

Monday, next, it stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order on Tuesday next, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 12 o'clock noon, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ENERGY ACT ON TUESDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next, the Senate resume the consideration of the conference report on the National Emergency Energy Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President,

I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 24, 1974, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1070) to implement the international convention relating to intervention on the high seas in cases of oil pollution casualties, 1969.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will not be in session tomorrow. On Monday the Senate will convene at the hour of 12 o'clock noon. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, following which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each, the period to extend not beyond 30 minutes. At the conclusion of routine morning business the Senate will resume its consideration of calendar order No. 471, S. 2686, the so-called Legal Services Act. Yea-and-nay votes are expected to occur thereon. The distinguished majority leader has indicated that sometime in the afternoon there may be a disposition to move to go into executive session to begin debate on the Genocide Convention.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 1974

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:25 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 28, 1974, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Thomas O. Enders, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service Officer of Class one, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

James R. Cowan, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Richard S. Wilbur, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Curtis Marshall Dann, of Delaware, to be Commissioner of Patents, vice Robert Gottschalk, resigned.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Arthur S. Flemming, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Commission on Civil Rights, vice Maurice B. Mitchell, resigned.

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY

John Eger, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, vice George Frank Mansur, Jr., resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LIKE FATHER LIKE SON

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout the years, Bergen County, N.J., has produced many fine athletes. Citizens of the county have been continually afforded the opportunity to witness an outstanding brand of interscholastic sports. Today, however, I would like to focus our attention on the achievements of one family in particular—the Calabrese family, of Cliffside Park.

Presently, high school senior Tom Calabrese is enjoying a splendid season on the basketball courts, leading Cliffside Park High School's attack. Tom is presently considered to be one of the finest scholastic basketball players in the country and his sensational shooting has caught the attention of many college coaches.

However, Tom is not the first Calabrese to shine on the courts. His older brother Gerry was also an outstanding basketball player at Cliffside Park. And his father, Gerard, Sr., now mayor of

Cliffside Park with a record of dedicated service to his community, county, and State, was an all-America basketball selection at New York City's St. John's University before playing with the Syracuse Nationals of the National Basketball Association.

An interesting article highlighting the achievements of the Calabrese family appeared January 8 in the New York Times. I would like to take this opportunity to share this article with my colleagues as it is a fine tribute to the dedication and community commitment of one individual family:

NEW JERSEY SPORTS: IN FAMILY TRADITION

The name Calabrese has had a familiar ring in Bergen County for many years. A few years back, it appeared with regularity in the box scores of college and then professional basketball games.

Today, that name is drawing much attention even from points beyond Bergen County, where young Tom Calabrese is performing brilliantly on the court for Cliffside Park High.

College scouts are eager to land the 6-foot senior for a career starting in September. One basketball magazine has rated Tom among the 15 best players in the nation.

The young guard is scoring about 33 points a game, his rate for last year, on a wide assortment of moves and a rather accurate

jump shot from up to 22 feet. He has worked hard and long to achieve his success—and he has had quite an impressive crew to follow.

His father, Gerard Sr., is the mayor of Cliffside Park. He was quite an athlete, too.

STRONG TIES TO BASKETBALL

The senior Calabrese gained all-America honors at St. John's University in New York City before joining the Syracuse Nationals of the National Basketball Association. Tom's older brother, Gerry, also played three years at Cliffside Park, the last one with a 20-point average. And an uncle used to coach high school basketball.

"It's something he just naturally fell into," said Bart Talamini, the Cliffside coach, of Tom. "Hard work and determination have made him excel. If he grew a little, I feel he could be a professional."

Tom is the shooting guard in Cliffside's offense, a role which has allowed him to score more than 1,500 points and become the school's career scoring leader. Last season, he connected on 284 of 316 attempts from the foul line. This season he's shooting 50 per cent from the floor.

With all the glory, Tom has continued his quiet mannerism. "Sometimes he's so quiet, you would not know he's there," said Talamini. "And he shies away from publicity."

TOM'S FINEST MOMENT

A recent game Cliffside played with its rival, Englewood, was not completed because of a problem with the court floor, Tom

scored 35 points before play was suspended with nearly two minutes remaining.

In one sense it was an individual battle between Calabrese and Englewood's superstar, 6-8 Tom Willoughby, who eventually fouled out. Calabrese guarded the taller boy, who plays a guard-forward spot, holding him to 10 points in the first half.

And Englewood, rated the best in the county, was trailing by 3 points when time was called.

Tom drives well and has the body control to get off shots while in the air. His leaping brings him above the rim. He'll be missed when he graduates, but, like the other Calabreses, not forgotten.

WHAT THEY PREACH, BUT DON'T PRACTICE

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a highly interesting editorial was carried in the January issue of the American Rifleman. It accurately portrays the extreme partisanship shown by the Washington Post for leftist causes and for accompanying issues such as depriving law-abiding citizens of the right to own weapons, even for their own defense in crime-ridden Washington.

Interestingly, it portrays the different attitude shown by the Post when its own representatives defy the myriad antigun laws which have been imposed on Washington by the city government. It all depends on whose ox is being gored.

The editorial is worth reading. It is entitled "What They Preach, But Don't Practice," and I submit it for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT THEY PREACH, BUT DON'T PRACTICE

Violence in America takes its strongest news media form in *The Washington Post* Company's outbursts against firearms. Few media can match the virulence of this organization's anti-gun campaigning on the air and in print.

So it is interesting to note in passing that not all of its newsmen practice what *The Washington Post* and its anti-gun television station, WTOF, constantly preach.

A *Washington Post* reporter was arrested some time ago on a charge of carrying a concealed firearm "within a few blocks of the White House," as the *Post* is fond of saying sinisterly in other gun connections. He got off with a small fine, his newspaper published a very small news item about it, and that presumably was that.

More recently, Washington, D.C., police responded to a midnight call about gunfire in the 1500-unit Van Ness Apartments and arrested a newswoman from the *Post's* WTOF-TV. As the *Post* reported it, the newswoman fired a .357 Magnum revolver "several times" in his backyard. As another Washington paper reported it, neighbors counted "up to 18 rounds." That's a lot of shooting in a dense residential area.

The TV newswoman explained that he was upset by the death of his father three weeks earlier, "had never owned a gun and never wanted one," but brought the .357 revolver back from Richmond, Va., because it had belonged to his dad. He apologized on a TV newscast that evening. Washington police allowed him to forfeit \$25 collateral and, though the revolver was unregistered, marked the case closed. Federal authorities

said they were "looking into the matter," as it involved acquiring a firearm in another State and transporting it across State lines.

USING OVER-THE-COUNTER INTELLIGENCE MAKES GOOD SENSE

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased this week to observe on television and in the newspapers the leading edge of a long overdue drug education campaign.

Using National Pharmacy Week as the kickoff time, the American Pharmaceutical Association has begun a year long program urging the public to consult the pharmacist before selecting nonprescription drugs. APhA offers the "over-the-counter intelligence" of its membership to help people avoid the health hazards of drug interactions and improper use.

As a physician, I understand the need for caution in selecting and using many of the hundreds of thousands of nonprescription medications on the market today. Many members of the general public do not know, for example, that certain common antacids block the effect of a frequently prescribed antibiotic; or that aspirin or aspirin containing compounds can be harmful to the patient with an ulcer. There are many other situations in which an existing condition or the use of a prescription drug can make the use of a drug obtained over-the-counter a threat to the patient's health.

Also as a physician, I am pleased that the pharmacists have accepted the responsibility of helping to safeguard patients by freely offering their time and expert knowledge to patients wanting to self-medicate. I believe that a person has the right to get rid of his headaches, try to relieve his upset stomach or treat other minor ailments without rushing to his physician. However, I also believe that he has a right to expert counsel in selecting self-medication.

The label is not big enough to tell everything a patient needs to know about nonprescription drugs. It does not list, as a rule, prescription/nonprescription drug interactions or all chronic conditions for which the drug is contraindicated, nor does it explain the need to vary dosage in connection with age, weight, sex, or general condition of health. These are things that the pharmacist understands and can explain to the patient.

I have long admired the work of pharmacists like my good friend from Topeka, Jake Miller. Jake understands, as I do, that the pharmacist plays an important role in the health care delivery system of this country and is a valuable link between the physician and his patient. The patient may not inform his physician of treatment by another physician, probably a specialist. He may not tell of medication prescribed by his dentist. More likely still, the patient will not call his physician before purchasing a nonprescription drug.

It is the community pharmacist who sees the patient when he enters the pharmacy each time and who, when consulted, can ask the right questions and provide the right cautions.

I wish Jake Miller, his colleagues in the Kansas Pharmaceutical Association and the APhA every success in getting their message across in the coming year. Using over-the-counter intelligence makes good sense.

A POEM IN HONOR OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY BY MR. GEORGE VICTOR, POET LAUREATE OF THE 19TH OHIO CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in these times of crisis, Americans are looking to the future with doubt and pessimism. But it was only a dozen years ago that a spirit of optimism and hope was sweeping across America. The man largely responsible for this mood was our idealistic young President, John F. Kennedy.

If we stop and reflect upon some of the goals that President Kennedy stood for, the clouds of gloom that hang over this great land of ours may begin to lift.

I would like to take this opportunity, therefore, to insert in the RECORD a poem written by one of my constituents, Mr. George Victor, which speaks of the goals of our late President, John F. Kennedy:

HIS GOAL

As time and tide have passed the last decade—
Many, Many changes have been made—
But still the memory of the great J.F.K.
Is here as if the past were here today.

He held the hopes of all in highest esteem—
And we as humans should prevail to prove
his dream—
The world to have peace—Liberty—freedom
from fear—
Were some of the goals he held so dear—
So as the decade has raced through our life—
We as people should take up a knife—
Not to kill or maim or slay
But to cut all strings that hold human life
at bay—
Yes at this hallowed time of the year
We should strive to eliminate fear.
Strive with all the power we can as humans
collect—
To build in his memory—a memorial erect.
All countries—all folks—should as unity
can—
Bring to this earth—the goal of that man.

Our President, yes—but also the world's
son—
Who only wanted health and freedom for
everyone—
Who as he strived to bring humanity to face
The pitfalls and recessions of the human
race
Was slain by the act of an inane fool—
Using an arm of foolish wars tool.

Now as I sit on this day a decade past—I
myself will try to help bring a love—
that will forever last—
Dedicate myself to achieve all goals in his
name
Please, oh please world won't you join me
in his wonderful game—
Called Brotherly Love

BUCKLEY SPEAKS OUT FOR LIFE

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, as I noted on the floor 2 days ago, the thousands of Americans who marched on the Capitol to demonstrate their concern for all human life were only a small representative sample of the millions more throughout the Nation. Rallies and demonstrations against last year's Supreme Court decision on abortion were held throughout the land.

After speaking to those assembled here in Washington on Tuesday, Senator BUCKLEY, who has emerged as the Senate leader in the fight for the unborn, left for Philadelphia, where he addressed the Pennsylvanians United for Life. I would like to share some of his remarks with my colleagues and I include them at this point in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM SENATOR JAMES L. BUCKLEY'S RIGHT TO LIFE SPEECH

At the heart of this issue lies a fundamental choice between two wholly opposed understandings of what it means to be truly human. On the one side we confront the so-called "new medical ethic" in which the dignity and sanctity of the person is sacrificed upon the altar of social utility; and on the other hand we behold more than two thousand years of humane wisdom and a tradition which teaches that every child conceived in his mother's womb has the right to be born.

I am often asked: Senator, what is it that we can do, now? What can we do that will best advance our cause? That is not quite so easy to answer as you might at first think, for there is so much to be done, and all of us, I know, feel that most of it ought to have been last week, or last month, or last year.

First, as the old radio pitchmen used to say, keep those cards and letters coming. I can report to you that in the immediate aftermath of the Court's decisions in January of 1973, mail to my colleagues in the House and Senate was very heavy and overwhelmingly pro-life. . . . I am sure you realize how important a factor it is in political making. A substantial flow of individually-written letters is one of the most sensitive political barometers as to the intensity and breadth of public feeling on any given issue. I would suggest to you, therefore, that you write to your Senators and Congressmen, not just once, but often; make it a habit to sit down every week and write a note to one or the other expressing your concern and urging him to support the Human Life Amendments. By such action you will be informing him that this is no ordinary issue, that his actions are being observed, that his letters are being read, and that you expect him to be frank and forthright in stating his views.

If he agrees, welcome him warmly to the ranks; if he disagrees, seek to convince him again and again and again by reasoned argument. But whatever his views, you must remind him that you are out there, that you are vigilant, that you intend to see this thing through, that the defense of the unborn is more important to you than taxes or inflation or a host of other problems that impinge upon our daily lives.

Secondly, let me charge you with another simple duty. Not so simple as the first, and yet well within the reach of most of you. The charge is simply this: that each of you leave here tonight with the firm resolve

during the next month to bring just one other person into active involvement with the pro-life movement. As all of you are aware, there are many, many millions of persons who are no less shocked by the Court's ruling, no less horrified by the toleration of easy abortion than you are. And yet, many millions of these same people have not yet been activated, have not yet been encouraged to take that *extra* step, not yet aware that what they do can make all the difference in the world. Plan, then, to go back to your neighborhoods and towns and select just one other person—more if you have the time and talent and try during the next month to get him or her actively involved on behalf of life. And urge each recruit in turn to enlist another, so that the ranks of those actively involved in the struggle to protect life will truly reflect the vast public opposition to the abortion-on-demand mandated by a transient majority on the Supreme Court.

In a larger, more political sense, there is another undertaking that can and must be pursued. This is the effort to get your state legislatures to petition Congress for the enactment of a Human Life Amendment. This, of necessity, will require a larger-scale enterprise than the first two suggestions I have made. But it is an effort that will have a powerful influence upon those in Congress who will be making the ultimate decisions. Fifteen states, as you know, have already memorialized Congress, and the effort is underway in a number of other states. Where that effort is in progress, join it, encourage others to support it; and where it is not yet underway, work with your state and local leaders in the movement and in political office to formulate a plan of attack. What we are asking, is that we the people be entitled to judge so important a matter, that the matter of life and death is too important to be left to the arbitrary discretion of doctors and judges. The disastrous Supreme Court decisions nullified the abortion laws of all fifty states, and the ethical heritage of more than twenty centuries of Western enlightenment. Surely the *people* are entitled through the cumbersome political process of a constitutional amendment to determine for themselves whether the country shall in fact repudiate its historic commitment to the sanctity of human life. I have every hope that your legislators will listen, just as I know that those in Congress will be impressed by the voice of the people as expressed through their elected state representatives.

Fourth, it is vitally important that you learn to be as persuasive as possible in presenting our cause to your friends and neighbors, in letters-to-the-editor, in letters to your representatives. Master the facts, and you will puncture the myth and dispel the fears spread by the abortionists. A truly informed public will rally in defense of life. In November of 1972, after months of debate, the voters of Michigan and North Dakota overwhelmingly rejected proposals for liberalizing their abortion laws, by majorities of 3-to-2 in Michigan and 3-to-1 in North Dakota.

Perhaps the most flamboyantly vicious myth of them all is the one that says that the concern for unborn life is somehow the unique preoccupation of the 21% of Americans who are Roman Catholic, and who are intent on imposing their narrowly-sectarian moral standards on a helpless American majority. The relentless attempt to tag opposition to abortion as a uniquely Catholic issue is as vicious as it is false; vicious because it plays on hidden fears and latent prejudice; and false because every fact belies the assertion. Those who make the charge ignore the findings of the University of Michigan study which demonstrates that a clear majority of each Protestant denomination opposes abortion-on-demand. They ignore the referendum of 1972 in Michigan and North Dakota. They ignore the fact that of the

nine Senate sponsors of my Human Life Amendment, seven are Protestant. They ignore the fact that many of the most dedicated and articulate defenders of life are Protestants and Jews. No, the commitment to life is not narrowly sectarian; it is as broad as this land, and as deep as our nation's historic commitment to human dignity.

In the weeks ahead, we will, I pray, be moving toward hearings in the Senate. Your efforts in your states and communities will have a great bearing on the work of Congress. In the Senate we will continue to do our part—and let me take this opportunity before this gathering to thank my colleagues in the Senate who have so courageously and selflessly dedicated themselves to this great effort. Let me mention them by name, for I want you to remember them, and, as occasion permits, to thank them for their moral courage. First, my distinguished friend and colleague from Oregon, Senator Mark O. Hatfield. From Iowa, Senator Harold Hughes. From Utah, Senator Wallace Bennett. From Oklahoma, Senator Dewey Bartlett. From Nebraska, Senator Carl Curtis. From North Dakota, Senator Milton Young. From North Carolina, Senator Jesse Helms. And from Mississippi, the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, Senator James O. Eastland.

These men have stood forth. They have borne witness for life. And they will ever stand for life. For yours, for mine, for our children's, for the very life of this nation. But their efforts will come to nought, unless you resolve to see this thing through, unless you and your friends and neighbors join together to undo the damage that has been done and will be done to the moral fiber of this country.

And let us not deceive ourselves. What is called the "abortion issue" transcends those evils associated with abortion. We are indeed concerned with the moral fiber of the country.

Do I exaggerate? It would not seem so, judging from articles that have appeared in newspapers in recent months. There would appear to be a totally different attitude toward the sacredness of life among growing sections of the medical world, an attitude best summed up by the term "the new medical ethic," but best understood by reading and hearing what that ethic means in human terms.

We read of the Director of Newborn Services in a large hospital in the Eastern United States stating that "There are babies . . . who have severe deformities noncompatible with human life" and that therefore he and his colleagues must make life-death decisions for these babies every two or three weeks, by either granting or withholding life-sustaining treatment. "Noncompatible with human life" is a term so grotesque in its blend of antiseptic scientism and ethical idiocy that it sounds as if it were taken from Orwell's *1984*.

Then there is the Pediatric surgeon at Johns Hopkins University who says that "there are many things worse than death" for deformed babies and therefore he and his colleagues should be given the right to decide for the baby whether or not death is preferable.

It should not be surprising, given such attitudes as I have just described, that last year a University of Maryland professor informed a meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association that the federal government should issue or withhold, depending upon its judgment, licenses to those who wish to become parents. I want to quote this gentleman's attitude toward the sacredness of life: "We cannot afford the luxury of any fool adding to our numbers at any time."

Over thirty years ago Winston Churchill spoke of the monstrous evils that would result from the totalitarian application of a

"perverted science." It seems clear that advocates of such a science, devoid of ethical standards, possessed of immense power and prestige and to a large extent supported by taxpayers' dollars are succeeding beyond the dreams of those enemies of civilization of whom Churchill spoke during the dark years of World War II. The voice of the new medical ethic is the voice of science; but the message is the message of philosophical barbarism.

Let it be said that because of you, at an hour of great peril to the nation's moral life, the American people rededicated themselves to the proposition that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by the Creator with inalienable rights, the greatest of which is the right to life.

**MUTUAL BROADCASTING'S BILL
GREENWOOD PRESS CLUB VICE
PRESIDENT**

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the National Press Club is known and respected as one of the most prestigious press clubs in the world. Its membership reads like a "Who's Who" of American journalism.

Little doubt then that those of us from Florida are proud of the honor conferred upon one of our own in being elected vice president of the National Press Club for the coming year.

He is Bill Greenwood, 31, chief congressional correspondent for the Mutual Broadcasting System. It is interesting to note that he has also been named vice president of the Radio-TV Correspondents' Association, the first to hold both positions simultaneously.

Serving his fourth term as a member of the standing committee of correspondents of the House and Senate Radio-TV Galleries, he is a native of Jacksonville, Fla. He attended Florida State University and then American University in Washington where he received his B.A. degree.

Bill began his broadcasting career at 13 in Jacksonville Beach, Fla. He was a television anchorman while attending FSU, Station WFSU-TV, and worked in radio stations in Tallahassee and Jacksonville before moving to Washington in 1966.

Since arriving in the Capital City, he has become a familiar figure on the Hill, covering the Congress for the national educational radio network, UPI, and now Mutual Broadcasting.

His daily newscast is originated live from the House Radio Gallery and is heard on more than 600 radio stations. His is the only regularly scheduled live program from Capitol Hill.

He has covered the past two Presidential campaigns, national nominating conventions, and inaugurations and was the only broadcaster to provide live coverage of the funeral services for President Harry Truman. As the network pool reporter, his broadcasts were carried on all of the Nation's networks—ABC, CBS, NBC, and Mutual.

Greenwood's family lives in Jacksonville, Fla. He is married to the former Marsha Sheppard.

Bill Greenwood is a respected newsman and a credit to his profession. I value his friendship and admire his professionalism.

All of us who know Bill are delighted that the National Press Club membership has decided to confer this leadership role upon him. I know from past experience that he will do an outstanding job.

A POSITIVE APPROACH

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in the present era of change and challenge, we are again reminded that men and women of sound vision, possessing a firm faith in the ultimate goodness of mankind, indeed, constitute our country's greatest asset.

Such a man is William H. McMurren, the president and chief executive officer of Morrison-Knudsen Co., one of the Nation's largest corporations, with home offices in my own State of Idaho.

In his company's monthly publication, the M-Kayan, Bill McMurren recently devoted a few well-chosen words to the energy crisis and related events. His remarks evidence the kind of thinking that has made him one of America's most successful executives. I am inserting his remarks in the RECORD today so my colleagues and others may have the opportunity to read this most timely and important message:

REMARKS BY WILLIAM H. McMURREN

Some Americans seemingly have become so obsessed with the energy crisis and other disquieting headlines of the times that they are wallowing in gloom, if not predicting some sort of economic Armageddon. Such thinking is unreasonable.

There is no denying that we, as a nation, are confronted by problems.

There is no denying that a serious shortage of fuels and of certain materials and supplies does exist, and may continue for some time to come.

There is no denying that this nation, and others, have enjoyed an era of affluence that often has bordered on the profligate.

So we change our ways, even if it hurts.

What is wrong with adapting to realities? What is wrong with working harder, and doing more with less? What is wrong with applying a full measure of the resourcefulness, the technology and the versatility that have brought us this far and will carry us through again?

Any individual, any nation, is far better off when lean and self-sufficient than when fat, comfortable and dependent on others.

As construction contractors, we often are accused of being hopeless optimists (all the pessimists eventually go out of business). We readily admit to such optimism—based on realistic appraisals at this time of our company's situation both at home and abroad. In our view, what is needed right now is a massive infusion of national confidence—confidence in our country, in our system of government, in our future, and in ourselves.

THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, many believe that any legislation enacted by the Congress must preserve the traditional role of the press in bringing vital information to the attention of the public. An article which recently appeared in the Boston Globe, on January 20, addresses itself to this point, and for the review of my colleagues, I include the article:

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 20, 1974]

A BILL FOR THE RIGHT TO KNOW

A long and hard battle is still going on in the courts and legislatures to make secure the right of the American people to know. That right, so basic in a democracy, had been thought to be protected under the First Amendment until the US Supreme Court, in June, 1972, ruled in the Caldwell case that there was no absolute protection against the disclosure of confidential information when it was subpoenaed.

A number of cases since then have shown the great need for legislation: Last September a Federal court allowed lawyers for former Vice President Spiro Agnew to subpoena newsmen in an effort to track down news leaks about his legal problems. They could have gone to jail for refusing to disclose their news sources, and probably would have if Mr. Agnew had not nullified the effort by resigning on Oct. 10.

In another case, the highest court refused last October to hear the appeals of two Baton Rouge, La., newsmen from their convictions for defying a judge's gag order by saying it "could not withstand the faintest breeze emanating from the Constitution," but nevertheless let the convictions stand. Solicitor General Robert H. Bork agreed that reporters must obey a judge's gag order, even an illegal one. And Justice William O. Douglas was the only one of the nine Supreme Court Justices who thought the case was worthy of review.

In a third case, the highest court did agree recently to hear an appeal from a Florida Supreme Court ruling holding, 7-to-1, that a 1913 law which allows a politician free space for "any reply" to newspaper criticism of him was constitutional. A county judge had held the state cannot "assume the editorial function and direct a newspaper what to print."

But if the people's right to know has taken a pounding in some courts, some encouraging progress has been made in Congress. Recently a majority of the news media organizations, led by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, reached general agreement with a House Judiciary Subcommittee on a bill to protect newsmen and the people's right to know against forced disclosure of confidential information. In reaching it, subcommittee chairman Robert W. Kastenmeier (D-Wis.) and Cong. William S. Cohen (R-Me.) were particularly effective.

The agreement, which will be incorporated in amendments to be considered by the full Judiciary Committee, will result in considerable improvement of the so-called shield law proposal originally approved by the subcommittee last June.

First and foremost, the bill would provide that no newsmen could be required to disclose confidential information or its source to a Federal or state grand jury or in any pre-trial proceeding. In a trial itself, disclosure could be required only if the court were satisfied that the information was in-

dispensable to either side in the case, could not be obtained from any other source, and a compelling public interest was involved.

This follows, in general, the new guidelines laid down on the subject last year by then Atty. Gen. Elliot Richardson before he resigned in protest against the firing of Prof. Archibald Cox.

Instead of calling it "The Newsmen's Privilege Act" and thus emphasizing the protection of newsmen rather than of the public's right to obtain information, the bill would be entitled "The News Source and Information Protection Act." And that is all to the good.

The definition of "newsmen" would be broadened to include the electronic media and executives and corporate entities. And the privilege against disclosing a newsman's source would not apply when the newsman is a defendant in a civil defamation case.

The bill, we strongly believe, is a most necessary one for Congress to pass this year. We would have preferred to stand on the protection afforded by the First Amendment, but the US Supreme Court itself has made such a stand risky. And in the *Caldwell-Branzburg* cases, that court explicitly invited such Congressional legislation.

The question now is what course Congress will follow. If it heeds public opinion it will pass the bill, for a Gallup poll taken last October and published last Jan. 4 reported that 62 percent of those questioned agreed that newsmen should be protected from being forced to disclose confidential sources—a five percent increase over a similar poll in December, 1972, before most of the Watergate disclosures.

But while the public interest in knowing what goes on in government is tied directly to the freedom of the press to report what goes on, there are those in government, at both high and low levels of it, who do not want it reported. Hence the battle in Congress may be a hard one. But if the people let their Congressmen and Senators know how they feel, there is now an excellent prospect of enacting this necessary legislation.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 63

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent letter to Members of Congress, former Mayor John Lindsay said:

Police Commissioner Donald F. Cawley and I believe that nothing the Congress does in the coming year could be more important to the safety of our nation's police and law-abiding citizens than the enactment of stringent federal firearms control.

The report that Mr. Lindsay attached is a fairly complete documentation of the facts and figures involving handgun crimes. The report indicated that in 1972, more than 600 handgun crimes, including murder, robbery, and assault were committed each day.

I urge my colleagues to review their copy of Mr. Lindsay's study. It demonstrates conclusively that strong handgun control legislation must be passed by Congress as speedily as possible in this session.

Included below is an account of a handgun murder. The death of Tyrone Johnson, as reported in the January 12 Washington Post, could have been avoided if

strong gun control legislation was a fact instead of a dream:

YOUTH, 16, SLAIN AT DANCE IN NE

A 16-year-old Northeast Washington youth was shot through the heart and killed about midnight last night during an altercation at a dance at a Florida Avenue NE community center, police reported.

They said that Tyrone Johnson, of 1421 West Virginia Ave. NE was shot in or near the Martin Luther King Center in the 1300 block of Florida Ave. NE, as a dance there was letting out. He was pronounced dead on arrival at D.C. General Hospital at 12:40 a.m. today.

Police said that no arrests had been made as of early today.

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS: BUREAUCRATS GAIN, CITIZENS NIGHTMARE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I was opposed from the beginning to the imposition of wage and price controls on the American people. I warned then that such controls would lead to shortages and more regulation and intervention in the lives of every individual American. My warnings have now been fulfilled. We find ourselves with shortages not only of fuel but also such commodities as paper bags and numerous other materials. The Government is unable to fix prices and to maximize production. Once the Government does get involved in these areas, production goes down, shortages result, and gray and black markets begin to make their appearance.

In the December 31, 1973 issue of *Newsweek* the well known and respected economist, Milton Friedman, had an article entitled "Why Now?" Dr. Friedman presents some of the problems that have resulted from the numerous attempts at controlling prices. I urge my colleagues to give attention to this article. The text follows:

WHY NOW?

(By Milton Friedman)

"Running Out of Everything" was *Newsweek's* cover headline some weeks back. It dramatized the fact that, for the first time since World War II, the U.S. has begun to experience major shortages not only of petroleum products, but of a wide range of other items.

Of the many attempts to explain this state of affairs that I have seen in the media, not one faces up to the crucial question: Why now? Why did shortages not emerge in 1968 at the height of the Vietnam war, or in 1958, or for that matter in 1938 or 1928? What is different about 1973?

THE MIDEAST WAR, NO

The Mideast war is one obvious answer. The Arab boycott it unleashed has exacerbated the shortage of crude oil. But an energy shortage was well on its way before the Mideast war broke out. Government allocation of fuel was already on the way. And none of the other shortages owes anything to the Mideast war.

One popular answer—particularly for the energy crisis—is that consumption of energy has been increasing rapidly. But that has been going on for decades. Why should it have produced shortages only now?

The response is typically that we are run-

ning short of reserves of fossil fuel—that there are only ten or fifteen years of proven oil reserves, for example. But that too has been true for decades. In the 1920s, scare stories were being written about the danger that we would run out of oil because the then proven reserves would last for only ten or fifteen years. In the interim, consumption of crude oil has multiplied manyfold—and so have proven oil reserves. The fact is that it does not pay to find and prove more than about fifteen years' oil reserves at any time.

But this time, it is said, we are short of refining capacity? Perhaps so, but why now? How is it that until now, refining capacity was able to keep up with demand, but in the years 1971 to 1973 it was not?

The greedy, selfish oil interests? If, as is frequently charged, they have conspired to create a shortage profitable to themselves, why have they been so slow? They are no more powerful now than they have been for many years. Why did they wait so long before squeezing the hapless consumer? And how do they make profits by having no oil to sell? By full-page advertisements urging consumers to economize on fuel? This is simply the irrational search for a devil.

The answer to "Why now?" is straightforward—yet I know from bitter experience how hard it is to persuade anyone other than an economist that so simple an answer can be correct. Nineteen seventy-three is different from other peacetime years because, for the first time since World War II, the U.S. has had extensive price and wage controls. The key to today's shortages is the price freeze ordered by President Nixon on Aug. 15, 1971.

Has fuel oil been especially short? Aug. 15, 1971, was summertime. It will surprise no one that fuel-oil prices are generally lower in the summer than in the winter. The result of freezing prices at summertime levels was to make gasoline more profitable to produce than fuel oil. Has pipe been hard to get for drilling new wells? As it happened, the controlled prices for pipe and flat steel made it more profitable to produce flat steel.

PRICE CONTROLS, YES

I am not enough of an expert—no one is—to know the million and one places where prices fixed by bureaucrats on the basis of arbitrary rules and accidental starting points have created distortions and shortages. Some have been dramatic, like the beef shortage and the destruction of baby chickens. But most have not been. They are hidden in the interstices of an incredibly complex production system that cannot operate without the enormous efficiency of a market-price system to adapt changing demands to changing supplies. And many have been overcome by millions of citizens who found ways to avoid or evade the price controls.

I know that it is hard for you to believe that so seemingly simple a matter as price fixing can produce so complex a phenomenon as widespread shortages. But then, I find it hard to believe that an automobile engine is a complex matter until I start probing around in its innards when it stops functioning on a dark road in the early hours of the morning.

At any rate, if this is not the answer, what is? In what other respect—pervasive enough to produce the pervasive effect we see—is 1973 different from earlier peacetime years?

ST. JUDE HOUSE

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, St. Jude House in Jamaica Plain, Mass., has

served many Boston residents who suffer from alcoholism. Their fine work was recently singled out for particular praise by the U.S. Jaycees Foundation. I am pleased to share their letter with my colleagues:

PROJECT UPLIFT,
U.S. JAYCEES FOUNDATION,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1974.

Mr. THOMAS W. DINEEN,
St. Jude House,
Jamaica Plain, Mass.

DEAR MR. DINEEN: It is with great pleasure that I am able to inform you, on behalf of the U.S. Jaycee Foundation, that the Saint Jude House has been selected as one of the country's most outstanding self-help programs.

You were chosen as a part of a four month nationwide study, administered as Project UPLIFT for the U.S. Jaycee Foundation. Entries came from over 900 self-help programs, many pointing the way to new kinds of community-initiated, community-run activities, and illustrative of "what people themselves can do."

The final selection was a difficult one. However, the Board of Review, research analysts and Project UPLIFT staff were impressed with your initiative and success in bringing positive change to the low income community you serve.

It is the belief of Project UPLIFT that if this kind of innovative program can be brought to other economically and socially isolated communities, the devastating effects of poverty may be more readily overcome.

On behalf of the U.S. Jaycee Foundation, I congratulate the Saint Jude House and hope that through the recognition of your success other low income communities will benefit from your experiences.

Wishing you continued success, I remain
Sincerely,

SUSAN DAVIS, Project Director.

A SALUTE TO THE NATIONAL ATHLETIC HEALTH INSTITUTE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House a new, nonprofit organization dedicated to the research and development of new techniques and equipment in the area of sports medicine and recreation health.

One of the primary goals of the National Athletic Health Institute, Inc., is a thorough and objective nationwide study of the status of young athletes from sandlot to campus; the quality of their equipment, playing conditions, medical care, injury records, and rehabilitation. An average of 14 American boys died each year between 1931 and 1965 in sandlot and high school football. In Little League, some estimate that up to 100,000 boys develop chronic elbow strain in a single year and physicians have often traced crippling deformities to injuries incurred while playing high school sports. In my judgment, these figures certainly point out a need for concern and for making athletics safer for young people.

With the growing awareness of the relationship between good health and physical exercise, and with a growing

participation in sports by Americans, there is a growing need for research and education in the area of sports medicine. For example, last year there were over 17 million Americans injured in sports and recreation and all too many of these injuries—some of which are permanent and severe disabilities—could have been prevented. We have learned, for instance, that very personal factors determine both the kind and amount of exercise that one should take, and the capability for exercise varies widely among individuals because of genetic and adaptive factors. With weekend athletes multiplying, it is time to make available the means of testing individual needs for exercise and individual limits beyond which it can be dangerous.

Among the board of directors, which includes Vice President Ford and the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BURKE), is Mr. Keizo Saji, chairman of Suntory Ltd., Osaka, Japan, who expressed the hope that this program could also become international in scope, which aside from the benefits in the area of health, would certainly enhance our understanding and communications with other nations through a common and worthwhile effort.

I commend the goals of the National Athletic Health Institute and I wish them every success in their effort to improve the health and safety of every American who participates in sports or physical activity.

QUIE LAUDS FINAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FINANCING OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, today, after 14 months of hard work, the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education made its final report to the President and the Congress.

We created this Commission in the Education Amendments of 1972. If one thing was clear from 2 years of effort on that legislation, it was the shockingly low quality of information about the financing of secondary education—institutional as well as general industrywide information. This report goes a long way toward filling the gap.

It was a good decision on our part to require the appointment of four Members of Congress to serve with 13 others appointed by the President. I commend the work of Representatives JOHN DELLENBACK and JOHN BRADEMAs and Senators J. GLENN BEALL and WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY. They will add a new dimension of expertise to the work of the committees which must now scrutinize the report and begin a thorough evaluation of present and proposed Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, although none of us has had the time to digest this 400-page report, I would like to point out a few highlights:

First. The report has the most concise presentation of current sources of revenue and expenditures for postsecondary education that I have seen. This in itself will help local, State, and Federal policymakers better understand the big and complex picture.

Second. This Commission has done the hard development work on a rather sophisticated analytical model to evaluate all the many financing schemes we hear about in a way that allows some meaningful comparison. I hope researchers in education will begin at once to further refine this most useful tool.

Third. The Commission concluded that the national objectives it identified are not now seriously jeopardized because of the financial difficulties of many individual institutions. But it identified warning signs and made significant suggestions on how we might measure the financial health of postsecondary education in the future.

Fourth. Guidelines are presented that should move us toward the day when we can develop meaningful cost-per-student data for various segments of postsecondary education.

Fifth. After analyzing a wide variety of funding strategies, the Commission concluded that targeting Federal assistance on needy students is the best strategy to achieve the goal of equal access to further education and to maintain a viable private sector—two of our highest objectives. In other words, the Commission's analysis seems strongly to confirm the high priority many of us have placed on fully funding the basic education opportunity grant program.

Sixth. Finally, the Commission left us the fruits of its efforts to collect the most complete data files possible on over 10,000 institutions of postsecondary education. Government agencies, researchers, educational institutions, and the Congress should have easy access by remote terminals to this computerized information.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us in Congress congratulate the members of this Commission for a job well done. We must now move forward, in cooperation with local and State governments and representatives of all segments of postsecondary education to develop a more cohesive long-range policy of financing postsecondary education, one that identifies the different roles to be played by each major source of funding this \$30 billion and growing enterprise.

LEGISLATION TO REPEAL DAY-LIGHT SAVING TIME

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 I introduced legislation which would repeal Public Law 93-148 which established year round daylight saving time. I did so because the large majority of the people in the Third Congressional District of Tennessee are profoundly

disturbed at the effect this legislation has had on their lives.

Many students have written me that they have been forced to abandon part time jobs after school because of later opening hours for classes. The family transportation schedule is completely disrupted in other cases. One family wrote that the father had to be at work at 8 a.m. while the children did not go to school until 10 a.m. Classes then dismissed at a time which threw the children into the evening rush hour of traffic.

School athletes write they no longer have time for regular after school practice sessions. Many other extra curricular activities have had to be curtailed. Teachers complain because they also have families. They have to get meals for those who leave home early in the morning and try to have some semblance of schedule late afternoon and early night. With the change in school schedules there is no time to relax in many instances. Children have no time for lessons in piano and dancing is another complaint. One teacher complains that her husband goes to work at 7 a.m. and gets off at 3:30 p.m., while she must be at school at 10 a.m. and gets out at 5:15 p.m.

Another parent says she feeds her child at 7 a.m. in the morning with the rest of the family but the child does not have lunch until 2 p.m. and is famished by that time. Other children who eat just before they leave for school have lunch at 12 which makes the two meals too close together. Schoolbus schedules have become most complicated. The superintendent of schools decided the time change was absolutely necessary for the safety of the children. Even so, they have to pick up a few children in the dark in order to get the high school students there by 10 a.m. This information all came from city schools. Out in the rural areas it is even worse where bus routes are much longer.

I find this difficult to justify. It has not been demonstrated to my satisfaction that all this inconvenience is balanced by a significant savings in energy. My bill simply proposes a return to time as it has been over the past years.

NATIONAL APATHY ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the year 1973 was one of great turbulence and tragedy for this Nation. The erratic state of our economy drove thousands of Americans to the brink of poverty; Watergate and its related scandals have left an indelible mark on this administration and its ability to govern. Yet for one particular group in this Nation, the hundreds of widows and family members of our law enforcement personnel killed in action, 1973 was an especially tragic year.

Recent end-of-year statistics issued by

the Federal Bureau of Investigation confirm the true extent of this tragedy. During this past year, 131 police and other law enforcement personnel were killed in the line of duty. This figure represents the highest total ever recorded in the time the FBI has maintained these records.

What do these figures represent beyond mere statistics? In a very human sense they are translated into hundreds of women and children becoming premature widows and orphans as the result of the depraved acts on the part of sick and desperate criminals. Yet these figures signify even more. They show that 131 gallant and dedicated individuals met violent and untimely deaths as a result of merely trying to uphold law and order in the United States.

These killings are further symptoms of a disease which continues to infest this Nation, namely a disregard and disrespect for the police. While it is true that the actual killings are done by a small group of people, the lack of response on the part of the overall nation to these outrages is indicative of a deeper malaise.

Ironically, this national apathy is balanced against polls which show that most Americans are in support of the police due to the recognition that crime is the No. 1 problem facing us today. In a recent poll conducted in New York City, an overwhelming 63 percent of all persons questioned indicated that crime was the issue of greatest concern to them. In contrast the high cost of living was chosen by only 20 percent.

During this past year, I have spoken out repeatedly against the senseless and brutal killing of policemen. Let me cite for you a vivid example of a police murder. In late December, an undercover policeman working in Silver Spring, Md., was shot to death as he attempted to make a cocaine buy from an alleged major dealer. The slain officer, 25-year-old William Conroy was shot repeatedly in the abdomen, despite the fact that he was unarmed. He died in a matter of minutes. Conroy's partner was also shot but fortunately recovered.

As a 23-year veteran of the New York City Police Department, I am particularly appalled at the killing of policemen. What can we as a nation do? First it is time to respond to the needs of the police, they need better protection from the lunatic fringe of the society.

We, as a nation, must realize that the inherent strength of a strong democracy rests with a strong and vibrant law enforcement system. One way to register this belief is through a nationwide reestablishment and revitalization of respect for the man in blue, as well as the understanding that they are serving our interests as well as those of our neighbors and families.

Already in 1974 policemen have been murdered. Yet despite this unfortunate beginning there are signs that 1974 will be a better year for law enforcement in this country. For one thing there is the recent Supreme Court decision which expanded the policeman's right to search suspected criminals. This will be its first full year of implementation, and it

should aid both police efficiency, as well as police safety.

A further aid to the cause of law enforcement is contained in legislation languishing in the House which will provide \$50,000 in death benefits for the widows and survivors of police killed in action. We must not compound the tragedies which those grieved widows and families of slain policemen face. Instead, we should act to insure their financial security.

Before 1973 passes on entirely, let us take its hard lessons. Law enforcement is essential for this Nation. The system was dealt a severe blow with the loss of 131 of its members. We must prevent this tragedy from happening again in 1974.

REMEMBER OUR MIA'S

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 27, 1974, marks the first anniversary of the signing of the Vietnamese peace agreement in Paris. On that date we were finally able to bring about a settlement in Southeast Asia and secure the release of our prisoners of war. I believe that I speak for the majority of Americans when I say I am glad that our military involvement in Vietnam finally ended.

Yet while we reflect upon our success let us not forget our servicemen who are still reported missing in action. There are approximately 1,138 MIA's, and we must continue our efforts to force the Hanoi government to tell us the truth about the lives of our servicemen.

On August 28, 1973, I wrote a letter to Henry Kissinger, then Secretary of State-designate, urging that it should be the highest diplomatic priority of this country to effect a complete accounting of all those servicemen who have served in Southeast Asia. I also wrote a letter to Le Duc Tho of North Vietnam in which I urged his government to reconsider its policy toward American servicemen missing in action and to allow search teams to make the necessary accounting.

Maj. Anthony Shine, the son of Mr. and Mrs. George W. Shine from Pleasantville, N.Y., is one of those who has been reported missing in action after being shot down over Laos in December 1972. I recently spoke to his mother and reassured her that I would do whatever I could on her son's behalf.

The wives, mothers, and friends of the MIA's are looking to us for action regarding their loved ones. The peace treaty is empty for those families of men missing in action. These families have not lost faith and we in Congress must keep faith with them. I urge the State and Defense Departments and my colleagues in both Houses to take the necessary action to effect a full accounting of the servicemen missing in action.

The letters follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1973.

Dr. HENRY KISSINGER,
Secretary of State Designate, National Security Council, Old Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment to become Secretary of State. This is certainly a reflection on your outstanding diplomatic achievements of the past four and a half years, and I have every confidence that the Senate will swiftly confirm your appointment.

I hope that one of your initial concerns as Secretary of State will be the men who are still missing in action in Southeast Asia. Hanoi has yet to live up to Article 8B of the cease-fire agreement and, as a result, the families of those missing in action exist in limbo. They do not know whether the men are dead or alive. No American search teams have been allowed to go into Communist held territory.

It is inhumane to allow this situation to exist. The peace treaty is empty for those families of men missing in action. I believe that it should be the highest diplomatic priority of this country to effect a complete accounting of all those who have served in Southeast Asia. It is my firm hope that as Secretary of State you will pledge to make this commitment to the families of those men missing in action.

Again, congratulations on your appointment.

Sincerely,

PETER A. PEYSER,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1973.

Mr. LE DUC THO,
Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party, Hanoi, Democratic Republic of Vietnam

DEAR MR. THO: I am writing you on a matter of deep urgency to the people of the United States, and a matter which threatens to jeopardize the Paris Accord signed by our respective countries. Specifically, this is the issue of American servicemen who are missing in action in Southeast Asia and who are not accounted for by your country.

Your government has not abided by Article 8B of the cease-fire agreement, and has not allowed any American search teams to go into territory which you possess. This is an inhumane situation, and one which could be easily alleviated by your government. Surely your government has nothing to gain by continuing to prolong the agony and heart-break of the families involved.

I can personally assure you that the United States Congress is deeply concerned about this situation and that much of its future actions concerning your country will be guided by what you do concerning these missing servicemen.

Sincerely,

PETER A. PEYSER,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., September 7, 1973.

HON. PETER A. PEYSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PETE: Thank you for your good wishes on my nomination.

You have my assurance that the men missing in action have not been forgotten. The President is determined that all of them will be accounted for to the degree that is humanly possible. The service of these men and the courage, devotion and sacrifice shown by them and their families, make it clear we can do no less.

Warm regards,

HENRY A. KISSINGER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTERLOCKING DIRECTORSHIPS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of speculation lately as to why the oil companies behave in such a monopolistic manner. I believe that a large part of the answer lies in the fact that a number of interlocking directorships exist among the oil and gas firms. These interlocking directorates have the effect of eliminating competition since common directors tend to monopolize a market and provide the opportunity for exchange of information.

I have asked Attorney General Saxbe to investigate the apparent violation of the Clayton Act, which bans interlocking directorates in competing companies, by 19 individuals. The various Attorney Generals who have served in the current administration have avoided offering a precise definition of what constitutes an interlocking directorate.

We have all become very concerned about the energy shortage and how it has come about. I would like to suggest that this problem, like so many others, is a result of the activities of individuals. For far too long the oilmen in this country have been allowed a free hand. They have created an international cartel beyond the reach of most governments. If there is to be any good to come out of our present uncomfortable circumstances, it is that we should never again allow the control of our resources to be vested in the hands of a few men.

A list of the 19 interlocking directors follow:

INTERLOCKING OIL COMPANY DIRECTORS—
SOURCE: SEC COMPUTER SEARCH OF OIL & GAS EXECUTIVES

F. A. CALVERT, JR.

Halliburton Co., Director.
Mapco, Inc., Director.
Calvert Exploration, Chairman of the Board.

EDWIN L. COX

Sedco, Director.
Plateau Natural Gas Co., Director.
Edwin L. Cox Co., Owner.

PAUL A. CONLEY

Pauley Petroleum Inc., Director.
General American Oil Co., Director.
Wilshire Oil Co. of Texas, Director.

J. B. LADD

Ladd Petroleum Corp., Officer.
KRM Petroleum Corp., Director.

J. B. RANKIN, JR.

McMoran Exploration Co., Director.
Sundance Oil Company, Director.

T. B. PICKENS, JR.

Mesa Petroleum Co., Director.
Wainco Oil Ltd., Director.

JOHN SHAW, JR.

Offshore Company, Officer and Director.
Southern Natural Resources, Director.

JOSEPH A. THOMAS

Halliburton Co., Director.
Getty Oil Company, Director.
EARL M. JORGENSEN
Christiana Oil Corp., Director.
Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., Director.

LOUIS MARX, JR.

Pan Ocean Oil, Director.
Marline Oil Corp., Director.

January 24, 1974

L. F. M'COLLUM, JR.

Apco Oil Corp., Director.
Rowan Drilling Co., Director.

DONALD M. KENDALL

Atlantic Richfield, Director.
McCullough Oil Corp., Former Director (Apr. 3, 1967–February 1972).
Investors Diversified Services,* Board Member—4 Mutual Funds of which I.D.S. is an affiliate.

CLIFFORD W. MICHEL

Cities Service Co., Director.
Dome Petroleum Ltd., Director.

JOHN B. M. PLACE

Marathon Oil Company, Director.
Celanese Corporation, Director.

TODDIE L. WYNNE, JR.

American Liberty Oil, President.
New Zealand Petroleum Co. Ltd., Director.

GEORGE H. BRUCE

Halliburton Co., Director.
Western Oil Fields, Inc., Director.

ROBERT E. AIKMAN

Dorchester Exploration, Inc., President.
Mana Resources Gas Exploration Fund, Chairman, Board.

STEPHEN A. WELLS

Pyramid Petroleum Inc., Officer.
Amarex Drilling Program, Officer.

ALGUR H. MEADOWS

Fargo Oils, Director.
General American Oil Co. of Texas, Owner.

A BILL AUTHORIZING PARTITION OF JOINTLY HELD HOPI AND NAVAJO TRIBAL LANDS

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, in September of last year I introduced a bill intended as a compromise solution to the tragic and costly land dispute between the Hopi and Navajo Indian Tribes in northeastern Arizona. At the same time, an identical bill was introduced in the Senate jointly by the two Senators from Arizona, Mr. FANNIN and Mr. GOLDWATER.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to resolve a dispute which began more than a century ago, and in recent times has resulted in bitter and sometimes violent intertribal conflict and has allowed tribal lands to become desolate and unproductive.

Prior efforts by the Federal Government and courts to resolve this dispute have been unsuccessful because Congress has never granted authority to the courts to define the territorial boundaries of the two tribes in a partition proceeding. Enabling legislation must be passed by Congress in order to bring about a lasting settlement.

It is a matter of history that President Chester A. Arthur in 1882 directed that 2,500,000 acres of public domain land be set aside for the use and occupancy of the Hopi, and for such other Indians as the Secretary of the Interior may see fit to settle thereon. Over the years many Navajos have moved from their adjoining reservation onto the original Hopi lands,

* Not listed in SEC report—information obtained from SEC and IDS officials.

and conflict and mutual distrust has grown between the two tribes.

In 1958, Congress authorized the U.S. District Court of Arizona to determine the respective interests of the Hopi and Navajo Tribes in the disputed area. The Hopis contended that the lands in question belonged solely to the Hopi people, while the Navajos asserted that the land upon which they had settled had become their own.

The district court ruled that 600,000 acres were exclusively Hopi and that the balance of 1,900,000 acres was owned jointly between the Hopi and Navajo Tribes, share and share alike. This ruling was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The district court also ruled that it was without express congressional authorization to partition the jointly held lands. Thus, the dispute was not completely resolved. The two tribes have been unable to jointly administer their common reservation. In fact, in supplementary proceedings, the district court has found that the Navajos, who number about 120,000, and the U.S. Government, as trustee, have prevented the Hopis, who number about 6,500, from using any significant portion of their one-half interest in the joint-use area. In addition, the absence of proper land management has created a situation which has nearly destroyed the productivity of the area.

The district court stated in December of 1973, that unless the unregulated overgrazing of Navajo livestock on the joint-use area is promptly controlled and the area restored, neither the Hopis nor the Navajos will be able to make any use of this land.

Although there have been efforts by the two tribes to reach a negotiated settlement of this problem, those efforts have been totally fruitless concerning even such basic issues as the control of grazing. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has also been ineffective in establishing and enforcing measures which will protect the valuable resources of these Indian peoples. Continued failure to cope with even these basic conservation issues, will result in the further impoverishment of the Indians living in this area and the swelling of the public welfare roles. As Congressman LLOYD MEEDS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, has said:

If we fail to make a decision at this time, it will only tend to exacerbate an already complicated situation.

Numerous hearings have been held over the last 2 years before the House and Senate subcommittees, both here in Washington, D.C., and also in the field. The tribes and the Government have expended a great amount of time and money in presenting and examining all sides of these issues. The time for action is now upon us.

The bill as approved by the subcommittee is a compromise effort to reach a final settlement of this situation which will recognize what has already been determined by the court and will resolve remaining issues in an equitable manner for all concerned. The bill authorizes the district court to partition equally the surface of the joint-use area between the Hopi and Navajo Tribes, giving consid-

eration to present population densities and locations and thereby avoiding undue social, economic, and cultural disruption. The bill further implements the court's previous decision by providing that each tribe will receive an equal share in the quantity and quality of land.

Under the bill the equal partition of this land will be made by the court after both tribes and the United States have had a full and fair opportunity to present all relevant facts. The bill also provides funds to assist in the relocation and reestablishment of any Indian families which are displaced by reason of the partition.

If we do not squarely face the issues in this matter, the sometimes brutal forces of nature will cause the mass reduction of livestock through drought, starvation, and disease which in turn will result in the forced displacement of many more Indians without the assistance provided in this bill.

I strongly urge that we take swift action to adopt the bill as favorably reported by the subcommittee.

OIL COMPANIES' PROPAGANDA RESENTED

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter that appeared in the January 13, 1974, Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, one of the most widely circulated newspapers in my district. Although I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the information, for few of us can honestly say we have all the facts, and accurate ones, surrounding the energy crisis, I feel that what this constituent reflects is a general lack of trust felt by many Americans toward the oil companies, as well as a loss of confidence in the administration, not only by the effects of Watergate, but by their hesitancy in copying with the emergency at hand. Hopefully, through the investigations of several congressional committees, we will have sufficient information to determine whether or not an oil shortage does exist, and the extent of it if it does exist, and whether or not the various allegations made against the oil companies are indeed factual.

The letter follows:

OIL COMPANIES PROPAGANDA RESENTED

To the Editor:

An interesting postscript to the energy crisis and the accompanying emphasis on conservation has been the realization that for years the U.S. has possessed the technical potential to produce better, more efficient forms of energy. Ever since our forebearers constructed this country with integrity and adaptability Americans have searched for and found a better way of doing everything. Now however, big business prefers to channel creative genius into increasing profit margins at the expense of improving product quality and efficiency. If someone should by chance express an original idea, the patent rights are immediately bought and fled away in some corporate tomb.

Times have been good and it has gone virtually unnoticed that corporate giants have

made planned obsolescence the American way of life. "Everything for everyone—cheap" was the basis for all the soft-sell slogans. If it wears out just buy another. So we did.

Now the same commodities are expensive and we are hard-pressed to find a product we can afford that won't self-destruct in five seconds. The advertising tune has changed, of course. "Don't buy that super-power, 15-cylinder, gas guzzler we shamed you into buying last year. You must heretofore live your lives in total frugality because there is an energy crisis and you, the public are to blame."

If indeed there is an energy crisis the public must accept responsibility to a certain extent. The Federal Energy Office via William Simon never misses an opportunity to reprimand the improvident public for its avarice. Why then do we hear so little about corporate culpability? Because the long arms of big business are too busy scratching governmental backs with the left hand and patting themselves on the back with the right.

BETTER GAUGE NEEDED

Mr. Simon suggests we measure the urgency of the crisis by the lines at the service stations and the spiraling price increases. Using this barometer the oil companies can regulate the severity themselves by controlling the flow of oil from the refineries. The simple act of omission, in this case non-distribution, would indeed create a shortage. Not real but contrived. That this places our domestic companies on a parallel with the Arab blackmailers which he so vociferously condemns apparently does not disturb Mr. Simon. If he can offer us no better gauge than this as proof that a crisis exists then he is in the wrong position.

The oil corporations bombard the public daily with promotional claptrap and statistical rhetoric intended to convince us that they are doing their best for America and are working to keep our trust. Meanwhile we hear of widespread price-gouging, windfall profits and domestic oil shipped out a few miles and returned to be sold as "imported" at an inflated price. Their reaction to public outrage is wounded bewilderment, as though they thought us too stupid to embrace any opinion but their own.

Besides enabling them to implement a 200 per cent or more price increase, this "crisis" assures occlusion of the independents, immediate action on the Alaska pipeline legislation, and relaxation of environmental standards controlling offshore drilling, etc. A convenient Mideast oil embargo and a President with an obvious affection for campaign-fund potential combine to make an ideal climate for cultivation of the crisis atmosphere. Best of all, the liability for the entire problem could be shifted to the public and the environmentalists. With this in mind it is difficult to dispel the vision of a gaggle of oil magnates and PR men milling about an executive board room, intent on conjuring up an energy crisis.

THE NEED TO WORRY

Americans are obsessed with the need to worry about something. A few years ago the "in" thing was concern over the environment. We passed laws, issued directives and generally scrubbed up everything whether it needed it or not. Possibly in their zeal to improve our surroundings the environmentalists supported legislation that was unreasonable and/or unnecessary. Certainly, though, their hearts were in the right place, since they had nothing whatsoever to gain except a cleaner country which could be enjoyed by everyone.

The anatomy of a corporation places its heart in the immediate vicinity of its pocket-book, and the public be damned.

To immediately repeal every law pertaining to conservation would serve no purpose except to cancel out any good done for the country by such legislation and would facilitate fattening of the corporate till. Surely

realistic conservation measures can gel smoothly or even complement corporation objectives. In fact it is imperative that industry and environment come to terms, for do they not sustain one another? Compromise is a business byword. Why should they make an exception when it concerns our natural resources?

We realize business must make a profit. Our economy relies on industry. Millions of us are employed by and have benefited from our association with corporations. Most of us are middle-class, non-executive, unsophisticated people who ask for adequate pay for our work and a modicum of respect from our employers. This energy crisis is a thinly veiled violation of the public trust. We emphatically resent the oil companies' pious protestations and condescending assurances of good will when their actions so obviously belie any such intentions.

POOR "EXPENDABLE"

As always, the fullest impact will be felt by the poor and the elderly, always expendable pawns in any economic chess game. They get the full clout only because they are so far removed from executive consciousness that they represent little more than a statistical afterthought.

Oil corporation promotion consultants (what a supposedly indigent industry needs with a promotion consultant is an enigma) have written volumes of statistical summaries in defense of the corporations. They never refer to people, only percentage points, which coincidentally never total 100 per cent. Most of us are tired of being statistics. How long before we become this headline: Spokesman Says Only 4 Per Cent of Population to Freeze This Winter: Country Can Live With This Figure? All their facts and figures may impress them, but they bore us beyond belief.

As they have in the face of every crisis the American people will tighten their belts and stoically do whatever is necessary to weather the storm. We will play "energy crisis" because we have no choice. We implore the perpetrators not to insult our intelligence by demanding that we gullibly accept their imperious propaganda as well. It leaves us, well, cold.

C. A. JONASCH.

GAMBLING AND THE GOVERNMENT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, with the prospect of legalized gambling spreading to professional sports, the Wall Street Journal saw fit to enumerate the several arguments against it in an editorial on January 4, 1974.

The success of off-track gambling on parimutuel horseracing in New York State expectedly has caused a rush to cash in on the gambling sweepstakes. But certain fundamental differences between horseracing and professional sports cannot be passed over. Horseracing appeals primarily to gamblers; professional sports appeal primarily to devotees of competition and athletic skill. NFL Commissioner Pete Rozelle is dead set against legalized bets on pro football knowing of the increased security problems the league would face and the increased fan suspicion of rigged games.

Before the momentum for legalized

gambling on professional sports becomes irreversible, I suggest we consider the arguments against it.

The Wall Street Journal editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 4, 1974]

GAMBLING AND THE GOVERNMENT

An old story tells of the confirmed gambler who dutifully sat in on a weekly poker game even though he knew it was rigged, because "it's the only game in town." Not all gamblers are that addicted, of course, but you might not know it from looking around. Cities and states, searching for new ways to raise money, are busily setting up lotteries, sanctioning off-track betting and laying the spadework for casino gambling.

It is considered a foregone conclusion, for example, that the New Jersey legislature and electorate soon will endorse casino gambling. This reflects the assumption that "controlled" gambling is preferable to the freelance variety. It also reflects the hope that gambling revenues will give a renewed lease to the state's rundown resort towns and such economically depressed cities as Newark. And the potential rake-off from gambling is regarded as a painless alternative to a state income tax.

Off-track gambling on parimutuel horse racing is already legal in New York. But some legislators and spokesmen for the off-track betting agency (OTB) hope to broaden this mandate to include legalized betting on other professional sports. Their cause received renewed impetus in the wake of a recent scandal at Roosevelt and Yonkers Raceways, where rigged races supposedly netted a crime syndicate \$3 million. Irregularities in betting patterns at the tracks were discovered by OTB officials, therefore the agency looks to some like a special force for honesty.

There would seem to be an inconsistency in demands for consumer protection agencies, coupled with demands for legalized gambling. As Professor Irving Kristol pointed out on this page several months ago, gambling is "technically a swindle: the payoffs on bets must be less than fair, and the overwhelming majority of the 'investors' must eventually lose their money, if the gambling enterprise is to survive and prosper." Therefore, he noted, the case for legalized gambling is "simply an argument in favor of the government raising revenues by swindling its citizens rather than by taxing them."

Supporters of legalized gambling don't see it quite that way. They contend that people are always going to gamble, therefore why not build schools and hospitals with some of the money that would otherwise go to bookmakers and crime syndicates? There is some truth in that appeal, at least as it applies to horse racing, whose attraction overwhelmingly is to bettors rather than to those attracted by its pageantry. But professional sports, despite the millions of dollars wagered on important contests, still primarily appeal to the emotions and loyalties of non-gamblers. That is one reason why NFL Commissioner Pete Rozelle is dead-set against every proposal to legalize bets on pro football. He also knows the higher stakes would compound the league's security problems, and would plant seeds of suspicion and doubt every time a game didn't go according to form.

The rush to broaden and extend legalized gambling is unlikely to abate any time soon, yet it might be well to ask some fundamental questions. Do we really want the Super Bowl, World Series and pro basketball play-offs to become little more than exercises in wagering? Do we want state governments, many of which permit parimutuel wagering at race tracks under controlled conditions, to lend themselves wholeheartedly to a vice that trades on cupidity and exploits those

who can least afford it? Morals aside, do we really want governments acting as shills for gambling by undertaking slick advertising campaigns, a la OTB, that go beyond appealing to committed gamblers by implying that losing one's money to government bookmakers not only can be fun but may even be considered a charitable act?

The arguments against legalized gambling and against broadening its scope are not really new. But because of the way they are being glossed over in the rush to cash in on the gambling sweepstakes, sometimes it's a bit hard to remember that they exist at all.

ON SCHEDULE, WITHIN BUDGET

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we have become accustomed, if not hardened, to the idea that defense supply contracts, particularly in aviation, invariably exceed original cost estimates and appropriations, it is pleasant indeed to note the development of a new plane which was completed on schedule and within the contract budget.

I had the privilege of attending the "roll-out" of just such a plane, the Compass Cope R, designated by the Air Force as the YQM-98A. This is a prototype, high altitude, long endurance, remotely piloted vehicle developed and produced by Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical in San Diego.

Ryan's president is Barry J. Shillito, well remembered by many in Congress as a former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics. Addressing the roll-out ceremonies on January 4, Mr. Shillito reviewed the development of a plane which is aimed at removing the human peril from certain risky military air missions. He also took the opportunity to emphasize how a little judicious extra spending by Congress could hasten their future appearance in a combat-ready capacity.

By unanimous consent, I offer a copy of Mr. Shillito's remarks for the RECORD:

REMARKS OF BARRY J. SHILLITO

First of all, I would like to welcome our many visitors to Teledyne Ryan. This is a potentially rather significant occasion in that you are participating in the "roll out" of one of the major advancements as regard unmanned vehicles. In months and years to come, you are going to hear much more about these vehicles, and I hope particularly much more about this program which is identified as Compass Cope.

On 13 June, 1972, Teledyne Ryan received its cost-plus-fixed-fee contract for the Compass Cope program. Roy Fields and Bob Reichardt assure me this was really a no-fee type contract. This was about 12 months after a similar award was received by Boeing. On June 9, 1972, Teledyne Ryan received a letter relative to this program from Lieutenant General James Stewart, Commander of the Air Force Aeronautical Systems Division. It states in part:

"The program objective is to demonstrate the feasibility of a high altitude, long endurance remotely piloted prototype vehicle. Under the prototype concept, this demonstration must be accomplished within the limits imposed by the funds to be placed on contract. If this funding control cannot be ac-

completed, the program will automatically be terminated. Admittedly, the funding constraints being imposed on this program are severe. However, I am confident that highly skilled engineering and management personnel exist within the Ryan Company who can bring this program through to success."

From the inception of this award, TRA put together a team, under the superb leadership of Messrs. Arthur J. Sullivan and Norman S. Sakamoto, that was determined to meet or beat the stipulations contained in the Stewart letter. Rather early in the program, particularly early this past year, we decided that total cost could be minimized by delivering both of our "roll out" models concurrently.

FAMOUS FIRSTS

It is my understanding that this dual "roll out" is a first. Ryan, as you know, has a history of "firsts" in aviation. These range from major aircraft developments almost a half century ago, to unmanned vehicles today. A few of these sometimes forgotten "firsts" are:

In 1926 Ryan produced its M-1 passenger/mail plane—the first monoplane to be produced in volume in the United States.

The "Spirit of St. Louis," built by Ryan Airlines, was rolled out on April 28, 1927 and made its first flight the same day. Lindbergh actually arrived in San Diego to discuss the aircraft on February 23, 1927. Work was begun five days later. This, of course, was the first aircraft to cross the Atlantic, from New York to Paris, non-stop, on May 20 and 21, 1927. I am told that there could have been a few minor overruns on the "Spirit" but that these costs on this historic aircraft were absorbed very simply by employees working in a dedicated, partially non-compensated manner. This spirit still exists.

The Ryan ST, produced in 1939, was used during World War II. It was the first low wing mono plane, primary military trainer.

The Ryan FR-1 Fireball of 1944 was the world's first combination jet-propeller powered aircraft. It was really our Navy's first jet aircraft.

The Ryan X-13 verti-jet pioneered V/STOL research planes. It was the world's first jet-powered aircraft capable of vertical takeoffs and landings. It was built in 1957, and I understand Claude Ryan considers it to be among our company's greatest technical achievements. All other later V/STOLs profited significantly from this development.

Ryan built the first jet powered drone aircraft in 1948. The latest standard sub-sonic Firebee I has been in production in Ryan since 1950—longer than any other manned or unmanned aircraft produced in the United States—and probably elsewhere in the world.

Every U.S. space vehicle, manned or unmanned, which has landed on the moon has done so with the guidance of a Ryan Landing Radar (and we will be providing the same support for the Viking Lander when it lands on the surface of Mars on July 4th, 1976). The first U.S. unmanned soft landing on the moon, Surveyor 1 with Ryan Landing Radar aboard, was on June 2, 1966. The historic first manned landing was made on July 20, 1969 aboard an Apollo Lunar Module guided by Ryan radar.

The BGM-34, rolled out in February 1973, was the first unmanned strike aircraft with a capability to launch Maverick, Hobo and Shrike missiles.

So the Compass Cope aircraft represents another first for Ryan in the very advanced unmanned vehicle field and, again, to my knowledge this is the first time any company has built two roll-out aircraft, side by side, and delivered them, ready for flight, at the same time.

Let me assure you, this is a major complex system. It will fly at a very high altitude. It has long endurance and a very long range. It has a 4,050-pound thrust turbo fan engine, made by the Garrett Corporation.

This engine itself is truly unique and a highly sophisticated advancement in engine technology.

The Friday before Christmas, 21 December, we had a "button up" ceremony for our people—our team—who had been dedicated to the accomplishment of this program. My primary purpose at that get together was to congratulate our Teledyne Ryan truly dedicated group of people. On the 21st of December, as many of them know, we received a wire from the Air Force Program Director, Colonel Hemenway, a portion of which reads as follows:

"Congratulations on meeting this important milestone on time and within cost. The Air Force recognizes this achievement as a significant step forward in the development and furthering of the Drone/RPV concept in the application of aerospace power. I recognize that your people, under the leadership of Mr. Sullivan, have worked long and hard. Please convey my personal appreciation for all the dedicated effort in accomplishing this task under very difficult time and budget constraints. I am looking forward to an exciting, challenging, and successful flight demonstration program. Again, congratulations on a job well done, and I wish you all a Happy Holiday Season."

RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

Without fear of contradiction, I can state that I have had more experience than anyone in this audience in explaining individual and collective weapons systems, cost growth, overruns, etc. to the Congress and the American public. These experiences have not been among my more enjoyable experiences.

I know that all of us at various times have been exposed to the significant amount of publicity given to the various instances of DOD weapons cost growth. Seldom do we hear of programs that met their milestones and were developed within the planned dollars. For some reason, good news often doesn't seem to make news. It may not in this instance, I would hope, however, that our distinguished Congressman and the members of the press take note of this fact, and that this truly outstanding accomplishment on the part of the Air Force and the contractor receives just a little recognition. Both our military and our aerospace industry are too often criticized, and too seldom complimented.

The Compass Cope Program can and should become a major step forward in the further acquisition and utilization of Remotely Piloted Vehicles. Unfortunately, the immediate flight test program for these two vehicles is somewhat uncertain as to schedule due to a very recent \$1.7 million cut in the Air Force's FY 1974 program by the Congress. These aircraft could have flown by the first of February, 1974. Interestingly, practically every member of Congress is completely sold on the future and, most importantly, the economic need for these type vehicles. Any delay in moving ahead with vehicles of this type will have an adverse economic and operational impact on our country. Up to very recently, remotely piloted vehicles (RPVs) performed a number of missions in different places under a cloak of secrecy.

The public was unaware of their role and only a very few persons in government were permitted to know of their activities. Their comparatively insignificant funding, plus this very recent awareness of their capabilities, undoubtedly is the reason Congress has not been able to give too much of their attention to this very small segment of the DOD budget. I know enough about the budget process and our Congress to firmly believe that sound programs such as this will be approved and, in fact, accelerated. I am sure that the \$1.7 million decrease does not reflect any negative attitude on the part of the Congress relative to RPVs, and undoubtedly is a correctable, unintended fall-out resulting from the complexity of putting

together a \$74 billion budget. In other words, this \$1.7 million, relating to a program that is meeting all its milestones, literally "slipped through the cracks."

I would leave you with one other point. I used the word "team" in defining our Teledyne Ryan effort on Cope. I want to emphasize that this has really been an Air Force/TRA team effort. Every step of the way there has been complete and open communications and a desire, above all else, to get the job done within the very tight constraints.

WHY NOW?

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, during the Christmas recess of Congress, Prof. Milton Friedman published an excellent essay on the causes of the current economic disruptions which appeared in the December 31 issue of Newsweek magazine.

Professor Friedman's arguments point the blame for the present shortages of vital materials directly at the chief culprit—the wage and price controls that have unnaturally restrained the operation of the free enterprise system. He answers the key question "Why now—the energy crisis?" by responding:

Nineteen seventy-three is different from other peacetime years because, for the first time since World War II, the U.S. has had extensive price and wage controls. The key to today's shortages is the price freeze ordered by President Nixon on August 15, 1971.

Milton Friedman's ideas make a lot of sense, and I commend my essay to the attention of my colleagues. The full text is printed hereinbelow:

WHY NOW?

(By Milton Friedman)

"Running Out of Everything" was Newsweek's cover headline some weeks back. It dramatized the fact that, for the first time since World War II, the U.S. has begun to experience major shortages not only of petroleum products, but of a wide range of other items.

Of the many attempts to explain this state of affairs that I have seen in the media, not one faces up to the crucial question: Why now? Why did shortages not emerge in 1968 at the height of the Vietnam war, or in 1958, or for that matter in 1938 or 1928? What is different about 1973?

THE MIDEAST WAR, NO

The Mideast war is one obvious answer. The Arab boycott it unleashed has exacerbated the shortage of crude oil. But an energy shortage was well on its way before the Mideast war broke out. Government allocation of fuel was already on the way. And none of the other shortages owes anything to the Mideast war.

One popular answer—particularly for the energy crisis—is that consumption of energy has been increasing rapidly. But that has been going on for decades. Why should it have produced shortages only now?

The response is typically that we are running short of reserves of fossil fuel—that there are only ten or fifteen years of proven oil reserves, for example. But that too has been true for decades. In the 1920s, scare stories were being written about the danger that we would run out of oil because the

then proven reserves would last for only ten or fifteen years. In the interim, consumption of crude oil has multiplied manyfold—and so have proven oil reserves. The fact is that it does not pay to find and prove more than about fifteen years' oil reserves at any time.

But this time, it is said, we are short of refining capacity. Perhaps so, but why now? How is it that until now, refining capacity was able to keep up with demand, but in the years 1971 to 1973 it was not?

The greedy, selfish oil interests? If, as is frequently charged, they have conspired to create a shortage profitable to themselves, why have they been so slow? They are no more powerful now than they have been for many years. Why did they wait so long before squeezing the hapless consumer? And how do they make profits by having no oil to sell? By full-page advertisements urging consumers to economize on fuel? This is simply the irrational search for a devil.

The answer to "Why now?" is straightforward—yet I know from bitter experience how hard it is to persuade anyone other than an economist that so simple an answer can be correct. Nineteen seventy-three is different from other peacetime years because, for the first time since World War II, the U.S. has had extensive price and wage controls. The key to today's shortages is the price freeze ordered by President Nixon on Aug. 15, 1971.

Has fuel oil been especially short? Aug. 15, 1971, was summertime. It will surprise no one that fuel-oil prices are generally lower in the summer than in the winter. The result of freezing prices at summertime levels was to make gasoline more profitable to produce than fuel oil. Has pipe been hard to get for drilling new wells? As it happened, the controlled prices for pipe and flat steel made it more profitable to produce flat steel.

PRICE CONTROLS, YES

I am not enough of an expert—no one is—to know the million and one places where prices fixed by bureaucrats on the basis of arbitrary rules and accidental starting points have created distortions and shortages. Some have been dramatic, like the beef storage and the destruction of baby chickens. But most have not been. They are hidden in the interstices of an incredibly complex production system that cannot operate without the enormous efficiency of a market-price system to adapt changing demands to changing supplies. And many have been overcome by millions of citizens who found ways to avoid or evade the price controls.

I know that it is hard for you to believe that so seemingly simple a matter as price fixing can produce so complex a phenomenon as widespread shortages. But then, I find it hard to believe that an automobile engine is a complex matter until I start probing around in its innards when it stops functioning on a dark road in the early hours of the morning.

At any rate, if this is not the answer, what is? In what other respect—pervasive enough to produce the pervasive effect we see—is 1973 different from earlier peacetime years?

EMERGENCY ENERGY LEGISLATION

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as another attempt to enact emergency energy legislation comes before us next week, I would like to share with my col-

leagues a letter I received recently from Mr. J. W. Pinkston, Jr., the executive director of Grady Memorial Hospital in Atlanta:

JANUARY 16, 1974.

HON. ANDREW YOUNG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: As Executive Director of one of the largest non-profit, general hospitals in the Southeast, I feel that you need to be aware of what is happening to the price of fuel oil that we burn in our steam plant for heating and other related requirements necessary for the operation of our facility.

Last July 1, 1973, we entered into a contract with Exxon Company, U.S.A., for 750,000 gallons of #5 fuel oil at a delivered price of 0.13113 per gallon. As of December 1973 our price had increased to 0.29075 per gallon. We have just been notified that effective January 12, 1974, our price has been increased to 0.29217 per gallon, over 100% increase in 7 months.

We have had no problem in getting the oil that we need from Exxon, but we do feel that you need to see what is happening to the price, if you are not already aware of the situation.

Your interest and any comments you may have regarding this critical situation will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. PINKSTON, JR.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspapers inform us that Exxon's profits rose 59 percent in the fourth quarter of 1973. We also know that these oil industry executives contributed at least \$5.7 million to President Nixon's reelection campaign. We are all too aware that while the American people send their children to school in the dark, wait in long lines to pay more for less and, even in the face of runaway inflation and rising unemployment, pay a disproportionately large share of Federal taxes, these oil executives profit immensely, unthreatened by an administration which is so beholden to them that it cannot accept a stiff tax on their benefactors' excess profits.

Grady Memorial Hospital is a non-profit institution. Thus, every dollar that goes to further swell the profits of Exxon comes out of much-needed resources for healing our sick and injured citizens.

I urge my colleagues to bear this example in mind as we are once again asked to forget these perversions while we gut hard-won environmental safeguards and grant still more power to an administration which has mismanaged so much so monumentally.

It is now clear who is sacrificing and who is profiting from this so-called "crisis." Our responsibility as representatives of the people should be equally clear.

FAIR PRICING WILL PRODUCE MORE OIL

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents sent me an excellent editorial that he has saved from

the December 26, 1973, Wall Street Journal. With all of the wild statements coming from Washington, he thought it was time we again establish some commonsense in our reasoning.

This was a long article. It was written by Dr. W. Philip Gramm, professor of economics, and Dr. Richard R. Davison, professor of chemical engineering at Texas A. & M. University. The following sections highlight some of the basic logic.

Let us have more commonsense and solve the energy crisis before it causes more cutbacks in industry.

The article follows:

FAIR PRICING WILL PRODUCE MORE OIL

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 reserves 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 approaching 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 in 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.

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.

GILMAN URGES A HALT TO WHEAT EXPORTS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation on January 28, 1974, amending the Export Administration Act of 1969 to place a temporary embargo on the exportation of wheat from the United States.

Along with current shortages of fuel oil and gasoline, we are now being told by both the Agriculture and Commerce Departments and industry spokesmen that there exists an imminent shortage of wheat prior to the first spring harvests in late May and early June.

At a time when a shortage of many commodities exists, the possibility of not having enough wheat to meet our domestic demands is an outrage to all our citizens, particularly in light of the large quantity of wheat now being exported. Last year, our Nation exported over 1,400,000,000 bushels of wheat with the highest percentage going to Red China, the Soviet Union, and Japan. Because of these exports and the failure to learn the lessons of the disastrous wheat deal with the Soviet Union, the price of bread in my congressional district has already jumped an average of 3 cents a loaf in the past few weeks and threatens to go even higher. We should not ask the American consumer to endure such a severe penalty in order to enhance foreign trade.

Under the provisions of this bill, all wheat exports would be halted for a 6-month period, a period of time that will

CXX—52—Part 1

allow the results of the spring harvest to be duly evaluated. During this time, our Commerce and Agriculture Department officials should be able to develop proper planning to make certain that we do not run short of wheat as a result of any excessive exports so that our consumers will not be faced with any drastic price increases.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in support of this wheat embargo and I respectfully request that the full text of this measure be printed as follows:

A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 by establishing a temporary embargo on the exportation of wheat

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Export Administration Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-184), as amended, is further amended by:

SECTION 1. That during the one hundred and eighty-day period, beginning on the tenth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, no person, corporation, association, cooperative, or similar group shall export from the United States any wheat.

SEC. 2. Any person, corporation, association, cooperative, or similar group who violates the first section of this Act shall be fined not more than \$5 per bushel of wheat exported or be imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

TVA RATE HIKE ENGENDERS PROTESTS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for the seventh time in 6 years, the Tennessee Valley Authority has announced a power rate increase, which I feel is unjustified and unwarranted.

In an effort to strengthen TVA's financial position and hopefully to prevent further rate increases, I have been pleased to join with Congressman Bob JONES of Alabama other Tennessee Valley congressmen in introducing H.R. 11929, a bill which would permit TVA to credit against its annual repayments to the U.S. Treasury the costs of pollution control measures.

The Nashville Banner, in a recent editorial, supported my position in opposition to escalating rate increases.

In this connection and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people, I place in the RECORD herewith the editorial from the Nashville Banner and an article from The Tennessean concerning the bill recently introduced to assist the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The editorial and article follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 18, 1973]
TVA RATE HIKES RAISE QUESTIONS WITH CONSUMERS

Rep. Joe L. Evins of Smithville has spoken for thousands of Tennesseans in expressing concern and wonder over the latest increase in power rates by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In the heartland of public power and, pre-

sumably, low rates, the cost of heating and lighting has gone up again, this time 14 per cent. The higher price—TVA's seventh rate increase in six years—will show up on next month's bill.

The average consumer can figure on spending an extra \$2 a month to accommodate the increase. The total bill, with these annual increases, is about 90 percent more than it was six years ago.

The higher rates concern Rep. Evins, one of the biggest friends TVA has ever had.

"I deplore the recent rate increases announced by TVA—I fear that TVA is destroying its image as the low-cost power yardstick of the nation," he said.

Rep. Evins thinks there may be some collusion between the Office of Management and Budget and TVA. If TVA raises its rates, some may reason, then private power companies can use TVA as an example to justify their rates increases.

The gist of Rep. Evins' argument is that TVA seems headed toward a high-rate yardstick, rather than a low-rate one.

Certainly, the TVA has experienced increased costs of operation, just as all Americans have, but the ability of TVA to generate revenue from congressional appropriations, bond sales and operating revenues causes some to wonder why TVA shouldn't be one power company able to hold down its rates.

Cheap power is and always has been the chief reason for TVA's existence. That shouldn't change now.

In this area of public power rates there is plenty of room for political demagoguery and no doubt there will be efforts by some to tie TVA shortcomings, if that's what they are, to President Nixon's coattails.

But Rep. Evins generally steers clear of solely partisan prater. The questions he has raised are ones that Tennesseans have a stake in. The TVA, if it is to continue in the role for which it was created, should fully explain why users must bear this increase.

[From the Tennessean, Dec. 18, 1973]

BILL WOULD ALLOW TVA TO DEDUCT POLLUTION COSTS

WASHINGTON.—A bill giving TVA the right to charge off against its U.S. Treasury payments \$100 million to \$150 million in annual pollution control spending was announced yesterday by Rep. Joe L. Evins.

Evins and the Tennessee Valley's other senior congressman, Rep. Robert Jones of North Alabama, are the bill's principal sponsors. All 18 of the Tennessee Valley's congressmen are cosponsors.

If the bill could receive early committee hearings and pass Congress quickly, it might eliminate the need for another 20% TVA rate increase anticipated for June or October 1974.

But there is no possibility that it could become law in time to head off or alter the 16 to 23% rate increase just announced by the TVA board for January.

The bill simply would give to TVA the privilege long enjoyed by private power companies of federal taxpayer assumption of their costs of meeting federal environmental requirements. All of the companies, as far as could be learned yesterday, are passing these benefits, on to their stockholders—not their rate payers.

The Evins-Jones proposal simply credits certified TVA expenditures for pollution control to the interest payment the TVA makes each year to the U.S. Treasury, according to Evins. This interest payment now ranges from \$55 million to \$65 million each year.

"The credits for TVA would be somewhat similar to those already provided by the Congress for pollution control equipment and other investments by private industry," Evins added.

"Through enactment of various measures, the Congress has recognized that relief

should be granted to private industry for investments which were required for the benefit of the general public, such as facilities to enhance the environment.

"The consumers of TVA power are required to make similar investments for the benefit of the general public yet there has been no acknowledgement of this vast expenditure."

THE RUSSIANS ARE STILL COMING

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in a number of speeches I have been pointing out the Soviet need for advanced U.S. technology in a number of areas. Soviet reliance on Western technology has been well documented by Anthony Sutton in his works.

Although the Soviets require Western technology, they would rather be able to obtain it through "arrangements" rather than by paying cash. The United States Export-Import Bank and the Commodity Credit Corporation, both financed in large part by the American taxpayer, have helped provide credits to the Soviet Union. Wall Street is also becoming a place that the Soviets may turn to for financing of their various "deals."

The following article from the Los Angeles Times of Wednesday, December 19, 1973, entitled "Russians Turn To Wall Street 'Comrades'" provides an interesting commentary on the Soviets' efforts to gain financing in this country and their views of those who are opposed to the increasing giveaway programs to the Soviet Union. I think that it is time that the United States stop their welfare program to the Soviets. The text of the article follows:

RUSSIANS TURN TO WALL STREET "COMRADES"
Moscow.—Wall Street is becoming the Soviet Union's best friend in America.

Hardly a day goes by without some Soviet newspaper praising the stronghold of world capitalism for sweet reason and realism.

The issue is Soviet-American trade, and Moscow's interest in gaining advantages without concessions on free emigration is the touchstone for telling the good guys from the bad.

Right after the U.S. House of Representatives voted to deny credits and most-favored-nation status unless the Russians changed their emigration procedures, *Izvestia* called on the Wall Street Journal—"the organ of American business circles"—for support.

Pravda Tuesday chose the views of Business Week—"the organ of American business circles"—to reinforce its view that the conditions Congress wants to impose on wider trade are "no good."

Pravda added on its own that Wall Street is standing firm against a motley alliance of labor leaders, right-wing social democrats, Zionists and various ultra-right fascist groups.

Pravda has not disclosed what the congressional conditions are. It has only condemned them as inadmissible interference in Russia's internal affairs.

Soviet propagandists have also not attempted to explain how it is that American capitalists have not been able to impose their will.

For more than five decades, the Soviets have been taught that big business runs

America, riding roughshod over the working class and the labor unions.

WORST JOKE IN 200 YEARS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning I have been a critic of the preposterous waste of the American taxpayers' money that is represented in the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, recently promoted to full bureaucratic glory by being converted into an agency—one which, incidentally, will undoubtedly be in existence for years after 1976 has faded into history.

I am not opposed to a celebration of the birth of this Nation, but I do not believe the muddled plans developed by this outfit are either meaningful or proper. They are already far afield in some instances.

Typical of the boondoggles fostered and paid for by these bureaucrats is the disgusting project sponsored by officials of the District of Columbia which resulted in a hate-America mural on the walls of this city's so-called Bicentennial Center.

U.S. News & World Report Editor, Howard Flieger, comments in the January 28, 1974 issue of the magazine and I believe he expresses the feeling of the vast majority of Americans who have heard of this farce.

I commend Mr. Flieger for this article and include it for insertion in the Record at this point:

WORST JOKE IN 200 YEARS

(By Howard Flieger)

With varying degrees of originality, communities all across the nation are getting ready to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the United States in 1976.

In 1776, when the country was born, the population was 2.5 million.

Now it exceeds 210 million.

If you are one of those millions of American citizens, you have just been insulted.

The Bicentennial Center for the District of Columbia, the nation's capital, was dedicated on January 14 by the Mayor of Washington. A representative of the White House was there. So were other dignitaries.

Looking down on the occasion was a new mural, done for the Bicentennial office by an artist named H. H. Booker II.

Among the personages depicted—

Karl Marx, the father of Communism.

Friedrich Engels, Marx's associate.

Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union.

Mao Tse-tung of the Chinese Communists.

For extra measure, the muralist included a caricature of President Nixon wearing a mustache and clad in the costume of a movie gangster. He sketched the President's daughter, Tricia Nixon Cox, with an Afro hairdo. He included a portrait of Angela Davis.

This is Americana?

Where are Washington, Jefferson, Tom Paine, Ben Franklin and the Adams family?

Where are such symbols of American culture and uniqueness as Washington Irving, Mark Twain and Carl Sandburg? Winslow Homer, Frederic Remington and Thomas Hart Benton? Francis Scott Key and George M. Cohan? John Philip Sousa and Louis Armstrong? Samuel Gompers and Andrew Carnegie? Thomas A. Edison and Mary Beth-

une? Where are the pathfinders—Lewis and Clark, Charles Lindbergh and Neil Armstrong, to name a few?

The list is endless. If portraits are needed to dramatize two centuries, you can take your pick from within our own borders, including many immigrants from other lands.

Granted, the planning for the Bicentennial observance has been uneven, often halting and short of real achievement on a national scale. But hundreds of communities, many States and regions have pitched in with their own projects and are moving ahead to the anniversary with enthusiasm and pride.

Granted, too, there has been honest disagreement. One group, for example, feels that the basic aims of the American Revolution are being overlooked. But such things are legitimate dissent—which is the American way.

The mural in Washington is something else.

A member of the staff of this magazine asked an official of the District of Columbia Bicentennial Commission about the inclusion of the Communist figures. The explanation was that those people are a valid part of the American scene because "all were involved in some way with the United States over the past 200 years."

When asked what Marx, Engels, Stalin and Mao had to do with the U.S., the official, irritated, broke off the conversation.

The muralist explained to a reporter for "The Washington Star-News" that his employer told him to "make faces" on the walls, so he sketched those he considers interesting. He called it a "lot of fun" and seemed to regard the whole affair as a very clever joke.

Marx, Stalin and Mao as characters in an American panorama—this is a joke?

It is a coarse insult to the very word, a desecration of everything truly American from 1776 to today. It is high jinks of the lowest order, done in the poorest taste.

Those who had anything to do with it—whether through deliberate participation, irresponsibility, arrogance or plain ignorance—should hang their heads in shame.

BILLIE JEAN CARSON OF NEWTON FALLS, OHIO, RECEIVES RED CROSS CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a very brave young lady, Miss Billie Jean Carson. Miss Carson, who is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William C. Carson, of Newton Falls, Ohio, was named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit.

Billie Jean received this award for her meritorious action of October 14, 1973. On this day, she was walking near a river when she heard cries for help. She ran to the river and saw a young man struggling weakly in the water. Immediately she dove into the water and swam to the helpless person. In spite of the size and weight of the struggling person and his heavy water-soaked clothing, she succeeded in bringing him to safety.

The Red Cross Certificate of Merit is the highest award given by the American National Red Cross to a person who saves or sustains a life by using skills learned in a Red Cross first aid, small craft, or water safety course.

Without a doubt, Billie Jean Carson's use of her skills and knowledge saved

the life of another human being, and I commend her for this heroic deed.

THE L.B.J. YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF NORTH CAROLINA

HON. CHARLES ROSE III

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon Baines Johnson died 1 year ago this week. As one who admired President Johnson and as a former president of the Young Democratic Clubs of North Carolina, I am especially proud that he and Mrs. Johnson were jointly honored when the Orange County Young Democratic Club became the first unit of the Democratic Party in the Nation to name itself as the LBJ Young Democratic Club.

In November 1973, Mrs. Johnson visited Orange County to accept a hand lettered scroll copy of the resolution naming the club. This resolution now hangs with the permanent collection at the LBJ Library in Austin, Tex.

Among the many newspaper articles concerning this evening of tribute to a President and First Lady was an article in the Carolina Times by Mr. Clifton P. Jones, a prominent black North Carolina leader who is president of the American Arthritis Association, Inc. The late editor-publisher of the Times, Mr. Louis E. Austin, was a personal friend of President Johnson. I feel it especially appropriate that an article from the Times should be included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON GUEST OF LBJ YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB
(By Clifton P. Jones)

It could have been the fall of 1964, the flags were all flying and Chapel Hill was in a festive mood—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson was in town as guest of The LBJ Young Democratic Club of Orange County.

Acting jointly Mayor Howard Lee of Chapel Hill, Mayor Robert Wells, Jr. of Carrboro, Mayor Fred Cates of Hillsborough and County Commissioner's Chairman Norman Walker proclaimed Thursday, November 8, as LBJ Day throughout Orange County and "ordered and extended the Freedom of our Precincts and our Towns to Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson."

The former First Lady visited the Carrboro Town Hall where she was given a rousing welcome by Mayor Wells and a large number of school children. She spoke briefly and signed autographs for the children. Chief John Blackwood and the entire Carrboro police force formed a saluting guard of honor as Mrs. Johnson arrived in Carrboro. She departed having won the hearts of all present.

The Chapel Hill Public Library was the next official stop for Mrs. Johnson. She was welcomed by Mrs. Howard Lee, officials of the library, a number of excited school children, and a host of newsmen. She autographed copies of Vantage Point by President Johnson and White House Diary by herself and presented them to Mrs. Richmond Bond and Mrs. William Geer for the Library. Chatting and sipping hot coffee, she met most of those present. As she left, one lady remarked "she really is as gracious as everyone says she is."

The main event of the day was "A tribute

to a President and First Lady" at 7:30 P.M. at the American Legion Building. Air Force R.O.T.C. Cadets from Cummings High School in Burlington sharply and with precision presented the American and North Carolina Colors. Henry Muldrow, Jr., a talented young black UNC-CH student, sang the National Anthem. Father Harry J. Sutcliffe of New York, blind since birth and Director of the Episcopal Guild for the Blind, gave The Invocation.

Following a meal of barbeque, brunswick stew, hush puppies and coffee, Lieutenant Governor James B. Hunt, Jr., extended official greetings on behalf of the State of North Carolina.

Mayor Howard Lee presented the key to the city on behalf of Chapel Hill. Mayor Robert Wells, Jr., and Mayor Fred Cates extended official greetings on behalf of Carrboro and Hillsborough. Colonel Robert M. Pace, former Orange County Y.D.C. President introduced special guests and Mrs. Howard Lee read letters and telegrams from Carl Albert, Hubert Humphrey, Henry Jackson, Howard Baker, George Meany, Howard K. Smith, Roy Wilkins, and others.

Former Governors Terry Sanford and Robert W. Scott and former Senator B. Everett Jordan spoke of their associations with President and Mrs. Johnson. Former governor Luther H. Hodges gave the main speech, A Tribute to the LBJ's. He spoke of the warmth and compassion of President Johnson and cited the 1964 Civil Rights Act as perhaps the greatest achievement of the Johnson administration. He called Mrs. Johnson "the most outstanding First Lady of modern times" ranking her even ahead of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Club President John W. Hamilton and Secretary Mrs. Charles Attardi, Jr. presented Mrs. Johnson with a hand lettered scroll copy of the resolution which named the club in honor jointly of President and Mrs. Johnson. The LBJ Young Democratic Club is the first unit of the Democratic Party in the nation to so honor President and Mrs. Johnson. Joining the club officers in signing the resolution were former governors Luther H. Hodges, Terry Sanford, Dan K. Moore, and Robert W. Scott; former Senator B. Everett Jordan, Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., former Congressman Nick Galifianakis, former Y.D.C. President Robert M. Pace, Mrs. Howard Lee, wife of Mayor Lee, and Mrs. Samuel Selden, childhood friend and college roommate of the former First Lady who lives in Chapel Hill.

Mrs. Johnson spoke briefly of her affection for North Carolina, of her memories of the "Lady Bird Special" and of her appreciation for the evening of tribute and memories of her husband. She received standing ovations as she entered the hall, when she was introduced, and when she concluded. Mrs. Howard Lee summed up the evening perhaps best "This is the nicest event in Chapel Hill since Howard has been mayor. Mrs. Johnson carries all our hearts back to Texas with her."

BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF BIRTH OF MOTHER SETON

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend on Saturday, January 5 at St. Joseph's Provincial House in Emmitsburg, Md., the commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Blessed Elizabeth Ann Seton. Mother Seton was born August 28, 1774, and is the

first native-born American to attain the honor of beatification. She arrived in St. Joseph's Valley near Emmitsburg in 1809 where she founded the American Sisters of Charity.

I would like to share with my colleagues an article from the Frederick News describing the commemorative service:

SETON CELEBRATION SCENES: SUN SHOWS A LITTLE MIRACLE

EMMITSBURG.—The brilliant rays of winter sun burst through heavily overcast skies here Saturday afternoon, turning the ice-covered outdoors of this northern-most Frederick County community into a jeweled wonderland of sparkling beauty.

A sudden freeze Thursday night had encased in icy glass all the trees, bushes, benches, fences, utility wires and statuary. As the dark clouds pulled apart about 1 o'clock to let the sun shine through, St. Joseph's Valley glistened like a beautiful lady robed in diamonds.

This phenomenon of nature is not unusual in Emmitsburg nor is it peculiar to this region, but it can be seen as having a special significance on this particular Saturday afternoon, Jan. 5, 1974. For on this day, some 1,400 persons were gathered here—from Rome, from Paris, from all over—to participate in a Mass or Eucharistic Celebration to mark the beginning of the bicentennial year of Blessed Elizabeth Ann Seton and to pray for the canonization of Mother Seton into Sainthood.

As though it were part of the Mass, the sun broke through the foreboding skies, and the full radiance of the sun filled the Sanctuary of the Church at Saint Joseph's Provincial House at precisely the high point of the Pontifical Blessing in the concluding rite.

The Celebrant had intoned the words: "Go in peace to love and serve the Lord."

The rays of the sun poured into the church as the audience responded, "Thanks be to God," and as the 100-voice Seton Bicentennial Chorus resounded with the beautiful "Hallelujah," from Handel's "The Messiah."

It was no little miracle that Mother Nature provided here for the world-wide Mother Seton Bicentennial observance that began Saturday in this small town where this someday-soon Saint-to-be worked her own miracle in founding America's parochial school system almost 165 years ago.

TRIBUTE TO THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SANTA MONICA HOSPITAL CLINIC

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, during this month of January, the outstanding clinic of the Santa Monica Hospital Medical Center is celebrating its 30th anniversary of operations.

Founded on December 12, 1943, the Santa Monica Hospital clinic has served for 30 years as a harbor for those troubled by sickness. It was established by the Lutheran Hospital Society of Charitable Corporation.

Although the clinic began as a free wartime health service for low-income families, it now functions as a part-pay comprehensive medical program for hard-working, well deserving families

whose incomes are too low to afford comparable services on an individual basis.

Originally, the clinic was located in a 1,000 square foot, old wooden house on the corner of 15th and Arizona in Santa Monica. Today, at the same location stands a modern out-patient facility with 16,000 square feet of space.

Thirty years ago the clinic served 750 people and handled 1,000 outpatient visits. Presently there are 900 families totaling 3,200 patients enlisted in the clinic program.

In 1943, 25 volunteer physicians and 21 dentists staffed 9 specialty clinics. Today, 19 full-time, family practice residents and 150 volunteer physicians staff 28 specialty clinics.

In 1969 the Santa Monica Hospital Clinic instituted a training program for family practice residents. The program has grown from 1 resident when it started to 19 residents and is presently considered to be one of the most outstanding training programs in the country.

The clinic currently serves more than 30 percent of the medically indigent families in the Santa Monica-West Los Angeles area. It maintains the highest standard of therapeutic and preventative medical services for patients of all ages, races, and creeds.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I call attention to the 30-year anniversary of the clinic of the Santa Monica Hospital Medical Center.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the week of January 27 marks the 56th anniversary of Ukraine's independence proclaimed on January 22, 1918. This national independence was destroyed by the first wave of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in 1920 and ever since, the 48 million Ukrainians—the largest captive non-Russian nation have been struggling to regain it. It is a time for the Ukrainian people to recall and to preserve what they have, in the hope that one day Ukraine will become a free and independent country once again.

I would like to take this opportunity to praise the people of Ukraine who have kept the spirit alive under the adverse conditions under which they suffer today. The nation of Ukraine is imprisoned and those who purport to represent Ukraine in the United Nations, in international, external and internal affairs are enemies of the people of Ukraine and cannot possibly represent their welfare and best interests. The present government of the so-called Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not truly represent the people of Ukraine but the said government would in fact prevent them from appealing to the United Nations in behalf of their fundamental human rights.

In commemorating the 56th anniversary

of Ukraine's independence, I find it essential to the dignity of the human race that an oppressed nation of 48 million people such as Ukraine should have a voice in the United Nations. A petition on the subject of human rights for Ukraine by the Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., was presented to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations on December 4, 1973. This petition appeals to our Ambassador and to the U.S. Government to bring to the attention of the world opinion and to the member delegates of the United Nations, the secret trials, arrests, and conditions of intolerable terror in Ukraine. And therefore, I support the petition on the subject of human rights for Ukraine on the floor of Congress, and I hope the Russians will take note of it.

BINARY WEAPONS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Army intends to ask for funds for the development of binary chemical weapons—a move that could jeopardize any hope of an international agreement on the control of chemical weapons—I would like to share with my colleagues three recent articles that examine the history of chemical warfare, the negotiations at the conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva where nerve gas is on the continuing agenda, and the steps that led to the development of the binary weapons concept:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 6, 1974]

UNITED STATES MUST JOIN GAS WARFARE BAN

(By Alan C. Nixon)

The long and unsavory recorded history of chemical warfare began more than 2,500 years ago. From "Greek fire," a mixture of burning pitch and sulfur catapulted onto attacking ships or over the walls of cities, it has come to include poison gases, herbicides, tear gas, liquid fire and similar unpleasant compounds.

During the evolution of chemical warfare, man has made attempts to restrict or prohibit its use. There has been the general feeling that somehow chemicals are not cricket in warfare—that they lack the clean, sporting thrust of the dagger, the sword, the arrow, the blunderbuss, the bullet or even high explosives. So it was natural to look for ways to bar chemicals from the sporting business of war.

Both peace conferences at The Hague in 1899 and 1907 issued declarations forbidding the use of poisonous gases on the grounds, the 1899 resolution read, that this kind of warfare was inhumane.

The reasons given for the United States withholding its support from the 1899 resolution were that the inhumane aspects of gases had not been clearly established and that restrictions to inventiveness were not conducive to world peace.

The League of Nations, as part of an effort to outlaw war in general, attempted to ban biological and chemical warfare during the 1920s. The Geneva protocol of 1925 binds its signers "to abstain from the use in war of asphyxiating, poisoning or similar

gases." The United States did not sign the treaty.

In 1970, President Nixon resubmitted the treaty to the Senate with his interpretation that "riot control agents and chemical herbicides" were not covered. The Senate refused to accept the interpretation. (It is my personal opinion that the Army's recent plan to create a safer-to-handle binary "nerve gas" would be prohibited even under President Nixon's interpretation of the treaty.)

The American Chemical Society, the world's largest society of professional chemists, had opposed the 1925 protocol "on the grounds of humanity" because the conference "showed . . . a lamentable lack of understanding of chemical warfare . . ." and "it was against national safety to try to outlaw chemical warfare." In 1970, we supported the Administration's interpretation.

But last fall, the society's council endorsed Senate Resolution 48 for "approval without qualification of the Geneva protocol." It is interesting to speculate on what brought about the society's reversal from its 1925 stand.

The general feeling at that time was best expressed by something Ida M. Tarbell wrote in the Washington Herald in December, 1921:

"The fact about chemical warfare seems to be that it is at once the most effective weapon of attack and defense ever devised by man and at the same time, it is the most humane—ironical as it is to use the word with the infernal business of war . . . You cannot outlaw chemical warfare unless you are willing to destroy the chemist and all his work. We cannot do that."

The most extensive military use of poison gases occurred during World War I. The Germans, ignoring both the 1899 and 1907 resolutions, had used gas against the Russians in Poland early in 1915, but the winds did not cooperate and it was not particularly successful.

However, chlorine, released from cylinders under favorable wind conditions, had a devastating effect against the British, French, Canadians and Portuguese on the western front of Ypres. This led to the development of protective masks and retaliatory capabilities. (It is interesting to note that in 1862 the U.S. government rejected the idea of using chlorine in artillery shells fired in the Civil War.)

After Ypres, both sides used chlorine gas until July, 1917, when the Germans introduced mustard gas, which caused the greatest poison gas casualties of the war. In the Somme offensive against the British and French in March, 1918, the Germans fired 500,000 mustard gas shells.

Both sides had planned extensive use of chemical warfare during 1918, but, of course, this was prevented by the signing of the armistice in November, 1918.

Poison gas, as such, was not used during World War II although all soldiers and many civilians were equipped with gas masks, both sides built up large stocks of gases and research was accelerated to develop new chemical warfare agents.

The reason it was not used probably stemmed from the belief of each side that its opponent was equally prepared, so that no strategic advantage would result from its use.

Since World War II, the tide of public opinion has been running strongly against the use of chemical and biological agents in warfare, stimulated, no doubt, by Chinese propaganda during the Korean war and the effects of accidental spillages and misadventures with industrial chemicals and chemical warfare agents.

The antiwar feeling that swept the country as a result of the Vietnam war has undoubtedly affected the attitudes of the American Chemical Society's membership. So have adverse publicity on the use of herbicides in Vietnam and reports on their deleterious and

long-range effects. Student protests against the production of napalm helped change chemists' views. So did alleged excessive use of tear gas and Mace by police to control crowds.

Although no referendum was held among the society's membership, there has been little opposition to the stance taken by the board of directors and council. In the main, protests I have received are based on the old argument that since all modern warfare is chemical in nature, if chemistry were not used, warfare could not be conducted.

I agree. But it also so happens that what we can do at this moment to work toward ending war is to encourage our government to endorse the Geneva protocol. It is really not terribly important that the possibility is small of reducing either the likelihood or the horror of war by endorsement of the Geneva protocol.

What is important is that every move made to limit warfare, every commission working for disarmament, every conference called to reduce armaments, is beneficial in that they move world public opinion further in the direction of our ultimate goal: the complete end to all warfare.

[From the Long Island Newsday, Dec. 13, 1973]

GETTING RID OF NERVE GAS

One item on the continuing agenda of the 26-nation Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is nerve gas. The Russians have introduced proposals for banning its use in warfare, but the U.S. isn't satisfied with the safeguards against stockpiling. The U.S. has presented no proposal of its own, but the international community is looking for us to do so when the conference meets again in Geneva next spring.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Army has come up with an idea for developing a new binary nerve gas weapon and wants \$200,000,000 from Congress for research and development—and production if it proves feasible. The advantage of the new gas is that it consists of two chemicals which are harmless when kept apart, as they would be in the new weapons. This makes them much safer to transport and store than existing nerve gas shells, which caused a furor when some of them got out of control in 1968, killing more than 6,000 sheep in Utah.

But does it make sense to spend \$200,000,000 on a deadly new compound that should and probably will be banned before long? The President has announced that the U.S. would not be the first country to use nerve gas and that our stockpiles are primarily a deterrent. As long as we have an adequate—though admittedly more dangerous—deterrent now, we'd be better advised to forget about expensive refinements and redouble our efforts to offer a workable plan for banning nerve gas altogether. That would be easier on both our pocketbooks and our nerves.

[From the Nation, Jan. 5, 1974]

THE NERVE OF IT

Faced with a public relations problem, the Army is never at a loss for a gimmick. In this instance the difficulty centers on public concern over storage of mustard gas, phosgene and other lethal chemical warfare weapons at Rocky Mountain Arsenal just 10 miles from the center of Denver. Another source of embarrassment is Sen. Frank E. Moss' reminder that 6,400 sheep were killed in his state—Utah—a few years ago when some VX-type nerve gas was released from a military airplane in an experiment that miscarried. The Army, consequently, has been faced with the problem of showing that poison gas could be produced in some relatively harmless form. It need not be quite as harmless as, say, nitrous oxide—"laughing gas"—used as an anesthetic in dentistry, but apprehensive civilians had to be assured that, if acciden-

tally released, it would not kill them outright.

A happy solution was found in the binary concept of chemical munitions. Two different gases would be stored in, say, an artillery shell, with a membrane separating them. While neither of the gases would be recommended for breathing, as long as the membrane was tight there would be no serious reason for alarm. Only when the shell was fired and the membrane ruptured would the mixture become lethal, to the discomfort of the enemy (whether military or civilian does not really matter).

Even so, accidental mixing is readily conceivable; but the Army regards this as a minor risk and certainly, from a public relations standpoint, it is placed in a more defensible position. The question that is not readily answered goes to the heart of the matter: why do we need chemical munitions at all? The Army's answer is that the Russians might use gas in some future war, so we must have gas to counter their gas. Even if war does not come, our gas will deter their gas. An editorial in the December 13, 1973, *Washington Post* derides this view. "This," the *Post* says, "is like saying that in order to deter the Russians from trampling us with elephant herds, we must raise our own elephant herds. It is, in a word, ridiculous. No canon of war requires the United States to respond with the same weapons used by a foe. We would still retain a broad range of other choices if we relinquished nerve gas and like chemical agents. By relinquishing chemicals, however, the United States would be making a modest but real contribution to a more civilized international society."

This is hardly an argument that will appeal to military men or the learned civilians who serve them and have been converted to the military way of thinking. Nor is it merely a question of weapons: the question is rather the extent to which reason can be brought to bear on problems of "defense." Senator Moss and Sen. Floyd K. Haskell (D., Colo.) tried, last September, to get an amendment adopted that would come up with an answer to a related question—the most effective means of eliminating all existing supplies of nerve gas. The amendment became part of the defense authorization bill but was dropped in conference. Thus a sane, sensible suggestion went by the board.

Second, in this matter of chemical warfare we are not as virtuous as we like to proclaim ourselves. In his first term President Nixon renounced "first use" of lethal and incapacitating chemicals but he was not moved to sign the Geneva Protocol which outlaws first use. He submitted the protocol to the Senate in 1970 but explicitly excluded "riot control agents and chemical herbicides," obviously to keep himself free to carry on his wars in Indochina without impediment, and to use gas against the ferocious young people who were protesting vehemently against the associated policies. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee thereupon sent the treaty back to him, probably not to Mr. Nixon's displeasure, and there the matter rests.

A third point involves the almost forgotten Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which subsists on a starvation budget of \$7 million annually and has nothing to do with major arms control negotiations. The agency is consistently ignored by the Pentagon, which in the case of the binary nerve gas insisted that this was strictly a military question of "modernizing" the Army chemical warfare weapons. Instead of knuckling under to the Pentagon, Dr. Fred C. Ikle, who took over as director of the failing agency in July 1973, protested that the binary nerve gas was militarily unnecessary and would further thwart international efforts to control chemical warfare. Another argument offered by the Arms Control Agency is that semi-industrialized nations might resort to the binary gas technique in their wars with

one another, or to quell domestic opposition. If it does nothing else, the controversy has brought the agency into public notice, and perhaps henceforth the Pentagon will be less contemptuous of it.

The Army says it will cost \$200 million to convert to binary nerve gases. *The Washington Post* says \$500 million. On the basis of past experience, *The Nation* is willing to bet on the *Post's* figure. The key question, however, is whether the vested interest of the Army's chemical warfare service is to prevail, or whether common sense and the best scientific intelligence are to be paramount in this and many other military projects.

OUR NEXT SHORTAGE: RED MEAT

HON. JOHN MELCHER

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have just reviewed the cattle-on-feed report in which the Department of Agriculture tells us how many cattle there are in the feedlots of America being fattened for slaughter.

Thanks for the Cost of Living Council with its beef price freezes and thaws of several months ago, cattle feeders have been reluctant to get caught out on a limb with too many cattle. The uncertainty of Cost of Living Council policy coupled with rising feed costs has caused them since mid-1973 to be cautious and reluctant to keep their feedlots full.

The report shows that as of January 1 there were 6 percent less cattle in the feedlots, 13,673,000 compared to 14,432,000 on January 1, 1973, a decline of 795,000 head. The report, however, shows that for the next few weeks a lot of over-fat cattle will leave the feed lots to be processed for America's meat counters. There are more heavy cattle, 1,100 pounds or over, ready for market—about 19 percent more which ought to be marketed within 30 days. Most of these cattle are really too fat to suit the average housewife and some of the excessive fat will have to be trimmed—a real waste.

These animals were obviously held by feeders in the hope that prices would get up somewhere close to cost of production. The Department of Agriculture published a study in December which showed that feeders had to have \$55.25 per hundredweight for feed steers just to break even. Actual prices were down around \$40 in the markets then, so feeders were losing about \$150 a head on animals marketed. Some obviously held their fed animals in the hope of saving their economic hides and cattle prices did come up close to \$50 per hundredweight early this year, but still not enough to pay costs only to cut losses from \$150 to \$50 per head.

Beyond these cattle that have been held back but will shortly be gone—and this is the real glimpse at the future—we are looking at some very steep declines in fed cattle supply. There were only 78 percent as many calves under 500 pounds and only 77 percent as many weighing 500 to 700 pounds in the lot's January 1 as the year before.

Those figures mean a real beef shortage in April-May-June, when the animals should be reaching market weight. They point to a decline of 20 percent or more in fed cattle coming to market and in beef at the meat counters.

I have no doubt that Director Dunlop of the Cost of Living Council and others will shortly be reassuring us that there are a lot of feeder animals that can be rushed into the lots to augment meat supplies, and there are more than normal around. But it takes 4 or 5 months at best to get them up to market weight and condition, and there is absolutely no sign that feedlot owners are rushing out to fill up their pens again so they can lose a lot more money. On the contrary, the figures indicate that more and more of the pens are being left empty until there is some hope that cattle will bring what they cost to produce.

Placements on feed in December were down 15 percent under a year ago in the last quarter of 1973. They were off 24 percent in December in the seven big feeding States on which reports are compiled monthly.

Unless something happens mighty quickly, the prospect is that cattle placed on feed during the entire first half of 1974 will be less than 10 million head—about 1½ million—compared to 11,736 in the first 6 months last year.

Over the past 5 years, feeders have placed between 56 and 59 percent of all cattle going on feed during the marketing year in the feedlots in the 6 months from July through December. The average has been 57.4 percent. The other 42.6 percent has gone in during January-June. If patterns are normal this year our placements on feed to supply beef-steak and roasts for tables starting in June and July will be down 2.3 million head, or over 20 percent.

If this is allowed to come to pass, the red meat shortage may very well displace the energy crisis in the headlines.

There is not going to be any upsurge in pork production to replace the beef. The December 1 pigs and hogs on farms report showed 3 percent more on farms than the year before, but the Department's estimates on the pork outlook have become so notoriously misleading—slaughter hasn't come close to the indicated level for a couple of years—that no one really expects pork output to exceed last year's low levels even by the 3 percent indicated. If you want to know how low last year's pork production levels were, let me tell you that in 1971 we slaughtered 94 million head of hogs, in 1972 that dropped to 84 million head, and last year, with the encouragement of Mr. Dunlop's Cost of Living Council, hog producers cut their marketings back to 1965 levels at only 76 million head—18 million or about 20 percent below 1971.

The lamb and mutton outlook parallels beef.

Sheep and lambs on feed January 1 were 7 percent under the year before. Placements were up a little—2 percent—probably because a great many sheep growers are liquidating altogether. Losses to predators since the ban on toxic baits, and the failure of the administration to control coyotes by other means

as the President promised, are causing many sheepmen to give up. A further reduction in red meat supplies, to add to the beef shortage, is just one side effect. The price of wool, wool fabrics and wool clothing will, of course, start mounting too.

The big, serious shortage we confront which will effect nearly every American, is red meat supply.

We are about to reap the harvest of the administration's unwise meat price ceilings of last year. The administration cannot meet or even ameliorate the red meat shortage as it has tried to do it in the dairy line—by letting in hundreds of millions of pounds of foreign products. We are already getting all the foreign red meat there is available. Meat import restrictions were pulled off 3 years ago to keep our domestic cattle producers from making any money, if possible, at that time.

It is not going to solve the situation for the Agriculture Department to come out in the next few days with a big inventory of cattle in the United States, an inventory overstuffed with the phantom calves of phantom cows to make it appear like the pastures and prairies of America are crowded with beef on the hoof.

Phantom feeders are no substitute for steaks and roasts and hamburger in the meat counter.

I am making these remarks today to avoid, if possible, consumers or colleagues who represent consumers, misunderstanding the cause of the meat shortage. Farmers and ranchers simply cannot pay out \$55.25 per hundredweight to produce beef and stay in business with \$40 return.

The mess we are in is very unfortunate for it is unnecessary. It was not only predictable, it was predicted last year when the meat price tampering started. For the benefit of members interested, I include in the Record a table of cattle on feed January 1, by weight groups, which tells the story statistically.

We slaughter about 2.2 million head of fed cattle monthly—more when meat is abundant. Steers are normally marketed around 1,050 pounds and heifers at 950 to 1,000 pounds. The weights are as of January 1, of course. The animals under 700 pounds should supply markets in May and June.

The table follows:

	Jan. 1, 1973	Jan. 1, 1974	1974 as percent of 1973
All cattle and calves:			
Less than 500 pounds.....	1,946,000	1,516,000	78
500 to 699 pounds.....	3,847,000	2,977,000	77
700 to 899 pounds.....	4,346,000	4,161,000	96
900 to 1,099 pounds.....	3,076,000	3,404,000	111
1,100 pounds and over.....	646,000	1,004,000	155
Total.....	13,861,000	13,062,000	94

RESOLUTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Institute of Electrical

and Electronics Engineers has passed a resolution on the human rights, particularly immigration rights, for their Soviet colleagues. Surely, this resolution expresses the hopes of Americans in every work of life that individual freedom must grow in the Soviet Union and throughout the world.

The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

The Board of Directors of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, having learned with dismay the serious penalties imposed on engineers and scientists who desire to emigrate from the Soviet Union, requested that the following resolution be respectfully forwarded to President Siforov of the Popov Society, and to President M. Keldysh and Vice President V. A. Kotelnikov of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, with an urgent request to render assistance:

"The Board of Directors of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, an organization of approximately 160,000 electrical engineers all over the world, is keenly interested in the welfare of engineers and scientists everywhere.

"This Board views with great concern the infringement on basic freedoms wherever they occur, particularly when engineers and scientists are singled out as victims because of their profession.

"This Board regrets that many engineers and scientists and their families have been denied their right to emigrate in violation of recognized international practices, often solely because of their professional qualifications in Science and Engineering.

"These practices seriously endanger the spirit of transnational friendship and cooperation on which the operation of this Institute is based. The Board of Directors of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers appeals to its sister organizations, and to the National Academies of Science and Engineering in every country, to join in support of equal human rights for engineers and scientists."

SOLZHENITSYN: A HERO FOR OUR TIME

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that many, in the alleged spirit of "détente," are attempting to set forth the thesis that communism has changed and that the Soviet Union should receive trade and other concessions from the West, the real facts about communism persist in reappearing.

The latest description of the real nature of the Soviet system is to be found in the recent book, "The Gulag Archipelago," by Nobel laureate author, Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Unlike his earlier works, "The Gulag Archipelago" is not a novel, and it makes serious charges not only against Stalin, but against others both before and after him, from 1918 to 1956.

Lenin, still a hero in the Soviet Union, is pictured not as a near saint, but as a man who established a police state under Marxist auspices, one far worse in terms of mass executions and deportations than the Okhrana of Czarist days.

Also cited, along with a demand for

their punishment, are such leaders as Vyacheslav Molotov, Foreign Minister under Stalin who, argues Solzhenitsyn, has reached an honorable old age "stained with our blood."

Mr. Solzhenitsyn's charges embrace many of the older members of today's hierarchy who either supported Stalin or failed to intervene. He notes that only 2 dozen Soviet officials have been convicted of terroristic crimes—compared with 78,000 former Nazi officials convicted in West Germany.

By writing this important book, the author has placed his life in jeopardy. He has shown great courage and a large part of his desire to share this story with the world is found in his interest in correcting the false illusions in the West about the real nature of communism.

Mr. Solzhenitsyn is truly a hero in a world with too few men who are willing to stand alone for the truth. Discussing his courage, American Author Saul Bellow notes that—

The word "hero," long in disrepute, has been redeemed by Solzhenitsyn. He has had the courage, the power of mind and the strength of spirit to speak the truth to the entire world.

Mr. Bellow stated that Americans "should make it clear that they stand by Solzhenitsyn. It would be the completest betrayal of principle to fail him."

Following is the letter by Saul Bellow which appeared in the New York Times of January 15, 1974:

SOLZHENITSYN'S TRUTH

To the Editor:

Andrei Sakharov and four other Soviet intellectuals have appealed to "decent people throughout the world" to try to protect Aleksander Solzhenitsyn from persecution.

The word "hero," long in disrepute, has been redeemed by Solzhenitsyn. He has had the courage, the power of mind and the strength of spirit to speak the truth to the entire world. He is a man of perfect intellectual honor and, in his moral strength, he is peculiarly Russian. To the best Russian writers of this hellish century it has been perfectly clear that only the power of truth is equal to the power of the state.

It is to be hoped that the Brezhnev and the Kosygin will be capable of grasping what the behavior of such a man means to the civilized world. Persecution of Solzhenitsyn, deportation, confinement in a madhouse or exile will be taken as final evidence of complete moral degeneracy in the Soviet regime.

We cannot expect our diplomats to abandon their policy of détente (whatever that may mean) or our great corporations to break their business contracts with Russia, but physicists and mathematicians, biologists, engineers, artists and intellectuals should make it clear that they stand by Solzhenitsyn. It would be the completest betrayal of principle to fail him. Since America is the Soviet Government's partner in détente, Americans have a special responsibility in this matter.

What Solzhenitsyn has done in revealing the unchecked brutality of Stalinism, he has done also for us. He has reminded every one of us what we owe to truth.

SAUL BELLOW.

CHICAGO, January 7, 1974.

It is Mr. Solzhenitsyn's contention that up to 12 million people at any one time have occupied forced labor camps in the Soviet Union, enduring incredible cruelty and hardships and dying in large numbers. It was not the aberration of Stalin

which produced this system of terror, he believes, but the very nature of communism itself.

Discussing the courage displayed by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the Wall Street Journal noted editorially that—

One of the Nobel laureate's recurrent themes has been that those in the West who enjoy liberty do not recognize that the Soviet system is the chief menace to it today. In this he is certainly right; many who profess to protect liberty apply one standard to South Vietnam and another to North Vietnam, one standard to Greece and another to Russia.

How freedom is to be preserved by enriching through trade and subsidization, as was the case with the wheat deal, a society which has systematically deprived its citizens of every vestige of freedom and dignity, is impossible to say. Unfortunately, many in our own country seem willing to sacrifice the long-range interests of freedom for what they consider to be the short-range interests of financial gain.

Following is the editorial, "Perspective on Freedom," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 9, 1974:

PERSPECTIVE ON FREEDOM

Alexander Solzhenitsyn has once again called the world's attention to the inhumanity of the Government under which he lives. As Western readers digest his account of the Stalinist slave labor camps in "The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-1956," they can gain a new perspective on their own freedom.

For it is hard for anyone nurtured in the Western democracies to understand that life under repression has historically been the fate of the bulk of mankind. Even today repression prevails. About the time Mr. Solzhenitsyn was releasing his new book, Freedom House in New York was completing its annual survey of political and civil freedom in the nations of the world. It found that 1.3 billion people were "free," 1.6 billion "not free" and 0.8 billion "partly free."

A great deal of the repression in the world today finds its historical roots in Mr. Solzhenitsyn's "gulag archipelago"—the prison camps stretching across the Soviet Union like a string of islands. He describes a kind of repression unrelieved by the least trace of human feeling; police arrest someone whose child has just died, overturn the coffin and throw the corpse on the floor.

The publication of this new book in the West puts the present commissars on the spot. They have been talking about using the international copyright convention to prevent such publication, and with consummate courage, Mr. Solzhenitsyn has called their bluff. Now what will they do? Will they really try to go into Western courts to suppress the work? Will they really arrest Mr. Solzhenitsyn and throw him back in the labor camps of which he writes, thus confirming the thrust of his charges?

Mr. Solzhenitsyn and physicist Andrei Sakharov gain some protection from their fame in the West, but the Soviets remain quite capable of packing dissenters off to labor camps or insane asylums. They have in fact been picking off dissenters one by one, and are now succeeding in suppressing the *samidzat*, or underground publications. Mr. Solzhenitsyn apparently has other volumes to release if arrested, recounting how repression continues today.

One of the Nobel laureate's recurrent themes has been that those in the West who enjoy liberty do not recognize that the Soviet system is the chief menace to it today. In this he is certainly right; many who pro-

less to protect liberty apply one standard to South Vietnam and another to North Vietnam, one standard to Greece and another to Russia.

In this respect the Freedom House survey is particularly revealing. Freedom and repression are very much matters of historical inheritance. The free nations are those of Western Europe and the North Atlantic littoral, a few in South America and a few, notably India and Japan, who have benefited from an injection of Anglo-Saxon constitutionalism. Liberty is found only within this broad Western tradition.

Freedom House's "not free" nations come in more cloaks, but the main thrust is clear. Of the 1.6 billion people living under repression, 1.2 billion live in Communist nations. Nowhere is there a Communist nation that is also free or even "partly free." The tradition of Marx, Lenin and Stalin is the most powerful force for repression in the world today.

Now, these observations need be no call to holy war. Americans should not embark on the fool's errand of bringing democracy to, say, China. There are sharp limitations on what the United States can do to aid Mr. Solzhenitsyn's campaign for a more liberal Russia. But the Western world can insure that his message is heard and remembered.

Most important of all, the Western world can take care to protect and nurture its own traditions. Externally, it needs to keep itself strong enough that it cannot be bullied by the opposing tradition. And internally it needs to keep in mind that despite all its faults, Western culture provides the only source of freedom mankind is likely to find in today's world.

What the future holds for Solzhenitsyn is impossible to tell. Attacks upon him are mounting in the Soviet press, and real fear exists for his life.

This is the time for those in the West who are sincere in their espousal of freedom to make it clear that we will not sit idly by and permit the destruction of this courageous man.

Columnist William F. Buckley, Jr., declared that—

This is the moment not for bureaucratic response, but for gallant response.

Mr. Buckley urged that—

If a hair of the head of Solzhenitsyn is harmed: One. The United States of America will suspend all cultural exchange with the Soviet Union beginning immediately. Two. An absolute embargo, for a mourning period of one year, will be imposed on commerce of any kind with the Soviet Union, and against any purchase of goods of any kind from the Soviet Union.

In his column appearing in the New York Post of January 15, 1974, Mr. Buckley concluded that—

Perhaps Solzhenitsyn requires martyrdom, fully to anneal his work to the service of humanity. Perhaps, even, he desires it. But we cannot willingly play the role of Pontius Pilate.

I wish to share this column with my colleagues, and insert it into the Record at this time:

SOLZHENITSYN AT BAY

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The new volume of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn raises policy questions for the West which, if we answer them wrongly, will bring down upon us that curse of history reserved for those despicable men who, though knowing everything they needed to know, declined to act, thus contributing to a crucifixion. Solzhenitsyn is only an individual, but there was

never in human history a clearer identification of an individual and a class.

Martin Luther King as representative of the American Negro pales alongside the authority of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn as representative of the 200 million people of Russia who have suffered, and continue to suffer, at the hands of the creed-ridden tormentors of that wretched country.

The Soviet government does not disguise its feelings about Solzhenitsyn, any more than the establishmentarians disguised theirs toward Jesus. Now, on the publication of "The Gulag Archipelago," they have begun their offensive. It is clearly launched with a certain tentativeness—else they'd have simply yanked him from the streets and shipped him off directly to Siberia, or to a convenient warren in the cellar of the Lubyanka, there to receive a little lead in his stupefying, or inspiring mind.

Though Solzhenitsyn is only one man, his elimination would amount to an act of genocide. It is now as if, 35 years ago, Adolph Hitler had released, for the convenience of the next few editions of the World Almanac, the projections on the diminishing percentage of Jews alive and well in Germany. Would the West, in such circumstances, do anything about it? Or would that be to interrupt the rhythm of detente?

Permit a drastic truncation—in just a few sentences—of the experience of just one Soviet victim. This one an American citizen who, incredibly, has been living in Maryland since 1971. It required that we should learn of his existence from Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. His name is Alexander Dolgun. He was a clerk with the American Embassy. In 1948 he was seized on the streets of Moscow and would spend eight years in Soviet camps, and another 15 years in civilian detention. A cheerful representative of the Workers' Paradise, second in charge of Soviet security, called Ryumin, called in young Dolgun, who had declined to confess to crimes he had not committed.

"And so," said Ryumin politely, stroking his rubber truncheon which was an inch and a half thick, "you have survived trial by sleeplessness with honor. So now we will try the club. Prisoners don't last more than two or three sessions of this. Let down your trousers and lie on the runner."

"The colonel sat down on the prisoner's back. Dolgun had intended to count the blows. He didn't know yet what a blow with a rubber truncheon is on the sciatic nerve. The effect is not in the place where the blow is delivered—it blows up inside the head. After the first blow the victim was insane with pain and broke his nails on the carpet. Ryumin beat away."

"After the beating the prisoner could not walk, and of course, he was not carried. They just dragged him along the floor . . . [then] Ryumin went wild, and started to beat him in the stomach and broke through the intestinal wall, in the form of an enormous hernia where his intestines protruded. And the prisoner was taken off to the Butyrka hospital with a case of peritonitis, and, for the time being the attempts to compel him to commit a foul deed were broken off."

The reason Brezhnev, *et al*, are so much afraid of Solzhenitsyn is that his indictment isn't of the man Stalin, or even of the man Lenin, whose atrocities figure greatly in this book. His indictment is universal: an indictment of totalitarian society. Brezhnev can no more convincingly denounce Stalin than he can denounce his own aorta. The governors of the Soviet Union cannot break with their own past without walking, unmanacled, to Red Square, to set a torch upon themselves.

This is the moment not for bureaucratic response, but for gallant response, and those of us who know Henry Kissinger pray that he will take the initiative—no one could do it better.

If a hair of the head of Solzhenitsyn is harmed:

One. The United States of America will suspend all cultural exchange with the Soviet Union beginning immediately.

Two. An absolute embargo, for a mourning period of one year, will be imposed on commerce of any kind with the Soviet Union, and against any purchase of goods of any kind from the Soviet Union.

Perhaps Solzhenitsyn requires martyrdom, fully to anneal his work to the service of humanity. Perhaps, even, he desires it. But we cannot willingly play the role of Pontius Pilate.

SEATBELT INTERLOCKS MUST GO

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, the so-called safety standard which requires new cars to be equipped with an interlock between the seatbelts and the ignition system is expensive, an invasion of privacy and, ironically, dangerous.

Not only do cars cost more because of this system, but they will be more expensive to repair, as well. Mechanics are either going to have to jump-start the car, put a weight on the front seat, or hire someone to sit in the car while it is being repaired.

I agree that seatbelts can often save lives, although there are some cases where they can trap an occupant during or after an accident. But I do not think it is any more the Government's right to invade a person's privacy and tell him how he must protect himself in this way than it is to tell him to wear his rubbers when it rains.

Can you imagine what thoughts would go through your mind if your car stalled in a short-cycle left turn lane at a busy intersection. Try this: the car jumps ahead a foot or two and stalls; you try to restart it; nothing happens. Then you remember. You turn off the ignition, open your seatbelt, close it again, and try to start the car. If it has not flooded, maybe you can catch the green light next time around. Meanwhile, traffic has backed up, horns are honking, and three cars back someone has tried to pull out and go around, causing an accident. This is not safety—it's foolishness.

I recently received several petitions in support of my bill. The 79 signatures were gathered in a short period of time by only one of the many repair shops in my district. Their customers were very rightly concerned at the prospects of even higher repair costs in the days to come. When the cost of living is rising all around us, Congress has a duty to remove this added and unwelcome burden on our citizens. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 10664, which would repeal the interlock requirement, and urge my colleagues to join in passing this much-needed bill.

The text of the petition is short and to the point, and I include it at this point in the record:

PETITION

To the Congressmen, Senators and Auto Manufacturers:

We, the undersigned, urge you to support the bill HR 10277 requiring the removal of the interlock system from all vehicles.

1. The systems will be far too costly to repair;

2. The systems will be most inconvenient for those of us who have a pet or put packages on the seat;

3. The systems create a dangerous situation if the car stalls and the system fails to start properly;

4. The requirement that the system be in a car is an unconstitutional infringement of our personal rights to select what we shall wear and how we shall protect our persons from injury or disease.

Your support of the above bill to repeal the requirement of the interlock system will be appreciated.

THE ENERGY FACT BLACKOUT

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months we have come to realize that the energy monopoly in this country, for such it is, has a vested interest in preventing the average American from knowing any basic facts regarding the real state of our resources. For a number of years now, all energy facts have been concentrated in the hands of the eight major oil companies which dominate the market so effectively.

Today, we know little about how much refinery capacity is at any one time because the oil industry will not tell the public. We know little about what use pipelines are being put to in terms of transporting adequate supplies of fuel. Why? Because the large oil companies see fit to withhold the information.

Today's energy crisis, many Americans believe, is a contrived thing arranged by the major oil companies, with the acquiescence of the Federal Government. Today, the American consumer, is paying a premium price for all forms of energy because the energy monopoly has been allowed to operate almost totally in the dark.

The Federal Government has allowed itself to be placed in the disgraceful position of accepting all energy facts from these companies and offering them to the people and media as gospel. No Federal agency of any kind, except the Federal Trade Commission, has sought energy facts from the companies. That is why they have been able to tell any and all critics that they know nothing and cannot be allowed. Following such successful attempts to discredit any critics, they come forward with their own versions and ask for public belief. Government agencies, disgracefully depend upon them for facts, have in the past only been able to agree dumbly with the specious arguments advanced by the private interests the agencies are supposed to police.

The Federal Power Commission, for example, takes what figures the oil and gas interests offer it, and puts them out as Government gospel. No outside interests operating on behalf of the public is allowed access to these figures, because the agency claims business confidentiality is vital. Other Federal agencies seeking such figures in the public interest are denied such information, as has been

the case with the Federal Trade Commission. When the FTC sought industry data from the FPC, a sister agency, the FPC did all it could to block FTC access to this information. At one point, it asked FTC to submit an application for the data. Other events, including attempts to destroy public documents, have also characterized the FPC's actions. And because we know nothing about the true state of energy reserves, the FPC, operating behind closed doors, has been able to effectively deregulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead through the optional pricing procedure. By granting individual price hikes of huge proportions, the normal procedures have been evaded.

The U.S. Geological Survey and the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior also bear a large part of the blame for this Government ignorance of energy facts. Both these agencies play massive roles in the administration of public lands. Yet neither of them conducts an annual census of publicly owned energy resources. Neither of them publishes any annual report on such resources or on what has been extracted by private interests from public lands. In fact, the activities of these agencies give observers reason to believe that they are on the side of the oil companies in almost every aspect of the energy crisis. In no way have these agencies done anything to alleviate the situation. And when we turn to them for data, all they have to offer is again what the oil and gas monopolies have thrown to them as a pittance. So once again, as the questions grow in number and complexity, the Federal Government is operating without effective and definitive information.

Because of this situation, the oil companies have been allowed to plead any excuse for their incredible policies, which have driven their minimal competition to the economic wall. Because we have not taken the trouble to find out what they are doing and how they are doing it, they have been able to half convince the public that there are actual shortages, when in fact they are manipulating the situation to their ultimate financial advantage. Why, for example, were they able to construct numerous cutrate gas stations for their secondary brands this summer while pleading a gasoline shortage which drove 1,500 small gas station operators out of business?

Now we are confronted with the heating fuel shortage, which has effectively allowed them to raise their prices on home fuel and gasoline to unheard of levels. Yet when confronted with a threat of congressional action if they did not reveal what their actual stocks of reserves were, they told the Nation their stocks of vital fuels were higher than at this time last year. Some observers might construe this as a contrived attempt by the oil companies to frighten the public into acquiescing in stratospheric price hikes, which have, of course, become the norm.

Recent hearings into oil company profits and taxes have revealed devastating facts. Walter Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic

Advisers, estimates that these major oil companies will coin \$13 billion in excess profits in 1973, above and beyond what they made in 1972. Further, the taxes they will end up paying the Federal Government on this may well be nil because of the foreign tax credit, allowing them to write off what they pay the Arabs dollar for dollar against their American Federal income tax. That loss to the Federal Treasury means that the average American will have to make up the Federal tax deficit out of what he pays. Calmly, dispassionately, and with hurt tone, the oil executives admit that this in fact is the case, and offer the excuse that they are multinational in their operations.

This in turn brings out another point. These companies are so multinational and are devoted so singlemindedly to the profits they earn, that national interests of the United States and the well-being of the American people come far down the list of their priorities. We come last, and shall continue to come last. Which points out the true evil of the huge multinational conglomerate. If they will gain economically by harming the United States, even though they are ostensibly an American company, to make the big dollar, they will efficiently and without hesitation pursue a policy that will hurt America. No greater illustration of this can be offered than the energy embroglio we are presently wrestling with.

The United States has to act in self-defense against these companies, and the first steps can and must be taken at home and within the Federal Government. An independent source of statistics must be brought into being, to gather information for the Congress on energy.

Therefore, I am joining in cosponsorship of the measure to create a Bureau of Energy Information to conduct surveys, gather facts, supply Congress with answers to current questions, and insure that we shall not have a repetition of the present situation.

The public and the Congress have a right to know all pertinent facts about pipelines, refineries, and tanker fleets, including who owns them, the scheduling, contents, and marketing procedures. If the oil companies do not like sharing this information with the people and the Congress, that is simply too bad. Much of our present difficulty can be traced to the indulgence we have traditionally offered to the domestic oil industry, which emerges as a parasitic middleman, devoted to making money out of our present crisis, rather than devoted to alleviating it. And this is merely a beginning.

FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN IS NO SOLUTION TO WELFARE MESS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, rumors have been circulating to the effect that the administration may introduce

a revised version of the family assistance plan. This welfare reform or guaranteed annual income measure was strenuously pushed by the President during his first term in office and then dropped during the 1972 campaign.

It would be a serious mistake for the President to resurrect this radical and thoroughly discredited program. In the 1972 elections, the American people voiced their support for a reduction, not an increase, in welfare spending. McGovern and his \$1,000-for-everyone giveaway welfare proposal were overwhelmingly repudiated. It is ironic that after criticizing McGovern for his \$1,000 giveaway scheme, the administration is now supposedly considering one which is almost equally ridiculous. Would the President really have us believe that the American people who one year ago overwhelmingly rejected \$4,000 for a family of four would now accept a program guaranteeing a minimum payment of \$3,200 for a family of four?

I am quick to agree that we need a major overhaul of our chaotic, costly and inefficient welfare system. Even more disturbing than the staggering cost, the present system tends to foster dependency on the Government as a way of life. Many recipients now view welfare payments as a lifetime right, rather than a temporary measure to assist them through difficult times.

The family assistance plan, however, will only further expand the welfare mess. More, not less, people will be on the welfare rolls. More, not less, money will be spent on welfare benefits. More, not less, people will be dependent on the Government for their food, shelter, and clothing.

Once the idea of a guaranteed annual income is accepted, the Government will have gone perpetually into the charity business. Our Nation will have taken a giant step toward a permanent welfare state.

DOES FREEDOM OF THE PRESS EXTEND TO FREEDOM TO UNDERMINE COMPETITION?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in these times of political and moral upheaval it seemingly has become commonplace for people in public and private life to be critical of the news media. And, in return, it has become commonplace for the media to defend itself against charges of deception, half-truths, and innuendo as attacks on their first amendment rights.

But, unprecedented is the current local situation where one of the two Washington, D.C. newspapers accuses the other of "errors" in reporting its financial strength. Perhaps, even more unprecedented is that the complaining editor's letter has now appeared in the letters to the editor of the other paper, accompanied by the editor's note admitting one "error," denying any intention of mis-

representation on another point, and admitting no plea to the remainder.

We should all be happy that, at least as yet, neither newspaper has accused the other of attacks on its historic right to a free press. An informed electorate requires access to varied opinions from its newspapers. Freedom of press must never be given a single monopolistic voice, in Washington, D.C.—our Nation's Capital.

I insert the letter to the editor from a newspaper president which appeared in the January 24 Washington Post at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1974]

FINANCIAL STRENGTH OF THE WASHINGTON
STAR-NEWS

The Post was guilty of a number of errors concerning The Washington Star-News and Washington Star Communications, Inc. in an article entitled "Mixed Fortunes" which appeared in its Business Outlook section on Sunday, January 13.

First, the errors of fact:

The Post is in error in its description of Washington Star Communications, Inc., and in listing its subsidiary and affiliated companies. Three of our companies were not listed in the paragraph which purports to show our holdings: WCIV-TV, our NBC-affiliate in Charleston, S.C.; The Washington Star Syndicate; and Commercial Electronics, Inc. These holdings are no secret; they are published every day on page two of The Star-News.

The Post is in error in stating that we hold a 45 per cent interest in Tal-Star Computer Systems. The proper figure is 81 per cent.

The Post is in error in reporting that The Star-News "killed" its Sunday magazine. It would be more accurate to state that the magazine was replaced by Family Weekly, a nationally syndicated supplement that has proved extremely popular with our readers. (We note that your article fails to mention that The Post discontinued publishing Book World as a Sunday supplement.)

The factual errors were aggravated by misleading comparisons and a generally slanted tone.

To state that The Star-News has been losing advertising business since last fall is misleading. The Star-News enjoyed a 9.2 per cent gain in advertising for the year, versus a 6.8 per cent gain for The Post. Since, in the same article, The Post cites its own lineage figures on an annual basis, simple fairness would indicate that The Star-News' improved position should be noted on the same basis.

The Post cites unattributed rumors about the sale of The Star-News. These rumors are unfounded. And they seem to be the only instance of rumors that were reported in your review of Washington businesses.

The article is so framed in several other respects that it creates an impression of financial problems. The sale of our minor 8.4 per cent interest in the Spruce Falls Paper and Paper Company of Canada is linked to a need for cash in the same sentence that reports rumors of an impending sale of our newspaper. The Spruce Falls holding was sold as a prudent and very profitable business transaction.

You associated Star-News' increases in advertising and circulation rates with "cutbacks last year to save money." In the next paragraph, similar increases by The Post are justified by "higher expenses, particularly wages and newsprint."

Higher expenses are, indeed, a problem for all publishers. Recognizing this, one might expect The Post to describe The Star-News' elimination of its closing stock market edition in the context of efficient management, rather than relating it to "financial difficul-

ties." The plain fact is that when The Star-News added an earlier edition, production of its last edition was on overtime. By combining the last two editions of the day, The Star-News experienced no loss in circulation while saving overtime expenses.

In the framework of business review, capital expenditure is a barometer of vitality. While your article mentions in passing that The Star-News has a new photoengraving printing process, it makes no reference to other substantial capital investments. The printing process alone, is the result of a \$1.75 million dollar investment. Your article also fails to report a \$1.5 million dollar investment made in mailroom equipment presently being installed to improve Star-News service to its advertisers.

Our company is growing. It is investing heavily in the future. We are confident that Washington Star Communications will continue to expand its operations.

We recognize the obvious reportorial difficulties in comparing a privately held corporation with a publicly held one. Nonetheless, most of the information was capable of verification; and, more seriously, the selection process and pejorative use of words casts into doubt the journalistic responsibility of the article.

JOHN H. KAUFMANN,
President, Washington Star Communi-
cations, Inc., The Evening Star News-
paper Company.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The Post was in error on the amount of Washington Star Communications, Inc., holdings in Tal-Star Computer Systems. On the matter of the incompleteness of our listing of the area's largest firms, there was no intention to list all subsidiaries of the companies involved—including all those of the Washington Post Co. For the rest of Mr. Kaufmann's arguments, we enter no plea, on grounds that they have to do largely with genuinely arguable questions of emphasis, nuance, and tone.)

ALABAMA'S INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the industrial growth and expansion of the Southeastern region of these United States during the past 25 years has been spectacular and this region has proven itself to be an integral part of the Nation's economic success.

Alabama has made exceptional growth during this period and this past year of 1973 was marked by record industrial growth and expansion for this Southern giant.

I would like to congratulate Gov. George C. Wallace, Mr. R. C. "Red" Bamberg, director of Alabama's Development Office, and the hundreds of other Alabamians whose outstanding efforts made 1973 the greatest year ever for Alabama industrial growth.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this press release for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to further explain Alabama's industrial growth during the year of 1973. I do hope that all Members of Congress take the opportunity to read of Alabama's success:

CAPITAL INVESTMENT ANNOUNCED FOR 1,005
NEW AND EXPANDING INDUSTRIES IN 1973
DOUBLES 1972 FIGURE; EXCEEDS BILLION
DOLLARS FOR FIRST TIME

The years 1972 and 1973 were tandem years of record-breaking industrial growth for

Alabama with the announced capital investment for 1973 almost doubling the previous year's figures and exceeding the billion dollar mark for the first time in history, Gov. George Wallace announced today at Garrett Coliseum.

Addressing a luncheon group of several thousand people from all over the State, Governor Wallace reported that the announced capital investment for new manufacturing plants and expansions of existing facilities reached a record high of \$1,652,726,535 during 1973, almost double the \$838,290,120 reported in 1972.

The capital investment figure represents outlays to be made for 164 new plants and 841 plant expansions which will create an estimated 42,998 new jobs when all of the announced facilities are completed and are in full operation.

The Governor termed the announcement a "prodigious achievement" for the people of Alabama and another indication of significant progress in the State's climb up the economic ladder.

"This announcement portends a continuing upsurge in economic growth and all the things that accompany such growth," the Governor said.

J. Craig Smith, president of the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce and well known textile executive, said, "This is the second consecutive year that an all-time record has been set which indicates that we definitely have an attractive business climate in Alabama. We should strive to maintain this good business climate and develop our State in an orderly manner. Nearly half of the total amount of expansion announced is from industries that are already in Alabama, further proof of a favorable attitude toward industry in Alabama. As it has in the past the Alabama Chamber will continue to work with the State, county and local governments in making Alabama a better place in which to live."

The annual year-end industrial report is compiled jointly by the Alabama Development Office, State Chamber of Commerce, and the Industrial Development Department of the Alabama Power Company. The figures it contains on capital investment and new jobs to be created are those reported by company officials. "It is a reflection of the combined efforts of industrial development groups in both the private sector and on the State level and of locally elected officials throughout Alabama," the Governor said.

Capital investment announced for 164 new plants in 1973 was \$840,913,220 a new record. Jobs to be provided by these new plants when full production is reached are estimated at 20,606.

Announced capital investment for 841 expanding Alabama industries was \$811,813,315 and will create an estimated 22,392 new jobs when the facilities are completed and in full operation. Each of these figures represents a new record for Alabama.

The grand totals for new and expanding industries in capital investment, numbers of plants and jobs to be created are, likewise, new all time highs for the State.

R. C. "Red" Bamberg, Alabama Development Office director, said he was highly gratified with the industrial successes enjoyed during the year. He praised the efforts of the ADO Industrial Development Division and the leadership provided by Fred Denton, State industrial development director. He also stated that he wanted to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance many organizations and individuals provided. "Without their support," he said, "no records could have been set."

Governor Wallace praised T. L. Faulkner, director of the Vocational Education and Community Colleges Division, which administers the Alabama Industrial Development (AID) Training program. He said that much of the industrial growth of the past three years can be attributed to the AID program which is now recognized as the finest in the

nation. The Governor said that delegations from other states are now visiting Alabama to study firsthand this program, which trains workers for industry while new plants and expanding plants are being constructed. Often it is the deciding factor in the decision of plant officials to locate in Alabama.

According to Faulkner, the AID program has been committed to 109 industries. After all training has been completed for these industries, 13,203 workers will have participated in the program.

Fred Denton, State director of industrial development, said, "The record for industrial growth set in 1973 is a direct result of the excellent cooperation that exists between the various industrial development groups operating in Alabama. Many people throughout the State including the industrial developers of utilities, railroads, chambers of commerce and banks as well as city, county, state and federal officials have made important contributions to our 'total' industry-seeking effort. We on the State level acknowledge with gratitude these contributions."

"While I am always grateful for announcements of new industries coming to our State, I am equally grateful and pleased to see expansions by our Alabama industries," the Governor said. "No real progress can be made in industrial growth unless our established industry is doing well."

GOVERNOR LISTS NON-INDUSTRIAL GROWTH INDICATORS WHICH GIVE EVIDENCE THAT ALL SEGMENTS OF ECONOMY HEALTHY

In addition to a great year in industrial growth, the Governor reported that there are many other indications that all segments of our economy are moving forward, some of which are listed below.

1. For the third consecutive year, Alabama's farmers set new records in gross agricultural income with a 1973 figure of \$1.6 billion, up \$500,000 over 1972. In 1971, the State's farmers exceeded a billion dollars in gross income for the first time.

2. Again in 1973, total deposits in State chartered banks increased substantially over those of a year earlier, growing from a 1972 figure of \$2,609,297,107 to \$2,704,158,561 as of October 17. Combined total capital rose from \$216,000,000 to \$259,000,000. There is now a total of 195 State chartered banks with 113 branches.

3. According to figures provided by the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, total deposits of all member banks in Alabama increased from \$4,572,000,000 in 1972 to \$5,153,900,000 in 1973.

4. Capital savings on deposit with Alabama Savings and Loan Associations increased from \$1,664,398,000 in 1972 to \$1,830,000,000 according to the Alabama Savings and Loan League.

5. The Home Builders Association of Alabama reported construction was started on approximately 24,400 new homes, down 2,600 from the year before, but at an estimated average cost of \$29,000 for a total expenditure of \$707,600,000, an increase of \$181 million over 1972.

6. Taxes collected by Alabama's Department of Revenue in fiscal year 1972-73 increased more than 12.52 percent . . . from \$717,493,520 to \$807,314,906. This increase is directly related to the multiplier effect of new industrial payrolls being created in the State.

7. Retail sales in Alabama totaled \$9,759,-

400,000 in 1973 which was a 10.8 percent increase over the \$8,815,265,000 of 1972. This is the estimate of the University of Alabama Center for Business and Economic Research.

8. Economic growth is reflected in the expenditures of utility companies, which must anticipate increased needs for their services. In 1973, Alabama Power Company invested an estimated \$364.7 million for new generating, transmission, distribution, and related facilities. Company officials expect to spend approximately \$466.9 million in 1974 for such facilities. This is part of the \$1.5 billion expansion program involving new electric generating plants previously announced by the company.

Alabama Gas Corporation plans to spend \$8.6 million for various construction projects during their current fiscal year which began October 1. These expenditures will be primarily to serve new customers and for systems improvements.

Officials of South Central Bell have estimated their construction budget for 1974 at \$141.6 million. Company projections indicate that there will be an additional 88,500 phones in service in Alabama by the end of 1974.

Combined 1974 expenditures by Alabama's three major utilities will be approximately \$617.1 million.

9. Net earnings of the State Docks for the fiscal year ended on September 30, 1973 were approximately \$1.5 million. Governor Wallace reported this to be the best port financial achievement in the United States this year. In addition, for the first seven months of the calendar year, imports through the Port of Mobile increased 31.6 percent and exports 106.8 percent.

INDUSTRIAL GROWTH CHART—STATE OF ALABAMA, ALABAMA DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

Year	New industries			Expanded industries			Grand totals, new and expanded		
	Number of plants	Capital invested	Jobs	Number of plants	Capital invested	Jobs	Number of plants	Capital invested	Jobs
1947	164	\$47,735,000	9,018	13	\$450,000	415	177	\$48,185,000	9,433
1948	127	18,513,000	4,055	14	3,307,000	705	141	21,820,000	4,760
1949	84	9,744,400	3,442	12	2,845,000	515	96	12,589,400	3,957
1950	41	28,238,000	9,876	8	73,570,000	2,805	49	101,808,000	12,681
1951	45	115,348,000	16,669	41	232,848,000	6,350	86	348,196,000	23,019
1952	43	21,478,000	4,715	25	14,799,000	2,520	68	36,277,000	7,235
1953	101	22,899,000	7,684	52	48,670,000	2,959	153	71,569,000	10,643
1954	67	27,844,000	3,724	62	23,960,000	4,543	129	51,804,000	8,267
1955	66	172,812,000	5,645	90	188,278,000	8,801	156	361,090,000	14,446
1956	84	76,853,000	5,996	79	197,528,000	4,550	163	274,381,000	10,546
1957	65	13,960,000	3,280	49	91,149,000	4,560	114	105,109,000	7,840
1958	47	12,831,500	4,665	41	36,270,000	1,970	88	49,101,500	6,635
1959	103	21,567,500	5,161	161	80,278,500	7,011	264	101,846,000	12,172
1960	127	80,109,500	6,828	174	132,129,200	7,485	301	212,238,700	14,313
1961	89	27,060,000	4,111	157	191,607,500	4,887	246	218,667,500	8,998
1962	111	62,174,000	7,854	150	86,467,000	6,907	261	130,641,000	14,761
1963	125	101,446,000	9,445	176	242,645,980	9,910	301	344,091,980	19,355
1964	136	175,168,439	10,762	177	230,846,493	11,712	313	406,014,932	22,474
1965	136	279,971,700	10,031	224	343,479,300	17,861	360	623,451,000	27,892
1966	122	91,248,000	11,581	208	237,349,000	13,251	330	328,597,000	24,832
1967	93	232,712,100	10,140	151	423,934,500	7,207	244	656,646,600	17,347
1968	119	140,535,600	9,928	198	272,808,850	13,023	317	413,344,450	22,951
1969	128	168,373,000	18,315	171	331,770,000	9,624	299	500,143,000	27,939
1970	148	85,855,968	15,632	201	267,950,997	10,731	349	353,806,965	26,363
1971	159	164,974,975	15,684	155	198,591,848	5,236	314	363,566,823	20,920
1972	193	290,895,372	20,727	1489	547,394,748	12,151	682	838,290,120	42,878
1973	164	840,913,220	20,606	841	811,813,315	22,392	1,005	1,652,726,535	42,998

¹ Previous record.

CHINESE NEW YEAR

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the celebration of the Chinese New Year for millions of Chinese both in the United States and throughout the world. As the Chinese inaugurate the Year of the Tiger they look ahead with great anticipation to a hopeful new era of peace in the world.

The Chinese have had a rich culture which has left its mark in this country. They have contributed particularly to the fields of medicine and science. One of the highlights of the medical year 1973 was the widespread and successful use of the sophisticated Chinese medical technique acupuncture in the United States. This ancient Chinese treatment has provided countless thousands of Americans with relief from various ailments.

The Chinese New Year is celebrated with particular zeal in my home city of New York. In the area known affection-

ately as Chinatown, thousands of Chinese-Americans will join tonight in marking this festive occasion with religious services, lavish parades, as well as holiday meals. It is an event which few people who have witnessed it will ever forget.

I would like to join with my colleagues in the House in celebrating this joyous day, and extend my hope that our relations with both the People's Republic as well as with the Nationalist will continue favorable throughout the "Year of the Tiger," 1974.

STEPHEN S. WISE AWARD PRESENTED TO HON. FRANK L. KELLOGG

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Stephen S. Wise Award of the American Jewish Congress was recently presented to the Hon. Frank L. Kellogg, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration "for distinguished contributions to the movement and resettlement of persecuted and homeless refugees around the world." The Wise Award was established in 1949 to celebrate Rabbi Wise's 75th birthday and to honor men and women whose qualities of moral courage, love of liberty, and service have exemplified the noblest teachings and ideals of the Jewish heritage. Recipients in previous years have included Earl Warren, Roy Wilkins, Leonard Bernstein, Arthur J. Goldberg, Adlai E. Stevenson, W. Averell Harriman, Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, Harry S. Truman, and Herbert H. Lehman. Mr. Kellogg embodies the humanitarian spirit demanded of the times and certainly deserves to be honored for his efforts.

Reprinted herewith are Mr. Kellogg's remarks upon receiving the 1973 Stephen S. Wise Award emphasizing the resilience of the human spirit despite adversity:

REMARKS OF FRANK L. KELLOGG, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR REFUGEE AND MIGRATION AFFAIRS

(Presented to the Stephen S. Wise Awards Dinner of the American Jewish Congress, The Pierre, New York, N.Y.)

DECEMBER 9, 1973.

I would have to be blessed with the legendary eloquence of Rabbi Wise to be able to express to you the true depth of my feelings on this occasion. To be asked to join the distinguished company of Wise Award laureates, to have the attention for a few minutes of this important audience—well, my cup runneth over.

Let me say, that if I have at all earned this distinction, it is because of the work of many people, and they deserve to share the honor. For quite a few years, in private life and now in government, I have been fortunate to labor in association with them—some of the finest men and women who walk the earth—the leaders of the humanitarian movements of this and other countries, individuals dedicated to the protection of the rights of man and the advancement of human dignity. I am aware of the pioneering contributions of Dr. Wise toward these goals here in the United States; I grew up in and around New York, and I am old enough to recall his campaigns to eradicate discrimination in college entrance procedures and in employment practices, and his other efforts in causes of social and economic justice and the correction of civic wrongs.

This man was a giant. His works live after him. Just one of them, the American Jewish Congress which he founded, I count among the important organizations, national and international, sectarian and non-sectarian, which are striving, each in its own field, to advance the common aim. Ladies and gentlemen, as we near the three-quarter point of this century of ours, looking at the world around us, I only wish it were less of an uphill fight.

But I'll get into the global outlook a little later, and our options as I see them. First

I'd like briefly to discuss the present state of human rights and the dignity of man in relation to refugee situations, and then to share with you some of the moving personal experiences I've had in connection with one of the more dramatic migrations of these times, the movement of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel.

It is entirely likely, in my opinion, that the historians someday are going to identify the 20th Century not as the century of advancement or enlightenment or achievement but as the Century of the Refugee, for no single human problem has been more persistent or more dominant over all these years. Every war—and we have not been without at least one war at any given time—has taken not only a toll of lives but also has dispossessed multitudes of people and sent them into flight. Genocide has been all too frequent; it was the Nazi regime which took power 40 years ago that first put the U.S. Government into the business of refugee assistance. Varieties of ideological oppression, particularly in the communist countries in later years, have resulted in a long and steady flow of refugees, punctuated from time to time by surges such as those from China, Tibet, Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Cuba. And finally, in the past couple of decades, some of the developing nations have begun to contribute to the toll as the result of political, tribal, even religious violence, and sometimes the erratic cruelties of petty dictators.

In Africa alone, today, we count more than a million men, women and children in refugee status; in the Middle East, a million and a half. Around the world the total is in the neighborhood of 8 million, and despite massive and continuing resettlement and repatriation programs over the years, there have seldom been fewer than that as long as records have been kept. Soon after I took up my job in Washington three years ago the number soared drastically with the flight of nearly 10 million people from what is now Bangladesh. It remains a miracle of world humanitarian achievement that the masses of destitute and frightened Bengalis, huddling in more than a thousand teeming camps, somehow were housed, clothed, fed and protected from epidemic for a year, until they were able to return to their homes.

The causes are many and the numbers of human victims are vast, but I think you can't really comprehend the situation until you translate it into terms of individual human beings. I move among refugees in the course of my work and I've met and talked with dispossessed and displaced people of many nationalities, races and creeds and have witnessed their physical privations and their devastated morale. But there is another side of the coin, and that is the resiliency of the human spirit. I have watched the penniless migrant who reaches a new land, straightens bowed shoulders and sets out to achieve self-sufficiency and self-respect, and I have been awed by it. Over and over I have observed this phenomenon of human response in the presence of hope and challenge, and in the atmosphere of a just society. Quite recently, for example, I flew from Vienna with a group of Soviet emigrants to Israel, and I saw their exhilaration, their tearful joy, their great emotion as they set foot on the soil of their new homeland. It was deeply touching to see; it reminded me that "Hatikvah," the Hope, is probably the most appropriate anthem in the world today, for that was what I was witnessing, hope personified, that afternoon at Lod Airport.

The United States Government, as I'm sure you are aware, is assisting the Soviet Jewish migration, in a program enacted by Congress. The taxpayer funds are substantial—not nearly as great, of course, as the money raised privately in this country to assist Israel—but they make important contributions in the form of help with transportation of the immigrants, and their re-

settlement. We are giving scholarships in Israel for vocational training and other education through university level, paying subsistence costs in some cases, and we are assisting in the construction of physical facilities. These include absorption centers and hostels at Rehovot, Holon and Hfar Saba; housing at Carmiel, Ashdod and other places, and a flood of the splendid new Rambam Hospital in Haifa, where immigrant doctors and nurses will be retrained.

It is one of the happier programs in which I have been engaged as a government official. Last May, touring Israel, I saw some of the human results—children and old people learning their new language, scientists already doing useful work, musicians tuning up with new colleagues, professional men and women moving into new careers. There were problems everywhere I went, but the warmth with which the newcomers were being received, the enthusiasm of both the immigrants and their Israeli teachers and colleagues, the hope reflected in faces and in almost every conversation—they were sights and sounds and experiences I will not forget.

One of the questions I am most frequently asked is why the Department of State engages in these widespread operations of assistance to refugees and migrants. What has this to do with the execution of American foreign policy?

The answers are several.

From the practical standpoint, these programs almost always are conducted or coordinated by, or at least involve the participation of international humanitarian organizations within or outside the United Nations system, such as the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. ICEM, as it is called, is in fact directing the transport of Soviet Jews from Austria to Israel under the U.S. assistance program.

Many of the programs have the support of other nations, and this, of course, also brings the Department of State into the picture.

Again, the existence of a refugee situation can be an important factor in day-to-day conduct of foreign policy. Stated simply, any large number of uprooted and despairing people creates or complicates animosities between nations and leads to all kinds of international problems; the Middle East situation of the past 25 years provides an example. On the other hand, the resettlement or repatriation of refugees tends to ease tensions and encourage the prospect of peace. Sudan at this moment, for instance, is completing the return to their homes of nearly 700,000 people in a program contributing to a peace which ended a long civil war.

Beyond these factors, in the international arena, you have the unshakeable American tradition of compassion and our national dedication to the rights of man. And finally our basic belief, restated most recently by Henry A. Kissinger in his first address as Secretary of State, that the ultimate goal of foreign policy has to be a world of true peace in which basic human rights are the birthright of every man and there is justice and the rule of law.

The kind of world, as the prophet put it, in which men "shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make them afraid."

Dr. Wise, an eminently practical man, put it another way years ago, in a sermon on the occasion of his 45th anniversary as a rabbi. Again looking to the ultimate future, he observed that "there will be no real Jewish emancipation until there is human emancipation all over the world."

My own view is that we don't have a lot of time. We have been inching too slowly and too long toward the just and viable world

to which we aspire, and events are catching up with us. Nations and tribes and sects and ideologies continue to claw at each other on nearly all the continents, generating new quarrels or prolonging old ones, taking lives, causing misery, creating reservoirs of despair along the way—as if Albert Einstein had never lived, as if the missile silos and the bombers and the submarines and the nuclear warheads were mythological instead of very real. Either mankind is going to start moving with more determination and more effectiveness toward a world of justice, universal human rights and true peace, or we are going to founder along that other path at the end of which lies holocaust, obliteration, a lifeless planet.

Well, I don't want to sound like a harbinger of doom on this auspicious occasion. The thought I want to leave with you—beyond my appreciation for your attention and the great honor you have bestowed on me—is that we of this century have it in our power to move toward a safe and decent world in which the human spirit has a chance to realize itself. It has to be done step by step, by finding practical solutions to real problems, by building toward tolerance and understanding, justice and willingness to share. It will require wisdom, determination, sacrifices, compromises and large doses of unselfish compassion, in the legacy of the great man whose name is perpetuated in these awards. Let us get on with the job.

Thank you.

EMERGENCY DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME SHOULD BE REPEALED

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps you heard on radio news this morning, as I did, of the tragic consequences which have occurred in Florida as a result of observing daylight savings time during these winter months.

Quoting from memory I recall the newscast reported that in Miami-area hospitals today are three children, victims of accidents which occurred while walking or being transported to school in the dark because of daylight savings time. Throughout the State of Florida it is reported that five children have been killed in accidents related to daylight savings time so far this year. And for the year to date there have been 13 children injured or killed in accidents related to school travel compared with only 14 for the entire year of 1973.

In my own district, Tennessee's Fifth, we have been more fortunate, or should I say luckier. While there have been no deaths there have been injuries. Yesterday a 15-year-old boy was seriously injured on his way to school at 7:05 a.m. when his motorbike crashed into a parked truck.

A junior high school girl narrowly escaped serious injury when her bicycle was struck by a car at 7:20 a.m.

And another youngster was barely missed by a vehicle but the boy's dog who was walking with him to school was not as fortunate. He was struck and killed.

In the Metropolitan-Nashville-Davidson county Tennessee public school system some 50,000 children are bused to school each day. About 20 percent of

these are being bused because of court order and many more are being bused beyond the school nearest them because of this same order.

Because of the tremendous increase in busing it has been necessary to stagger the opening times of the public schools. This is simply because there are not enough buses to get the students to school all at one opening time.

As a result our high schools open at 7 a.m. Our junior highs open at 7:30 and 8 a.m. and the elementary schools open at 8:30, 9, and 9:30 a.m.

Why not open an hour later? Even an hour later in the middle of winter would still bring high school students to school in total darkness so nothing would be gained even if the transportation were available, which it is not.

For the elementary children an opening an hour later would take them out of the morning safety problem but throw them right into the same hazard in the evening.

The rationale behind legislating year-round daylight saving time was that it would conserve energy. As I recall the debate on the proposal no one could demonstrate just how or how much energy would be saved.

It is my belief that any energy conservation resulting from the bill is going to prove negligible, certainly nothing commensurate with the danger hundreds of thousands of schoolchildren face each morning.

In fact, I would be willing to go a step further and guess that when the figures are in the results will actually show a loss of energy. In the Nashville public schools, for instance, the daylight saving time is forcing the schools to be opened an hour earlier each morning, meaning that an additional hour of lighting and heating is required.

In addition, many parents who formerly let their children walk to bus stops are now driving them there and waiting in their cars, motors running to keep warm, until the bus arrives.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to repeal this act. On Monday I intend to invite every Member of this body to join in cosponsorship of this legislation. Year-round observance of daylight saving time is unnecessary, a public safety hazard, and ineffective as an energy conservation measure. It should be repealed.

THE STRANGE HISTORY OF THE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE—I

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the coming of this winter's energy shortages has provoked the embarrassing questions, "How did we get here?" and "Who is responsible?" The fact is the energy crisis represents the most monumental failure of public policy since the Depression. We have to find some of the answers to these questions if we are to be successful in charting a successful course for our social

and economic future. However, up until now there has been much heat and only a little light. The President blames Congress for not acting. The Congress blames the administration for not seeing. And the oil companies blame everyone for not understanding. The truth of the matter is that before a year ago, nobody much cared about energy. Nearly everyone assumed that it would just be there.

But despite what we would like to believe, our energy problems did not arise overnight. They are the product of years of shortsighted policy, the unwarranted intrusion of special interests into the area of policymaking, and simple neglect. Our fiscal policy toward the petroleum industry is the prime case of failure—but there are others. Through the depletion allowance, fast tax writeoffs, import quotas, and State prorationing, we have encouraged the wasteful consumption of our domestic petroleum—a drain-America-first policy. In recent years, as domestic wells have dried up and costs have risen, the focus of the domestic oil industry has turned to foreign production. In fact, we have actually encouraged this movement of capital resources through several ill-conceived provisions of our tax code.

Mr. Speaker, in our frenzy to find a solution to these energy shortages, we must not neglect the tremendous role—the pivotal role—our tax policy has played in precipitating this condition of shortage. In the days and months ahead, we must begin a searching analysis of the taxation of oil and gas income. We must throw out wasteful, counterproductive subsidies and construct in their place a program which is equitable and efficient and which serves our goal of energy independence.

Any discussion of the tax subsidies for oil and gas production should begin with an examination of the congressional intent in first establishing those benefits. In looking back at this legislative history, we find a jumbled story of confused intent, foggy logic, and arbitrary—almost capricious—policymaking.

The strange history of the oil depletion allowance, and all tax matters relating to depreciation, begins in 1913 with the passage of that year's Revenue Act. That legislation provided that for the consumption of net income for the normal tax on corporations—which stood at 1 percent—there should be allowed as a deduction "a reasonable allowance for the exhaustion, wear and tear of property arising from its use in business."

The 1916 act recognized the need to limit this provision. That act read, in part:

... when the allowance authorized ... shall equal the capital originally invested, or in the case of a purchase made prior to March 1, 1913, the fair market value as of that date, no further allowance shall be made.

By limiting the deduction to the actual capital investment of the taxpayer, the lawmakers prevented depreciation from becoming an open-ended subsidy. This is essentially the same depreciation concept that we know today throughout most businesses and industries.

Special provisions for the natural resources arose in the 1918 Revenue Act. In that year, the concept of "discovery

value depletion" was born. Instead of tying the deduction to any measure of invested capital, discovery value depletion allowed a deduction on the basis of the "value" of the property. The sentiment behind the provision is revealed most clearly in the report filed by the Senate Finance Committee:

The prospector for mines or oil and gas spends many years and much money in fruitless search. When he does locate a productive property and comes to settle it, it seems unwise and unfair that his profit be taxed at the maximum rate as if it were ordinary income attributable to the normal activities of a single year.

Because the deduction is tied to a different concept of capital than the depreciation deduction, discovery value depletion cannot be thought of as analogous to depreciation. Indeed, discovery value has injected into our tax laws a concept of capital which is inappropriate for tax purposes. Since the deduction for depletion is not tied to the taxpayer's actual investment in the property, it is in essence a subsidy, where the taxpayer can recover his initial investment many times over. Prof. Reid Hambrick has estimated that under the present system of percentage depletion—which, as we shall see, replaced discovery value depletion—the taxpayer generally recovers his investment 18 times over.

Discovery value depletion ran into immediate opposition in Capitol Hill. Senator La Follette introduced an amendment which would have killed the proposal as it came out of the Finance Committee. His amendment obviously failed. Despite vigorous efforts to defeat the allowance in the Senate, the House, curiously, had no debate on the provision. However, Representative Kitchen, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, stated in explanation of the conference report:

... there are some relief provisions, especially those known as the mineral, oil, and gas provisions, which I cannot subscribe to... I cannot subscribe to them because I regard them as pieces of special favoritism... I want to say that in my judgement they are unwise, unjust and unwarranted.

In hearings on the 1921 Revenue Act, Dr. Thomas S. Adams, a representative of the Treasury, expressed his opposition to discovery value depletion. In addition, he pressed for an annual limitation—but not a total limitation—on the deduction. He proposed 50 percent of net income. The Finance Committee at first balked, but finally recommended an amendment which would limit a taxpayer's annual deduction to 100 percent of net income. In 1924, this limitation was lowered to 50 percent of net income. This limitation remains today in present law.

In 1925, the Ways and Means Committee again held hearings to revise the Revenue Act. During those hearings the new chairman of the committee, Representative Green, made some stark comments on the short history of discovery value:

... I might as well say at this point that if I had my way I would wipe out this discovery depletion entirely. I consider it might have been justified in a time of war, and that was the only justification given for it to begin with... for inducing men to go

ahead and make these discoveries. At the time we put that in, as I recollect it, it was practically admitted that in normal times they would not be entitled to anything of that kind.

In that same year, Senator Couzens committee submitted its "Internal Revenue Bureau Investigation Report." The report was highly critical of the oil depletion deduction system. In referring to the mechanics of discovery depletion, it stated:

There appears to be no system, no adherence to principle, and a total absence of competent supervision.

Significantly, however, the report was even more distressed with the rationale used to justify the entire concept of depletion allowances:

The increment in the value of the property due to the discovery of... oil... can in no way be differentiated, in principle from the increment in the value of real estate, stocks, bonds, or other property, yet all such increment is taxed... the greater part of the allowances for discovery depletion are made to those who drill in proven ground... Furthermore, every investor in speculative stocks, particularly those who invest in new enterprises... assume a great risk of loss... (yet no other) investor is permitted to set up the value of his business, as a deduction from the profit to be derived from that business for the purpose of determining his net taxable income. Discovery depletion is not a deduction permitted for the purpose of arriving at the net income derived from mines and oil and gas wells. It is clearly an exemption from taxation and as such is a discrimination against every other taxpayer in every other industry. (Emphasis added.)

As the Couzens report outlined, the administration of discovery value depletion was a nightmare. Quite simply, it became nearly an impossible task to determine the value of the discovered deposit. Accordingly, the Senate Finance Committee, again the prime mover for this legislation, recommended, a substitute system of percentage depletion. Under this scheme, the year's depletion deduction would be determined as a percentage of the taxpayer's gross income from the property. As the committee report outlined:

The administration of the discovery depletion of existing law in the case of oil and gas wells had become very difficult because of the discovery valuation that had to be made in the case of each discovered well. In the interest of simplicity and certainty of administration your committee recommends that in the case of oil and gas wells the allowance for depletion shall be 25% of the gross income from the property during the taxable year. The provisions of existing law limiting this amount to an amount not in excess of 50% of net income of the taxpayer from the property is maintained.

A lengthy debate in the Senate followed the committee's presentation. It featured Senator Reed of Pennsylvania explaining the Finance Committee proposal. Certain of the colloquies are revealing of the uncertainty which shrouded the entire concept of percentage depletion. Various points were raised which remain unanswered today and which are in fact flaws in the essential concept:

Mr. REED. Ever since early war days Congress has followed the policy of what they call discovery value for both oil and gas wells

and for minerals. It is perfectly obvious that if I buy an acre of land in the Rocky Mountains and pay ten dollars an acre for it, and then, by hard work, discover a rich deposit of gold on it, the calculation of my depletion on the original \$10 basis would not allow me any adequate return on my real capital. So in allowing what is called discovery value, Congress and the Bureau have tried to get at the real but the unknown value of the property owned by the taxpayer.

Whether it is wise to handle the problem in that way or not I am not entirely persuaded. It has led to some large deductions from income, but to refuse to do it and to calculate the depletion on the original cost is not fair, either, because in these uncertain industries there is much property which is bound to be worthless, on which the taxpayer really makes a dead loss; but there is no production and consequently no depletion from that property. Mr. King: *And no tax.*

Proponents of the depletion deduction have always managed to be quite romantic about the exploration for oil. But they have never been able to resolve why exploring for oil is so much different than any other business enterprise:

Mr. COUZENS. Does the Senator know of any other industry where that (the depletion deduction) is allowed?

Mr. REED. The production of minerals is the only one I know of... It is only in the production of such minerals that the element of uncertainty enters so largely.

Mr. COUZENS. We cannot determine the degree of the element of risk that enters into the respective industries, but I submit that anyone who undertakes an industry... has an element of risk, has he not?

Mr. REED. Yes; he has an element of risk but his property is generally worth something, even if the risks go against him. This is not true of the man who takes a worthless mineral claim.

Mr. COUZENS. If he discovers oil he gets the results similar to the man who produces some trade-marked article that happens to please the people. He may or may not trade-mark an article that appeals to the public. In other words, he may go on for years experimenting with a trade-marked article and he may lose many millions of dollars; then he may discover an article which appeals to the public, but he is not allowed to capitalize all his previous losses in computing his taxes.

In reviewing the strange history of the depletion allowance, we find a remarkable lack of any rigorous examination of the subsidy scheme. Why was a depletion allowance necessary? How many small operators had failed? What was the rate of business failure in the petroleum industry and how does this rate compare with other industries? Why was it not sufficient to rely on the market mechanism—the price of crude oil—to compensate producers for their risk? Why is petroleum exploration inherently more risky than other business enterprises? How much will this subsidy cost? What are the benefits, in dollar terms, to the Government and to the consumer of the depletion scheme? If the depletion allowance is to encourage the exploration for new oil, how can one justify extending the privilege to production in proven fields? Why not just pay for unsuccessful wildcats and thereby remove any risk of financial loss? How much would a scheme like this cost in comparison to percentage depletion? If the depletion allowance was to help out the small or marginal producer, how can one justify extending the privilege to large operators with a proven record of profitability?

Disappointingly, we must conclude that these questions were never raised and never satisfactorily answered.

COHEN, HOGAN, AND AGRONSKY
ON IMPEACHMENT

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, surveys have shown, that the critical issue of impeachment is often misunderstood by the American people. In a recent interview with Martin Agronsky, two of my colleagues, Mr. COHEN, of Maine, and Mr. HOGAN, of Maryland, did much to explain impeachment procedures and practices. For review of my colleagues, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TRANSCRIPT OF MARTIN AGRONSKY'S "EVENING EDITION," BROADCAST FROM WETA-TV, CHANNEL 26, LIVE FROM WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 15, 1974

ANNOUNCER. This is "Evening Edition." Now, from Washington, here is Martin Agronsky.

AGRONSKY. Good evening. If you had an occasion to take a cab in Maryland during the last few days, you may have had Representative Larry Hogan as your cab driver. And if you've been walking around Maine in the last year, you may have run into junior Representative William Cohen from Maine who, this year, has walked hundreds of miles in his district, the largest Congressional district east of the Mississippi. Now, these aren't part of Congressional campaign, physical fitness or salary increases, but they're a unique effort on the part of both these Congressmen to stay in touch with the American voter and to get reelected. Political experts predict a bad year for Republicans. But does the public agree? So tonight, on "Evening Edition," a discussion of the 1974 Congressional elections and the mood of the country in regard to the Republican party with two Republican Congressmen: Congressman William Cohen of Maine, who is the walker, and Congressman Larry Hogan of Maryland, a cabbie. Both Mr. Hogan and Mr. Cohen are members of the House Judiciary Committee where, as you know, the historical impeachment proceedings, or the effort to determine whether to go ahead with impeachment of the President, have already begun.

Now, gentlemen, just this afternoon, as you know, we had a pretty dramatic business in this whole impeachment thing that's going to come into your purview soon and that is the testimony by technical experts before Judge Sirica that an 18-minute gap in the subpoenaed White House tape—that's the Haldeman conversation, I believe—was caused, according to the experts, by erasure and by re-recording. They say no speech on that tape can be recovered. What do you make of this finding after Rose Mary Woods' testimony on all this? Do you want to begin?

HOGAN. Well, I think it's a very serious development. It's one in a series of unexplainable things that have been happening in the entire case. I would say at this point, it's the responsibility, in the judicial system, of the Department of Justice to see where perjury might have been committed and to prosecute those responsible for it.

AGRONSKY. Now, I want to understand what you're saying. Are you saying that at this point it becomes a matter for the Department of Justice—that is, the Attorney General—rather than the Special Prosecutor, Mr. Jaworski, to pursue?

HOGAN. No, actually either one has jurisdiction. The Special Watergate Prosecutor has a very broad mandate. Certainly a perjury prosecution growing out of the Watergate itself would be within his purview. But either of them—I would say they have concurrent jurisdictions in this regard.

AGRONSKY. You don't think it's a matter for your committee?

HOGAN. I think it's a matter for our committee in that we should be concerned with who might have been responsible for the erasure and at whose instance it might have been done. One of our efforts, as I'm sure Bill will agree, in the coming weeks and months will be to try to define what an impeachable offense is. History doesn't give us very much help, because there are no real definitive guidelines as to what an impeachable offense is. But, for my mind, obstruction of justice certainly is an impeachable offense.

AGRONSKY. This would be obstruction of justice?

HOGAN. If we could prove, for example, that the President asked someone to erase 18 minutes of tape or, in another context, asked someone to grant an offer of immunity to someone in exchange for not testifying, this would be obstruction of justice and, to me, it would be an impeachable offense.

COHEN. I think the most recent disclosure certainly removes any doubt from what I consider to be a rather implausible contention in the first place, that it was accidentally erased by Miss Woods for an 18½-minute period of time. And I think it is also rather clear evidence—and I'm assuming that the experts' testimony will hold up—that there was a deliberate attempt to tamper with potential evidence and to obstruct justice. And to what Larry just said I would only add that not only would there be an impeachable offense if the President gave a direct order, but also if it were done with the President's consent. It doesn't have to be by direction or by mandate, but simply by consent that something is done. So that will have to be determined also. I think the next step will be taken by the judge. Sirica will either turn the matter over to the grand jury for further consideration about an indictment. And again, pursuing the question of whether perjury . . .

AGRONSKY. [Interrupting]. Indictment of time. I think certainly . . .

COHEN. I appreciate that. But perjury is an indictable offense.

AGRONSKY. Who would be involved in a question of perjury at this point?

COHEN. Well, you have all those who have been called to testify concerning the continuity of the tapes to begin with: where they were, who had them for what period of time. I think certainly . . .

AGRONSKY [interrupting]. Would you like to identify those people?

COHEN. Well, I don't think I can offhand. I think Miss Woods will be called back to the stand to offer further testimony, and I'm sure that all the other participants—anyone who had possession of that particular tape. Now, I don't recall whether this particular tape was in the possession of Mr. Haldeman or not, but certainly . . .

AGRONSKY [interrupting]. You mean the tape he took home, whether it was one of them. We don't know that.

COHEN. Anyone who had possession of those tapes would certainly have an explanation to give, and . . .

HOGAN. Excuse me, if I may interrupt there. It may be that perjury has not yet been established, but at least, as Bill observes, if the judge calls everyone who was in a position or had access to the tapes and elicits their testimony from them as to this matter, and they're under oath, at least you can set up the possibility of perjury. I'm not prepared to say that Rose Mary Woods is responsible for the erasures. She may or may not be.

AGRONSKY. I'm just trying to understand

this. Then the next step in the effort to determine whether or not perjury has been committed—A—and B, to identify those who may have committed the perjury, takes place in Judge Sirica's courtroom at this point.

HOGAN. Yes.

COHEN. Or the Grand Jury Room.

HOGAN. Well, any prosecution has to come in that arena rather than, say, the Supreme Court or the House Judiciary Committee.

AGRONSKY. You had raised the prospect of Justice Department involvement, and that's why I thought you meant some separate procedure.

HOGAN. You see, the Justice Department is the prosecutive arm of the federal government, and it could initiate in either place. Now, I would assume that Jaworski would take the initiative in any kind of perjury prosecution, because it does relate to Watergate and his mandate is certainly broad enough to cover it.

COHEN. And not only perjury, Martin. I think the additional factor is the tampering with potential evidence—the obstruction of justice. Those will be the secondary grounds to look for.

HOGAN. Or the conspiracy to do so.

AGRONSKY. Let me ask both of you gentlemen this, because time and time again the question has been raised: Has anything been produced which is regarded as an impeachable offense as it applies to the President? Now, if the President were to be connected with this, would this be regarded as an impeachable offense?

HOGAN. I would say from my own—and, you know, Bill and I are both in an unfortunate situation. The committee has not really gotten into developing any parameters in the impeachment investigation. But obviously he and I both have given a tremendous amount of thought to it in our own way. And in my own mind I have said to myself that, if the President asked someone to erase some critical information from one of the tapes before the court, that's obstruction of justice. If the President asked someone to make an offer of immunity or lighter sentence or pardon to someone in exchange for not testifying, or caused money to be given in exchange for not testifying, those are obstructions of justice and, to my mind, are impeachable offenses.

COHEN. I'll agree with that. And I think Larry touched upon it earlier: Conspiracy also has been alleged as an impeachable offense, one of the counts before the Judiciary Committee. Conspiracy would simply be an agreement between two or more parties to perpetrate an unlawful act, and even though just one of the parties actually carries that act out, the other can be held responsible. So I think you can tie it to a criminal involvement, if the evidence is there.

AGRONSKY. Now, gentlemen, you're both members of the House Judiciary and you're both Republicans, and I'd like to take this opportunity to pick your brains on one thing. It's extraordinary—as often as we've attempted, on this program, actually, to define what the meaning of impeachment is, there still seems to be a lot of confusion in the country about what is an impeachment? I wonder if I could get either one of you to define impeachment and make the distinction that I think is so little understood between impeachment as an indictment rather than as a finding of guilt.

HOGAN. Well, it isn't precisely an indictment, Martin, but it is analogous. The analogy is inexact, but you're right. I think the general public—and Bill probably learned that during the recess, as I did, that when people talk about impeachment, they think that's going to remove the President from office. It is not. The Constitution creates the mechanism for possible removal. The House is given responsibility for impeachment. If the House votes by a majority for impeachment, the matter then goes to the Senate where a trial takes place, presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and, in

order for conviction of the offenses charged in the . . .

AGRONSKY [interrupting]: The Vice President stands aside.

HOGAN. That's right, and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presides. But in order to reach a finding of conviction on the impeachment charges, a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required.

AGRONSKY. I think that's clear enough, and I hope all the people who are writing and phoning to say please explain it will have heard that.

COHEN. You know, the problem we have to face, Martin, is the definition of an impeachable offense, and there is considerable debate, not only on the Judiciary Committee itself but also within the academic community. You know, there are those who would have a strict construction on the Constitution—namely "high crimes and misdemeanors" taken in that context means a criminal offense. Others maintain it can be something less, an act or a series of acts which bring disgrace or infamy upon an office. There are those all the way to the other extreme who say it's anything that Congress votes at a given time.

AGRONSKY. And there are those who say something else: That the President is in effect responsible for his subordinates.

COHEN. Well, assuming again that you don't apply the criminal definition.

AGRONSKY. It's fascinating that your counsel for the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Jenner, in a television interview in Chicago a few days ago, made some . . .

HOGAN [interrupting]: Counsel for the minority. He's the minority counsel.

AGRONSKY. Yes, The Republican Counsel for the committee, as opposed to Doar who is the counsel for the whole committee. Jenner said this: Certainly within some areas the President should be responsible for the actions of aides even if he didn't know what an aide was doing something that would be regarded as an impeachable offense if the President himself did it.

HOGAN. Bill, I'm sure, has been going through the same agonizing that I have. All of us are trying to conscientiously prepare ourselves for our responsibilities on the committee, and I've been reading up on past impeachments, and I know Bill has, and they were as confused in history, every time they had an impeachment, as we are now. It's never been resolved historically. The only thing the Constitution says is that impeachment is for "bribery, treason or high crimes and misdemeanors." And that's where all the confusion comes in. Our founding fathers would have done us a great service if they had explained precisely what they meant by those two words.

COHEN. But I think we should make a point that impeachment proceedings are not a substitute for judicial proceedings and therefore we should not impose criminal standards, and that's what Jenner is advocating at this point, that it may be something less than a criminal offense being an act or a series of acts for which he might be responsible, even though he did not have knowledge of them.

AGRONSKY. I'm sure you're both aware of some interesting observations made by James Madison in the Federalist Papers that is completely pertinent to this point that we were just talking about and that Jenner makes. Madison wrote: "I think it absolutely necessary that the President have the power for removing from office." And then he said, "It will make him, in a peculiar manner, responsible for their conduct and subject him to impeachment himself if he suffers them to perpetrate with immunity high crimes or misdemeanors against the United States or neglect to superintend their conduct so as to check their excesses."

HOGAN. That's an interesting point. Of course, the Federalist Papers have no real

historical efficacy except for the insights they give us into the minds of the founding fathers . . .

AGRONSKY. Interpretative . . .
HOGAN. Right. But in the same context of Madison's statement about the . . . the only impeachment of a President we ever had was because he fired the Secretary of War . . .

AGRONSKY. You mean Johnson.
HOGAN. Yes, Johnson was impeached by the House because he fired his Secretary of War when he succeeded Abraham Lincoln as President upon Lincoln's assassination. And Congress had enacted a law freezing the Secretary of War into his job, which Johnson said was unconstitutional. And, as it turns out, the Supreme Court did declare the law unconstitutional.

COHEN. And I think there's some significance to draw from them. Although they're not relevant in that sense, they are very significant in the historical background they give us, as are the Constitutional debates when you had the proposal to use the word "maladministration" instead of "high crimes and misdemeanors." Now, that was defeated, and they left the word out. I think Raoul Burger makes this point in going back historically to try and define or gain some sort of sense of the parameters of impeachment proceedings. We have to look back to English practice, which did not relate it to an indictable offense.

AGRONSKY. I've been enticed into this because it's such an opportunity to get a reading from you gentlemen. You're both on House Judiciary, and you're beginning the study now. I only want to make one other point and then I want to go to your own personal experiences. Jenner—again, the Republican counsel—also said he felt that any subpoena voted by the House would be honored by the Executive Department. Now obviously, somewhere along the line, your committee is going to be asking for Presidential papers. Would you agree with Jenner's interpretation?

COHEN. The first thing we have to do when we go back into session is get the authority from the full House. Presently the Judiciary Committee does not have the subpoena power. We're requesting that.

AGRONSKY. Will you get it, in your opinion?
COHEN. Yes, I assume that we would.

AGRONSKY. Do you think so?
HOGAN. Yes. There is no question in my mind that the Executive Branch is absolutely required to honor subpoenas from the House of Representatives. No question at all.

AGRONSKY. Suppose they do not?
HOGAN. Suppose they do not? Well, that in itself would be, to me, an impeachable offense.

AGRONSKY. You would regard that as contempt of Congress?

HOGAN. Well, I don't know whether I'd call it precisely that, but it would certainly be an unconscionable flouting of the Constitution and a violation of the oath of office.

AGRONSKY. Gentlemen, we're heading for some interesting times, aren't we? It's been an interesting time.

HOGAN. On that subpoena thing—I don't know how Bill feels about this—it troubles me that the Chairman of the committee himself is seeking personal subpoena powers, as he did from the committee. By a straight party-line vote we gave him all the power we had on the committee. But it's insufficient now, we find out, so he wants it from the House. I think the committee should have the subpoena power. There won't be that many of them used, but all of us share the responsibility. It's not a one-man responsibility.

COHEN. If I could add just one note. Larry and I differ a little bit on that particular point, because I think the subpoena power will have to be granted first to the House Judiciary Committee, who will then take another vote to give it to the Chairman. I agree

that I think it would be better—politically, at least—to have a joint subpoena power. Politically from the symbolic point of view. In other words, it will look as if it is a bipartisan approach. But I don't think, knowing the Chairman, that he will abuse that power or use it in any partisan way.

AGRONSKY. I'm tempted to go right down this line because it interests me so much, but I think it would be very unfortunate to miss the opportunity to hear from both of your experiences in other areas. You've been driving a cab here in Washington . . .

HOGAN. In Maryland—let's make that clear!

AGRONSKY. What have you found out?
HOGAN. Well, it's not a very scientific analysis of public opinion polling. Obviously, I didn't turn around and say, "I'm taking six questions now." What I did is, I held conversations with my constituents in an anonymous way, just to see the kinds of things that were bugging them. And the conclusion I made is that not much is. Not much is bugging them at all.

AGRONSKY. Impeachment doesn't bug them, gas prices don't bug them, the economy doesn't bug them . . .

HOGAN. This is an interesting thing. Everyone seems to be pretty happy and relaxed. The thing they talk about most is their own personal problems or why they happen to be taking a cab: The car broke down, they're late for work or some other factor. But then, in my conversations, I would try to elicit from them things in discussions that I wanted to know something about. They are very concerned about the oil crisis. That, overwhelmingly, is the thing they do complain about when you get them on those kinds of issues. In my sampling in shopping centers and in the taxicab—only one person brought up impeachment in the shopping centers, and no one brought it up in the taxicab until I brought it up.

AGRONSKY. What do you make of that?

HOGAN. Well, I think it's not the thing that's on the top of their minds. I went beyond that and talked to some of the other cab drivers, and they said that people were talking about impeachment when Cox was fired. So the conclusion I make is that they talk about the thing that is uppermost that day. On last Saturday they talked about the Super Bowl. On Monday they talked about the Super Bowl because they'd all watched it the day before.

AGRONSKY. Then your poll didn't bring you to any conclusions?

HOGAN. It wasn't really a poll, Martin, and I knew it wouldn't be. It didn't have any scientific or statistical efficacy at all. But it was just a way for me to have very interesting conversations with my people in an anonymous way that I otherwise wouldn't have had.

AGRONSKY. What was your most interesting conversation?

HOGAN. It would be a long, involved one—there were so many, but perhaps if I could pick one that was most interesting: I had a young girl who was a practical nurse working in a nursing home for the elderly in the senile ward, and then she also talked about her work with retarded children. This was by far the most interesting, because I saw a girl with fantastic motivation doing a real service. That's not germane to the issues of the day, but it was very interesting.

AGRONSKY. What did you find in Maine?

COHEN. I had quite a different experience than Larry had, perhaps because of the different climate, for one thing. Maine experienced a rather cold week this past week, when the temperatures dropped down below zero several days running, and they were worried about heat. They were worried about their jobs. Two of the major paper companies in my state were in danger of losing oil from Canada, which would put nearly 4600 people out of work and shut down the

various newspaper outfits throughout the state of Maine. There were serious questions about employment, about heat. People are making tremendous sacrifices in the state. I find it incredible that, being as cold as it is, that in the past few weeks they've been dropping their thermostats down to 60 during the day, 65 in the evenings, and vice versa, making tremendous personal sacrifices. But I would also tell you that they are tremendously cynical about the energy crisis, and a great majority of them . . .

AGRONSKY [interrupting]. They don't believe it.

COHEN. Well, they believe that it's here, in the sense that they are not getting as much oil, but they also believe it's artificially created by the oil companies.

HOGAN. If I could interrupt just for a brief comment. When it did come up, this was exactly the same reaction. They are very skeptical and cynical about the oil crisis.

COHEN. The other point I wanted to make was, again, different from Larry's experience and that is, although the impeachment issue as such is a secondary or subsidiary issue, it's just below the surface and not too far below the surface, and it keeps bubbling up quite frequently. People are concerned about it. They're quite anxious to talk about it. And I found . . .

AGRONSKY [interrupting]: They want it to happen?

COHEN. Well, I found almost an even split. There are people, of course, who are polarized. There are people who want him impeached under any circumstances, and those who would be opposed to impeachment under any circumstances. The great bulk of people are anxious for things to get on, to wrap them up as expeditiously but as thoroughly as possible, and they seem to be evenly divided.

AGRONSKY. What about resignation? Did they raise that?

COHEN. Yes, they raised that.

AGRONSKY. Do they think that would be an easy way out?

COHEN. Well, I think they do not want to see a long, drawn-out impeachment proceeding, but those who are calling for resignation also are calling for impeachment at the same time. I think the important point here is that they're concerned about what the impact would be domestically, on the international level, and they don't want to see it. Others say we have to go ahead.

AGRONSKY. The Wall Street Journal did a very interesting survey of 100 Republican Congressmen in 45 states. They've come up with a lot of interesting answers, and I'd like to test those answers against you. In Massachusetts, Silvio Conte said that Republicans are desperate to put as much distance as possible between the President and themselves to get reelected. His point was, if Republicans hang in there and defend him—meaning Mr. Nixon—they're gone. With the energy crisis and economic problems, you've got all you can do to survive without that albatross. How does that reflect what you find? Do you agree with that or disagree?

COHEN. I think it's a fairly accurate statement on the part of Silvio. I think what he's saying is that Republicans are not going to go to the wall to defend the President if in fact, the President is involved.

AGRONSKY. He goes beyond that. He says it's an albatross. Do you want to get away from him as far as you can? Do you want to put as much distance as you can between yourself and Mr. Nixon?

COHEN. As far as impeachment is concerned?

AGRONSKY. As far as your reelection is concerned?

COHEN. Well, let me put it this way, Martin. I didn't run on the President's coattails to get elected, and I don't intend to run on the administration's record, certainly, to get reelected.

HOGAN. I think that's a very good answer that Bill just gave.

AGRONSKY. It's a diplomatic answer.

HOGAN. No, I'm sure he knows what he's talking about. In the two times that President Nixon and I were both on the ballot, I led him. Now, I'm not saying he rode in on my coattails, of course, in my district, but I did lead him in votes. I am not one who shares this feeling that Republicans are all going to go down the tube because of Watergate or impeachment or anything else. Every Republican is going to be judged on his own individual merits. If the man, who is Republican or Democrat, is representing the wishes of his constituents and working hard at his job, he's going to be reelected. The electorate today is intelligent enough not to hold Watergate against people who had nothing to do with it.

AGRONSKY. All right, Mr. Congressman, level with me. In your efforts to get reelected, are you trying to avoid any mention of the President? Are you trying to stay away from that issue?

HOGAN. Being on the Judiciary Committee, Martin, it's impossible to avoid the discussion of it. I've said that I think the President is entitled to the same presumption of innocence as any other citizen and he should have due process in impeachment proceedings. I also say that impeachment proceedings should go through promptly, as Bill said, but I'm not avoiding talking about the issue.

AGRONSKY. Ok. Fair enough. Now, you indicated that in your taxi you didn't get people talking about impeachment, and you say it's beneath the surface. Now, you all know Clarence Brown of Ohio, a Republican Congressman. He made this observation. He said, "A large body of the people in my district are relatively silent, and this is a district where one would anticipate a more defensive reaction for the President than brooding silence," and he said this is not good news for Mr. Nixon. What do you think of that evaluation?

COHEN. Once again, I think it's a fairly accurate portrayal of what is taking place in this country. Republicans are concerned about the revelations. They're not hanging in despair, however. They're prepared to face the consequences and meet up to it. But I think they're not overjoyed with the performance of this administration on the domestic level with the activities, the criminal activities that have taken place. They're not proud of those. And so they're not talking about that.

AGRONSKY. A very interesting comment was made by Republican Congressman William Hudnut of Indiana. He said if he remains in office—the President—he can regain confidence to a certain extent, but his capacity to lead has been impaired. And he says there's the "snicker factor." People he's trying to persuade laugh at him. They say, "Who are you to talk about saving energy or election reform?" What about that comment?

HOGAN. Well, I think that the public opinion shifts. Now, we all concede that a year ago there couldn't have been a stronger President. A year from now, who knows what the situation is going to be? But some things have happened that are indefensible. No Republican in his right mind is going to defend now what appears to be an intentional erasure of tape, which we started the show talking about. There's no way you can defend that. We're as interested in seeing the guilty prosecuted and brought to justice as anyone else, and we've got to let the chips fall where they may. If it results in impeachment, so be it. But I don't think it's going to be the end of the Republican party. They predicted the same thing in 1964 when Barry Goldwater lost in a landslide. We came back very strongly.

AGRONSKY. So be it. Thank you, gentlemen, and good night from "Evening Edition."

MAJOR OIL COMPANIES CONTRIBUTIONS TO REELECTION CAMPAIGN OF PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, an astounding allegation has been leveled at the Aramco oil consortium by Senator HENRY JACKSON. If it is true, and we have no evidence to the contrary, it means that Standard Oil of California, Texaco, Mobil, and Exxon shut off the supply of oil to the military forces of their own country during the mideast war alert last October.

Whatever the circumstances were surrounding this move, it is vital that all of us here in the Congress make a searching examination of every aspect of the international oil cartel's operations. For the benefit of my colleagues and others interested in the problem I am inserting in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a listing of the officers and directors of the major oil companies, including the members of the Arabian-American Oil Co. and a breakdown of their contributions to the reelection campaign of President Nixon.

STANDARD OF OHIO

Harnett, J. D., VP	\$500
Shepard, Harold A., Director	550
Atkinson, Ralph G.	500
Hanna, Howard M.	1,000
	500
	500
Spahr, Charles E. (Dir & Chrm)	1,300
Foster, Clyde T.	2,000
Total	6,850

ASHLAND

Atkins, Orin E. (Chrm. of Bd.)	\$1,000
Cash	100,000
Gordon, Robert D. (Exec. VP)	1,000
Seaton, William R. (V.Chrm.)	500
Webb, Clyde M. (VP)	1,000
Total	103,500

ARCO

Anderson, Robert O. (Chrm. of Bd.)	5,000
	2,500
	3,500
	1,000
	3,147
	3,124
	3,147
Dolley, Chester F. (Pres.)	500
Eckis, Rollin (Chrm. of Bd.)	1,000
Grazier, Joseph A. (Dir.)	600
Gross, C. S. (Dir.)	1,000
Jones, R. W.	3,000
Kendall, D. M. (Dir.)	10,000
	6,000
	9,000
	3,000
	2,000
Ingersoll, Robert S. (Dir.) (OC)	3,000
Ellmore, C. Patterson (Dir.)	2,000

CITGO/CITIES SERVICE

Gates, T. S. (Dir.)	1,000
McGillicuddy, John F. (Dir.)	1,000
Michel, Clifford W. (Dir.)	2,000
Sellers, Robert V. (Chrm. of Bd.)*	1,500
Waidelich, Chaler J. (VP.)	1,000

Total 6,500

EXXON (STANDARD OF NEW JERSEY)	
Galloway, J. H. (VP.)	1,000
Garvin, C. C., Jr. (Pres.)	1,000
	2,200
Herrington, Carl G. (VP.)	1,700
Loftis, John L.	1,000
MacNaughton, Donald S. (Dir.)	1,500
	525
	1,000
McGrew, V. V. (Jr.) (Div. Man.)	800
Meyer, Randall (VP.)	2,600
Milbrath, R. H. (Sen. VP.)	2,200
Piercy, George T. (Sen. VP.)	1,000
Spangler, W. S. (Pres.)	750
Steen, R. L.	2,000
Rockefeller Family	268,700
Thomas Pappas	101,672
J. K. Jamieson (Dir.)	2,500
Bert S. Cross (Dir.)	1,500
M. M. Brisco	2,800
Total	127,747

HESS (AMERADA)	
Callender, J. D. (Exec. VP & Treas.) (CC)	12,000
Cohen, Norman G. (VP)	956
Hess, Leon (Chrm. Exec. Comm.)	160,000
Kramer, Philip (Pres.) (CC)	12,000
Simmons, J. J. III (VP)	1,000
H. W. McCullum (Dir.) (CC)	42,000
Ralph Adler (Dir.)	
GAO	5,000
CC	39,000
Total	261,956

TRANSCON GAS PIPELINE	
Whitney Stone	21,000

MOBIL	
Warner, Rawleigh C. J. (API), Chairman of the Board	1,000
Abbott, Rich L., Gen. Mang.	1,100
Lapham, Lewis A., Dir. & Vice Chairman of Board	1,000
Albert L. Williams (Dir.), Bronxville, N.Y.	1,000
William Tavoularcas (Dir. & Pres.)	\$200
Total	4,300

PHILLIPS	
Houchin, John M., Deputy Chairman of the Board	2,000
	500
Keeler, W.W., Chairman of the Board	1,000
Cash	100,000
	500
Minter, Lloyd G., VP, General Counsel, Director	2,000
John M. Houchin, Dir. (Dep. Chm of Bd)	2,000
William C. Douce, VP & Dir	2,000
William Piel, Dir	2,000
W.F. Martin, Pres	2,000
W.C. Hewitt, VP	2,000

SHELL	
ages, H. (NPC) President	2,000
inn, William P. (Dir)	1,500
Bretteville, Charles D.	1,000
Shell Advertisement, National Convention	20,000
Total	24,500

STANDARD OIL OF CALIFORNIA	
Allen, William M. (Dir.)	2,000
Ballou, G.T. (VP)	500
Bell, Howard W. (VP, Finance)	1,000
Boucke, F.C. (VP)	500
Gosline, J.E. (Dir.)	1,000
Grey, J.R. (VP)	1,000
Haynes, H.J. (VP)	1,000
Kitto, C.W. (VP, Manu.)	500
McCammion, W.C. (VP)	500
McCone, John A. (Dir.)	2,000
	10,000
Miller, Otto N. Chairman of Bd.) (cc)	50,000

Peterson, R.A. (Dir.) (cc)	1,000
Savage, R.T. (VP, Chemicals)	500
Vice, Leslie T.	500
Wasson, E.H. (Dir.)	500
Willoughby, R.E. (Treasurer)	500
D.L. Bower (VP Mkt.)	1,000
James E. O'Brien (VP Legal)	1,000
G.M. Keller, (VP & Dir.)	1,000
N. T. Bogart (VP Ind. Res.)	500
Packard, David (Dir.)	87,000

SUN OIL	
Dunlop, Robert G. (Chrm. of Bd.)	6,500
Mayes, Fred M. (VP)	500
Pew, Walter C. (Dir.) and Family	3,000
	3,500
	3,000
	6,000
	3,000
	51,650
CC	27,000
CC	3,000
CC	30,000
Donald P. Jones (Dir.)	1,250
R. Edwin Ross (Dir.)	500
Darwin W. Ferguson (VP)	500

UNIFICATION OF MILITARY AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, news that the Nixon-Kissinger-Bunker team plan to use their "personal diplomacy" to give away U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone is now seemingly counteracted by an announcement that the Defense Department is considering establishment of a naval base in the British-held island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. Justification for the new U.S. naval base is said to be a counter to a potential expansion of Soviet naval power, due to the anticipated reopening of the Suez Canal.

The release does not make it clear whether the military action has been approved by Dr. Kissinger or cleared with Soviet détente.

Vis-a-vis, we place our naval operations in the Indian Ocean to watch the Soviets in their puppet control over the Suez Canal, while we, with full knowledge of the consequences, would give the Russians puppet control over the activities of the Panama Canal through their friends in Panama.

As is usual in our diplomatic and military negotiations, there is no mistake, the American people lose. Few Americans are reminded by the news media that with Dr. Kissinger serving as the head of two titular posts—that is, Chairman of the National Security Council and Secretary of the State Department—he is now in a position of controlling the policies, decisions, and goals of both the military and the State Department. Nothing out of Washington these days just happens—it is planned that way.

Related newsclippings follow:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1974]

U.S. BASE

The Defense Department, as a counter to a potential expansion of Soviet naval power due to the anticipated reopening of the Suez Canal, is considering establishment of a naval base on the British-held island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

Defense officials said yesterday that preliminary discussions had already been held with the British about expanding a small naval station on the island so it could support naval operations in the Indian Ocean.

[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.

FISHERY ZONES BASELINES

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, when the yeas and nays were called on Tuesday for passage of H.R. 11809, setting straight baselines for our contiguous fisheries zone, I was meeting with some of the hundreds of my constituents who had come in connection with the pro-life demonstration. I was, therefore, unable to reach the Chamber during the 15-minute period allotted for the vote. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "yea" with the understanding that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries plans to hold early hearings on my cosponsored bill to extend the limit to 200 miles.

E. PAUL MAGAHA

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, Mayor E. Paul Magaha, of Fred-

erick, Md., relinquished office after serving two nonconsecutive terms as mayor of Frederick. I want to commend Paul Magaha for a job well done over a period of 8 years. Paul was a true public servant who sought to serve the interests of his constituents and to represent them well.

I would also like to wish Paul Magaha well in his endeavors away from city

hall. I feel sure his energy and devotion to his community will lead to further contributions to Frederick and the surrounding area. His efforts as mayor of Frederick have resulted in a better community, and I know that he will continue to give unstintingly of his time and experience for the benefit of his neighbors.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 28, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee.—Isaiah 26: 3.

Eternal Father, lift us above the din and dust of the past with all its failures and frustrations that we may gird ourselves adequately for the work of this day and the tasks of this week. To us our Nation looks for genuine leadership to guide her safely and sanely through these trying times. May the stature of our souls, heightened by hope, strengthened in spirit and fruitful with fidelity rise to meet the crying needs of these crucial days. Keep our steps steady, our faith strong, our decisions wise and let us not waiver when the test comes to be true-hearted and wholehearted in our devotion to the highest good of these United States of America.

So may we walk steadily in the steps of Him who kept His mind stayed on Thee. 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

THE UNAUDITED FEDERAL RESERVE'S NEW GRAB FOR POWER

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Federal Reserve System announced still another grab for power.

This giant bureaucracy now seeks to extend its power so that it controls directly the reserves of virtually every bank in the Nation—regardless of whether these banks are members of the Federal Reserve System.

This, of course, would be a direct challenge to the dual banking system and would greatly reduce the power of State banking authorities and the independence of the small banks around the Nation. The Federal Reserve has been

losing members rapidly in recent years and it now seeks to have the Federal Government—through action of the Congress—mandate that these banks—virtually every bank in the Nation—remain hitched to the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, this new power is not needed by the Federal Reserve to control monetary policy and it amounts to little more than that uncontrollable bureaucratic urge to control more and more from the marble palace in Washington. The monetary bureaucrats know no limits to their boardinghouse reaches.

FRS REFUSES TO BE AUDITED BY GOVERNMENT

This grab for power is even more galling when it is realized that this is the same agency which thumbs its nose at Congress and the people and insists on keeping all of its activities secret and unchecked by the General Accounting Office. Here is an agency which lobbies desperately—and improperly—against independent audits by the GAO while at the same time asking the Congress for more and more power.

If the Federal Reserve really thinks it can make a case for more power—as suggested by Dr. Arthur Burns—then I suggest that it open its books and let the Congress and the people find out just how this massive bureaucracy operates. I cannot believe that the Congress will give an agency vast new powers when it refuses to let an auditor through the front door.

SHORTAGE OF GASOLINE IN NEW JERSEY AND NEW YORK

(Mr. HOWARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday I returned from a 2-day personal survey which shows that while the New Jersey-New York area is presently crippled by a shortage of gasoline, you can get all the gasoline you want or need in many other States.

Appalled by what I saw in my driving trip, I telephoned my office and dictated telegrams and letters to the President and the Federal Energy Administrator, William E. Simon, demanding an immediate infusion of gasoline into the New Jersey-New York area under the so-called fair allocation system.

I have also requested an investigation into how and why this situation was allowed to reach such crisis proportions. The letters to the President and to Mr. Simon have been signed by all members of the New Jersey House delegation, with one exception, and by both of our U.S. Senators.

During my drive through South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, I made a total of 47 stops at gasoline stations. Forty-six of the stations had gasoline, and 36 of them had no limit on how much gasoline could be purchased. Ten of them had some limit, but still had plenty of gas. Two stations remain open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Two stations offered a free car wash provided you filled up your tank.

While people in the New Jersey-New York area are unable to get to work, while police stations and municipal officials are calling me and saying that they cannot get gasoline to meet their municipal obligations, people in other parts of the country can get all they want.

The situation is appalling and impossible; it cries out for an explanation. I plan to pursue this matter and to get to the bottom of this obvious contradiction.

BINGHAM PROPOSES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO ALLOW FOREIGN BORN U.S. CITIZENS TO RUN FOR PRESIDENT

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which would provide for a constitutional amendment that would delete the present requirement of article II, section 1 of the Constitution, that the President of the United States must be a natural born American citizen.

Naturalized citizens may serve in every other position in the Government. In fact, there would be great resentment if it were proposed that a naturalized citizen be barred from serving in the Cabinet or on the Supreme Court or in Congress. It makes no sense that the Presidency should be any different.

Mr. Speaker, my proposed constitutional amendment does not amount to an endorsement of Henry Kissinger as President. But I must say in all candor his achievements as Secretary of State have highlighted the problem.

Why should a citizen of Dr. Kissinger's talents be barred from the Presidency? More importantly, why should the American people be denied the right to elect a Kissinger to any office?

The same could equally well be said of Professor John Kenneth Galbraith, who was born a Canadian citizen, and of many other distinguished naturalized Americans.

I recall that in 1928, when my father, Senator Hiram Bingham, had been mentioned for the GOP nomination for Vice