakthrough in fusion research. He sees fusion as the source of our future energy supplies, and I am including this article in the *RECORD* to call attention both to his work and ideas:

THE TAR HEEL OF THE WEEK: FUSION IS HIS CANDIDATE FOR OUR FUTURE ENERGY NEEDS

(By Brad Stuart)

It's like putting a cold pack on a cancer! . . . Short-sighted . . . Ridiculous!"

Dr. Willard H. Bennett, an internationally-known physicist heading the Plasma Research Laboratories at N.C. State University, was talking about the government's efforts to ease the energy crisis. Instead of redoubling efforts to find new energy sources, Bennett complained, the government is seeking to prolong the life of energy sources which will soon expire no matter what is done.

With all the world's oil-reserves due for total depletion within a few decades, with uranium in short supply and nuclear power under attack of posing cataclysmic dangers, and with other energy sources unable to meet future demands, Bennett sees the present long-overdue reactions to the fuel crisis as paltry and pathetic.

Bennett believes a greater national effort should be made to bring about controlled "thermonuclear fusion," the reaction powering the sun and the hydrogen bomb.

Controlled for peaceful purposes, scientists interviewed by the N&O have said, the power of the H-bomb could provide all the energy man needs for millions of years.

The world's oceans are full of the fuel for fusion—nonradioactive hydrogen.

Bennett himself recently made headlines with a major breakthrough in fusion research.

By firing electron beams at solid objects, Bennett has achieved "fusionable temperatures" of nearly 200 million degrees Fahrenheit for the first time in history in a device other than a nuclear bomb.

Scientists have long said that achieving such temperatures is an essential step towards getting controlled fusion. Previous to Bennett's breakthrough, the highest temperatures reached in controlled fusion experiments were around 95 million degrees Fahrenheit, only half that needed, according to scientific journals.

If Bennett can achieve controlled fusion "within two years," as he has claimed, he would be years ahead of official government projections.

But it wouldn't be the first time Bennett has made scientific history.

Bennett was the first man to predict the earth's Van Allen radiation belts. He predicted them in 1953, five years before James A. Van Allen discovered the belts using information from our first satellite—and Bennett's research.

Bennett is now patenting his "super-pinch" fusion reactor. It is called the "super-pinch" because its electron beams create "the strongest magnetic fields ever created," Bennett said. This magnetism is designed to tightly contain the powerful fusion reaction in an area only a fraction of an inch across, a feat greater than holding a dynamite blast in a cigar box.

All controlled fusion experiments, except recently tried and so far unsuccessful laser beam experiments, use "magnetic bottles" in attempts to contain fusion.

Bennett invented the first "magnetic bottle" over 30 years ago in discovering the "Bennett pinch effect." He demonstrated that when high electrical currents are passed through gas "plasmas" (with both negatively

and positively charged gas molecules), the gas is "pinched" down to a tiny fraction of its former volume. This heats the gas to very high temperatures.

Since Bennett's discovery, billions of dollars have been poured into research seeking to "pinch" and electrically heat hydrogen to fusible temperatures.

Bennett himself, seeing continued failure in these gas experiments, went over to his new method of heating solids with electron beams. When frozen hydrogen or hydrogen-rich plastics are heated by his device, he expects the first controlled thermonuclear reaction in history which gives off more energy than it uses.

The great mass of federal money is still going into gas fusion experiments. Bennett decries a kind of scientific "inertia" which causes more and more efforts to be applied where efforts have already been made in the past.

The cause of much of this inertia is the dependence of sophisticated research on large grants from federal bureaucracies, he said. To get grants, scientists must show they are in the mainstream. Once research is under way, researchers justify their efforts to the bureaucrats, assuring them that success is inching ever closer.

Bennett's work is well funded. A grant from the U.S. Air Force supports his fusion research. The university provides the Plasma Research Labs, including shops and specialists to make the equipment he and his colleagues design. More equipment is provided by the Boeing Radiation Laboratories in Seattle, Washington, where the fusion experiments are carried out.

Bennett received his doctorate at the University of Michigan and did postdoctoral study at the California Institute of Technology.

During World War II, he served as officer-in-charge, research section, Aircraft Radio Laboratory at Wright Field, Ohio and as liaison officer to the radiation laboratory at MIT. He was chief of the physical electronics section at the National Bureau of Standards following the war.

#### SPEAKING UP FOR AMERICA

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, when newspapers and news programs are constantly filled with the problems facing these United States, I think that it is worthwhile to stand back and take a look at those many things which are good about our great land. Mr. Gordon Sinclair, a Canadian radio commentator, has put the case well in his broadcast of November 30, 1973.

It is good to know that at least some residents of other lands do appreciate the works of the United States. The text of Mr. Sinclair's broadcast follows:

#### CANADIAN OPINION

This Canadian thinks it is time to speak up for the Americans as the most generous and possibly the least-appreciated people in 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 the Niger. Today, the rich bottom land of the Mississippi is under water and no foreign land has sent a dollar to help. Germany, Japan and to

a lesser extent, Britain and Italy, were lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans who poured in billions of dollars and forgave other billions in debts. None of those 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 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 spring 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 these countries are writing about the decadent warmongering Americans.

I'd like to see just one of those countries that is gloating over the erosion of the United States dollar build its own airplanes. Come on . . . let's hear it! Does any other country in the world have a plane to equal the Boeing Jumbo Jet, the Lockheed Tristar or the Douglas 10? If so, why don't they fly them? Why do all 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 American put theirs right in the store window for everybody to look at. Even the draft dodgers are not pursued and hounded. They are here on our streets, 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 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 to you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble.

Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to the Americans in trouble? I don't think there was outside help even during the San Francisco earthquake.

Our neighbors have faced it alone and I'm one Canadian who is damned tired of hearing them kicked around. They will come out of this thing with their flag high. And when they do, they are entitled to thumb their nose at the lands that are gloating over their present troubles.

I hope Canada is not one of these.

GORDON SINCLAIR.

#### POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been discussion in recent months in the media concerning the Government of South Vietnam and charges that this

Government has detained large numbers of civilian prisoners. Unfortunately, these charges have been made against the Government of South Vietnam with very little investigation of the validity of the charges. In the cause of fair reporting, I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement issued by the information office of the Embassy of the Republic of Vietnam which discusses this issue in a forthright manner. I believe this statement will give us a better perspective on the entire question.

The statement follows:

#### FACT SHEET: THE ISSUE OF CIVILIAN PRISONERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

While the Republic of Viet-Nam is making every effort to maintain peace, the communists and their friends are creating "phony issues" aimed at discrediting the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam. The issue of "political prisoners" is the most persistent of these false issues.

The communists have launched a vigorous campaign charging that the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam is holding hundreds of thousands of so-called "political prisoners." In the face of such outrageous and false charges, the Information Office of the Republic of Viet-Nam deems it necessary to make certain clarifications regarding this issue by presenting the following facts, facts, which, unlike the claims and charges of the communists, are well documented and can be substantiated:

Fact: In the Republic of Viet-Nam, no one is arrested and detained only because his political opinions are at variance with the government. The law of the Republic does not permit the arrest of a person merely because of his opposition to the policies of the government. The people can freely express their opinions and are constantly doing so in South Viet-Nam. In fact, some of our senators and representatives and, especially members of the press, are well-known for their criticisms of the government. The place to look for political prisoners, therefore, is not in South Viet-Nam but in the innumerable prisons, concentration camps, and mental institutions in North Viet-Nam.

Fact: From the juridical point of view as with regards to penal law, even within a democracy in time of peace, attempts against internal and external security of State such as vandalism, robbery, rebellion, spying, cooperating with the enemy, high treason, should be punished with extreme vigor. We have to take drastic measures against these elements, who cannot, in any sense of the word, be called "political prisoners." As in any nation in the world, the elected government has the duty to safeguard security and to enforce law and order. Any element, who through his actions, has endangered security and public order, must be classified as a criminal, in accordance with the legal practice of any country.

Therefore, in danger of being repetitious, we deny the charge that there are "political prisoners" in the Republic of Viet-Nam. The only people we hold in our prisons are either communist civilian personnel and/or common criminals.

Fact: The communists at first claimed that the Republic of Viet-Nam detained 200,000 of their civilian personnel. This ridiculous claim was not substantiated by any list of names or locations of capture. Obviously it was a conveniently round figure pulled out of the blue in order to discredit the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam. When they are faced with the fact that all the prisons in South Viet-Nam combined would not contain more than 35,000, including communist civilian personnel and common criminals, the figure came down to 100,000, and finally, the communists admitted that

perhaps the number of detainees held by the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam is closer to 50,000. This inconsistency, along with the lack of any documents to back up their claims, clearly shows that the communists charges are absolutely false. The truth is that the Republic of Viet-Nam only held 5,081 communist civilians, a figure which we immediately released after the signing of the peace treaty.

Fact: Article 8C of the Paris Peace Agreement of January 27, 1973, deals with the return of Vietnamese civilian personnel captured and detained in South Viet-Nam. It reads as follows:

The questions of the return of Vietnamese civilian personnel captured and detained in South Viet-Nam will be resolved by the two South Vietnamese parties. . . . The two South Vietnamese parties will do so in a spirit of national reconciliation and concord with a view to ending hatred and enmity, in order to ease suffering and to reunite families. The two South Vietnamese parties will do their utmost to resolve this question within ninety days after the cease-fire comes into effect.

In respect of this provision, the Republic of Viet-Nam presented a list of the 5,081 civilian detainees it held within 15 days of the signing of the treaty. The communists, on the other hand, at first, said that they had only 142 civilian detainees. This ridiculous figure was later revised to 200, then to 400 and finally to 637. The inconsistency of these figures denotes the ill-will of the communists in implementing the provisions of the Paris Agreement and the Protocol concerning the return of detained Vietnamese civilian personnel and casts serious doubts on the real number of South Vietnamese prisoners still in communist hands.

Fact: From 1954 to April 14, 1973, the communists abducted and captured 68,621 South Vietnamese civilians of which 16,798 are government officials, social workers, and rural cadres. It must be pointed out that even after the ceasefire, the communists continue their deliberate policy of terrorism. In the period from March 24, 1973, to April 12, 1973, alone, the communists abducted and captured 1,076 South Vietnamese civilians. The Republic of Viet-Nam has a complete list of those people with all the details concerning their identities and the times and locations of their abduction.

The most significant cases of capture and detention occurred in Hue during the 1968 Tet Offensive and in several hamlets north of Binh Dinh province during the 1972 Easter offensive. The number of captured personnel in these two places alone already exceed more than ten times the figure of 600 and some civilians that the communists claimed they held. This suggests the possibility that a great number of captured personnel could have been massacred or taken to the battlefields to provide forced labor or are still being detained in communist concentration camps.

Fact: The Republic of Viet-Nam has done its best to implement the provisions of Article 8C as well as all other provisions of the Paris Agreement. It has returned all the 26,750 communist POW's and 1,575 of the 5,081 communist civilian detainees. The Republic of Viet-Nam will release the rest of the civilian prisoners as soon as the communists show signs of their willingness to respect the Paris Agreement.

On the other hand, the communists have only returned 4,608 of the Republic of Viet-Nam's 31,818 POW's and 271 of the 69,839 civilians which they have kidnapped or captured during the war.

From these figures, it is obvious, then, that the communists have no intention of carrying out the provisions of the Peace Agreement which they themselves have signed and pledged to uphold.

It is the communists and not the Republic of Viet-Nam who are detaining thousands

of civilians in their concentration camps. It is the communists and not the Republic of Viet-Nam who are violating the peace treaty. As is often the case, it is always the fellow who is doing the robbing who shouts the loudest that he is being robbed.

Closely related with this issue of "political prisoners" is the matter of the treatment of prisoners. Here again, the communists and their supporters have been strident in their charges of the "inhumane" treatment of prisoners in South Viet-Nam. Without fanfare, we would simply like to present what the eyes can see and the ears can hear and leave it up to your objective judgment as to who is the inhumane party in this all too human drama.

Fact: The American and the Republic of Viet-Nam's POW's released since the signing of the Peace Agreement looked as if they had all been to hell and back. Their mental and physical states were on the verge of collapse. The American POW's have repeatedly told their stories of the unimaginably inhumane treatment they received from communist hands that it is unnecessary for us to reiterate their charges. Suffice it to ask, "Who is calling whom inhumane?"

Fact: Since 1966, the International Red Cross and other international observers have visited the Republic of Viet-Nam prisoners' camps no less than 195 times. Question: How many times have the North Vietnamese allowed the International Red Cross or any other international organization to visit their jails? Answer: Never. Question: Which side has something to hide? The answer is obvious.

When the peace treaty was signed in Paris on January 27, the world breathed a sigh of relief. At last the protracted war in Indochina is going to stop and people can turn their minds and efforts to constructive endeavors. Unfortunately, from the very beginning, the communists have violated every provision of the treaty. They have continued their military build-up by infiltrating more men and better equipment from the North; they have built an oil pipe line from North Viet-Nam into Quang Nam province; they have constructed air fields; they have brought hundreds of tanks into South Viet-Nam in short, they have never stopped their war of aggression. They have violated the ceasefire more than 19,000 times causing close to 1,500 deaths, 3,300 injured and 14,000 missing among the innocent civilian population.

Furthermore, instead of contributing constructively to the rehabilitation of the country, in accordance with the aspirations of the people, the communists are actively maneuvering to either take over all of South Viet-Nam or at least to carve out for themselves a piece of the territory south of the 17th parallel with the aim of creating a second state in South Viet-Nam. With this objective in mind, the "National Liberation Front" has evaded all attempts to negotiate seriously with the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam at the conference of the two South Vietnamese parties. They have stubbornly rejected the constructive and concrete proposals put forth by the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam and made hazy counter-proposals as well as inconsistent and unsubstantiated charges in order to intentionally delay a political solution and to avoid democratic and free general elections agreed upon in the Paris Agreement. For them, ending the war and restoring a lasting peace for the country are not ultimate goals. They want to gain time with the help of their big communist brothers in order to pursue their future political and military ventures.

Thus the propaganda campaign they have launched is one delaying tactic aimed at discrediting and alienating the duly elected Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam. Unfortunately, they have succeeded in convincing certain elements in the United States

who are giving them support by publicizing all their lies. They have even sown seeds of doubts in the minds of some of our friends.

It is our hope that by presenting the above facts we will have convinced our friends and shown our foes that it is not the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam that is guilty of the charges levelled against it by the communists but the communists themselves who are guilty of such crimes.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS OF OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, AND SOME STOCKHOLDERS OF OIL AND GAS COMPANIES TO PRESIDENT NIXON'S REELECTION EFFORT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a study of campaign contributions made by officers, directors and some stockholders of oil and gas companies to President Nixon's reelection effort. I believe that the fact that 413 individuals directly involved in the oil industry contributed over \$5.7 million dollars to the President's war chest goes a long way to explain the glaring inequities in this administration's handling of the energy situation.

The President is unable to control the oil cartel because they financed at least 10 percent of his campaign. The entire burden of solving the oil shortage has been thrown on the consumer with no sacrifices asked of the oil companies. In fact, the oil companies have been the biggest beneficiaries in this situation, their profits have skyrocketed and an effort has been made to undermine the environmental movement.

I suspect that this study only revealed the "tip of the iceberg" of big oil's activities on behalf of the President. I have asked the Senate Select Committee to investigate possible additional secret gifts by oil interests.

The list of contributions follow:

Ada Oil Exploration Co.:	
Adam, K. S. Jr. (Pres.)	(? CC) \$ 1,000
Aladdin Pet. Co.: Bruce,	
George H. (Pres.)	1,000
Amarillo Oil Co.:	
Quakenbush, W. W. (Exploration Man.)	880
Walker, W. E. Jr.	1,000
An Car Oil Co. Inc.: Sterge,	
John C.	5,000
Anchor Prod. Co.: Blair,	
B. B. (Pres.)	(CC) 1,000
	(GAO) 1,000
	(GAC) 1,500
	(GAO) 2,000
Apache Corp.:	
Plank, Raymond (Pres.)	500
Sweatt, Charles B.	1,000
Armour Oil: Armour, Ogden	
B. (Pres.)	500
Total	\$17,380
Ballard & Conell Corp.:	
Munchak, Theodore J. (Dir.)	\$ 1,955
	5,865
Bass, H. W. & Sons:	
Bass, Henry W. Jr. (Pres.)	2,000
Bass, R. D. (VP)	3,500

Bell Bros.: Pappageorge, S. Charles (Gen. Man.)	500
Belridge Oil Co.: Whittier, Leland K.	9,794
Big Heat Pipeline Corp.: Zarrow, Henry (Pres.)	7,000
Bonded Oil Co.: Deer, Paul U. (Chrm. of Bd.)	500
Bond Operating Co.: Bond, Ronald S. Jr. (Pres.)	(Jr.) 1,000 (Sr.) 1,000
Bridwell Oil Co.: Bowdel, Margaret (Partner)	2,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$35,614</b>
Cul-Mon Oil Co.: Monaghan, Robert L., Midland, TX Pres. & Chmn of Bd	\$3,207
Calvert Exploration Co.: Calvert, F. A., Jr.	500
Chmn. of Bd., Tulsa	1,000
*Nelson, Herman A., Frisco, Director	1,500
Canadian-American Resources Fund: McMahon, David A., Fort Worth, Director	500
Cardinal Petroleum Company: Palmer, Hugh E., President and Gen. Mangr	1,000
Caulkins Oil Company: Higbie, Harley G.	1,100
Cayman Corporation: Coenen, Dale S., Director, 280 Park Ave. NY	3,868
Rentzel, Delos W., Dallas, Director	1,000
Central Kansas Petrol Co.: Scupins, Carl A., Abilene, VP	1,000
Champlin Exploration Inc.: Champlin, Douglas H., VP	500
Charter Oil Co.: Keaton, Darius N.	37,000
Pres. & Dir. Charter Trading Co.	3,000
	6,000
	3,000
Charter Trading Co.: Radic, Charles E.	500
VP & Dir	1,000
	1,500
Chevron Chemical Co.: Kent, J. W., Pres	500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$70,675</b>
C & K Petroleum Company, Inc.: Chambers, C. Fred, Pres.	\$1,000
Kennedy, W. D., Exec VP	500
Cleary Petro Co.: Cleary, W. B., Pres.	2,000
Clinton Oil: Avery, William H. Jr.	500
Exec VP	1,000
Geo. H. Coates Co.: Coates, Geo. H.	3,000
	1,000
Coastal States Gas: Wyatt, Oscar S., Jr.	3,000
Chmn of Bd.	7,000
(son)	22,000
	1,000
	1,000
	4,000
	1,000
(CC)	25,512
*Ware, Jack	500
Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.: Laird, W. F., Pres.	625
Commonwealth Oil Refining Co., P.R.: Keith, Norman C., Pres.	2,000
	2,000
Consolidated Natural Gas: Rose, H. Chapman	1,000
Director	1,000
	10,000
	500
Consumers Petro Co.: Aymond, A. H.	500
Chmn & Pres.	900
Cotton Petroleum Corp.: Cotton, Doyle W. Jr., Pres, Tulsa	1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$93,037</b>

Edwin L. Cox Co.: Goggans, J. Lawson, Dallas	\$1,000
Cox, Edwin L.	4,183
Owner—Large Independent	6,366
	8,366
	4,013
	5,108
Davis Oil Co.: Davis, Marvin, Gen. Manga	1,000
Delta Drilling Co.: Zepa, Joseph, Pres	1,000
Digas Co. of Delaware: which is in LA, Spitzer, Arthur, Pres.	3,000
Diamond Shamrock: Adams, Richard E., Asst. Mangr. (CC)	525
Dorchester Exploration, Inc.: Aikman, William H., Exec VP	1,000
Aikman, Robert E., Pres	1,000
Eddy Refining Co.: Blanton, J.S., Chmn of the Bd	500
East Ohio Gas Co.: Tankersley, G. J.	5,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$19,150</b>
El Paso Natural Gas: Young, S. D., Director	\$1,500
Rockwell, Willard F., Jr., Director (CC)	500
(GAO)	1,000
(Father)	1,500
Kayser, Paul F., Director	2,000
*Glassell, Alfred C. (Dir.)	1,000
Equitex Resources Corp.: Goldbaum, Stanley	1,000
	6,832
	22,683
	2,297
Fair Oil Co.: Fair, Wilton H., Senior VP	2,000
	550
Falcon Seaboard Inc.: Law, Theodore N. Chmn of Bd. (CC)	14,000
(GAO)	2,000
(GAO)	2,000
Forest Oil Co.: Casey, Martin F.	1,000
Chmn, Exec. Com.	1,000
Central American Oil Co. of Texas: Conley, Paul A.	1,000
Meadows, Algur H.	3,000
	3,000
GHK Co.: Hefner, Robert A., Jr.	2,000
General Crude Oil: Montague, K. E.	1,000
Global Marine, Inc.: Bauer, R. F.	1,000
Chmn of Bd.	1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>73,862</b>
Goldston Oil Company: Goldston, Iris, Chmn. of Bd.	\$5,000
Gt. Plains Natural Gas: Durham, C.W., Pres.	(CC) 10,000
Graham-Michaels Corp.: Graham, William L., VP	(CC) 500
Claude B. Hamill-Independent	1,000
Claude S.	1,000
Petro Suppliers Equipment Assoc.: Harbin, J. P., 2nd VP	2,000
Hamilton Bros. Petro Corp.: Hamilton, Ferris F., Vice Chmn., Pres.	5,473
Harkins & Co.: Harkins, H. B., Chmn. of Bd.	1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$25,973</b>
Heyser, Estill S.: Ind. Oil Co. Dallas	\$1,000
Hilliard, H. T.: Hilliard Oil & Gas	1,000
Highland Resources: Ralph O'Connor	1,000
HNG Oil Co.: Roden, William F.	1,000
Herring, Robert E.: Houston Nat. Gas	1,000
Howell Corporation: Paul Howell	1,000
Hudson Oil Co.: Frank Vandergrift	2,000
T. L. James & Co.: Floyd B. James	500
Kansas Nebraska Nat Gas: Mc Dill Boyd, Dir.	500
Kissinger Petrol Corp.: Clyde G. Kissinger, Pres.	500
Koch Oil Co.: Robert L. Williams	1,000
Lafayette Funds, Inc.: J. C. Trahan	1,000
Ladd Petrol Co.: J. B. Ladd	500

Laketon Asphalt Ref. Co.: Samuel Bronstein, Pres.	1,000
Longhorn Prod. Co.: Frank Pitts	1,000
Maguire Oil Co.: Cary Maguire, Pres	12,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$26,000</b>
McKnight Petroleum Trust: McKnight, W. L. (Trustee) (CC)	\$100,191
McMoRon Exploration Co.: Rankin, B. M., Jr. (President)	500
Medders Petroleum Co.: Medders, Tom B. (Chrm. of Bd.)	500
Mesa Petrol 166: Pickens, T. B. Jr. (President)	1,000
Michigan Oil Co.: McClure, Harold (Chrm. of Bd.)	2,900
	2,900
	17,400
	5,800
Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co.: Fisher, John W. (Superintendent) (CC)	2,500
	1,000
Missouri Public Service Co.: Williams, Kelly (VP-Finance & Sales)	2,000
Murphy H. Baxter: Baxter, Murphy H. (Owner)	2,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$138,691</b>
Northern Pump Co.: Hawley, J. B. Jr. (President)	\$1,000
	1,000
North Penn Gas Co.: Ware, John H. III (Chrm. of Bd.)	1,000
Northwest Oil Co.: Brachman, S. (VP & Treasurer)	1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,000</b>
Oasis Pipe Line Co.: Orefice, Paul F. (VP & Dir.)	\$500
Ocean Drilling & Exploration Co.: Blanke, Albert G. Jr. (Dir.)	1,896
	1,000
O'Neill Oil Properties: O'Neill, Joseph I. Jr. (Owner)	6,000
	1,000
W. B. Osborn Co.: Osborn, W. B. Jr. (Manager)	1,000
Osceola Refining Co.: Hansen, Armond (President)	2,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$13,396</b>
Pacific Gas & Electric Co.: Gerdes, Robert H. (Chrm. of Exec. Comm.)	\$1,000
Patol Corp.: Shield, Fred W. (President)	500
Patrick Petroleum Co.: Patrick, U. F. (President)	500
Pauley Petrol Inc.: Pauley, Edwin W. (Chrm. of Bd.)	35,000
Penrose Prod. Co.: Penrose, Neville G. (Chrm. of Bd.)	1,000
Petrol Exploration & Operating Co.: Franklin, James B. (Dir.)	4,000
	3,000
	15,000
Kaplan, Stanford (Dir.)	5,230
	2,615
Portal Pipe Line Co.: Downing, Robert W. (President) (CC)	500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$71,345</b>
Salmon Oil Co.: Salmon, Barton D. (VP)	\$1,000
	500
Saxon Oil Co.: Saxon, Bill D. (Chrm of Bd.)	1,000

Southwestern Oil & Refining: Seltzer, S. S. Jr. (Chrm of Bd.)	2,000
Southern Natural Gas Co.: Shaw, John S.	2,800
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,300</b>

Shaheen Resources: John M. Shaheen	\$104,000
Tamarack Petroleum Co.:	
McKeithan, D. F. Jr. (VP)	\$2,000
Uihlien, Joseph	500
Uihlien, Joseph Jr.	700
Tauber Oil Co.: Tauber, O. J.	2,000
Teton Exploration Drilling Co.:	
Lisco, Richard K. (President)	500
	500

Texas Independent Producers:	
Mitchell, George P. (President)	3,000
Texas Pipeline Co.:	
Killam, Radcliff (President)	1,500
	2,000

Tippepary Land & Exploration Corp.: Stoltz, Deane H.	1,500
Triangle Refineries: Love, F. C. (Chrm of Bd.)	3,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$17,200</b>

Urich Oil Co.: Urich, George	\$3,000
Vaughn Petroleum Inc.: Vaughn, Jack C.	2,000
Venus Oil Co.: Ames, Eugene L. (Jr.) (Exec. VP)	1,000
Vickers (Sub. of Swift): Swift, Edward F. (Dir.)	1,000
Viersen Oil & Gas:	
Viersen, Sam	700
Viersen, Sam Jr.	1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,700</b>

Walker Manufacturing Co.: Rapp, Wayne E. (VP)	\$625
Washington Natural Gas Co.: Woods, William P. (Chrm. of Bd.)	500
Western Gas & Oil Assoc.: McMillan, John R. (Pres.)	1,000
White Eagle Overseas Oil Co.: Helmerick, W. H. (President)	1,000
Wood Oil Co.: Smith, Glenn J. (Chrm of Bd.)	1,000
Marshall R. Young Oil Co.: Young, Marshall R. (President)	1,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,125</b>

Husky:	
Eccles, G. S., Director	\$1,000
Nielson, Glenn E. (NPC), Director	1,250
	500
	1,000

Superior Oil Company:	
Howard Keck, Pres.	25,000
Superior Oil Corp (Ad)	10,000
Pacific Gas and Electric: Walter Haas	48,557
Great Plains Natural Gas Co.: C. W. Durham, Pres. (CC)	10,000
East Ohio Gas Company: G. J. Tankersly, Pres.	5,000
McCulloch Oil Co.: Ad.	10,000
Nicholas Varvinoganis: (Oil Refining & Shipping, Athens, Greece)	15,000
Trans Union Corp.: J. W. Van Gorkom	2,000
Time Oil Co.: Employees	16,000
Western Crude Oil: Courtlandt Pres., Dietler	3,500
Arch Rowan & Co. Inc.:	
Arch Rowan	1,000
Estill Heyser	1,000
Texas Pacific Oil (subsidiary of Seagrams) (Distillers): John Loeb (Partner Loeb Rhoades)	\$109,000
Newmont Mining: Andre Meyer (Partner Lazard Freres) Director	62,760

Delhi Australian International Oil Co.:	
John Murchison, Chr. (Cash)	50,000
	2,000
Perry R. Bass, Dir. (Cash)	20,000
	10,000
	82,000
Midwest Oil Corporation: Arthur E. Johnson (Former Chr.)	106,500
Quintana Petroleum Corp.:	
Roy H. Cullen, VP	11,000
Isaac Arnold, VP	23,000
Cullen, Harry	14,000
Belco Petro: Arthur B. Belfer, Ch. Bd.	13,250
King Ranch (Crude & Nat. Gas): Robert Kleberg	100,000
Grant Oil Tool: Henry Salvatore	99,415
American Liberty Oil: Toddie Wynne, Pres.	50,000
Jake Hamon: (Oil & Gas Prod.) (Cash)	25,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$695,925</b>

**OMB DIRECTOR ASH ANNOUNCES NEW POLICY—IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED BY CONGRESS TO END**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview Budget Director Roy Ash announced that the Nixon administration is discontinuing its longstanding policy of impoundment of funds appropriated by the Congress.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that this decision came after some 25 Federal district courts had held that such impoundments are illegal and invalid.

Furthermore, this practice of impoundments has been under strong attack in the Congress for some 3 years—and I have personally denounced excessive and arbitrary impoundments and freezing of funds appropriated by the Congress for education, agricultural programs, highways, public works and other programs for the growth and development of America.

I am pleased with the recent statement by Mr. Ash indicating a reversal of policy. The OMB director indicated that one exception to the new policy will be the continued impoundment of a limited amount of funds for grants under the Water Pollution Act.

Although the Director apparently does not consider the withholding of several billions of dollars in contract authority as impoundments in the technical sense, the effect is the same—cities and counties throughout the Nation will be deprived of the benefits of this antipollution program concerning which the country and the Congress is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest of the American people and my colleagues in this most important matter, I place in the RECORD herewith the article from the January 20 edition of the New York

Times concerning the recent statement by OMB Director Ash.

The article follows:

**DEVICE OF IMPOUNDING PROGRAM MONIES TO BE DROPPED**  
(By Edwin L. Dale)

WASHINGTON, Jan. 19.—President Nixon's new budget will all but abandon last year's highly controversial device of "impounding" funds for programs approved by Congress.

This was disclosed in an interview by Roy L. Ash, director of the Office of Management and Budget, who was in charge of preparation of the budget.

"You can retire that word impoundment from your type," Mr. Ash said. "We may even forget how to spell it."

Mr. Ash made an exception for the program of grants for sewage treatment plants under the Water Pollution Act, where the President has already announced his decision to allot more money in the new budget than was allotted this fiscal year, but again to withhold part of the amount authorized. Mr. Ash called this "a totally different" item, in which "it was never intended" that all the authorized funds could be spent.

**NO LIST OF CUTBACKS**

The big change is that the new budget of slightly more than \$300-billion will not contain, as the one a year ago did, a long list of more than 100 items in which the President decided to cut back on programs and eliminate some altogether.

His decisions sparked an immediate and intense battle with Congress and a flood of court suits. Eventually the President released funds for many of the programs in question, and some were changed by Congress in a manner acceptable to the President.

"We'll be talking about different things with Congress this year—not impoundment," Mr. Ash said.

The budget office, he said will revert to its normal practice of "reserving" appropriated funds for various programs, which includes doling them out to the various agencies on a schedule determined by ability to spend and other factors. This practice has led, for example, to "underspending" the money available for roadbuilding in the Highway Trust Fund for many years, mainly without controversy.

Congress in general has accepted the need for the "reserving" device, sometimes called "apportionment," as necessary for orderly spending, though there may continue to be some controversy this year over specific items.

The President's gradual retreat during 1973 on the impoundment issue has inevitably meant some increase in the budget. But Mr. Ash said the amount was less than \$1-billion in the current fiscal year, 1974, and about \$1-billion in the new fiscal year.

"Some of the things that caused the most controversy involved very little money," he remarked.

**"UNCONTROLLABLE" PROGRAMS**

One reason for the change in policy on impoundment is that the prospect of a slowdown in the economy this year has made possible a somewhat more relaxed budget policy in general, though Mr. Ash insisted that "restraint" had not been abandoned in wholesale fashion. Additional Government spending, without a corresponding tax increase, will help to stimulate the economy.

Mr. Ash had previously disclosed that the budget, which will go to Congress Feb. 4, would move a little above \$300-billion, about a \$30-billion increase from the current 1974 fiscal year. It will probably show an estimated deficit in the neighborhood of \$10-billion.

Of the \$30-billion increase in spending, he

said in the interview, about \$20-billion will be in "uncontrollable" programs such as Social Security and veterans benefits, where the scale of payments is fixed by law and the total spent depends on the number of persons on the rolls.

Of the remaining \$10-billion he continued, nearly all is equally beyond the Administration's control. It includes such items as pay increases for both the military and civilian personnel of the Government to keep up with inflation, and the impact of inflation in increasing "unit costs" of other programs, meaning more dollar outlay for the same program level of activity.

The spending total in the new budget will not be swollen significantly by new programs except for the previously disclosed doubling of outlays for energy research. The expected new health insurance program, for example, will not affect spending until after the fiscal year 1975.

LAWNDALE, CALIF.'S MAN AND WOMAN OF THE YEAR; FRED KNIGHTON AND MABEL McCULLEY

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 26, the city of Lawndale, Calif. will honor two fine citizens as its man and woman of the year. Both Mabel McCulley and Fred Knighton have truly deserved these accolades, for these people are examples of what an individual can do to make a difference.

Fred Knighton has the distinction of being the first non-Rotarian ever nominated by the Lawndale Rotary Club for this high honor. In fact, Fred is an Optimist—and a leader in this outstanding service organization. He has been president, vice president, director of pro-

grams, and chairman of the Optimist Club of Lawndale and now serves as vice president and director of the Optimist Home for Boys.

His energy is seemingly boundless and his achievements legion. He was president of the Lawndale Breakfast Club and chairman of the Jane Adams Memorial Wall project. He has been active in the Lawndale Chamber of Commerce, serving in every capacity from director to fundraiser for every conceivable civic event. His artistic talents were brought into play as he designed the chamber of commerce emblem and Lawndale's map.

Fred's philanthropy knows no bounds. Asked by the sheriff's department to assist during emergencies, Fred has pulled many a stranded motorist from flooded waters and serves as the official photographer and official witness for the law enforcement agency. To Fred, time is not money but value, and he has unstintingly devoted his energies to helping others achieve more happiness in their lives. He has donated the bird of paradise plants for Lawndale's main street areas and barbecues for the all city picnic; he has spent countless hours helping cheer senior citizens and the ill.

The Rotary Club, in nominating Fred Knighton for this award, said:

No one is worthy enough to write about the contributions of another. The measure of life, after all, is not its duration, but its donation. Lawndale would be much less a place if it was not for Fred Knighton.

In nominating Mabel McCulley as Lawndale's Woman of the Year, the Rotary Club wrote:

This wife and mother of two sons and two daughters moved to Lawndale nearly 27 years ago and our community hasn't been the same since.

For aside from the scouting and PTA

activities in which Mabel serves so actively that she was given an honorary life membership and Continuing Service Award from two PTA's, Mabel's civic work has been far reaching and imaginative. Twenty-two years ago she joined the Monday Eves, Jr. Women's Club where she soon was elected president; under her leadership, "Operation Skyrocket," a free public fireworks display at Alondra Park, was initiated.

While continuing her active work with this organization, she directed her energies to youngsters. Besides her continuous work with the PTA over a 22-year period, she has served on the Centinela Valley High School Advisory Council for the last 3 years and as chaperone for Leuzinger High grad night celebration.

This last December, Mabel helped bake and deliver 78 birthday cakes for the lonely youngsters at Juvenile Hall. And she has chaired the Lawndale Angel Tree program during the last 4 years, a program which funds Christmas baskets for over 500 needy people each year. Were it not for Mabel McCulley, thousands of lives would be the poorer and, because of her selfless efforts, she has earned the respect of the community and the joyous love of children.

Ever generous with her time, Mabel has served on nearly every door-to-door campaign—from the United Way to the March of Dimes. Her husband, Howard, a successful and hard-working businessman beams with pride as he says:

I don't care if Mabel is away sometimes at dinner. I would learn to cook if it meant some hungry kid could eat.

The Rotary Club calls Mabel "Lawndale's First Lady." By means of her commitment to others and sensitivity to their needs, she has well earned the honor of being named Lawndale's Woman of the Year.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 23, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Acquaint now thyself with God and be at peace; therefore good shall come unto thee.—Job 22: 21.*

Almighty God, who art the Creator and the Sustainer of all mankind, without whose benediction our labor is in vain and with whose blessing our good efforts are crowned with success, we pray that our lives and the life of our Nation may be built upon the rock of truth and love and may this rock be the foundation upon which every American lives his life, molds his character, develops his faith, and increases his love for our beloved land.

Guide with Thy gracious spirit these Representatives of our people and all who work with them. May they now and ever look to Thee who art the source of all true wisdom and from Thee receive strength for daily duties, courage to do the right, and faith to live with love at the center of life.

Give to each one of us a mind open to the truth, a heart sensitive to human need, a spirit that seeks to be understanding, and a will ready to do what is noble and good.

In the spirit of Him who dared to live by His faith we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 413. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the House and Senate on Wednesday, January 30, 1974, to receive the President of the United States.

### ENERGY PROBLEM

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on returning to Washington I can report that my people are demanding answers to the energy problem. They are shocked and alarmed by incredible inflation and scarcity. There is widespread skepticism as to the real extent of the shortage. Mr. Speaker, I propose that we establish a Special House Energy Investigation Committee. This special committee could look into every aspect of the situation, including whether or not a shortage has been manipulated and whether or not there has been hoarding, profiteering and black-marketeering.