

DESERVED RECOGNITION FOR
BILL CHAPPELL

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

MR. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying experiences for me during the past 5 years has been the opportunity to observe the exceptional work and outstanding leadership of our distinguished Florida colleague, BILL CHAPPELL. Now he has been honored through the commentary of veteran Capitol Hill correspondent Joseph McCaffrey on Washington radio station WMAL's "Meet the Member" broadcast. Mr. McCaffrey praises our colleague for his efforts to balance the Federal budget as a member of the Appropriations Committee. That praise is indeed well deserved.

BILL CHAPPELL came to Congress as a freshman with a wealth of legislative experience developed during his 12 years in the Florida House and his service as Speaker of that body. In Washington, his abilities were immediately recognized by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. BILL CHAPPELL is a hard worker and he does not hesitate to vote his convictions. As senior member of the Florida delegation, I can attest to his positive actions on behalf of all Florida.

A number of leaders in the House—among them Chairman WILBUR MILLS of Ways and Means, Minority Leader TIP O'NEILL, and our late and beloved Hale Boggs—have journeyed to BILL CHAPPELL's district to honor him. At the beginning of this his third term in the Congress, the leadership vested in him a signal honor for a third-term Member—a seat on the powerful Appropriations Committee. As a member of that committee, I can speak without reservation to the effective work BILL CHAPPELL has accomplished both on the full committee and in the three subcommittees on which he serves. His appointment to a third subcommittee by Chairman MAHON is one more testimonial to the significant contributions that BILL CHAPPELL has made to the committee and the Congress.

Joe McCaffrey had high praise for our colleague's citizens' advisory committees, as did Chairman MILLS, who once said he knew of no other congressional district which had committees of citizens to develop legislation.

Mr. Speaker, because some of our colleagues may have missed the "Meet the Member" broadcast, I hereby submit a transcript to be inserted into the RECORD:

MEET THE MEMBER

(By Joseph McCaffrey)

One of the watchdogs of the Treasury is Florida's Bill Chappell. He received the Watchdog Award in 1972 for his efforts to trim the Federal budget and has considerably increased his influence in the 93rd Congress as a new member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congressman Chappell believes that a balanced Federal budget holds the key in the fight against inflation and that Congress must reassert itself in the budget-making process. "We cannot continue to spend more than we take in," the Congressman asserts, adding that the \$24 billion interest payment on the national debt last year "is one sure way to feed the fires of inflation." Chappell is a prime supporter of budget-reform legislation.

As a Member of three appropriations subcommittees (1) HUD, Space, Science, Veterans; (2) Foreign Operations; (3) and District of Columbia, Chappell scrutinizes the budgets of more than 20 Federal agencies. Questioning, probing, snipping away, he helped to cut \$3 billion from the President's budget in Fiscal Year 74. He fought for improved medical care for veterans, and additional energy research funds. He more than offset those increases by demanding and getting a \$1 billion cut in the foreign aid budget request.

While hard at work trying to reduce spending, Chappell has continued to expand his unique communications system in the huge nine county Fourth District of Florida. Six special citizens advisory committees are hard at work studying problems that face the Fourth District and the Nation—crime, retired citizens, youth, environmental control, vocational education and oceanography.

Their recommendations have been translated into bills by the Congressman, and he has already seen four included in legislation passed by the House.

In addition to the six specialized committees, Chappell has formed an ACTION Committee (Action in the Community to Involve Our Neighbors). The Congressman works with ACTION members through get-togethers in the neighborhoods, mobile office trips over the district and with bulletins and letters to encourage direct contact between the people and their elected representatives. "Both they and we need this kind of close communication," Chappell says. "It proves our people can have a more effective voice in the workings of their government."

Mr. Chappell tells the people of his District, "What you think, how you feel about our country, and what you are willing to do for our country, all are vital to our future as a free nation. The people of the Fourth District are showing the kind of stuff they are made of. It is gratifying to see your faith in our nation reflected in your fine actions during this particular time in our history."

Mr. Chappell has long recommended accessibility to the people and because of that has set up three full time offices and seven part time offices in the Fourth District. He tries to keep as close to the men and women he represents as possible.

Mr. Chappell was a member of the Florida State Legislature where he served as Speaker of the House, prior to his election to the Congress in 1968.

POW'S AND MIA'S

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

MR. HARTKE. Mr. President, on several occasions during the past year, I have written to various officials within

the administration asking them to take concerted action to assure a full accounting of all American prisoners of war and those missing in action in Vietnam. More than a year has passed since the agreement ending American military involvement in Vietnam was signed. Nevertheless, a large number of American servicemen remain unaccounted for.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a concurrent resolution on this subject, adopted by the Indiana State Senate, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

A concurrent resolution XXXI memorializing the President and Congress to obtain full disclosure of the actual number of Prisoners of War and accounting for Servicemen missing in action, and to obtain the prisoners' immediate release.

Whereas, Over one year has elapsed since the hostilities in Viet Nam were ended by treaty; and

Whereas, Complete return of all prisoners of war, with full disclosure of those missing in action was agreed to in said treaty; and

Whereas, There are a number of American servicemen missing in action who have not been adequately accounted for; and

Whereas, Evidence from various reliable sources continues to come to light that a number of American servicemen are still being held prisoner, some under very inhumane conditions: Now, Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring:

Section 1. In the interest of all Americans we urge the President and Congress to take all appropriate action to obtain the quick release of all remaining American prisoners of war and also to obtain a full accounting of all American servicemen missing in action.

Section 2. The Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to all the members of Congress from the State of Indiana.

Adopted by voice vote this thirteenth day of February, 1974.

MOE BILLER TESTIFIES BEFORE
WILSON POSTAL SUBCOMMITTEE

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

MR. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities, Mail and Labor Management, which I chair, held the second in a series of hearings on the capital investment programs of the U.S. Postal Service. The hearing, which gave representatives of the postal employee unions an opportunity to present their views on the current status of the Postal Service was a valuable one, providing us with substantial new in-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

formation as well as an update on programs in which we have ongoing interest.

Among the union officials to appear before us was Moe Biller, president of the New York Metro Area Postal Union, the largest local serving U.S. Postal Service employees.

Moe is a courageous labor leader who has been active in postal unions for over 35 years and whose knowledge and experience is greatly admired throughout the postal community.

His statement before our subcommittee, which focuses on what he describes as the "dehumanization" of postal employees by the USPS management and the scandalous conditions which exist at the New York Bulk and Foreign Mail Facility in Secaucus, N.J., provides clear evidence that, despite some improvements instituted by Postmaster General Klassen, on the whole the Postal Service is still not adequately responsive to the needs of postal employees or the general public and, therefore, some corrective action by Congress must be taken.

The very incisive statement by Mr. Moe Biller follows:

STATEMENT OF MOE BILLER

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: My name is Morris Biller. I am President of the New York Metro Area Postal Union, the largest postal union in the nation, with 26,000 members. I also serve as Regional Coordinator of the American Postal Workers Union, and in that capacity I speak for a total of some 70,000 postal employees in the Northeastern part of the country.

One of the major thrusts of your inquiry has to do with the billion-dollar bulk-center concept. Much of what you have learned to date about the bulk program is the result of plans, projections, conjecture and even wishful thinking. As the only union leader in the country with any bulk-center experience, I hope you will listen carefully to what I have to report to you.

But, first let me tell you that I have been directed by my union members to carry a very clear and explicit and forceful message to you concerning the bulk operations of the United States Postal Service, as well as other of its operations. And let me start by advising you that the 70,000 postal workers in our region—constituting more than 11 per cent of the total national work force—welcome this investigation.

Through me, they have been calling for just this type of probe for more than a year. And, they are, I believe, reflecting a dissatisfaction with the postal service that is shared by hundreds of thousands of their co-workers in all the states and by countless millions of Americans who use the postal service.

They welcome this probe because they have faith in the Congress and because they believe that this court-of-last-resort holds their last hope for seeing the service salvaged from the unconscionable and outrageous bumbling that has placed it on a collision course with self-destruction.

Instead of building my presentation to what might sound like a sabre-rattling conclusion, let me say this at the outset:

America is faced with the very real possibility of a national disruption of postal service.

I cannot tell you when it will come, but I can tell you that it is coming. I could not tell you a year ago when the lockout or strike—choose your own term—would come in New York, but I could tell you it was coming. And it came, last January, when the

largest postal plant in the nation and possibly the world was shut down.

A possible national disruption of postal service is not an idle threat, nor, indeed, is it a threat at all. It is a reasoned conclusion arrived at by responsible officers of the largest postal union in America.

What the Congress intended in enacting the Postal Reorganization Act and what the USPS has perpetrated on the country in attempting to implement that goal are two very different things.

If I were to sum up in a word what the USPS has done to the postal service in the past three years—and in that same word describe its apparent and obvious end-goal—that word would be "dehumanization".

There is only one bulk center in the country now, and we have it. Before any of the 20 other bulk centers are built at a cost of additional hundreds of millions of dollars, please heed our experience.

In its dollar-sign, black-ink, balance-the-books approach to mail delivery, especially in the bulk program, the USPS has succeeded in:

Effecting mass relocations of workers to a remote facility;

Mandating arbitrary and unconscionable shift changes;

Disrupting the family lives of thousands of workers;

Stepping up the exodus of career postal workers through retirement and resignation;

Wiping out seniority considerations enjoyed for more than a decade;

Creating the suspicion among minority groups that the bulk-center concept is designed to preclude them from postal service jobs—although some 50 per cent of New York area employees are non-white. That percentage may be higher elsewhere;

Ignoring repeated union attempts to forestall confrontation and to keep the bulk facility operating; and

Failing to provide housing at the remote facility as mandated when the bulk-center concept was conceived.

All of these actions led to a massive shutdown of the New York Bulk and Foreign Mail Center in Jersey City, N.J., from January 21 through January 24, 1974. Workers stayed out despite leadership compliance with court orders that they tell them to return to work. Although we have a huge membership, we are a tight, unified labor union that speaks with a single voice. Nevertheless, despite our history of responsibility, the workers' frustration was such that even court order could not get the conveyor belts running again.

If venality could be proved, the decision of the USPS to locate its first bulk center in a Jersey swamp would be indictable. Transportation, frankly, stinks, as does the swamp. There is only one highway in the vicinity, and when it is closed due to accidents, fog or storms, thousands of workers are either late in reporting, or cannot report at all. Under administrative-leave provisions, however, they must be paid anyway.

Chairman Wilson, in opening these hearings, said that establishment of the bulk centers was so far advanced that the committee could only hope to avert future mistakes.

Let me respectfully advise you from first-hand experience what some of those mistakes were.

Despite your having suffered through years of high-decibel oratory in Congress, I defy you to understand a single eight-hour shift in that monstrous swamp facility with all of the clamor-producing machinery modern science can provide, but with none of the sound-reducing materials or techniques that same science is providing in private industry.

Not since World War II, perhaps, have Americans been forced to stand in line to

use the lavatory. It's World War II again in the swamp facility.

What happens when you project a facility for 2,600 workers and you hire more than 3,500—with more to come? What happens is that you have no place to stand—let alone sit down—in the lunchroom. Coffee-stained work clothes are the postal workers' OD's.

Workers volunteered for the Jersey City facility, based on promises—which proved to be lies—from management. All of the other degradations to which they had been subjected simply came to a head when USPS arbitrarily announced unacceptable shift changes. Our union fought those changes in federal court and in arbitration. We must have been doing something right. We won in both arenas, even forcing a pre-arbitration settlement in the latter case.

By the way, those tour assignments were ordered for January 21, 1974. Today—May 7, 1974—the bulk facility is still not geared for utilizing those tours. Mismanagement? Worse. Managerial stupidity.

Forget that the USPS provided only half the locker space actually required for workers, but don't disregard the fact that tons of mail must sit outdoors in expensive trailers for a week and more because "someone" miscalculated storage needs. Apparently, the designers never checked to see that mail boats don't leave every hour on the hour—but often a week or more apart.

When we tried to tell the service that combining foreign, military and bulk mail operations into one wouldn't work, they scoffed. Now, in view of the total failure of this program, that concept is being abandoned.

The bulk-center concept depends on the massing of huge volumes of mail from other dispatch points—for the purpose of expediting delivery. Despite the USPS contention that bulk mail is moving a little faster, we know otherwise. The best barometer in this country concerning mail flow is the postal worker. He says no.

The United Parcel Service is knocking our brains out in terms of rapid delivery. One of the reasons may be that UPS doesn't route a package from 42nd Street to a swamp in another state before delivering it to 43rd Street.

Can the bulk concept work at all, or should it be abandoned before it bankrupts the service? I simply don't know. I am here to relay the experience of many thousands of postal workers to the effect that it is not working. And, in view of the total loss of credibility of the USPS, nothing less than a thorough investigation by the Congress can determine whether it is salvageable. In any event, it could be catastrophic if the other centers were to be opened before the Jersey City center is fully operational, fully tested and working at least at acceptable levels.

Can the taxpayer continue to subsidize such costly blundering? I leave the answer to you committee members and your colleagues who must vote massive public subsidies for USPS each year.

The officers of my union have asked me to invite this subcommittee—and to urge this committee—to come to our region for an on-site inspection and for local public hearings. We don't ask you to listen just to us, but to the workers. They know where it's at. Because, where it's at is where they are at, and they don't want the service to fall.

In this regard, I might mention that since USPS's board of governors moved into their new penthouse headquarters here in Washington they haven't made any significant attempt to determine first-hand what is happening in the country's first bulk center. In fact, it took virtually a court order to get them involved in the January disruption—even after the prototype of their billion-dollar bulk program was shut down tight.

May 9, 1974

While you are in the New York area—and we hope earnestly that you will come—look at what is happening at other facilities since the USPS succeeded the former Post Office Department. Would you believe we had to throw a picket line around part of Rockefeller Center because 28 women workers were forced to share a single commode in the manager's office?

Would you believe that one postal facility was closed down because the workers were unable to handle mail in 21-degree temperatures? The broken boiler responsible for the condition is still held together with scotch tape and paper clips and I expect this facility will be closed down next winter.

Physical conditions in many of our facilities are unbelievable. One worker—at least—even takes off his work clothes outside his apartment door so that he won't carry roaches home.

Safety? Put aside for now the fact that one worker lost an arm in a conveyor belt—after USPS was warned by the union that the equipment was unsafe. Even more frustrating, perhaps, is the fact that the service's much-touted safety program is a fiasco. It is the product of managers talking to managers and no-one talking to the man or woman who operates the machine. The present local and regional health and safety committees have been a total failure. I can document for you that health-endangering and life-endangering conditions have gone uncorrected for several years after they were reported to management.

In the bulk facility and elsewhere, some conditions are so bad that one of my officers proposed that hard-hats be issued to our workers. In addition, guard rails are missing; lighting is so poor as to be conducive to accidents; equipment design is so faulty that workers constantly admonish each other to watch their fingers, hands and arms lest they be caught in the machinery. The litany of hazards is endless.

In the areas of safety, health and labor relations, the USPS has built a consistent track record of arrogance.

Chiseled in granite on the facades of postal buildings across the country is a now-famous legend which pays tribute to the dedication of the postal worker. Chip that legend away. Cover it up. Forget it.

There was morale, an esprit, in the postal service when I entered it in 1937. It continued, with some ups and downs, through the intervening decades. Now, it is all but gone.

The USPS has almost succeeded in destroying the human factor in the postal service. In its mechanization-mania, it forgets that we are flesh-and-blood people not holes in computer cards. We can't go home and expect the respect of our wives and our children if we have just spent more than a third of our waking hours in an atmosphere of disrespect and even degradation.

We tried to get that message across in the New York strike of 1970. We tried to get that message to you from the swamp in January, 1974. I am trying earnestly, on behalf of 70,000 workers in our region—and possibly the vast majority of the service's 600,000 workers—to get that message to you again.

While we continue our struggle for every working man's inalienable and inevitable right—the right to strike—we will not be deterred in our quest for human dignity by a clause in a contract, by any law that helps deny us that dignity or by any conclusion that when we entered government service we surrendered our rights as citizens.

I know of not a single postal worker who would rather walk a picket line without pay than pursue his chosen life's work and collect his paycheck. But, and this is something USPS has yet to learn, there are things more important than that paycheck.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Industrial Revolution helped make America the most affluent nation in the world. But, since it was truly a revolution rather than an orderly transition, it took a heavy toll. Miners died slow deaths in underground tombs and even slower deaths from lung disease. Sweat shops accounted for countless deaths and maimings of men, women and even small children. But, in recent decades, the private sector—albeit with Congressional, union and social prodding—has addressed itself to safety and health problems. But, not so the USPS. While attempting to automate the postal service, it is emulating not the private-enterprise approach of the late 20th Century, but the disastrous approach of the earliest days of the Industrial Revolution.

I realize that you cannot possibly—with all of the problems of governing that you face daily—fully understand how deep-rooted the workers' feelings are.

At the very moment that you are inquiring into the modernization programs of the postal service, the directors and the board of governors—with no accountability to anyone—are creating a climate of rebellion that is coming to a head.

Is this any way to run a post office, or even a toonerville trolley?

On behalf of 70,000 postal workers, the leadership of my union again urges you to come to the New York area and help prevent the continuance and the spread of an eventually-fatal disease in the postal service—total dehumanization.

Conditions in my region are not substantially different from those in other parts of the country, except that we have had the added experience of the nation's first bulk-center operation.

I am constantly in touch with postal union leaders and workers throughout the country, and I can tell you that many if not most agree with the officers of the New York Metro Area Postal Union when they say a national disruption of postal service is not only possible or probable but virtually certain unless the Congress heeds our plea and responds to our recommendations.

The postal workers in this country want the service to survive and prosper. They helped it thrive for decades. And, not once in this presentation have you heard me voice a word of opposition to automation, per se. That is not our thrust, as it has been in the Canadian postal strike. We are sophisticated enough to realize that you cannot run a 20th Century postal plant with 19th Century equipment and techniques. We will learn to run your machines and even improve on your techniques. But, while you are speeding into the future mechanically, don't expect us to sit still while the USPS degrades us with antiquated and barbaric working conditions.

Our recommendations to you are both reasoned and reasonable. They include:

(1) Greater Congressional oversight of USPS's massive capitalization program, at the same time avoiding hindering those programs that are working. We want oversight, not over-kill;

(2) The right to strike for postal workers. While hoping we would never have to exercise that right, we will not accept, nor do we now accept the second-class citizenship that has been forced upon us;

(3) Forcing USPS to comply with standards set by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. USPS claims compliance, but again there is no oversight. No one is allowed into the facilities for inspections. The secrecy at the Jersey bulk center is such that a New York Times reporter made a game out of it for an entire month, calling the general manager twice a day asking for permission to enter the premises. He was told

that the Times—and I therefore must also conclude the American public—had no right to see what was going on. (These three recommendations can be implemented by amending the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970); and

(4) On-sight inspections and local public hearings in the New York area by this subcommittee. We have nothing to hide. We have everything to show you.

The 70,000 workers in the region believe that together with the Congress we can steer the postal service off its collision course with disaster.

Thank you.

THE NIXON TRANSCRIPTS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a statement by the man who has done so much to make us proud to be politicians:

Congress is, of course, on its (inaudible). And yet they are so enormously frustrated that they are exhausted. Isn't that the point?

I completely agree with the President. That is exactly the point. Will our sense of betrayal and outrage remain as inaudible as the President? Or do we really take seriously what we say about the pride and vigilance of a self-governing people?

It takes a long time before a guest becomes so obnoxious we feel we must ask him to leave. It takes an even longer time before we feel that a President has overstayed his welcome and must be forced out. But when a President feels that transcripts such as these represent a defense, then I feel that time has come.

The few people who are still hardy enough to support the President—as opposed to those who merely say, "Well, perhaps he still isn't impeachable"—no longer say Mr. Nixon is believable when he says anything about Watergate: instead, they say, "Watergate isn't important." I agree that this is the only possible defense left—a fact which the White House itself doesn't seem to have grasped.

Is Watergate important? Mr. Nixon thinks that only the "(adjective-deleted) Republicans" would have that opinion, and that Democrats will shrug it off as "fun-and-games."

I assure Mr. Nixon he is mistaken.

Here is one Democrat who thinks otherwise—who thinks that Watergate and the unending stream of lies and cover-up evasions strikes at the very heart of a democracy: the truthfulness of the facts that serve as the basis of public debate, especially when those facts are guaranteed by the moral authority of government and its leaders.

But it seems hardly worthwhile for me to get up here and denounce Mr. Nixon. As eloquent as I am, I could never do the job on Mr. Nixon that he has done to himself. A poet once observed "what a tangled web we weave, when first we

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

practice to deceive." The surprise is that with all the practice Mr. Nixon has been getting, he never got any better.

Mr. Nixon has neatly summed up his own dilemma:

What the hell does one disclose that isn't going to blow something?

Our President spent a year trying to find the answer to that question. He still hasn't found it.

SOUTH ALLEGHENY KIWANIS CLUB

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most renowned and respected service organizations in the world is Kiwanis International. It encircles the globe and more than 267,000 individuals proudly wear the lapel pin which identifies them as being dedicated to serving youth, community, and Nation.

Kiwanians come from every walk of life and are bound by the common motto: "We Build." Voluntarily, they assume the mantle of leadership. They work with the young, the old, the poor, the handicapped, and the sick. They encourage church attendance and point the way to career possibilities for aspiring students.

The organization is an ever-growing one. It started with 16 clubs in 1916 and now numbers 5,948. I am pleased, therefore, to inform my colleagues today of the formation of another member club in Kiwanis International—the South Allegheny Kiwanis Club, organized in my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The South Allegheny Club was organized March 11, 1974, primarily through the guidance and sponsorship of the McKeesport Kiwanis Club and its president, Mr. Albert L. Greenberg. On May 17, 1974, Mr. William Laughlin, the Pennsylvania District Governor of Kiwanis, will present the new club's charter to Mr. Edward A. Pollack of 1015 Woodland Ave., Port Vue. Mr. Pollack, a man highly respected for his work in church and community activities, is the first president of the South Allegheny Club. I have been graciously invited to participate in the program for that evening along with Mr. Stanley S. Skrymes, the district's lieutenant governor; the Rev. Leo Beck, pastor of St. Eugene's Church and a charter member of the new club, and a number of prominent residents of the area.

Assisting Mr. Pollack in leading the South Allegheny Club during its first year of operation will be Mr. Harry N. Henderson of Lincoln, first vice president; Mr. Charles E. Gibson of Port Vue, second vice president; Mr. Dennis P. Hutskow of Glassport, secretary, and Mr. James L. Blaha of Port Vue.

Directors of the club include Mr. Joseph J. Anderko of Glassport, Mr. Clyde Doonan of McKeesport, Mr. Frederick Gibson Jr. of Port Vue, Mr. Robert W.

Kessling of Liberty, Mr. David C. Kohl and Mr. Robert E. Lee, both of Glassport, and Mr. William Cidboy of Port Vue. Committee chairmen include Mr. Kohl, Mr. Kessling, Mr. Vincent J. Restauri, Mr. Anthony J. Marcenelle, Mr. Lawrence S. Knapp, and Mr. Clifford C. Williams.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the officers and members of the South Allegheny Kiwanis Club. I know they will add to the already glowing record of Kiwanis International's outstanding accomplishments and make this a better world in which all can live.

JOHN GLOVER SAVES TWO CHILDREN

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we are deluged with tales of violence, strife, and corruption, it is refreshing to read of man's humanity toward man.

Today I would like to commend John Glover, a gentleman whose quick-thinking averted a terrible tragedy in my hometown of Joliet, Ill., last week. By keeping a cool head in an emergency, Mr. Glover was able to save the lives of two small children trapped in a burning car. I would also like to commend two Joliet city employees, Dan Hennessey and Ray Stefanski, who assisted in the rescue and extinguished the fire.

I am proud to submit for the RECORD a story which ran in the Joliet Herald-News describing their actions:

JOHN GLOVER SAVES TWO CHILDREN

(By Terry Haig)

A tragedy was averted Friday on Joliet's west side when John Glover came to the rescue of two small children trapped in a burning car.

Glover of 110 Third Avenue, had just driven his auto into a parking space outside a business at Jefferson and Hickory Streets when he noticed Clint and Stephanie Miller struggling inside their father's car.

Three-year-old Clint was trapped in the back seat of the car and his five-year-old sister was attempting to open a front door which was apparently jammed.

"I yelled at her to open the back door," said Glover. The girl responded and the two youths were carried from the scene to an ambulance which had just arrived along with fire fighting units.

Glover said the family was fortunate the auto door opened by pulling the handle. "If she would have had to pull up on the knob, it might have been a different story," he said later at the hospital.

Clint, whose parents live at 515 Columbia Street, was listed in good condition Saturday at Saint Joseph Hospital. He suffered minor burns and smoke inhalation.

Police units responding to the emergency are recommending Glover and two city employees for commendations.

Police said Dan Hennessey and Ray Stefanski assisted in the rescue and were responsible for extinguishing the fire.

Mrs. Miller said she had just filled the car

May 9, 1974

with gasoline and was running an errand when the mishap occurred.

A sister of Mrs. Miller was left in the car to attend the children. She left the car for a minute to remind Mrs. Miller to pick up an item.

"I still can't believe how fast it happened," Mrs. Miller said. "I was in the store only seconds when someone ran up and said, 'Your car's on fire!'"

It was unknown whether the small boy was playing with matches or the fire was a result of spontaneous combustion.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD E. CHEVERTON

HON. RICHARD F. VANDER VEEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the May 8, 1974, death of Richard E. Cheverton, 58. Dick was news director of WOTV television channel 8 in Grand Rapids, Mich.

Because of his belief in the public's right to know he helped develop the best and most competitive news markets in western Michigan.

I quote from the May 8, 1974, issue of the Grand Rapids Press:

He was past president of the national Radio-Television News Directors Association and of its regional and Iowa components, a director of the Associated Press Radio-Television board and of the National Editorial Conference.

Cheverton was a co-founder and charter member of the Press Club of Grand Rapids and a member of the club's first board of governors.

He was news director of both WOOD-AM and FM and the former WOOD-TV until a Federal Communications Commission order changed the name of the latter to WOTV, following sale of the radio facility to local owners.

Cheverton was a graduate of Monmouth College in Illinois. He worked for various newspapers in eastern United States before going to New York city to be a sports writer. Shortly afterward, he was named the first editor of *Parade*, the Sunday newspaper supplement tabloid.

After return from naval service in World War II, he became a reporter, then news director for a radio and television station in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. He came to Grand Rapids as news director in 1956.

On April 19, Cheverton was awarded the AP's First Amendment Award for his efforts in defense of the public's right to know and the journalist's right to publish.

His television news operation was declared the best in outstate Michigan. Awards won under his leadership included The RTNDA's Edward R. Murrow award, The Peabody award, The Sigma Delta Chi and DuPont medallions and the Gold Medallion of the Detroit Press Club.

Cheverton was one of four survivors in a party of six, when a Polish airliner, carrying members of a station-sponsored European tour and others, crashed in Russia. He spent eight days in a Russian hospital and several more days in Moscow before coming home.

He is survived by his wife, Virginia; his mother, Mrs. Maude Griffith; a daughter, Mrs. Thomas (Nancy) Campbell, all of Grand Rapids; a son, Richard E. of Philadelphia; and one granddaughter.

HOSPITAL MAGAZINE WARNS OF
EMOTIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST
MEDICAL RESEARCH

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the recent vote in the House limiting fetal research is described as politically motivated interference with the freedom of medical research in an editorial in the June issue of *Hospital Practice*.

This monthly magazine has a nationwide reputation for the high quality of its medical reporting and articles written by leading medical scientists and practitioners. It correctly describes the "emotion-arousing" campaign against fetal research as "a rampage of know-nothingism." The editorial follows:

A RAMPAGE OF "KNOW-NOTHINGISM"

(By David W. Fisher)

On April 11, in Boston, Mass., five physicians connected with Boston City Hospital were indicted by a grand jury. One was accused of responsibility for the death of a 24-week abortus removed by hysterotomy in an abortion completely legal under Massachusetts law. The charge: manslaughter. The other four had been involved in a study of antibiotic transport from maternal to fetal circulations. Their method had involved administration of the antibiotics to women scheduled for abortions, then measuring concentration in fetal tissue postabortion. They were charged under a 19th century statute forbidding the removal of human bodies or remains for dissection, an anti-grave-robbing law.

On April 25, in Washington, D.C., the U.S. House of Representatives approved by a vote of 281 to 58 an amendment to its 1974-75 appropriations bill for the National Science Foundation forbidding the expenditure by the NSF of any funds in or out of the country to "support research . . . on a human fetus which has been removed from the womb and which has a beating heart."

On various other recent dates, in Boston, Mass., Trenton, N.J., Sacramento, Calif., and Albany, N.Y., bills were introduced into the respective state legislatures to ban, limit, or encumber human fetal research.

Clearly, a pattern exists. The assault on fetal research is a concerted one, well organized by the national antiabortion or "Right to Life" forces. These forces, frustrated by legislative and judicial actions stripping away the fabric of anti-abortion laws, have apparently made a decision to mount an emotion-arousing campaign depicting scientific researchers as fiends in lab coats deriving sadistic pleasure from experimenting on and torturing helpless "infants." The "know-nothingists" approach of this campaign is clearly exposed when one reads the debate on the NSF limitation amendment that took place in the House of Representatives. Thus, Rep. Lawrence J. Hogan (R-Md.) is quoted in the Congressional Record (11931, April 25, 1974) as follows:

"I submit that this is a subject of debate on the floor of the House today precisely because of the ethics of the medical profession, which has brought us to a point where medical doctors no longer acknowledge their responsibility to preserve life, but fully acknowledge their authority to destroy life. That's the status of medical ethics in this country today."

By way of further illustrating the emotion-mongering employed in the assault on fetal research, one can turn again to the Con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gressional Record, this time to statements made by the congressman who both last year and this year sponsored the amendments to restrict NSF fetal research support, Rep. Angelo D. Roncallo (R-N.Y.). When Rep. Roncallo introduced his proposal in 1973, he spun this tale of horror (Congressional Record, vol. 119, pt. 16, pp. 20946-20947).

"Just last summer, Dr. Peter A. J. Adam of Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland went to Helsinki. Supported by NIH funds, he and three Finnish researchers performed some of the most abominable experiments on live human fetuses that I have ever heard of.

"Let me quote to you the description printed in *Medical World News*:

"To produce these data, the investigators severed the heads of 12 preivable fetuses obtained by abdominal hysterotomy at 12 to 20 weeks gestation. The heads were then perfused through the internal carotid arteries."

"Can you believe this, Mr. Chairman? It is the making of a new Frankenstein. These people cut the heads off living human fetuses while they still had a heartbeat and stuck them up on tubes. All this to find out if some sugar substitute called BOHE could serve as a human energy source."

Noteworthy, of course, is the fact that the "preivable fetuses" in the cited report became "living human fetuses while they still had a heartbeat" in Rep. Roncallo's peroration. Note too, that the purpose of Dr. Adam's research in Rep. Roncallo's version was to check out "some sugar substitute." In point of fact, the objective of the investigation was a comparative study of metabolic energy sources in the fetal brain, specifically a comparison of the utilization of glucose and of an alternative metabolic substrate, α - β -hydroxybutyrate (BOHB). This did not prevent the congressman from referring back to this "abomination" in the debate this spring, when he announced: "As for me and mankind, I will stick to saccharine rather than condone vivisection of live human fetuses." (Congressional Record, 12505, May 1, 1974.)

However, the purpose of this editorial is not to document the demagogic proclivities of members of our Congress. *Res ipsa loquitur*. Rather, it is to underline the nature of an organized assault on medical science, an assault that threatens some of the most promising investigative efforts in biomedicine today. In preparing to write this editorial, I spoke with a number of men and women actively involved in investigations related to prenatal detection of disease, the development of genetic studies involving human embryonic tissue culture lines, the antenatal development of immunologic competence, etc. The clear consensus was that any form of fetal research was risky in the context of indictments for manslaughter and grave-robbing and of legislative attacks born in ignorance and nurtured in imprecision. Many echoed the statement made in the *New York Times* by Dr. Frederick C. Robbins, Dean of Case Western Reserve medical school (and a Nobel laureate for work demonstrating the feasibility of the growing of polio virus in human embryonic tissue lines): "You have to be a brave fellow to do fetal research these days."

What is being built is hysteria. And, unhappily, it is being done with amazing success. It will be recalled that the vote in the House of Representatives approving the Roncallo amendment was overwhelming, a margin very close to five to one. In reading the full text of the debate, it was clear that this vote did not reflect any ideological revulsion by Congress against fetal research. Indeed, some of the individuals who voted for the amendment actually spoke on the floor against its burden. Nor did it reflect a failure on the part of opponents to make clear the antiscientific character of the proposal.

As a matter of fact, the opposition eloquently led by Rep. Bella S. Abzug (D-N.Y.), very specifically spelled out the areas of disease research that were being endangered.

What was being reflected in the overwhelming vote was the reaction of members of Congress to highly organized and vocal pressure. And clearly the only antidote to such pressure is a counterpressure from those in the best possible position to exert it—physicians. Unfortunately, to date there has been very little such counterpressure.

In saying this, there is no intention to denigrate or minimize the very outspoken stand taken by the leadership of the Boston medical community, or by the American Academy of Pediatrics through the chairman of its Committee on the Fetus and Newborn, Dr. L. Stanley James of the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, or of the deans of New York State's medical schools. The hard truth is that for most members of Congress, committees of the American Academy of Pediatrics and medical school deans cut very little ice. They represent damn few votes back home.

A much more potent force would be the physicians of their own communities and districts speaking through county and state medical societies. It would seem to us that the most effective course of action would be for concerned physicians to raise the issue in their medical societies and to do their best to move them into action in support of freedom of research and against flagrant political interference with that freedom.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION
WEEK

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, few things are more vital to the economic welfare of this Nation than an adequate transportation system. Missouri has prospered largely because of its superior network of highway, rail, air, pipeline and water transportation facilities. This network knits together the communities of Missouri from major metropolitan areas on both sides of the State to the smallest farm centers. All depend upon Missouri's unparalleled transportation network and all prosper on account of it.

Through St. Louis, the Gateway to the West, flows a steady movement of commerce going east and west, north and south. Here are joined the eastern and western railroad systems, the Missouri and Mississippi waterway traffic, our vast system of pipelines, one of the greatest concentrations of motor carriers in the world and one of the Nation's busiest airports.

This Nation's greatness owes in large measure to its ability to move goods and people. The State of Missouri has a proud record in the development of transportation of all modes and it will expand its transportation leadership as the economy of the State and the Nation continues to grow.

It is most fitting, therefore, that we salute the dedicated men and women making up our vast transportation system on the occasion of National Transportation Week, May 12-18, 1974.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE HELPS THE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, more than any other time in the history of the world, people from every country on our planet are looking for knowledge that will lead to a permanent peace.

Founded by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, People-to-People International accepted the challenge in 1956 to create international understanding in the world as a final passport to peace.

Since that time, every President of this great country has stood firmly behind the Eisenhower concept known as the People-to-People program.

President Kennedy said:

The nature of these People-to-People activities is as varied as the individuals involved. The housewife whose recipe contains the yeast of kindness. The soldier whose arms embrace homeless waifs. The doctor who heals with humility. All assert a single theme—the power of people, acting as individuals, to respond imaginatively to the world's need for peace.

President Johnson said:

People-to-People works outside government in a field vital to us all—the promotion of friendship among citizens of every land so they will understand each other and want peace. I know of no other task more important for the peoples of every country.

President Nixon stated in a White House conference—

Finally, may I say with regard to the People-to-People program that those little things you do—receiving a foreign student, spending time with an individual from a foreign country—seem inconsequential when you weigh them against the great decisions that have to be made in the Congress or in the State Department or in the White House. But . . . the fact that they have been here, the fact that they know from visiting our homes and our offices that Americans are a people dedicated to peace—this fact will make them leaders in the cause of peace.

People-to-People International has recently accepted the challenge to encourage all nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations to find leadership among themselves in respect to America's 200th birthday. In a meeting held on December 3, 1973, important nonprofit, NGO's with international dimensions were brought together by People-to-People International to discover new ways to host the millions of international visitors to the United States.

The emphasis of this meeting was to not wait for Congress or the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration to show the way, but for each organization to pick up the challenge and develop leadership within their own organization. To invite their colleagues, members, and counterparts from overseas to come see and share their homes.

This is the whole concept of People-to-People, people getting to know and understand each other. Representatives at the December 3 conference were the leaders of this Nation's strongest and fair-reaching organizations such as the women's

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

clubs, reaching 90 million women around the world, and the Farm and Garden Club in contact with thousands of garden clubs.

People-to-People International stands ready with information on how any organization can start its own bicentennial program without waiting for direction or funds as a result of this meeting.

Above all, People-to-People International wants the world now, through 1976 and beyond, to be one in which all peoples can live in peace. Given the chance, people always show respect and warmth for each other regardless of governments.

That is the goal of People-to-People—to know and understand and enhance the quality of peace.

ENCOURAGING PEOPLE TO VOTE

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely disappointed yesterday when the House voted down the rule and thus prevented consideration of H.R. 8053, the Voter Registration Act. It is my hope that this proposal to ease voter registration will once again be voted out of committee and come to the floor of the House before the end of this session of Congress.

We hear a lot these days about voter disillusionment and apathy. If any time is the right time to make it easier for people to vote, encourage them to do, it is now. I hope we have a chance in the near future to take up the Voter Registration Act establishing a national system of post card registration for all federal elections.

Our present registration system discriminates against men and women who work daily from nine to five; it discriminates against the sick and the elderly who cannot find transportation against the women with small children at home; against the poorly educated who do not know where or how to register.

I agree with the League of Women Voters that—

Millions of Americans fail to vote not because they are disinterested, but because they are disenfranchised by the present election system.

The fact that in 1972 almost half of our eligible voters did not vote is a striking illustration of the need for simpler, more easily available voter registration. Sixty-two million potential voters did not participate in the 1972 election and a poll found that three-fourths of these nonvoters would have voted had they been able to do so. It is a fact that 80 to 90 percent of those registered to vote, do vote.

Therefore it is time that we take steps to stop the decline in voter participation—from 64 percent of the voting age population in 1960 to 55 percent in 1972. The Voter Registration Act moves us in that direction.

This bill will establish a post card voter registration system designed to work within the framework of established election procedures of States and local-

May 9, 1974

ties. So we are not preempting States rights in this area. The Federal responsibility would include distribution of the registration forms and providing assistance to State officials on registration-by-mail or election problems generally. Prospective voters would return their completed forms to State officials, not to a Federal agency. Responsibility for verification of information, validation and notification of registrations remains with the State. It is important to note that State and local officials would retain jurisdiction over establishing the qualifications for all voters and the processing of all applications except that the residency requirements for eligibility to vote in Federal elections would be set at 30 days nationwide.

A Voter Registration Administration would be established within the General Accounting Office to prepare the post card registration forms, including upon them information necessary to comply with State registration laws and such other information as deemed necessary. The Postal Service would then deliver such forms to the voting age population at least once every 2 years, not earlier than 120 days nor later than 60 days before the close of registration for the next Federal election in each State. Post card forms would also be made available at post offices, upon rural and star routes and at military installations. The bill provides penalties for fraudulent registration by mail and authorizes States and the VRA to cooperate on the detection of violations.

Earlier this year I received a letter from the Governor of Minnesota which testified to the success of that State's post card and election day registration law that passed in 1973. Their program went into effect August 31 of last year and the Governor reported that between that date and the end of the year, a total of 11,152 people in the city of Minneapolis had registered by mail. They found no fraudulent registrations in this number of votes and they found that in 1973 there were 28,433—or 12.6 percent—more registered voters than in 1971.

Personally I have great faith in the American people in their conduct of elections and I want them to vote. I believe no American should be interfered with in the pursuit of the right to vote. I resent the difficulties that potential voters have had in registering and voting. Thus, I support this bill wholeheartedly and I believe it is a chance for us to broaden and deepen the relationship between the people and the Government. That has been the course of American democracy since 1789—expanding and encouraging the vote. I hope we have a chance to show our faith in the integrity of the American voter.

THE RETIREMENT OF CHARLES PATRICK

HON. CLAIR W. BURGENER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. BURGENER. Mr. Speaker, for 24 years San Diegans have had the val-

able service of Charles Patrick as a leader in our educational community. His leadership has been a major factor in the development of a community college system of recognized quality.

Charles Patrick has retired from his post as acting superintendent of the San Diego Community College District. But we can look back over the accomplishments of his career in San Diego and realize the results of his leadership.

Today, 55,000 students are benefiting from the institutions of the district and uncounted others are enjoying the benefits of the education they received at one of the four colleges which comprise the San Diego Community Colleges.

With four major campuses and a staff of over 2,000 the San Diego Community College District is now a major factor in higher education in southern California. The development of San Diego Evening College has contributed a major new concept in undergraduate collegiate education. The adult division of the district has added a new dimension to the traditional tasks of adult education.

All of this has been accomplished with Charles Patrick as the driving force behind development. He has come to be recognized both locally and nationally by professionals and laymen as an innovator with a commitment to expanding the opportunities of students whether they are pursuing a specific degree or expanding their educational backgrounds outside of a degree oriented commitment.

With a record like this, Chuck Patrick can take pride in his accomplishments. We will miss his leadership but we wish him well and hope that he will continue to find the time to remain active in our community for years to come.

HEARINGS SLATED ON HEALTH MANPOWER ACT AND NURSE TRAINING ACT

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R. 14721, the Health Manpower Act of 1974 for myself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUNNUT; and H.R. 14722, the Nurse Training Act of 1974 for myself, the cosponsors of the health manpower bill and Congressman FREYER. These bills would extend and substantially revise existing programs found in titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to schools and students in the health professions.

I am pleased to announce that beginning May 20, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment will conduct hearings on these two bills, an administration bill which I am advised will be presented to the Speaker next week, H.R. 14357 by Dr. ROY, H.R. 14196 by Mr. SYMINGTON, H.R. 11539, an administration bill which would revise the national health service corps program, and H.R. 13174, a bill which I have in-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

roduced which would extend the provisions of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act to Commissioned Officers of the Public Health Service.

We expect to hear from administration witnesses on May 20 and will hear public witnesses the remainder of the week.

MORE OF THE SAME VIETNAM SHELL GAME

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on two occasions last month the House clearly indicated its opposition to increased military aid to South Vietnam. On April 5, while considering the supplemental military procurement authorization, the House rejected a proposal to increase the statutory ceiling on obligational authority under the MASF—military assistance service funded—program by \$474 million. On April 10, the House confirmed this earlier action while debating the fiscal year 1974 supplemental appropriations measure.

Two days after the House rejected the additional \$744 million in aid, Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger wrote to the Armed Service Committees of the House and Senate, indicating that \$266 million worth of aid to South Vietnam, that had been applied against the ceiling on fiscal 1974 obligations should not, in fact, be applied, since, in the view of the Department of Defense, the \$266 million represented obligations made in years prior to fiscal 1974. The net effect of this change would have been to make an additional \$266 million in military aid available to the South Vietnamese regime.

An April 17 article in the New York Times, by Leslie H. Gelb, says of the Pentagon's sudden realization of the self-professed "accounting error":

The Pentagon has told a Senate Committee that it has found \$266 million extra for military aid to South Vietnam this year—funds that military officials said they did not know they had.

The upshot is that the Saigon government will receive additional arms this year in that amount though Congress will refuse to raise the spending ceilings, as requested by the Nixon Administration.

Today's Washington Post contains an article by Michael Getler suggesting that the \$266 million "accounting error" may be just the tip of the iceberg of the Vietnam aid coverup. According to the Post article, the Pentagon has padded each of its last three budget requests to hide nearly a billion dollars worth of military equipment intended for South Vietnam and our other Asian "allies." The article indicates that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, has charged that the Defense Department is "hiding" \$490 million, in the fiscal 1975 budget alone, intended for aid to Southeast Asian countries.

To put the icing on the cake, President Thieu has been actively seeking to exaggerate the military situation in South

Vietnam in hopes that the Congress will be prodded into increasing the already massive military assistance that props up the Saigon regime. I do not believe Congress will fall for Saigon's annual scare show. As indicated in a New York Times article of April 20, by James M. Markham, "most diplomats, journalists, and informed Vietnamese do not believe" the apocalyptic predictions of the Saigon government.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should not allow itself to be hoodwinked any further in this matter—either by the Saigon dictatorship or by our own Department of Defense. We must close the loopholes in existing law that enable the Pentagon to skirt the intent of Congress and cover-up stockpiled aid for South Vietnam. We must close the loopholes in the existing statute designed to limit aid, under the MASF program so that even the possibility of further multimillion-dollar "accounting errors" will be squelched. We should call for a full and searching investigation into the often ambiguous and contradictory claims of the Department of Defense surrounding the disputed \$266 million. Most important, we should not allow ourselves to be deceived by the antics of the Saigon regime, whose lack of veracity is beyond all doubt.

Mr. Speaker, the texts of the articles by Michael Getler and James M. Markham follow:

[From the Washington Post]

"HIDDEN" ARMS AID IN BUDGET DISPUTED

(By Michael Getler)

The Pentagon acknowledged yesterday that its last three budget requests included a total of more than \$1 billion to build a reserve stockpile of weapons for possible use by allies in Asia—rather than by American forces.

The Defense Department denied, however, that it had sought to hide the money in its budget.

But, after lengthy questioning by news-men at the daily Pentagon briefing and a subsequent Pentagon-ordered search of congressional testimony, Defense Department officials as of late yesterday were unable to produce any record showing that this request for funds had been clearly labeled or explained to Congress or the public.

The questioning arose after Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) charged that the administration was "hiding" \$490 million in the new fiscal 1975 budget now before Congress.

This hidden item is typical of the way the executive branch tries to get around congressional cuts in foreign aid," Fulbright said. "Congress turns off or cuts down the flow from one foreign aid spigot and they open up another one somewhere."

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee leveled his charges after his aides attempted to get an explanation from the Pentagon about what specifically was included in that category of the defense budget which will cost \$2.2 billion and is labeled as "Support of Other Nations."

This section includes \$1.45 billion for military assistance to Vietnam. But it also includes, Fulbright was told, \$490 million to buy and stockpile "war reserve" equipment and ammunition "earmarked specifically for use by" South Vietnamese, South Korean or Thai forces, if necessary.

Neither the official U.S. budget for the fiscal year 1975 beginning July 1 nor any other publicly released document at this time makes any mention of the \$490 million for war reserves stocks for allies.

In describing the \$2.2 billion "Support for Other Nations" category, the official budget book describes only the separate military aid for South Vietnam and virtually all the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

other relatively small items in the category, but not the war reserve stocks.

In attempting to explain the situation, Pentagon spokesman Jerry W. Friedheim revealed that about \$500 million had been similarly earmarked in fiscal 1974 and another \$25 million in fiscal 1973, the first year in which funds were included for additional stockpiles that could be used by Asian allies.

It has been known for many years that the United States stockpiled equipment for its own forces. But it was not known generally that weapons were being stockpiled for other nations, even though those weapons would be under U.S. control.

Friedheim yesterday pointed out references in March by Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger and the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, about the prospects for stockpiling arms for allies. But these statements indicated that was a future plan, as a result of the Middle East war when the United States was forced to ship large quantities of arms out of its own inventories to Israel. There was no hint that almost \$1 billion had already been requested for Asian forces in current and previous budgets.

One senior defense official said privately that Fulbright's statement marked the first time that Friedheim himself found out about the earlier stockpile requests.

The senator's challenge took on added interest since it came on the heels of a Senate vote denying the Pentagon a \$266 million increase in aid for Saigon this year. Some Senate aides believe the stockpile funds may be a way to get around congressional denial of additional funds.

Yesterday, however, the Defense Department said that the war reserve stocks for allies cannot be released from U.S. control "until a conscious presidential decision, with the appropriate congressional consultation, is made . . ."

This means the President could act without full congressional approval. But, in discussing the situation with newsmen yesterday, the general tone of Friedheim's explanation was that the Defense Department understood that it was the intent of the Congress to limit military aid to Vietnam to the congressionally imposed \$1.126 billion ceiling for fiscal 1974 and there would be no more legislative or bookkeeping attempts to get around it.

Friedheim also appeared to take a less dire view of the effects of the congressional refusal of the extra \$266 million than have some other defense and White House officials.

Friedheim noted that while the Pentagon has only somewhat less than \$100 million left of the \$1.126 billion ceiling on obligations for military aid to Saigon, only two months remain in the current fiscal year.

He also noted that the ceiling does not affect equipment already in the supply pipeline to Saigon, that Saigon has some reserves of its own, that fighting has generally been at a reduced level recently, and that the rainy season that normally restricts combat comes to South Vietnam in June.

Friedheim, under questioning, said, "There would not necessarily be a dramatic immediate effect in South Vietnam. At some point, however, there will be sort of a bubble in the pipeline and some reduction in the rate of deliveries."

He said Pentagon supply specialists were now trying to figure out where the shortages will be, and will try to use the remaining money to plug specific shortages.

The basic rationale behind the stockpiling of weapons for allies is to have a ready supply of arms—other than those earmarked for U.S. units—which could be used in an emergency by such countries as Vietnam, Korea or Israel, for example, if they were attacked heavily and perhaps simultaneously.

[From the New York Times]

SAIGON'S ALARMS STIR SKEPTICISM

(By James M. Markham)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, April 19.—Once again, heavy fighting has erupted in scattered parts of the country. And, once again, the Saigon Government has been making apocalyptic predictions about a Communist offensive. Last year such predictions were taken with a degree of seriousness, at least first, and mulled over and for the most part finally rejected. This time most diplomats, journalists and informed Vietnamese do not believe the Government.

On the contrary, it is widely believed that the Government orchestrated the news about the "fall" of a ranger base called Tong Le Chan—which is reliably reported to have been evacuated in the dead of night—in order to dramatize the North Vietnamese threat to the South.

In the wake of the capture of Tong Le Chan, Saigon suspended its participation in the political talks with the Vietcong outside Paris and virtually sealed off the Communist delegation here, canceling indefinitely its weekly press conference and cutting its telephones. And President Nguyen Van Thieu sent fighters to bomb Vietcong administrative center of Loc Minh.

LINK TO SENATE BILL SEEN

According to several American and non-American diplomats, it appeared that President Thieu was superheating the atmosphere of tension in order to increase the chances that a military appropriations bill would be approved in the United States Senate.

Saigon has been lobbying with unaccustomed aggressiveness for what it considers vitally needed money. Presently, for example, a group of Congressional aides is on an extensive Saigon-subsidized tour of the country.

The Communists do appear to have been launching attacks in Military Region III around Saigon and in the Central Highlands, but it is hard to find any disinterested party who believes that these presage a major offensive, as the Government contends.

The combination of Saigon's propaganda campaign, the Communists' attacks and the Government's own military initiatives—has soured a tentatively hopeful mood that had been building in recent months.

After a long stalemate, the exchange of civilian prisoners listed as captured before the January 1973 cease-fire was finally completed in March 8; the North Vietnamese returned the remains of American prisoners who had died in the north; the Vietcong presented a lengthy six-point peace proposal on March 22 that even American officials described as substantive; the Vietcong's chief delegate, Nguyen Van Hieu, returned to La Celle Saint Cloud, outside Paris, where the talks between Saigon and the Vietcong had been conducted.

Now events seem to be back in a less ambiguous trough, which is how President Thieu, who is chary of political dealings with the Communists, prefers things, in the eyes of some analysts.

No one argues that the recent upsurge in fighting is inconsequential. But the battle fields that really count right now may be economic ones, over which the Saigon Government has little control.

The faltering South Vietnamese economy is heavily dependent on imports, which are paid for almost exclusively by the United States. And in the last year the prices of key imports—rice, fertilizer, petroleum products—jumped by almost 50 per cent while the dollar level of aid fell off.

WORLD'S HIGHEST INFLATION

The Government now conceals its tiny foreign-reserves figure, which has dipped to about \$80-million, or the equivalent of little over one month's imports.

Last year, South Vietnam experienced a

May 9, 1974

rate of inflation of 65 per cent—one of the highest in the world; in the first three-and-a-half months of 1974. The cost-of-living index rose by another 22 per cent.

Gasoline now costs \$1.47 a gallon. Scandals surround the distribution of increasingly scarce and costly fertilizers (not to mention scrap metal, rice and other commodities) and the fertilizer shortage may endanger the next rice crop, according to economists.

In the big cities, swollen in population by the war, people are going hungry. On the destitute central coast, there have been reports of acute malnutrition.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE HEARINGS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the House Ways and Means Committee recently initiated hearings on national health insurance. One of the proposals under consideration is H.R. 14079 introduced by Senators LONG and RIBICOFF in conjunction with Congressman WAGGONNER.

The Senators build their proposal upon a belief that the present system of private health insurance should be continued and expanded upon to provide catastrophic assistance. They also adopt the premise that the Government should approach a system of national health insurance step-by-step rather than biting off more than it can chew. These premises are acceptable to those who feel we should adopt a conservative approach to Government health insurance. Although I personally do not support the concept of national health insurance per se, if it is to be inevitable then the sponsors of the Long-Ribicoff proposal are correct in identifying priorities.

However, there is an inherent danger in the Long-Ribicoff approach that is not readily apparent nor widely realized.

The financing mechanism of the bill is basically the same as that of the Kennedy-Mills bill and the Kennedy-Griffiths health security bill. This consists of a payroll tax to be funneled through the Social Security Administration which would finance health insurance for individuals. The difference is that while the Kennedy-Mills proposal levies a 4-percent tax, the Long-Ribicoff bill levies a 0.6-percent tax.

The bills are essentially the same in that the maximum liability limit differs only in amount. Under Kennedy-Mills it is \$1,000; under Long-Ribicoff it is \$2,000 and 60 days of hospital care.

The danger that I see is this: After initial implementation of such a plan, the trend will be to reduce the maximum liability, the copayments and deductibles, and increase the coverage until the end result could well be the health security plan, or complete Government-financed and controlled health care.

The political realities of Government programs inevitably lead to broadening of benefits of such programs. This can be seen by the gradual, yet constant, increase in coverage and benefits provided by medicare and medicaid programs.

Originally, the medicare and medicaid programs covered a relatively specific portion of the population with limited benefits. But now this coverage has been increased to provide for many more people with vastly increased benefits.

I am concerned that many, while adopting the conservative approach of the Long-Ribicoff bill, could be misled.

A payroll tax funneled through a government agency will inevitably lead to the results I have described. We have seen the payroll tax mushroom under the Social Security Administration's programs and I believe we may well have reached the breaking point in what we're asking the American worker to do involuntarily. If national health insurance is to be inevitable, I would recommend that an alternate method of financing be used.

One proposal has been the medicredit approach with 183 cosponsors. This approach enables people to purchase their own private health insurance through income tax credits, according to their income tax liability. For those with very low income and not covered by medicaid, the Government might issue certificates entitling them to purchase the certified policy of their choice. This preserves individual freedom of choice and encourages personal responsibility.

A variety of experts have endorsed the tax credit approach, from the Council of Economic Advisors to the Brookings Institute since it would more fully funnel benefits to low-income people than a tax deduction.

I would recommend that those Members attending hearings on national health insurance in the Ways and Means Committee give this approach their close consideration. We can no longer resort to the payroll tax as a "painless" way to separate a man and his money because, gentlemen, it has already started to hurt.

**LEGISLATIVE OPINION SURVEY,
1974**

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, each year that I have been in Congress, I have asked my constituents for their views on important issues facing this Nation. I receive those views in a wide variety of ways, and one of the most successful has been my annual legislative opinion survey.

Over 55,000 residents of the Seventh Congressional District of Texas recently responded to my 1974 questionnaire. The fact that so many people took the time to respond, many of whom included explanatory letters, is a solid indication to me of the interest of the American people in the operation of their Federal Government.

I would like to take this opportunity to share those views of 55,000 Americans with my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

Should tax dollars be used to finance political campaigns? Yes, 33%; no, 67%.

Do you favor nationalized health insur-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ance totally financed with tax dollars? Yes, 25%; no, 75%.

Do you believe that the energy shortage is real? Yes, 56%; no, 44%.

Should President Nixon be impeached? Yes, 31%; no, 69%.

Should the individual states be granted the right to pass laws restricting abortions? Yes, 61%; no, 39%.

Do you favor continuation of wage and price controls? Yes, 36%; no, 64%.

Should Federal anti-pollution standards be relaxed during a national energy shortage? Yes, 56%; no, 44%.

Do you favor year-round Daylight Savings Time? Yes, 45%; no, 55%.

Should the Federal government regulate the use of privately and State owned lands? Yes, 11%; no, 89%.

Would you favor a gasoline rationing program similar to that of World War II? Yes, 18%; no, 82%.

ANALYSIS OF "OIL AND GAS ENERGY TAX ACT" OF 1974

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the windfall profits legislation for the oil industry developed by the Ways and Means Committee is totally inadequate. It is a cover-up for a horrendous profit system in oil.

Its complexity is a testament of the committee's own confusion. For 13 weeks the committee meandered—aimlessly at times—along a convoluted course charted by the administration and the oil industry. For 13 weeks, we listened to the bland, reheated arguments of Big Oil concerning the absolute necessity of maintaining special tax favors for their industry. For 13 weeks, the committee struggled through proposal after proposal—all designed to give the appearance of action and mask the underlying lack of direction. It is no surprise, then, that after 13 weeks of labor on this mountainous problem, the committee has brought forth a molehill. The committee has dealt in platitudes—a "windfall profits tax" which does not tax profits—an elimination of the depletion allowance which is riddled with special loopholes.

In short, this legislation is fundamentally illogical. It purports to tax the high profit levels of the oil industry, but the principal thrust of this legislation is to chart new paths of tax avoidance. At a time when the credibility of our tax system has plummeted to an all-time low, it is a dangerous adventure to ratify new excuses for the oil companies not to pay taxes.

STATEMENT OF THE PROGRAM

The committee was confronted with two problems—one short-range and temporary, the other of more enduring significance. The failure to distinguish these two problems explains much of the confusion we now see before us.

First, the short term issue is the ballooning of oil company profits. A good statement of this problem was provided by Secretary Shultz in his testimony before the committee:

A windfall profit is one resulting in a change in price caused by a circumstance

which is accidental and transitory, such as the temporary shortage of a product because of a strike or, in this case, the cartel embargo of foreign governments . . . [F]or the next year or two price rises which have already occurred are more than sufficient to call forth additional domestic oil which will in fact be produced during that period. Some part of the present price produces windfall profits, and additional price increases resulting from the cartel-embargo would be pure windfall (emphasis added).

Second, the long term problem is to develop a tax policy to complement and promote our broader goal of energy independence.

WHAT THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSED

The administration has attempted to deal with windfall profits by suggesting a graduated excise tax on the price of crude oil. It is inflated rhetoric to call his scheme a windfall profits tax: an excise tax on crude oil has nothing directly to do with windfall profits. It is more likely to be a tax on consumers. Serious questions concerning this proposal were never satisfactorily answered. Among the unresolved issues are:

The degree to which the administration's tax would be shifted onto the consumer. This excise tax merely increases the cost of crude oil. It appears the consumer, not the oil company or its stockholders, will pay;

Whether flexibly administered price controls would be more effective than taxation in dealing with the short-term dislocations of price. This approach was endorsed in testimony before the Committee by one major oil company;

The extent to which the producers will withhold their oil from the market until the tax phases out; and

The accuracy of the administration's assumption that the long-term supply price for crude oil will be \$7 per barrel.

Beyond the inherent difficulties involved in the administration's tax proposal, the committee spent too little time examining the logic of a windfall or excess profits tax in the first place.

A recent report by the Joint Economic Committee puts the matter succinctly:

Even if an effective excess profits tax could be designed for the oil industry, the wisdom of imposing such a tax on an industry currently receiving several billion dollars each year in tax subsidies is questionable. Does it make sense for the Government first to give an industry large amounts of money through tax subsidies, and then to devise complicated new taxes to get the money back? The more logical first step would be to remove or reduce present tax subsidies.

THE COMMITTEE'S ACTION

On top of the issue of windfall profits, the committee has attempted to deal with the general failure of our tax policy to provide adequate supplies of petroleum or guarantee our national security. The most alarming aspect of this problem has been the massive expansion of overseas operations by U.S. oil companies, while our domestic supply situation has continually deteriorated. For decades, the oil industry has been the most protected and subsidized industry in our economy. Despite these massive taxpayer subsidies—\$34 to \$43 billion over the last 20 years—we find ourselves with neither sufficient nor secure sources of crude oil. We have instead accelerated the draining of America.

How did the committee respond to this mandate for a thorough review of our tax treatment of the oil industry? It is a complex and confusing story.

To start with, the committee had before it the present pattern of preferential tax benefits to the oil industry. These benefits include those outlined in table 1:

TABLE 1

Oil Company Preferences	Treasury Revenues
Percentage Depletion (domestic and foreign)	
Intangible Drilling Expense (domestic and foreign)	
Foreign Tax Credit	

The committee decided as a first step that the windfalls profits' tax may be preferences would not deal with the short term problem of windfall profits.

Therefore, the committee adopted the concept of the administration's windfall profits tax (table 2).

TABLE 2

Oil Company Preferences	Treasury Revenues
Percentage Depletion (domestic and foreign)	
Intangible Drilling Expense (domestic and foreign)	
Foreign Tax Credit	

	Windfall Profits Tax

However, the committee then decided that the windfalls profits tax may be counterproductive. The committee provided, therefore, a plowback provision, despite the fact that both the Treasury Department and the staff of the Joint

Internal Revenue Committee stated that a plowback would have no additional inducement for investment for the oil companies. Price was inducement enough (table 2).

TABLE 3

Oil Company Preferences	Treasury Revenues
Percentage Depletion (domestic and foreign)	
Intangible Drilling Expense (domestic and foreign)	
Foreign Tax Credit	
Plowback	Windfall Profits Tax

Then the committee decided that the tax benefits of foreign operations of the oil companies would have to be trimmed to be more in line with our goal of energy independence. The elimination of the depletion allowance on foreign properties was adopted, a step that the committee recommended and the House approved in 1969. However, removal of the depletion allowance on foreign wells will have virtually no impact on overseas oil

operations due to the availability of massive foreign tax credits.

Therefore, the committee decided to attempt to define an arbitrary formula to curb the oil companies' abuse of the foreign tax credit provision. A compromise was reached between a proposal by the committee and a formula proposed by the Treasury Department. The compromise, however, will allow the oil companies to generate about \$1.9 billion in

extra credits from oil production which can be used to shelter foreign shipping, refining, and marketing operations from U.S. tax.

In addition, to meet the problem of oil companies deducting foreign losses—such as North Sea exploratory drilling—from their U.S. income, the committee eliminated the "per-country" method of computing the foreign tax credit. This is a dangerous precedent because the alternative method of computation—the "overall" method—allows a firm to use the credits generated in one foreign country to offset a U.S. tax liability on income generated in a second foreign country. If this elimination of the per

country method of computation were extended to nonoil taxpayers, the U.S. Treasury would lose additional millions of dollars.

A more direct and simple approach to the problem of foreign losses would have been to disallow the option to expense intangible drilling costs for foreign wells. It is this tax benefit which is the primary cause of the foreign loss problem in the first place. With the intangible drilling provision allowed on foreign properties, the American taxpayer is, in fact, subsidizing the oil companies' foreign explorations at the expense of domestic explorations (table 4).

TABLE 4

Oil Company Preferences	Treasury Revenues
Percentage Depletion (domestic)	Percentage Depletion (foreign)
Intangible Drilling Expense (domestic and foreign)	
Foreign Tax Credit	
Plowback	Windfall Profits Tax

At this point, the committee went back and decided that the original set of tax subsidies would need revision after all. A depletion phase-out was adopted (table 5).

TABLE 5

Oil Company Preferences	Treasury Revenues
Percentage Depletion (domestic)	(phase out)
Intangible Drilling Expense (domestic and foreign)	Percentage Depletion (foreign)
Foreign Tax Credit	
Plowback	Windfall Profits Tax

It was then decided that a total phase-out, like the windfall profits' tax, would be counterproductive. Therefore, the committee began laying out plans to limit the impact of the action it had just taken. The 50 percent net income limitation—a limitation instituted in 1924 to

prevent abuse of the percentage depletion provision—was raised to 100 percent. In addition, the committee began carving out special rules—the 3,000 barrel per day exemption, the stripper well exemption, and the North Slope exemption. In devising these special exemptions, the com-

mittee ignored the advice of Frederic Hickman, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy. Mr. Hickman opposed elimination of the depletion allowance, but he repeatedly told the committee that if an elimination of the depletion allowance were agreed to, the committee should make no exceptions—

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

special rules, he suggested, only complicate the tax law, create tax shelters, and introduce distortions into the marketplace. But the committee went ahead anyway constructing the ultimate in Rube Goldberg tax contraptions (table 6).

TABLE 6

Oil Company Preferences	(phase out)	Treasury Revenues
Percentage Depletion		
(domestic)		
Exemptions		Percentage Depletion (foreign)
—3,000 barrel per day		
—stripper well		
—North Slope		
Intangible Drilling Expense		
(domestic and foreign)		
Foreign Tax Credit		Windfall Profits Tax
—52.8% net income limitation		
—elimination of per country		
—recapture provision		
Plowback		

As can be easily seen, the committee's bill is a mass of contradictions. I supported the motion to report this legislation out of committee, because it was clear that after 13 weeks of deliberation, there was little hope of meaningful progress being made on substantive tax issues. It is my hope that the bill can be improved in the House.

Two outstanding matters which deserve more complete consideration are the termination of the tax benefits for foreign oil production and the elimination of the percentage depletion allowance.

FOREIGN TAX BENEFITS

Under present law, the oil companies, like all U.S. multinational corporations, are allowed to credit dollar-for-dollar their foreign income taxes against their U.S. tax liability. The ostensible purpose of the foreign tax credit is to prevent the double taxation of the same dollar of profit. The oil companies, however, have taken advantage of their carefully cultivated relationship with the governments of the oil-producing countries to pervert the intention of the foreign tax credit and abuse this privilege which has been extended to them by the American taxpayer.

The abuse arises from the fact that the countries from whom the oil companies buy their oil are both landowners and sovereign states. As landowners they have the right to charge royalties. As sovereigns, they have the authority to levy taxes on the oil companies for the oil produced from their land. In their unique relationship with the oil companies, the countries have instituted pricing policies which provide for payments by the oil companies on each barrel of crude oil which is produced. These payments look like royalties; they are passed on to the consumer like royalties, but the foreign governments have chosen to call them "income taxes." Senator FRANK CHURCH recently developed the fascinating story of how, during the 1950's, the oil companies, the Departments of Treasury and State and the

producing countries all participated in developing this neat but utterly artificial arrangement.

The distinction between a royalty and a foreign tax is, of course, crucial in terms of a company's United States tax obligations. A royalty is treated as a business expense and only reduces the level of taxable income. A foreign tax, on the other hand, is a credit against U.S. taxes on foreign profits.

But the essential question in the controversy over the taxation of the foreign profits of the oil companies is not the academic debate between what is a tax and what is a royalty. In plain fact, no precise line will ever be drawn. The major issue is whether we should even be extending the privileges of the foreign tax credit to the oil companies.

The goal of tax neutrality—and its instrument, the foreign tax credit—is to eliminate tax considerations from international investment decisions. Given our goal of energy independence—and the unprecedented capital investment required to develop necessary domestic energy sources—it is a justifiable question to ask whether or not a foreign tax credit for oil production is in the national interest. Why should we not use our tax system to limit the attractiveness of foreign investment and increase the level of domestic investment?

Already there is a formidable problem. For years now the oil companies have eliminated virtually all U.S. tax liabilities on their foreign operations and they have been piling up excess, unused credits. These unused credits are available to the taxpayer retrospectively for 2 years and prospectively for 5. By virtue of the recent price escalations by OPEC, the Treasury Department estimates that the oil companies will pile up over \$16 billion in unused foreign tax credits in 1974 alone. These credits can be used to reduce U.S. tax liability on foreign profits for the period 1972-79.

The committee attempted to deal with this problem, but, under the reported bill, the abuse continues. Enough credits

will still be available for the oil companies to eliminate all U.S. tax liability on their foreign operations. And the American taxpayer will continue to provide enough additional credits to tax shelter income from—for example—expanded tanker operations in Liberia, an additional refinery in Spain, and a string of new gasoline stations in West Germany. Under the committee bill, the foreign tax credit will continue to be a major inducement to expanded foreign investment by the oil companies.

It is noteworthy that both George Mitchell of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association and Orin Atkins, president of Ashland Oil, supported the elimination of tax benefits to foreign production in testimony submitted to the committee.

Mr. Mitchell, himself an independent producer, stated:

Since the majors are spending \$5 billion for exploration overseas, there should be disincentive if you want to return that \$5 billion [to] the Nation . . . If we have an energy crunch in this Nation . . . I think all the attention must be given to make even the majors come back because we have to get up to \$15 billion a year to turn this around.

Mr. Atkins is president of a company which describes itself as an independent refiner. Here is what he recommended concerning the foreign tax credit—

Domestic exploration can be stimulated and substantial equity restored by eliminating the foreign tax credits allowable in respect of the production of oil and gas in the OPEC countries.

Serious consideration should be given to the termination of these foreign tax benefits for the multinational oil firms. I will seek to offer a floor amendment terminating the overseas use of the intangible drilling expense provision and the foreign tax credit for oil production.

SUBSIDIES FOR DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

With regard to the matter of extending taxpayer subsidies for domestic exploration, the administration—and, indeed, the committee—finds itself in an ambiguous situation. On the one hand, everyone expects the consumers to pay higher prices for his gasoline, as the price of crude oil reaches the "market clearing" level where supply meets demand. On the other hand, many of these same people are unwilling to advocate an end to these subsidies for fear that in the end, the consumer will pay. The assumption underlying these subsidies is that consumer demand alone is insufficient to stimulate enough production at "reasonable" prices.

Clearly, there is a confusion. Either we should follow a pricing policy, or we should follow a subsidy policy, but to waffle between the two, as we are doing now, only victimizes the American consumer and taxpayer and allows the oil companies a profit-cushioned and nearly tax-free ride.

Regardless of which policy we follow, the percentage depletion allowance has proved itself to be an extremely inefficient way of stimulating oil production. Professional economists are virtually unanimous in their opposition to the depletion provision as a sound public policy. In a recent statement, 59 noted econ-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

omists, including Nobel laureate Paul Samuelson, recommended the termination of the depletion allowance. Prof. Arthur Wright, a noted authority on energy economics maintains that the depletion allowance is a "very clumsy and ambiguous way to provide subsidies." Otto Eckstein, a member of the Council of Economic Advisors under President Johnson described the depletion allowance as "obsolete." And Stephen McDonald, chairman of the Department of Economics at the University of Texas, states that "a direct cash subsidy to, say, exploration would be preferable to the percentage depletion allowance."

In 1968 the Treasury Department released a study entitled, "The Economic Factors Affecting the Level of Total Domestic Petroleum Reserves." A major conclusion of this study stated:

Percentage depletion is a relatively inefficient method of encouraging exploration and the resultant discovery of new domestic reserves of liquid petroleum.

Perhaps the most convincing criticism of the depletion allowance, however, comes from outside the academic community. In December, Robert O. Anderson, chairman of the board of Atlantic Richfield, the largest oil company in the country, came out for a termination of the depletion allowance by saying:

We have to reintroduce the dynamics of the marketplace back into the industry.

Although William Simon, in his testimony before the committee, supported retention of the depletion allowance, he provided more extensive and, one suspects, more candid testimony on the value of the depletion allowance before the Senate Interior Committee in March 1973. In a letter to Chairman HENRY JACKSON, Simon wrote:

In the short run, changes in the percentage depletion rates should have little effect on the rate of expenditure of discovery effort. . . . In the long run, a change in percentage depletion should have no effect, *per se*, on the rate of production or additions to reserves. A reduction in the depletion percentage means, simply, that less of the cost of finding and developing reserves is borne by the Federal taxpayer.

Serious consideration should be given to a straight elimination of percentage depletion for all oil. We should be moving in the direction of getting government out of the marketplace for oil and gas. The long-range dangers of government protection and subsidy are far greater than the illusory, short-term benefits of unnecessary government support of the petroleum industry. As Walter J. Levy, an international oil expert and adviser to both the State Department and the oil industry has stated:

The difficulty with government sponsorship, protection and subsidy is that they sap the competitive thrust; once government supported undertakings have been embarked on, there is a tendency to impose the consequences upon the country's economy rather than to write-off unattractive ventures, as a commercial enterprise would be forced to do.

The committee has missed a tremendous opportunity. A positive step toward a new tax policy to meet the demands of our energy future could have been taken with this legislation. The burned-out wreckage of past policy failures could

have been cleared away. A degree of simplicity and equity could have been returned to our tax laws. All these objectives could have been achieved. Instead, all we have before us is a confusing, ambiguous, and hopelessly muddled piece of legislation. Unless this crazy legislative quiltwork can be improved on the floor of the House, it should be defeated.

LOWELL THOMAS—MAN OF VISION

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, I inserted an article by the eminent columnist, George Condon, about a very distinguished Ohio native, the incomparable Lowell Thomas.

The response to that article evidences the fact that longtime newscaster and world adventurer Lowell Thomas is held in fond esteem by a great many Americans, and well he should be.

Recently, Mr. Thomas, writing for Mainliner magazine, addressed himself to the question: "What About the Future?" Who better to address himself to that question than a man, well past the three-quarters of a century mark, who has spent his lifetime observing the strengths and weaknesses of the world, its leaders and its average citizens.

His answer holds such inspiring optimism and positive patriotism that I want to include it here for your interest:

WHAT ABOUT THE FUTURE?

(By Lowell Thomas)

To attempt to predict the future is presumptuous, at best—and at worst, an exercise in sheer fantasy.

As this is being written, for example, the energy crisis is much with us and so is Watergate, the war in the Middle East may or may not be over, and the Russians still have forty crack divisions on the long border they share with China. How these and other situations will be resolved, who knows for sure?

Nevertheless some of the broad outlines of 1974 are clearly visible, for many of the forces that will affect our future have been set in motion.

The new clothes we will wear, the new books we will read, the new cars we will drive, the new movies and plays we will see, the new homes we will live in and, indeed, most of the goods and services we will utilize through the coming year—for the most part, these have all been preordained by production and planning schedules set up months and even years in advance.

We know, too, that some of the most spectacular of coming events will occur in the heavens and beyond, among them the advent of the supersonic airliner, the approach of the once-in-a-lifetime Comet Kohoutek and the continuing exploits of our astronauts.

More to the point perhaps, we know that for every "miracle" in space, there will be thousands of down-to-earth achievements and innovations involving virtually every field of human endeavor. The proof is the immediate past, in many ways a mirror to the future.

On the medical front, where some of the greatest and noblest gains are to be found,

the past year has seen remarkable progress in the early detection and treatment of cancer, heart disease and arteriosclerosis, the nation's three prime killers.

In addition, organ transplants, once rare, have now become almost commonplace. We have come to understand, at least in part, some of the so-called "incurable" diseases such as multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy and cystic fibrosis. Doctors and engineers, working together, have succeeded in creating a line of artificial body parts up to and including even electronic eyeglasses for the blind.

While this new year may fail to produce another Salk vaccine, Americans in general will be living longer and enjoying it more.

SUCCESS IN THE CITIES

The United States is also experiencing an ongoing revolution in race relations—although "evolution" perhaps is the better word. All about us, in both our personal contacts and the various media, there is visible evidence that blacks and other minorities can make it. Those who do are purchasing homes, making sure their children get a good education, and building a real stake in society.

One result has been the election of black mayors this past year in Los Angeles, Detroit, Atlanta and Raleigh, North Carolina. The advent of black power at the polls and the end of the war in Vietnam have also had a calming effect on the entire body politic. "Law and order" are no longer code words for racial prejudice or political suppression. They now are goals within sight.

The "radical-liberal" is the wave of the past, says *The New York Times*. And the wave of the future, we are told, "The Conservative chic." Conservative or no, the American ethic is based on a bedrock of unparalleled economic prosperity, and the outlook for 1974, while somewhat clouded by the energy crisis, is still the best in the world.

The American success story is further serving as a model to friend and foe alike, right around the globe. It has been spurred on by tremendous advances in communications and the growing ease of world travel.

Out of all this, it appears likely the planet earth will slowly but surely develop a world economy, a world culture, as witness the growing cooperation in monetary reform, the worldwide battle against pollution and a genuine effort towards universal family planning.

THE REALITY OF DÉTENTE

One big bonus to date has been the growing détente between the United States and the Soviet Union, between the United States and Mainland China, which has led to the ending of two wars in the space of the past year.

In the view of Secretary of State Kissinger, the die is irrevocably cast. During his latest visit to Peking, Dr. Kissinger confided that, "The progress we have made in our relationship (with China) will continue in the years ahead, whatever happens in the future and whatever the Administration." The same is true, he assures us, with regard to Russia.

If we can build bridges to Moscow and Peking, it also stands to reason we can rebuild some lesser shattered bridges here in our own hemisphere. At this writing, at least, it is even possible that President Nixon's long-sought "generation of peace" may have already begun.

If the foregoing sounds a bit euphoric, let it be quickly noted that this new year will have its problems of course, some of them carry-overs from 1973; others—completely new—to bemuse or confuse us, and some that will shock us.

Is there any older saying—or cliché—than "necessity is the mother of invention?" We split the atom didn't we? So now may be the time for us once more to go all-out and find a way to solve our energy problems with atomic power. Also this is the time for us to

May 9, 1974

discover some less expensive way to transform both coal and shale into oil of which we are told we have enough to last for centuries. What about steam for propelling our automobiles? Inventor Bill Lear insists he can do it. Surely this year we'll hear much more about the use of steam.

As "Futurologist" Harman Kahn has observed, "The most surprising thing that can happen in a broad, long-range projection is that there will be no surprises." One of the biggest question marks is the world food situation. Our Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz recently noted that world food supplies have "improved considerably since the beginning of the crop year." He added, however, that based on best estimates, "1973-74 consumption will exceed production. There is unquestionably a need to have some system of guiding and encouraging countries to rebuild stocks and carry them forward in years of scarcity."

The coming World Food Conference, first urged by the United States, may provide just such an opportunity.

Another big question mark is the extent to which the average American workman will react to the continuing inroads of automation and computerization.

Some say we soon will be nothing more than "cogs" in a great monolithic machine run solely for the benefit of "big business" and "big government." However, if we are "cogs" in a vast machine, we are "cogs" vital to the machine's continued operation. If too many of us break up, go soft, or drop out, the system will be in real trouble.

"YOU'VE GOT A FUTURE"

In a booklet just out entitled, "You've Got a Future," the always positive Dr. Norman Vincent Peale says "Everywhere today the gloom and doom artists are at work. Every day they are crying their wares to the effect that young people are no good, the morals are breaking down, that indeed, everything is bad—bad, seeking to make us believe their no-future philosophy.

"We cannot dispute the existence of grave moral and economic problems. They are many and complex, and without attacking them creatively and soon, I suppose our country could go into a sad decline.

"But I am not numbered among those who dismally think we are going to end in a break-up. I believe that as a nation we have a future, a real future. And one reason I believe this is that increasingly from people everywhere we are hearing a fresh, new vital question. It is not that old helpless query, 'Why doesn't somebody do something about things?' That is passé, a bygone question. Instead, lots of people nowadays are resolutely asking, 'What can I do?'"

In the end, it's all of us working together that will most shape the coming year—and all the years to follow. From this you will surmise I am an optimist. That indeed I am. After roaming the world for more than six decades I am more convinced than ever that ours is the grandest country on earth, and so far as I know this is the best of all worlds. Why they are even getting ready to reopen the gold mines high in the Colorado Rockies where I spent my youth! Let's get ready for the best year we have ever had!

JAMES F. NOLAN IS DELTA NU ALPHA TRANSPORTATION FRATERNITY MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to learn that the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Delta Nu Alpha Transportation Fraternity will be honoring James F. Nolan as the Man of the Year at a banquet to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, on May 15.

Jim's record of achievement marks him as one who is well-deserving of this honor. Currently he is vice president of Wolverine Express, having been with the company for over 37 years. He began as a dockman, and in 3 short years, he worked his way up to a driver, then a dispatcher, and then to terminal manager. As is shown by the fact that he obtained a degree in law in 1961, and he taught college courses in transportation for 12 years, Jim has never been content to stand still. Rather, he has constantly worked to expand his capabilities, and thereby to serve better his company, and his community.

Jim has been active in the Northern Ohio Trucking Association, of which he is now president; the Cleveland Trucking Association, of which he was president in 1959; the ICC Practitioners, of which he was president in 1961; the Traffic Club of Cleveland; as well as the Delta Nu Alpha Transportation Fraternity, which is honoring him now.

Jim's community service extends beyond the transportation field for he is also active in the Knights of Columbus, and the Ancient Order of Hibernians, which honored him as Man of the Year in 1957. Jim is also a confraternity teacher at St. Patrick's Church in Cleveland.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to add to the tribute being paid to Jim Nolan by calling the attention of the House of Representatives to his achievements. I extend to Jim my warmest congratulations, and best wishes for continued success.

WALL STREET JOURNAL SAYS
TRANSCRIPTS REVEAL "A FLAWED
MENTALITY"

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, it is not news that the Washington Post and New York Times oppose the Nixon administration. But it is news when the Wall Street Journal comes to the parting of the ways with President Nixon. This newspaper, which usually presents the viewpoint of the business community has been giving the President the benefit of the doubt, but in an editorial May 7, 1974, it reveals its revulsion at what the transcripts reveal of Mr. Nixon's "flawed mentality."

The editorial follows:

THE IMAGINARY MEN

In our first comments on the presidential tapes we remarked that it helps to separate two questions: The general propriety of the conversations, and evidence of impeachable offenses. We have tended to emphasize the latter, and will return to it shortly. But today we would like to lay aside impeachment and other legal issues, and simply address what the conversations tell us about Richard Nixon, his administration and American politics.

This is of course what the rest of the press and the nation at large have been discussing

all along, and we should perhaps apologize for the quirk of mind that led us to believe the question on the table was whether to impeach the President. In any event, having said so many times over the last year that even without a case for impeachment Watergate will have done enormous harm to the American Republic, we can scarcely disagree with the widespread conclusion that the tapes reveal a flawed mentality.

If the case for criminal complicity does fall, for that matter, it will be only on the narrowest of grounds. The President's attorney will be arguing: Yes the President talked about paying blackmail, yes his words say several times he thought paying the money was the only immediate answer, yes someone might construe that as approval, but no that isn't what he meant, and no his words were not directly connected to the actual payoffs. Even if all this is true, what a defense for a President of the United States to offer.

More broadly, the tapes reveal a whole litany of presidential failings: A casual attitude toward lawbreaking by his subordinates. In particular a casual attitude toward perjury, indeed remarks that some lawyers construe as subornation of perjury. A reach for public deception, in particular a willingness to invoke national security and executive privilege for expedient reasons. A disinclination to probe and question his top subordinates on such questions as moving about large monies or "deep sixing" documents. And above all, a general disposition to concentrate almost entirely on the question, what can we get away with? at the expense of the question, what would be right?

Some things can of course be said in exoneration. The President apparently didn't know much before March 21, and part of this reaction was perhaps confusion. The President is not a district attorney, and at least up to a point is entitled to assume that prosecutors will do their job without his help on each fact. There are points, as in sending a message to John Mitchell not to refuse testimony to protect the President, at which he shows a concern with getting the story to law enforcement authorities.

Yet even on a sympathetic reading, the record must be that faced with a mounting crisis, Mr. Nixon reacted deplorably. He was willing to consider patently wrong courses of action. He was willing to trip along, and even conceivably cover, the line of outright illegality. He coupled any moves to expose crimes with moves to limit and contain the exposures. And finally, he chose and protected all of the aides whose personalities are so brutally revealed in these conversations.

A preoccupation with image rather than reality, it seems to us, is the characteristic that runs through both the conversations and the faults they reveal. In conversation after conversation, it becomes impossible to tell whether the participants are trying to recall events or concoct a story. One gets the feeling they did not distinguish between the two in their own minds, that to them there was no reality, only the image they could paint.

And always there was a concern not with the meaning of events but with their "PR." When in a conversation with Assistant Attorney General Henry Petersen it became apparent that eventually Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman would have to go, the questions on the Presidents mind were: Can one go without the other? Should it be before the Magruder testimony or after? Should it be before Dean goes or after?

We came back to a point we have made many times: The inhospitality of the Nixon White House to men of vision, intellect or stature. It is quite impossible to imagine these conversations going on as they did if they had included, to pick two men no longer in the White House at the time, Arthur Burns or Daniel P. Moynihan. To understand why such men were so few there, observe that Leonard Garment, who did see

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the extent of the danger the moment he learned of it, was treated as an object of faint ridicule.

This is ultimately the President's doing and the President's failing. He has accomplished much and promised more, but he filled his inner world with imaginary men. Empty men committed the type of blunder you would expect of them, and the President himself proved too empty to limit the damage. For this he has paid with his reputation and may yet pay with his job, and to the office and nation he sought to protect and restore, his legacy is further grief and further cynicism.

PUSHES TAX RATES UPWARD

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution that is identical to the one originally proposed by Congressman FROELICH, House Resolution 1076, and would amend the Rules of the House to require that each reported bill contain an inflationary impact statement.

Inflation is generated by Federal spending, and we must assume the responsibility for controlling this spiral by grasping complete control of the appropriations and authorizations process. An important step can be accomplished by this resolution which would focus attention on the inflationary implications of the Federal spending authorized or appropriated by each piece of legislation we consider.

An editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on May 6, 1974, points out that the Federal Government actually benefits from inflation by receiving additional tax revenues as a result of the inflationary push. The Federal Government's income inflates with rises in the Consumer Price Index. The editorial uses as an example the progressive personal income tax—

The faster the rate of inflation the faster taxpayers are pushed into higher tax brackets. The higher rate applies not only to gains in real income but to gains that merely represent inflation, and thus the real rate of taxation constantly rises as inflation proceeds.

The editorial emphasizes how important it is that Congress be aware of the inflationary impact of the bills we debate, which doubly robs our citizens by decreasing their spending power and increasing their tax burden. Curbing inflation is the most important "tax break" we can give the taxpayers we represent.

The full text of the editorial and the resolution I am introducing follows:

DE-INDEXING THE GOVERNMENT

As the nation anguished over double-digit inflation rates, there is naturally a hue and cry for the government to do something about it. As much as the politicians would like to respond, there is a serious barrier, the government itself. That is, the government has built-in incentives to inflate, almost invisible incentives that silently overwhelm whatever good intentions the politicians might have.

In a way, government revenues are tied to the Consumer Price Index. The Treasury is on an escalator, not only compensated for any losses incurred through inflation, but rewarded by it. Milton Friedman has drawn quite a bit of fire for his proposal for Brazilian-type indexing, which would give everyone in the nation salary increases as the Consumer Price Index rose. But it has nearly escaped attention that, to an extent unique in American society, the federal government's income is already indexed.

With progressive taxes, for example, the faster the rate of inflation the faster taxpayers are pushed into higher tax brackets. The higher rate applies not only to gains in real income but to gains that merely represent inflation, and thus the real rate of taxation constantly rises as inflation proceeds. Similarly, the capital gains tax cuts into real capital by taxing inflation-caused gains. The government's debt manages to draw a subsidy from those who hold it. And with this inflation-caused revenue pouring into federal coffers, the politicians have more dollars to pass out in government goodies or tax "cuts."

Nobody pays much attention to this rather diabolical taxing system when the annual rate of inflation is 2% or 3%. But at current inflation rates, it becomes painfully obvious that the government has all the cards stacked in its favor.

At a 10% annual inflation rate, for example, the wage earner whose gross income is \$15,000 today will rapidly be pushed into higher and higher tax brackets even though his real gross income remains unchanged. At that rate, in 20 years his annual salary, if his increases merely offset inflation, would be \$103,210, which puts him in the 70% tax bracket.

Similarly, a couple that buys a house today for \$15,000 would, at a 10% annual inflation rate, need to sell it for \$103,210 to recoup the original real investment after 20 years. At this point they would owe the government tax on a "capital gain" of \$88,210. The same occurs with a share of stock.

Historically, the government has also done wonderfully by borrowing from the public. The money you get back from savings bonds purchased in 1945 will buy a third as much now as then. At the current inflation rate, holders of Treasury securities are losing interest and capital. Only the government gains.

All of this makes life wonderful for politicians, in ways that even they may not entirely recognize. Every few years, for example, they get to "increase" Social Security benefits, reaping political mileage from their munificence. Also, they can "cut" taxes, and extract political mileage from that. Some congressional liberals are right now proposing to increase the personal exemption to \$850 from \$750. Whatever one thinks of the timing of this in terms of economic management, it is a very small bone indeed from the public sector to those it has been systematically robbing.

Senator James Buckley has introduced legislation that would take the government off this escalator, ending the charade once and for all. His proposal, leaning in part on Mr. Friedman's indexing but also supported by Senators Proxmire and McGovern, would tie to the CPI federal tax brackets, personal exemptions, asset depreciation and capital gains, and new issues of Treasury securities.

By automatically adjusting all these items to compensate for inflation, the government would forego its inflation dividend. Its income would rise only as the nation's real income rises. No longer would all the goodies that pour from the Capitol's cornucopia be financed by a perpetual tax increase most Americans are not even aware of. If Congress wanted to spend more, it would have to come out in the open and ask that taxes be boosted.

May 9, 1974

If the government were kicked off its escalator, "de-indexed," the rest of the economy would not have to be indexed as Mr. Friedman suggested. Once the government is no longer rewarded by inflation, but is stung like everyone else, we can be confident that the politicians will have every incentive to wring inflation out of the economy.

H. RES. —

Resolved, That clause 27(d)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Each report of a committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by such committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such a bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy."

FREEDOM AND FREE ENTERPRISE: MUST HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, despite the experience which the world has had with government control of and intervention in the economic life of a nation, few seem to learn from past failures.

One man who has devoted much of his life and energy to seeing to it that history's economic lessons are properly understood is Antony Fisher, a British farmer, businessman, and founder of the Institute of Economic Affairs in London.

Mr. Fisher has just written an outstanding book, "Must History Repeat Itself?" which is a study of the lessons taught by the repeated failure of government economic policy through the ages.

Believing that both history and theory have a vital role in freeing us from the syndrome of economic frailty and failure, Mr. Fisher notes that—

History provides evidence that where governments have pursued the policy of maximizing individual choice within a framework of law and moral conduct, their problems have given way to prosperity... Among the consequences will be low taxation and a maximum increase in the wealth of the poorer members of the community.

Graham Hutton, in his foreword, commends this book for "honesty of purpose, and integrity of reasoning. Mr. Fisher's argument from experience and history, his call for choice, self-help and self-improvement are required reading."

For those who have forgotten past failures of government in the field of controlling wages and prices, Mr. Fisher's book is essential. He discusses examples found in 5,000 years of history, ranging from Diocletian to Erhard, and he shows the relevance for today of Wat Tyler, the Pilgrim Fathers, the French Revolution, and the corn laws.

Consider the example of the Roman Empire. He writes that—

The classic example of the attempt by government to improve the life of the people by restricting their choice is that of the Emperor Diocletian about the year AD 300. He was faced with the familiar problem of rising prices in the wake of an increase in the

quantity of money and a debasement in its value.

He quotes the historian Duray:

Under the impression that to give a piece of metal whatever value they liked, it sufficed to engrave the Emperor's name upon it, the Roman Government had ended by putting in circulation pieces of "silver" and "gold" which contained neither silver nor gold . . . Very high prices resulted therefore from the depreciation of the currency.

In his effort to bring prices down to what he considered a normal level, Diocletian did not content himself with such half measures as we in the United States have been attempting. Instead, he fixed the maximum prices at which beef, grain, eggs, clothing, and other articles should be sold, and prescribed the penalty of death for anyone who disposed of his wares at a higher figure.

The fact that government control over wages and prices failed in Rome is now clear to all. A contemporary historian, Lactantius, writing within a decade or so of the event, presented the considered verdict on Diocletian:

After many oppressions which he put in practice had brought a general dearth upon the empire, he set himself to regulate the prices of all vendible things. There was also much blood shed upon very slight and trifling accounts; and the people brought provisions no more to markets, since they could not get a reasonable price for them; and this increased the dearth so much, that at last after many had died by it, the law was laid aside.

It was, notes Mr. Fisher, "left to the Emperor Constantine to restore confidence and stability by reintroducing a reliable currency based on gold which the people knew could not be debased for the convenience of politicians—as could paper or other substitute currencies."

Antony Fisher urges an economy free of government intervention, and his Institute of Economic Affairs has been a major source of information and inspiration for all of those who believe that freedom and free enterprise go hand in hand, and that a system of government coercion which minimizes individual choice will, in the end, eliminate all vestiges of liberty.

His book has been widely and favorably reviewed and is available in the United States from Transatlantic Arts (North Village Green, Levittown, N.Y. 11756). Columnist John Chamberlain writes that—

The greatest living proof to both the Labor and Conservative parties in England is not Jeremy Thorpe, head of the reviving Liberals. The honor of leading the true revolt against the inflationary welfare status quo in Britain belongs to a private citizen, named Antony Fisher, who built a fortune by selling chickens at uncontrolled (and therefore steadily falling prices) and put some of his money into an educational "trust" . . . the Institute of Economic Affairs.

Concerning the message found in his book, Mr. Chamberlain notes that—

Tony Fisher would be worth a dozen Harold Wilsons and six Edward Heaths to Britain if they would only listen to his program outlined in "Must History Repeat Itself?"

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I wish to share with my colleagues the column by John Chamberlain about the new book by Antony Fisher. This column, which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner of March 22, 1974, follows:

HOBLED ECONOMY

(By John Chamberlain)

Are people getting tired of their governments everywhere? The U.S. public opinion polls tell us that Congress is held in lower esteem than the President. The contempt of politicians, according to "The London Economist," is fully as pervasive in Europe.

In Denmark, a new party, conjured out of the air by Mogens Glistrup, got 16 per cent of the vote in a recent election by promising to abolish the income tax and fire the civil servants. In Belgium, the Walloon separatist movement provides an uneasy backdrop for the supposed integrating pan-European forces of NATO and the Common Market. In Finland, the two-party system finds itself threatened by a dissident group that now has 18 seats in parliament. Sweden and Norway have showed dissatisfaction with the celebrated Socialist "middle way."

Finally, the British have voted in a way that defies the analysts: Harold Wilson's Labor party now rules with a minority in the House of Commons, and nobody knows how the strengthened Liberals will ultimately choose to wield their third-party balance of power.

It could be that voters are at last realizing that governments have been trying to do all too many things that should be left to voluntary action.

The greatest living reproof to both the Labor and Conservative parties in England is not Jeremy Thorpe, head of the reviving Liberals. The honor of leading the true revolt against the inflationary welfare status quo in Britain belongs to a private citizen named Antony Fisher, who built a fortune by selling chickens at uncontrolled (and therefore steadily falling) prices and put some of his money into an educational "trust" called the Institute of Economic Affairs.

Tony Fisher is suddenly someone to conjure with in Britain as he goes about hawking his "non-political" politics which calls upon the government to sell off the nationalized industries and to allow people to "contract out" of the now compulsory cradle-to-grave insurance programs. Tony Fisher supports the voucher idea that has been suggested in the U.S. by professor Milton Friedman; he would let people use government-issued vouchers for everything from medicine to schooling, choosing between public and private institution as they see fit.

Fisher is much more than a "mere theoretician." He tells a little about his business experiences in a book called "Must History Repeat Itself?" but the book is mainly devoted to a review of general history and an outline of a program for reforming Britain.

To flout fashion he had to find a business that was too tiny to tempt the interventionists. Starting in 1954 with a few hundred day-old chicks, Fisher parlayed his poultry business into a 20 million pound company. He sold at free prices, and he created a "new" cheap food that widened the choice for millions of previously ill-fed Britons.

So convincing was his experience with chickens that he prevailed upon the British egg marketing board, which was already being done in by an illegal "farm-gate" sale of eggs, to disband itself.

Now Tony Fisher is trying to get Britain to free all industry, even as it freed the egg producers.

Tony Fisher would be worth a dozen Harold Wilsons and six Edward Heaths to Britain if they would only listen to his program as outlined in "Must History Repeat Itself?"

JUDGE DISMISSES FELONY CHARGE FOR "LACK OF A LAWYER"

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the ultimate in public injustice has now occurred in our Nation's Capital. A Federal judge has ruled that felony indictments against two defendants must be dismissed because no suitable lawyers could be found to represent them.

This latest constitutional interpretation of the right "to have the assistance of counsel as his defense" has now gone even beyond the point where the public must pay for the accused's attorney. Under the latest ruling, if the judge feels the "free" attorneys are overworked or "incompetent," then the criminals are to be freed—leaving the law-abiding public to suffer from the menace among us. Strange justice.

I insert a related newsclipping reporting on this latest judicial breakdown:

[From the Washington Star-News, May 5, 1974]

LAWYER LACK FREES TWO
(By Winston Groom)

A D.C. Superior Court judge has dismissed indictments against two men being held in D.C. jail on felony charges because, the judge said, no suitable lawyers could be found to represent them.

Judge Charles W. Halleck ruled Friday that because of a two-month-old strike by lawyers objecting to defending indigents for free, no competent defense attorneys were available to take the case. Yesterday, Halleck issued a written opinion specifying why the pair must be set free.

The defendants were James P. Chatman and Clifton Crawford, both charged with burglary. Both men have prior convictions and at the time of their indictment in the burglary case, Crawford was on parole for a robbery conviction.

Halleck is the first judge to dismiss an indictment because of the lawyer strike, although Superior Court Chief Judge Harold H. Greene has warned repeatedly that such action might become necessary unless Congress appropriates funds to pay attorneys who normally represent poor defendants.

Criminal Justice Act funds, which had been used to pay for indigents' attorneys, were depleted in February, and the Superior Court Trial Lawyer's Association voted unanimously not to take on any more cases until money was assured.

In July, the District government will begin paying the indigents' lawyers and the Senate Appropriations Committee has prepared a bill to authorize payment in the meanwhile but the House still has taken no action.

As a stop-gap measure, the court began drafting attorneys at random from the private bar, but many of them have not shown up as ordered.

In the case before Halleck Friday, attorneys had been appointed for both defendants on their arrest. However, when the case came before Halleck for arraignment, Halleck observed that both lawyers had caseloads far in excess of the maximum recommended by the American Bar Association and, in addition, found that one of the attorneys was incompetent to handle the case. Consequently, he granted one defense lawyer's request to be relieved and removed the other from the case.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Halleck then called in an official of the D.C. Public Defender Service and asked if his office could provide attorneys for the defendants.

The PDS representative, Mark Foster, told Halleck that lawyers in his office had absorbed all the cases they were able to handle under current bar association standards and were unable to take on any more.

Halleck then summoned a representative from the court section that presides over the draft of private practice attorneys and asked if any lawyers summoned by that office could be provided to handle the case.

Halleck was told that all attorneys from private practice who had shown up in court already had been assigned as many cases as they could handle and were unable to take any additional clients.

Asst. U.S. Atty. Stewart Gerson argued that Halleck should simply postpone the cases and arrange for bond so the defendants could be released from jail.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER PROJECT

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee now has before it proposals for further Federal funding for planning and development of the Dickey-Lincoln School Hydroelectric Power Project on the Upper St. John River.

There is widespread misunderstanding of the actual power potential, cost, and environmental impact of this project. To set the record straight, I would like to share with my colleagues the following background paper on the project prepared by the Friends of the St. John, a coalition of 15 State, regional, and national organizations concerned with the future of the Upper St. John River Basin:

FRIENDS OF THE ST. JOHN BACKGROUND PAPER

What is the Dickey-Lincoln Project? The Dickey-Lincoln Project is a proposal to build two dams on the upper St. John River in northernmost Maine for the purpose of generating hydroelectric power.

The larger dam would be built at Dickey and would have a capacity to generate 760 megawatts (MW) of electricity. Of this, 725 MW would be used to generate peaking power for southern New England (656 MW in Boston after transmission losses). This dam could operate only 2½ hours per day because of limited water flow in the St. John River. The second dam would be downstream at Lincoln School and would even out the flow from the dam at Dickey. Its additional electric generating capacity of 70 MW would allow the generation of 105 MW of power for 12 hours a day for Maine customers.

In addition to constructing the two dams, five smaller dikes would have to be built at various sites around the edge of the reservoir to keep it from spilling over into adjacent watersheds, and a minimum of about 150 miles of new transmission line rights-of-way would have to be cut through the Maine woods.

How big would the dams be? The dam at Dickey would have to be very big. It would rise more than 300 feet over the existing streambed, would have a crest length of nearly two miles (9200 feet), and contain 65 million cubic yards of rock and earthwork.

In total volume it would be the eleventh largest dam in the world and the sixth largest in the U.S., larger than Egypt's Aswan Dam. It would take seven years to build.

By comparison, the dam at Lincoln School would be small—87 feet high, 1290 feet long, and 2.2 million cubic yards.

How big would the lakes be? At high water, the dam at Dickey would flood 88,600 acres and the dam at Lincoln School an additional 2,200 acres (a total of about 140 square miles). At low water, the area of the lake behind the Dickey dam would shrink by about 30,000 acres. The water elevation behind the Dickey dam could vary up and down by as much as 40 feet, depending on the time of the year. It would take more than two years of annual average runoff to fill the larger reservoir.

Would the Dickey-Lincoln Dams make an impact on New England's electricity supply? Very little, the claims of the proponents notwithstanding. Despite the size of the project, its electric output would meet less than one percent of the electricity demands of New England by 1983, when the project would be completed. This is because there is not enough water flow in the St. John to keep the turbines running more than a small fraction of the time. The major part of the generating capacity would sit idle most of each day until the few hours of peak electric demand.

As a source of peaking power, Dickey-Lincoln would be somewhat more significant, supplying about ten percent of what traditional analysis would say peak loads will be in 1983.

The significance of Dickey-Lincoln as a power source will diminish with time as the size of New England's energy demand increases.

Would the Dickey-Lincoln Dams take the place of nuclear power plants? No. You would need four or five projects the size of Dickey-Lincoln to generate the same number of kilowatt-hours of electricity as one reactor the size of Maine Yankee or Boston Edison's Pilgrim I. Besides size comparisons, Dickey-Lincoln would be used to generate "peaking" power during the several hours a day when demand is highest for electricity. Nuclear plants operate steadily to produce "base load" power.

Then what would Dickey-Lincoln replace? If Dickey-Lincoln were available, we could reduce the size of one fossil fuel unit somewhere in Maine by 105 megawatts (for example from 605 MW to 500 MW). It is unlikely, however, that Dickey-Lincoln would also allow us to reduce the installed capacity of fossil fuel-fired peaking plants, because during the summer the peak in demand begins around 11 a.m. and extends to about 5 p.m., requiring the peaking units to operate for about six hours. While Dickey-Lincoln could supply two and one-half hours of that peaking load, there would still have to be enough fossil fuel generating equipment to meet peak demands for the remaining three and one-half hours.

Will Dickey-Lincoln have a major impact on the environment? Yes. The effect of the project on the lands and streams that would be buried under the lakes would be total devastation. The free-flowing St. John River, its tributaries, and the fertile bottomland bordering the river would be replaced by a large lake. Because of fluctuating water levels, the edge of this lake would have minimal value to wildlife and recreation.

During construction, there would be major disruptions of substantial areas near the reservoir site, including major quarrying operations in the Deboule Mountain region, a particularly outstanding scenic resource.

Construction of the necessary transmission lines would produce major environmental and aesthetic impacts.

On the beneficial side, approximately 5000 barrels of oil equivalent could be saved daily,

May 9, 1974

if Dickey-Lincoln produces power that would otherwise be generated by burning non-renewable fossil fuels. By comparison, New England consumes more than a million barrels a day of petroleum products. It should be borne in mind, however, that the free-flowing St. John River and the timber and wildlife that would be lost to the dams are also nonrenewable natural resources.

What is the significance of the environmental impacts? If the St. John River and the surrounding wild lands were just like any other river and forestland in northern New England, the significance to the region of the losses caused by the Dickey-Lincoln Project would not necessarily be great. However, the upper St. John basin is not just more of the same. The area has unique recreational potential to the hunter, the fisherman, and the white-water canoeist.

Of the 89,000 acres that would be inundated, 17,600 are deer yards, areas of bottomland which naturally provide the right kind of habitat to help the deer population get through the severe winters. Studies have shown that these areas support about 2200 deer and that such a population is capable of supplying as much as 30,000 hunter-days each year. If these deer yards are flooded out, the deer cannot simply move to other areas, because the other areas are either not suited or they are already occupied. It would be possible to mitigate some, but not all, of this loss by acquiring 36,000 acres of neighboring forestland and managing it for deer production at considerable expense.

The upper St. John and its tributaries today provide some of the best brook trout fishing in the nation. The reservoir behind the Dickey dam would flood 57 miles of the St. John and many more miles of its tributaries, thereby eliminating the river habitat that this species needs to survive in the upper basin. The lake fishery that would result from the dams would, according to the Fish and Wildlife Service, only partially compensate for the loss.

The Appalachian Mountain Club New England Canoeing Guide says of the St. John River: "an area which has no equal in the eastern United States in the number and diversity of wilderness canoe trips which can be made." One of the features that makes it unique is the extraordinary length of the run on the St. John mainstream. This would be broken by the proposed dams.

The demand for the sort of recreational experience that the upper St. John River is uniquely suited to provide is rapidly increasing in the heavily urbanized northeastern United States.

Will Dickey-Lincoln have a major impact on the Maine economy? It has been estimated that 11,200 man-years of labor would be needed to build the Dickey-Lincoln Project of which 3,950 man-years could be provided from the local labor pool. The rest would have to be imported. Most of the jobs for local laborers would be in unskilled and semi-skilled classification, jobs paying \$3600 and \$4000 per year, respectively (in 1967 figures). There is some concern that this labor will be provided at the expense of the local lumbering and potato farming industries. Because the dams would provide very few permanent jobs, there is also a worry about the economic and social impacts of the "boom and bust" economy that would accompany the construction and completion of the dams.

The land that would be flooded by the dams is presently harvested for its timber. Estimates are that 25,000 to 40,000 cords of wood, a renewable resource, would be lost to the local economy each year. The mill value of this wood has been estimated at \$660,000 annually (1970 figure) and the total value added in the local economy could run as high as \$8 million annually. Thus, jobs would be lost as well as gained, if the dams are built. The income from timbering and from guide

services associated with recreational use of the area, if preserved in its natural state, will flow each year to support the local economy. The power revenues from the dams will flow to the federal government to repay the low-interest, tax-free bonds that will be held largely by higher-income out-of-state investors.

How much will Dickey-Lincoln cost? Lots! The Corps of Engineers' latest official estimate (January 1974) is that the dams would cost \$356 million plus \$52 million in interest during construction (IDC) and that the transmission lines needed to bring the power to market would cost an additional \$123 million plus \$11 million in IDC (possibly less if a deal can be made to hook into an already-full transmission line that runs to New Brunswick and that is 150 miles away from Dickey-Lincoln). The Corps' estimate is almost certainly low because their estimate doesn't figure in the effects of inflation on construction costs during the seven years it would take to build the dams nor a profit for the contractor. Some people have estimated that the price tag will end up at \$800 million or even \$1 billion!

Won't Dickey-Lincoln power still be cheaper than that generated from expensive oil? Despite claims of cheap power, savings to consumers would be minimal, if there are savings at all. This point is very much in dispute. The answer depends very much on what assumptions you make in comparing Dickey-Lincoln with alternative power sources.

The Army Corps of Engineers' comparison indicates that Dickey-Lincoln electricity would cost 2.5¢ per kilowatt-hour (KWH), while the fossil fuel alternative would produce electricity at a cost of 3.4¢ per KWH. If this savings can actually be realized, New England consumers would pay \$11.7 million less for their electricity, but since they now pay \$1.6 billion each year for electricity anyway, the savings could amount to no more than a fraction of one percent.

Today's high price of imported oil (about \$12.50 per barrel) is figured by the Corps into the fossil fuel alternative's price estimate. However, probable increases above the Corps' estimate of a \$458 million project cost are not considered in the Dickey-Lincoln electricity price estimate. If there should be cost overruns for the dams, the price advantage of Dickey-Lincoln power would vanish.

In addition, the 2.5¢ per KWH estimate for Dickey-Lincoln power assumes substantial subsidies from federal, state, and local taxpayers. Because Dickey-Lincoln would be a federal project, it would be exempt from taxes. It would be financed by low-interest tax-free federal bonds (with an assumed 5% interest rate) which produce a tax break for individuals in high-income tax brackets but which reduce regular tax revenues.

Dickey-Lincoln power would actually be very expensive. The only reason why the price of electricity from Dickey-Lincoln has a chance of being lower than the price of electricity from alternative sources is because some of its cost would show up on your tax bill.

But, isn't the benefit-cost ratio for the project favorable? According to the Corps of Engineers' analysis, the so-called "benefit-cost ratio" for the Dickey-Lincoln dams is now 2.6. It is not correct to say, however, that for every dollar invested in the project, the government would "get back" more than double its money. By the rules of "benefit-cost" analysis, the price charged to the consumer by the government for electricity from the project is completely unrelated to either the "cost" or the "benefit" of the dams. Using the Corps' figures, buyers of power from Dickey-Lincoln would pay \$30.8 million each year for power from a project whose annual "cost" is only \$17.7 million and whose "benefit" is \$46.5 million. This demonstrates how artificial the Corps of Engineers' analysis is.

Because of the strength of the dam-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

builder's lobby in Congress, the Army Corps of Engineers is permitted to use a borrowing rate of 3 1/4% to calculate the annual "cost" for the benefit-cost ratio. On the other hand, they use a borrowing rate of 8 3/4% to judge the cost of the alternative which they don't want to see come to pass. They also build taxes into the cost of the power from the fossil fuel alternative, while the federally financed dams would produce power "tax-free" (meaning taxpayer-subsidized). If the Corps had to use the 8 3/4% borrowing rate in figuring the annual "cost" of the dams, this number would jump from \$17.7 million to \$46.8 million or more than the alternative. If, in addition, you figure in what a private utility would have to pay in taxes on a capital investment the size of Dickey-Lincoln, you would have to add \$20-\$30 million more in taxes. Thus, a private utility would find that Dickey-Lincoln power would be 60-80% more expensive than equivalent power generated from fossil fuel.

The Corps' analysis is also misleading in that it counts recreational, area redevelopment, and flood control "benefits" without considering the loss of recreational use of the wild river or economic losses that would accompany dam construction.

Wouldn't Dickey-Lincoln, which would be a public power project, be useful as a "yardstick" against which the performance of the private utilities in New England could be judged? Dickey-Lincoln would be more useful as a yardstick against which to measure federal boondoggles.

If we want to establish public power to serve as a "yardstick", it would be more sensible to build something more common to New England than an enormous, publicly subsidized hydroelectric project and to use more competitive assumptions.

Are there any alternatives to Dickey-Lincoln? Yes. Almost anything will provide more electricity than Dickey-Lincoln; so alternatives are not lacking.

We specifically recommend broadening the daily peaks in demand through modifications to utility rate structures to encourage use of electricity modifications to utility rate structures to encourage use of electricity for such things as hot water heating in off-peak hours. This can and should be accomplished by 1983.

We also recommend substantial investments in insulation of homes and installation of storm windows. The reduction in base load demand that these steps would achieve would save many more kilowatt-hours of electricity than Dickey-Lincoln would produce and would allow us to retire some of the more expensive, less efficient fossil fuel plants now in operation as base load or cycling units to serve as peaking units.

More efficient fossil fuel combustion (in combined cycle units and in fuel cells), the use of solar energy for space heating and cooling, and wind turbines all offer more promise for the intermediate term than Dickey-Lincoln hydropower.

And for those who were interested primarily in the public power aspects of Dickey-Lincoln, the prospect of a public role in the exploration for oil on the continental shelf or public development of alternative energy sources should offer a more attractive alternative than Dickey-Lincoln.

THE SOVIET SEA CHALLENGE

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations and student of Caribbean and Isth-

main Canal policy questions, I long ago recognized the importance of seapower as part of our national defense. Thus, it was with more than casual interest that I read, in a recent issue of the *World Wars Officer Review*, the bimonthly publication of the Military Order of the World War, a most informative paper presented by Vice Adm. George C. Dyer, U.S. Navy, retired, before the District of Columbia chapter of that organization.

In this paper Admiral Dyer evaluates the evolving relative strengths of the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. navies and summarizes his views of events to come, before 1980. The decision to open the Suez Canal, made after his article was prepared, may advance some of his projections.

Admiral Dyer's paper follows as part of my remarks:

[From the *World Wars Officer Review*, March-April 1974]

THE SOVIET SEA CHALLENGE

(By Vice Adm. George C. Dyer)

My talk about the Soviet Sea challenge will be divided into three parts, just as we learned in our long ago Latin lessons, all Gaul was so divided.

First, I will briefly bring you up to date by reminding you of previous sea power challenges against the then current No. 1 sea power, which have occurred during the twentieth century.

Second, I will name briefly the elements of sea power as they exist in the decade of the 1970's and point out some of the trends that are taking place in the Soviet Navy, and in the United States Navy.

Third, I will give you one man's opinion of where the United States Navy, the most important element of sea power of the United States, stands today in relation to the Soviet Navy, and where it might stand in 1980.

And all this in twenty five minutes.

PREVIOUS SEA POWER CHALLENGES

In the early years of the twentieth century, it was axiomatic that "Britannia rules the waves". Great Britain had over fifty colonies and Dominions scattered around the World and tremendously long lines of communication extending to Egypt, India and Australia in the East and to Newfoundland, the Falkland Islands and Canada to the West. Britain needed a large and active navy to protect these lines of communication and a strong merchant marine to sustain the commercial trade of the Dominions and colonies with the Mother Country. Britain had both and was definitely "Number One".

Kaiser Wilhelm and his predecessors and their advisors found time to study the books of our Admiral Mahan about the influence of sea power on history and took to heart the lessons set forth in Mahan's mighty volumes. If Germany was ever to be Number One in the World, Germany had to have sea power and a large navy. Germany set forth to challenge Great Britain in sea power.

At the great sea battle at Jutland in 1916, the British Navy turned back this challenge, and at the end of World War I, the German Fleet was surrendered to the British Fleet.

Based on a strong suspicion that the German challenge just might succeed, a success which would be an undesirable turn of events for the United States, Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson built up our Navy to close comparability with that of the #1 Sea Power, Great Britain.

The Washington inspired Limitation of Naval Armaments Treaty of 1922 sought to freeze naval strength as it then existed and put an end to naval challenges. Great Britain and the United States were allowed an equal big ship strength of 5, Japan a relative strength of 3, and France and Italy each a relative strength of 1.67.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I call your attention to the fact that the Navy of the Soviet Union in 1922 was a distinct "also ran" in naval strength, although back in 1900, the Russian Navy had been the third navy in size in the World, not too far behind France, which followed a respectful distance behind Great Britain.

During the twenty year period between World War I and World War II, the Soviet Navy built up its submarine strength so that this part of the Soviet Navy was the largest in the World amounting to, in 1940, some 240 submarines. But the Soviet Fleet was very unbalanced, being without an air or an amphibious arm, and the essential skill of going to sea and staying at sea.

More importantly to the United States Navy, during the twenty-year period between World War I and World War II, the Japanese Government, disregarding the Japanese Treaty obligations, built up the Japanese Navy beyond the limitations set on naval strength set by the 1922 Limitation of Naval Armament Treaty as well as by the later 1930 Naval Limitations Treaty. Japan denounced the treaties in 1934 and commenced its unbridled sea power challenge. Germany, getting a somewhat later start, also commenced to build up her navy at a rapid rate.

Great Britain easily turned back the second German naval challenge and the United States slowly but surely, and a bit painfully and commencing in mid 1942 turned back the Japanese naval challenge.

In the period following World War II and immediately following the formation of the United Nations organization, the Soviet Union torpedoed the formation of the planned for the Charter prescribed "United Nations Armed Forces". She insisted that each and every nation of the five permanent members of the Security Council must make equal contributions of Land, Sea, and Air Forces to the "United Nations Armed Forces". Since, at that time, 1947, China had no Navy to mention, and specifically no carriers, battleships or large cruisers and no amphibious forces, this proposal meant that the "United Nations Armed Forces" would have no real sea going naval power with a wallop, available, and that land and air forces only would be available in any United Nations crisis. It was quite natural that the United States, Great Britain and France would not accept such an unbalanced "United Nations Armed Force". So the "United Nations Armed Force" died aborning.

But the Soviet Leaders of 1951 were brighter than they had been in 1920 and 1930 and 1940 and much brighter than they had been in 1947. In 1951, after observing what sea power had done to them in Korea, they decided to build up their sea power and that included their Navy.

As the years passed after World War II and Korea, the lessons of Mahan in regard to the influence of sea power on history were heeded less and less in the United States and shoved under the table in Great Britain. The British excused themselves from doing what they knew was the right thing to do on the basis of poverty. The United States was content to slumber as a self confident No. 1. On the other hand, the Soviets having taken the decision that the Soviet Union couldn't be No. 1 in the World without having the No. 1 sea power forces in the World. They put their rubles behind their ambitions. They have gotten results.

Of the Presidents of the United States from Harry Truman to Richard Nixon, the present incumbent is the only one to clearly perceive that the United States can do little overseas for herself or for her allies in the cause of Freedom, without the broad means to get overseas and the power to stay. These objectives take sea power. President Harry Truman had the lesson forced upon him, when on the 24th of June 1950, the communist North Koreans poured over the border into South Korea. As President, however,

Harry Truman had not only tolerated but supported Louis Johnson as Secretary of Defense and Francis Matthews as Secretary of the Navy. These two, in 1949 and 1950, viewed sea power as an anachronism.

So the lesson of history in sea power of the first seventy years of the twentieth century has been that since the German challenge was turned back twice and the Japanese challenge was turned back once, that when the chips are down on the field of battle, challenges by even just slightly inferior forces don't succeed. On the other hand, confrontations as we confronted Great Britain during the first two years of World War I and as the Soviets confronted us during the Cuban Missile Crisis, are the energy foods which spur on the No. 2 to become the No. 1 sea power.

Now, let us look at my second point.

ELEMENTS OF SEA POWER

What are the elements of sea power in January 1974, and what are the trends taking place in these elements in the United States and in the Soviet Union today? Is the Soviet Sea Challenge for real?

Sea power is first and foremost the ability to conduct war at sea. But it is also the ability to exploit the economic, political and psychological advantages of a strong maritime presence. This latter requires a wide ranging fishing fleet, an active and strong merchant marine and a highly financed oceanographic research and exploration program.

First, a word about the Soviet Merchant Marine and a sad word about ours.

In 1960, I finished a book for the Naval Institute titled "Naval Logistics" and took my wonderful wife on a freighter trip around the World, as I had promised her to do. Except in ports like Okinawa, Olongapo and Manila, I was amazed, truly amazed to find that merchant ships of the Soviet Union outnumbered United States merchant ships by two to three and even four to one. I had spent two years, 1947-1948, in the Mediterranean—as a cruiser division commander—and the very opposite had been true in the Mediterranean then. But in 1960 in ports like Madang, Sourabaya, Port Swettenheim, even Penang and Singapore, these large fine looking Soviet Merchant Ships were always to be seen and in profusion.

And today, the imbalance has become more marked. By and large, our active merchant marine has shrunk from 2916 ships to 655 ships during the period from 1960 to 1973. In the same period, the Soviet active merchant marine has grown from 873 to 1480 ships. The active Soviet Merchant Marine is now two and one quarter times the size of our active merchant marine. The Soviet merchant marine is the fifth largest in oceangoing ships in the World, and what is more important it is remarkably new. Japan, Great Britain, Norway and Liberia are the current leaders in active merchant shipping on the highways of the oceans.

Another element of the Soviet Union's strong maritime presence is the Soviets' open ocean fishing fleet. It is the largest in the world and still growing.

And finally, the Soviet Oceanographic Research and Exploration Programs. They are beyond the range of any simple formula to rate, but they are judged by those who claim to know as "Highly Aggressive" and no less than "Second to None" to borrow an old US Navy Slogan.

Summarized, the Soviet Merchant Marine is large and active and growing rapidly: Ours is shrinking steadily: Their fishing fleet is first and growing: Their Oceanographic Research is "Second to None".

And now, my third point. And it is just one man's opinion as to where the United States stands today in relation to the Soviet sea challenge.

Is the Soviet Challenge for real? I answer "Yes".

May 9, 1974

With the challenged and the challenger being in the general area of equal strength, it would seem to me that the battle result in the years ahead might well be determined by the "Professionalism of the Officers Corps" of the two navies. I do not see how the United States Navy can expect to excel in this area in the year ahead when Secretaries of the Navy and at least one Chief of Naval Operations, the present one, downgrade seagoing command achievements and capabilities in seagoing skills and upgrade Fiscal Management, so called "people to people" relationships, "Management Skills" rather than "Command Skills". They do this in their letters of instruction to the Flag Officer selection boards, Flag Officer plucking boards, and in administrative practices and policies.

It was a lesson of World War II that not every naval officer wearing a flag officers uniform has the personal courage, the professional capability to fight well and to keep on fighting well over long periods of time to permit building up successful fighting teams. There were a lot of "Trial and Error" details of flag officers to combat assignment during World War II.

In World War III, it will be a lot more difficult for the United States Navy to resist the Soviet sea challenge, if the Navy starts out without a very large backlog of professionally qualified Flag Officers who have won their spurs at sea. Where will the United States Navy be with its Flag list filled with officers who have won their spurs ashore and keep themselves on active duty by saying "Yes Sir, it's a fine idea"?

The Soviet Navy has, at long last, in 1973, launched their first large aircraft carrier, of about 40,000 tons, and have laid down the keel of another. When the Soviets have commissioned and outfitted these ships, put them through a shakedown cruise, a considerable series of tactical exercises, they will have taken a big step ahead.

As the Soviets press ahead in this area, with the laying down of more keels and then have more launchings and more shakedown cruises, and more tactical exercises and deep water Fleet Problems, say in 1978 to 1982, the Soviets will be in a position to make a "chips down" sea challenge to the United States Navy.

For the Soviet Navy already has three times as many submarines as the United States Navy. The Soviet Submarines have been patrolling for some years off our coasts with their thirty one Yankee Submarines each armed with sixteen missiles good for 1300 to 1500 miles from launch position. In 1972 the Soviet Delta Submarine each armed with twelve 4,000 miles missiles commenced cruising in our offshore waters, able to pinpoint any location in the United States from either the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean.

As one more fact pointing up that Soviet sea power is on the move is that the Soviet Marine Corps has reappeared together with seagoing landing ships and crafts.

To reinforce the statement that the Soviet Navy is "On the make" let me advise you that from 1965 to 1972, the number of ship days the Soviet Navy is spending cruising at sea, that is one ship one day cruising in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, the Caribbean, the Indian Ocean and the Western Pacific Ocean increased from 6,000 in 1965 to 48,000 in 1972. An eightfold increase. From these figures you will know that the Soviet Navy is learning to go and to stay at sea.

The present emphasis in the United States Navy, currently accentuated by decreasing amounts of fuel oil available, seems to be on how much times the ships can stay in port, and how frequently officers and men may go ashore, and how small the watch on duty aboard may be.

During the recent Israel-Egyptian War, the United States Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean had its forces increased from 50 to 60 ships. The Soviet forces in the Mediterranean at the same time were increased from 50 to

90 ships. This is the portend of things to come.

THE PORTEND OF THINGS TO COME

My opinions are: (1) The decision has been taken in the Kremlin to become the No. 1 in sea power, and to make the Soviet Navy the largest in the world. I believe this will be accomplished, because there has been no decision taken in Washington by the President and the Congressional leaders of both Political Parties that the necessary steps must be taken to keep the United States ahead of the Soviet Union in sea power, expensive as such a decision would be. (2) The Soviet decision to be No. 1 will be brought to fruition shortly after 1980. (3) There will be some confrontations in the intervening years, but no "chips down" challenge. (4) The United States Navy does not appear to be acting like a Navy under very serious challenge, although it has not reached the non-chalance of the British Navy as it slid quietly from being No. 1 to No. 2 to a "Way back" No. 3.

When the Chief of Naval Operations of our Navy can take time from not only leading his subordinates, but pushing them a bit to develop professional excellence in meeting the sea challenges ahead, to personally cut the hair of the sailorman before television cameras, then it seems to me that the reality of the sea power challenge of the Soviet Navy has been missed.

So I recommend to each of you that you have your back yard bomb shelter building and ready for occupancy before 1980, because by that date at the present rates of growth and relative decline of the two leading sea powers, the Soviet Navy will be "Number One".

UNION WOMEN ORGANIZE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, recently labor union women from all over the United States met in Chicago to found the Coalition of Labor Union Women. This coalition grows out of the increasing awareness among working women that they face special problems both as women and as workers; and the convention's success reflects an impressive ability to organize to deal with these problems. The following story on the convention appeared in the United Auto Worker's Washington Report of April 8, 1974: WOMEN'S MOVEMENT SEEKS STRONGER VOICE INSIDE TRADE UNIONISM

(By Ruth Jordan)

CHICAGO.—It was just like any other big labor union convention. Standards dotted the floor marking the places where Machinists, Steelworkers, Clothing Workers, Teachers, Teamsters and Auto Workers were sitting—well, not quite like any union convention in recent years.

The delegates were different too—3,200 union women and several men from 58 unions, most of whom had paid their own way to attend the founding convention of the Coalition of Labor Union Women here.

The organizers of the convention, who had met last summer in the Chicago airport to discuss the idea for the first time, had watched their baby grow through several regional conferences. They expected some 1,500 women to attend this first national meeting. Instead, by Saturday morning when ses-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sions began, there were 2,000 registrants and the Chicago Fire Marshall had ruled that the overflow crowd would have to be accommodated in the lobby outside the Hotel Pick Congress' "Great Hall." And still the women kept coming. Three busloads from the Midwest arrived in the afternoon delayed by a spring snowstorm. The credentials committee was called into action again.

Addie Wyatt, one of the organizers of the meeting and director of the newly formed Women's Department of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, told a crowded night session—"We have had a difficult labor, but nine months after we began, we have given birth to this wonderful child . . ."

The Coalition adopted a structure and organizational guidelines to keep the organization growing until the first delegated convention planned for next year.

The majority of the delegates resisted efforts that would extend the organization's framework to include women outside organized labor voting down amendments that would open the organization to "all working women" and to "women in the Welfare Rights Organization."

Instead the organization was limited to "union members and retirees of bona fide collective bargaining organization . . ."

The new organization adopted as its purposes:

Organization into unions of the 30 million unorganized women workers in the labor force;

Affirmative action in the workplace to encourage women "and their union brothers" through their unions to take positive action against job discrimination in hiring, promotion, classification and other aspects of work;

To encourage women to run for political office and to press for child care legislation, full employment and job opportunities; ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment and an extension of "truly protective legislation for all workers"; and

To encourage union women to take an active role in their unions and to encourage their movement into leadership positions in their unions and the labor movement as a whole.

RESOLUTION TO BAN OPIUM PRODUCTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a concurrent resolution urging the President to initiate serious negotiations with the Turkish Government to prevent the revocation of their ban on opium production. The resolution further states that if the negotiations prove unsuccessful, then the President should exercise his authority provided by the Foreign Assistance Act, to terminate all economic assistance to the Government of Turkey. I would like to thank Congressmen RODINO, O'NEILL, and WOLFF for joining me in sponsoring this resolution; and Senators MONDALE and BUCKLEY for agreeing to sponsor it in the Senate.

As you will recall, in 1971 the President of the United States declared that the drug problem in our Nation had assumed the dimensions of a national emergency and that heroin addiction was the most difficult illicit drug to control and the

most socially destructive form of addiction. At that time it was estimated that between 500,000 and 700,000 persons in this country were addicted to heroin, and that 80 percent of this heroin originated from the Turkish opium poppy. A key part of our strategy to combat this menace to our society was to reduce the availability of heroin by eliminating the source. The President, with the support of the Congress, successfully convinced the Government of Turkey to impose a ban on opium production. In return, we pledged \$35.7 million to compensate losses accrued to the Turkish farmers and to assist in developing alternative crops. Unfortunately, although the Turkish Government has received a substantial portion of that money, the money received did not filter down to the Turkish farmers.

Today, we are just beginning to realize the fruits of this action. There has been a dramatic decrease in the quantity and quality of heroin on the streets of America, and a corresponding decrease in the number of heroin addicts. On the streets of New York, the purity of a "bag" of heroin has declined from 7.7 percent to 3.7 percent. The Drug Enforcement Administration reports a reduction of the estimated number of heroin addicts by more than 60 percent. Correspondingly, the number of heroin overdose deaths and criminal activity has shown a marked decrease. All this progress can be related to the cessation of opium production in Turkey. Therefore the resumption of opium production in Turkey poses a serious threat to the health and safety of our communities.

As you may know, rumors of the reversion of the poppy ban prompted Congressman WOLFF and me to visit Turkey recently. During that time I was convinced that serious planning to lift the ban was being conducted. In fact, seeds were being germinated which are to be used for planting this fall. Upon voicing my concern to the White House and the State Department when I returned, their response was less than encouraging.

I have recently seen reports of an absurd White House proposal to grow opium poppies here in the United States. Such talk from the highest echelons of our Government can only have a debilitating effect on any serious negotiations. The proposal called for growing poppies on two Government installations in Arizona and the State of Washington which would yield about half of the annual medical consumption in America. I am very concerned over the impact of this proposal on our present tenuous situation with the newly elected Government of Turkey.

I have sent a letter to the President expressing my deep concern over domestic cultivation based on inadequate and insufficient information on the opium shortage. Such action could well prove to be a severe detriment to our society and negate any possible negotiating posture with the Turkish Government.

The crucial aspect of both of these developments is that they are based on data which indicates an opium shortage from

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

information supplied by the three pharmaceutical companies legally authorized to import crude opium. The parallels to the oil shortage are too great to accept their assessment entirely.

I therefore have requested the General Accounting Office to investigate the alleged shortages of opium derivative drugs in this country. I also requested GAO to project the 5-year demand for opium which would substantially enlighten any decisions made about options and proposals necessary to meet America's crude opium demand.

So, it is with this understanding of the opium situation that the concurrent resolution has been introduced urging the President to become directly involved in continuing the Turkish ban or fulfilling the Foreign Assistance Act. The present cosponsors of the resolution have supported the Foreign Assistance Act and its conditions for narcotics control. Also, there are presently over 50 additional Members who have expressed an interest to joining me, and I have a dear colleague in this morning's mail requesting additional cosponsors when I reintroduce the resolution next week.

The resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

Whereas the President of the United States in 1971 declared that the drug problem in our nation had "assumed the dimensions of a national emergency," and that "heroin addiction was the most difficult to control and the most socially destructive form of addiction"; and

Whereas it has been estimated that prior to 1972, 80 percent of illicit heroin entering the United States was produced from a Turkish opium base; and

Whereas in 1972, the Turkish Government agreed to ban the growing of the opium poppy in exchange for \$35.7 million in assistance to be provided by the United States to compensate losses accrued to the Turkish farmers and to assist in developing alternative crops; and

Whereas the Turkish Government's ban on opium reduction in both quantity and quality of heroin available on the streets of America, which has resulted in the reduction of the estimated number of heroin addicts by more than 60 percent; and

Whereas the Turkish Government has permitted the germination of poppy seeds which could be ready for planting this fall; and

Whereas the Turkish Government is presently deliberating over the possibility of lifting the ban on opium poppy production in Turkey; and

Whereas the Foreign Assistance Act authorized the President of the United States to cut off aid to any nation that he determines had not taken adequate measures to prevent illegal drugs from entering the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Whereas the revocation of the opium ban in Turkey is counter productive to measures precluding illegal heroin from entering the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

(1) immediately initiate negotiations at the highest level of the Turkish Government to prevent the resumption of opium production; and

(2) if such negotiations prove unfruitful, exercise the authority provided by the Congress under the Foreign Assistance Act, to terminate all assistance to the Government of Turkey.

RESPECT FOR THE RULES

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article from today's New York Times for the interest of my colleagues. I am in full agreement with Mr. Lewis' excellent commentary.

The article follows:

RESPECT FOR THE RULES

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON, MAY 8.—When Willy Brandt resigned as Chancellor of the Federal German Republic, he gave the briefest of official explanations: "I accept the political responsibility for negligence in connection with the Guillaume espionage affair. The next day, for his parliamentary colleagues, he added:

"My resignation is a result of my . . . respect for the unwritten rules of democracy, and is to prevent my personal and political integrity from being destroyed."

Distinct themes were woven together there. One was the duty to put system above self: Mr. Brandt was saying that West Germany's institutions were more important than any individual, that the country's interest was different from his own. The other was personal, human, a matter of character: There are things that count more in life, Brandt was saying, than holding public office.

When the Federal Republic was born, just 25 years ago this month, it had to be regarded as one of the frailest of democratic enterprises. Even if one could have put aside the horrors of the immediate past, there was almost nothing in German history to provide confidence that the self-restraint, the commitment to constitutional order needed to make democracy work would be found among the Republic's politicians.

Today West Germany is at least the equal of any other country in Western Europe in the confidence and stability of her institutions. A major, perhaps the decisive, reason has been the performance of Willy Brandt.

ABROAD AT HOME

In his years as Chancellor the country faced severe tests of its Constitution, and passed them. There was the new coalition Government and the movement to the left. There was Brandt's Ostpolitik, breaking with all the shibboleths of the past. There were the tests of no-confidence votes and interim elections, met by Mr. Brandt without any trimming of principle.

His resignation is one more test of the Constitution, and in that sense a last great contribution on his part. For the West Germans will pass the test, will show that their fidelity is now to system rather than person.

Mr. Brandt's character was more important than his policy. He brought directness, simplicity, above all integrity. An American who was close to him said this week: "I'm convinced that his lasting value, for the Germans and for the rest of us, was his demonstration that there can be moral integrity in politics. That is why he quit as he did, with the simple statement that he took responsibility."

Americans are bound to make the comparison with their own embattled President. It is an instructive one.

In all those pages of White House transcript, there is not a word of concern on Richard Nixon's part for the integrity of our constitutional process—for law, for the courts, for Congress, for the public that is the ultimate sovereign. There are only fear, hatred and contempt for others.

Instead of a willingness to face responsibility, even responsibility for the modest

May 9, 1974

fault of negligence in controlling subordinates, there is a desperate search for ways to avoid it. Deception, public relations tricks, partisan maneuver, even crimes are to be preferred to truth.

Reading those transcripts, one perceives a man with no discernible commitment to any moral principle, with no interest in life save office and power: an empty human being, almost pathetic in his isolation and insecurity. The very rhetoric is mean, shabby, barren.

In Richard Nixon there is a total confusion of self and state. Like a child, he cannot see beyond the self; he therefore thinks that any attempt to curb him is wrong. His overpowering concern is for survival—his survival in office, at whatever cost to his country and its institutions. He is the Presidency.

Those who read the transcripts will find it hard to avoid The Wall Street Journal's conclusion that they "reveal a flawed mentality." Even Hugh Scott, the Senator Republican leader, now finds the performance "shabby, disgusting, immoral," and says he is "disturbed that there was not enough showing of moral indignation." (One wonders where Senator Scott's moral indignation was when he first read a transcript last January, but better late than never.)

What is happening these days is a public and political revulsion at the character of a President. It is precisely this situation that the Framers of our Constitution had in mind for impeachment. Madison spoke of a President's "negligence or perfidy" as reason for removing him, or his "betrayal of trust." Those generalities will underlie the specific crimes considered by the House Judiciary Committee.

But is it really necessary for this great country to go through months more of uncertainty and torment? Surely no one accepts any longer Mr. Nixon's claim that his survival is necessary for the sake of the Presidency. We do not have a parliamentary system, but the Constitution does envisage Presidents resigning. By that service Mr. Nixon could still hope to earn the gratitude of history.

THE DELIVERY OF SOCIAL SECURITY CHECKS

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, allow me to begin my remarks with a riddle of sorts: What is it that occurs every 30 or so days and makes bedfellows of thieves, postmen, bankers, State welfare workers, and social security recipients? That is easy, right? It is the monthly delivery of 30 million social security checks, which always takes place during a 4-day period beginning on the last day of every month and ending on the third day of the succeeding month. The postmen deliver the checks, the thieves and the recipients await their arrival, the bankers cash what the thieves do not get, and the State welfare agencies transform what the thieves have not taken on the trip from the bank to the local welfare office into additional benefits.

The odd thing about this rite, however, is that the only person who really likes the present arrangement is the thief. He knows when the checks arrive every month, and can choose either to break

into mailboxes and try to cash the check, or to assault the recipient on his or her way back from the bank. The recipients do not like the present setup because they have to stand in line, both at the bank, to cash their check, and at the local social services office, to obtain food stamps for example. The postmen do not like it because they have to deliver 30 million additional pieces of mail at the beginning of the month. The bankers do not like it because their banks become incredibly congested with recipients trying to cash checks. The State welfare agencies do not like it because they experience the same traffic problems the banks do, only several days later. With respect to the latter problem, I would like to insert a letter I received recently from a constituent of mine, Mr. John Vielbig, who is director of the Kalamazoo region office of the Michigan Department of Social Services.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: A recent news release from your office recommended the payment of Social Security checks throughout the entire calendar month as a benefit to the recipient.

I would like to strongly support your idea, both from the standpoint of the beneficiary and the service providers who are involved in their subsequent business (including the Department of Social Services).

We find our county offices extremely crowded early in the month, particularly with low-income Food Stamp applicants and recipients, many of whom are receiving governmental benefits. They must purchase their stamps as soon after their monthly check arrives as possible. The crowded conditions caused by these applicants have been increased by expanding caseloads caused by economic conditions.

Your suggestion would enable us to provide more efficient service to our applicants and make conditions more suitable for them too. We urge you to pursue this idea.

Sincerely,

A. JOHN VIELBIG,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Administration and the Bureau of Accounts of the Department of the Treasury, which issues the checks, have taken steps to solve part of the problem. Under the authority of Public Law 92-366, the two agencies have undertaken a program which it is hoped will lead to the direct deposit of most social security checks with financial institutions.

Under the plan, the check will not be mailed to the recipient, but instead, will be sent to the recipient's bank, savings and loan or credit union, and the financial institution, under a power of attorney, will negotiate the check and deposit it in the recipient's account. This proposal, which I heartily endorse, will cut the thief off at the mailbox, so to speak. Recent press releases issued by the Social Security Administration and the Bureau of Accounts indicate that this plan should be fully operational by January of 1976. I might add that the ultimate hope of the agencies is to put into effect a system of electronic transfer of funds to the recipient's financial institutions, which will eliminate the time-con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

suming preparation of individual, documentary drafts for each recipient.

In any event, I believe that the direct deposit approach is a step in the right direction, but only a step. Some recipients will always prefer to receive their checks personally, and cash them themselves—and I think they should have that choice without having to race a thief to the mailbox, or risk assault on the way from the bank. The solution, of course, is obvious. The checks should not be clustered in one 4-day period, but should be staggered throughout the month. In this way, not only would potential thieves be denied the knowledge of when any one recipient's check might be arriving, but it seems to me, the work of the Social Security Administration and the Bureau of Accounts would be made easier by avoiding an end-of-the-month push—not to mention the workload of the Postal Service.

I am, therefore, introducing today a bill which would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under whose ambit the Social Security Administration falls, to develop and implement a system for the payment of both the social security and supplemental security income benefits on a staggered or cyclical basis by July 1, 1975; it being my expectation that such payments would be made throughout the month in approximately equal daily proportions. I might point out that this proposal will come as no surprise to the Social Security Administration. In fact, I would like to quote from a report I received from Commissioner Cardwell on March 8, 1974, prepared by Mr. Hugh F. McKenna, who is Director of the Bureau of Retirement and Survivors Insurance:

Both the Social Security Administration and the Treasury Department are committed in principle to the mailing of RSDI and SSI checks on a staggered basis (cyclical mailing). For this reason, representatives of the Social Security Administration and Treasury have been meeting to identify the basic requirements for cyclical mailing. The work group has concluded that, while a large effort would be required to effect the many systems changes necessary, a system of cyclical mailing of benefits is quite possible from an operational point of view.

Now, it might seem to some that in the light of the preceding statement of commitment, legislation is unnecessary. However, in the course of my research on this problem, I learned that proposals for cyclical issuance of checks have been discussed from time to time for the last 20 years.

I, for one, am not willing to wait another 20 years for this manifestly reasonable plan to come to fruition. I think it is time to set a date certain for implementation, and I do not think July 1, 1975, is unfair or unreasonable, in light of the substantial work that appears to have been completed already.

I urge early adoption of this proposal, so that the Treasury Department and the Social Security Administration will know the Congress is expecting the plan to be in effect by this date.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

"SCIENCE ADVICE"—A STATEMENT BY BREWSTER DENNY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record the text of a most thoughtful editorial, "Science Advice—A Problem," published in the May 10, 1974, issue in the journal *Science*, the weekly publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The essay is written by Brewster C. Denny, the distinguished dean of the Graduate School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington.

The editorial follows:

SCIENCE ADVICE—A PROBLEM

At the February meeting of the AAAS, a recurring theme was the need to improve the mechanisms by which science advice is made available to state and local governments. These governments face an increasing number of problems with heavy scientific and technological content in the areas of land management, pollution, nuclear plant siting, river basin management, waste management, and social issues in an urban setting. Federal grant-in-aid programs, revenue sharing, and the "new federalism" have pushed greater technical and scientific responsibilities on local and state governments. With these developments has come the realization that scientific advice to state and local governments may be as important in the decades ahead as scientific and technical advice has been to the federal government in the decades just concluded. In the 1950's we had the science adviser to the White House and to the Pentagon. In the 1970's, we see increasingly the science adviser to the state house, the courthouse, city hall, and the department of sanitation.

At San Francisco, several serious scholars of American science identified in varying ways the urgent need for assuring the capacity of local and state governments to deal with present or soon-to-be-immediate problems. A common theme was that the mechanisms for obtaining and using science advice were weak but that the wells of advice were overflowing. How, pleaded the eloquent and talented at San Francisco can we get good advice to the decision-makers so that knowledge can be translated into decisions and actions?

While few argued that the problem was this simple, the simplistic equation of a bag of resources on the one hand and a desperate need on the other to seek a broker, a middleman, or an organizational device or gimmick recurred constantly. One speaker even stated that "the purpose of a science advisory mechanism for local and state government is to relieve decision-makers of the responsibility of evaluating technical competence." Here is, of course, the argument in its simplest form. Assemble the best minds, ask the most careful and thoughtful questions, reach solid conclusions, resolve the conflicts between conflicting technical views, and the public decision-maker can confidently adopt as policy the wisdom thus served to him.

It won't work that way and it never has. Governors, mayors, councilmen, and legislators are responsible for excruciating decisions in the face of conflicting technical advice just as Truman, Kennedy, and Nixon and their congresses had to make difficult decisions on the hydrogen bomb, nuclear

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 9, 1974

testing, and the ABM. In making these decisions they had to consider tough technical issues and needed to know whom to believe. Similarly, state and local officials, their staffs, the continuing civil service bureaucracies which serve them, and citizens will simply have to be brought up to a level of understanding at which decisions involving technical issues can be made through the political process. While the search for useful devices is not wholly futile and may well produce assistance on the critical problems, the governments themselves at local and state levels, just as in the past decades at the federal level, will have to meet the test. Local and state government structures and staffs largely designed to meet 19th-century problems will have to be brought up to speed to meet this century's challenges and those of the century almost upon us. Scientists, engineers, and thoughtful citizens must turn their attention to the very quality of local and state government itself, as well as to advice and advisory mechanisms.—BREWSTER C. DENNY, *Dean, Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Washington.*

A GIANT STEP BACKWARD

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried one story that was a pleasure to read. The administration has decided to throw its support behind legislation to ban throwaway bottles and cans.

A ban on "no deposit-no return" containers, coupled with a forceful Federal policy in support of recycling, would be a giant step backward—in this case, in the right direction—from our present policy of use it up and throw it away.

I am inserting in the RECORD for my colleagues' attention a portion of the text of the article, as well as my recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of the Interstate Recycling Expansion Act of 1973:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of the Interstate Recycling Expansion Act of 1973, it is a pleasure for me to submit my testimony for the record in full support of this legislation.

With the disappearance of the ragman from our towns and neighborhoods, we have come full-blown into the age of throwaways, with just about everything we consume tailored for easy disposal. Conspicuous consumption has come a long way from the days of Thorstein Veblen. In one sense, disposable income means just that—we can measure it by the number of trash cans at the end of the driveway.

There are two compelling reasons why change in both regulations and attitudes is imperative. First, if we don't begin to recycle and reuse our solid wastes, we will soon be fighting with the municipal sanitation departments for space. And second, much of the resources we now throw away cannot be restored. Visions of the 21st century people mining our garbage dumps is no longer beyond the limits of the imagination.

An estimated 16% to 24% of the nation's solid waste is potentially recoverable and reusable. Each year, cities dispose of metals alone worth \$5 billion. But to date, only about 1% of the nation's solid waste gets

recycled. Instead, our cities spend \$6 billion each year for collection and disposal. And the National League of Cities—U.S. Conference of Mayors warns that almost half of our cities will run out of current disposal capacity within one to five years. In fact, solid waste is growing five times faster than the population.

Each year, we throw away more than 250 million tons of residential, commercial and institutional waste. Only 3 million tons of nonferrous scrap metals and 11 million tons of waste paper are recycled each year, which translates into about 40% of nonferrous scrap metals and 19% of wastepaper which is available for reuse being recycled. It is particularly interesting to note that in 1945, 35% of all the production in the paper industry was recycled. In textiles, only 17% of the available textile wastes are being recycled.

The result of this extraordinarily wasteful use of our natural resources is not unexpected. The hard truth is that if this policy continues unchanged, the United States and the rest of the world will quite simply run out of necessary resources. To paraphrase a recent advertisement, a nation that runs on steel, iron, copper, nickel, etc., can't afford to run out.

As it is, the United States, with about 6% of the world's population, uses more than 40% of the world's scarce or nonreplaceable resources. The Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior says that the nation's known deposits of mineral raw materials is seriously depleted. The Bureau of Mines warns that by the end of the century, U.S. demands for metals also will have quadrupled, and without increased reuse, we will need imports at 7 times the present rate to satisfy our needs.

This warning is particularly ominous in light of the Arab oil embargo. The United States has gotten its first taste of what it's like to have to make do with what we have. We should remember that mineral-rich nations are not located in Western Europe, nor even in the developed nations of the world for the most part. With a need for enormous imports of resources comes necessarily a need to develop relations with the world's underdeveloped nations, whose governments are not as stable as we might like.

The road to resource poverty has gotten its highway assistance from Federal impediments to recycling, such as Federal purchasing policies which require virgin materials, regulatory agency discrimination against shipments of recyclable goods, and depletion allowances for virgin materials only. While at one time such policies may have been the best route to encourage the development of our natural resources, such policies today encourage exploitation, rather than wise utilization of our available resources.

Discrimination in freight rates for recyclable materials has been a particularly sore point. In the case of iron, freight costs average 17% of the delivered price of a ton of iron ore, while it constitutes 31% of the delivered price of a ton of scrap iron. This is just one example, and helps explain why manufacturers are buying virgin material. There is a definite economic disincentive to doing otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this Subcommittee for taking up this legislation early enough in this session that we might have a bill at the President's desk before the end of the 93d Congress. Environmentalists have pointed out the need for recycling for years. It's time that recycling became a national policy.

Resource	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Aluminum	1.17×10^9 tons	100	6.4	31	55	42
Iron	1×10^{11} tons	240	1.8	93	173	28
Lead	9.1×10^9 tons	26	2.0	21	64	25
Nickel	1.47×10^9 tons	150	3.4	53	96	38
Copper	3.08×10^9 tons	36	4.6	21	48	33
Manganese	8×10^9 tons	97	2.9	46	94	14

1. Columns: (1) Known global reserves; (2) static index in years (number of years reserves will last at present rate of usage); (3) average projected rate of growth; (4) exponential index in years (showing increased demand by percentage); (5) exponential index calculated using 5 times known reserves; (6) U.S. consumption as percent of world total.

Source: Adapted from "The Limits to Growth," published by Universe Books, 381 Park Ave., South, New York, N.Y.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTS BAN ON THROWAWAY BOTTLES, CANS

(By George C. Wilson)

The Nixon administration, agreeing it is time to reverse the "no-deposit-no-return attitude about our resources," yesterday endorsed the idea of a federal law banning throwaway bottles and cans.

John R. Quarles Jr., deputy administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, said in using those words that he was expressing the view of the administration—not just his agency.

The EPA has been at odds with the expressed policy of the administration on a number of other environmental issues, including the proposed weakening of the Clean Air Act.

But Quarles stressed in his testimony before the Senate Environment subcommittee yesterday that the administration sees a ban on throwaways as an assist to both environmental cleanup and energy conservation.

"Beverage containers are the most rapidly growing segment of all municipal waste," he said, reporting that six million tons of glass, 1.6 million tons of steel and 575,000 tons of aluminum went into the manufacture of beverage containers in 1972 alone. The process takes so much energy that using the same containers over and over instead of throwing them away could save the equivalent

of 92,000 barrels of oil a day, the EPA deputy administrator added.

MESSAGE FOR FREEDOM LOVING AMERICANS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, in today's mail I received a newsletter sent to me and all Members of Congress from Mrs. Robert Lyga—pen name, Sis Rachel—122 63½ Way Northeast, Fridley, Minn. That letter carried a very timely message for all freedom loving Americans, therefore I insert the following section in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MESSAGE FOR FREEDOM LOVING AMERICANS
I know less than nothing about politics and probably too old to learn. Being what you call a Black Woman, and a former high school drop out with a couple of college years I know that I know what I know by and through my Heavenly Father and experiences of myself and others. So today I am

expressing a prayer that you "Do Something to guarantee the rights of "Born Again" Christians to express themselves in the public media.

The time is coming, I feel, that "Born Again" Christians will not even be able to buy space in the papers or time on the radio, if you do not act. Mass canceling of subscriptions and turning off the radio will not help at that point. Like in Soviet Russia, only an approved R-e-l-i-g-i-o-n will be held up for our peoples or else.

I don't care if Carl McIntire would advocate sending part of Sis Rachel back to Africa—Give that man back his rights. As long as he is free to speak out so am I. What is the Fairness Doctrine? Fair to Who?? Certainly not to the growing minds of our youth. With all the filth shown on television and sometimes heard on radio and printed in the papers, like the April 24 headlined story on the girls in Chicago selling smut talk for \$10, again I ask, Fair to Who??

Well, I am spending all that I can on Free Speech and these paper Advs. There is no sense in saving for our little one's college education. For quite frankly, without a Christian Revival, this country has no future.

EDITORIAL ON PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an important editorial from today's Chicago Tribune for the interest of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

LISTEN, MR. NIXON

We saw the public man in his first administration, and we were impressed. Now in about 300,000 words we have seen the private man, and we are appalled.

What manner of man is the Richard Nixon who emerges from the transcripts of the White House tapes?

We see a man who, in the words of his old friend and defender, Sen. Hugh Scott, took a principal role in a "shabby, immoral and disgusting performance."

The key word here is immoral. It is a lack of concern for morality, a lack of concern for high principles, a lack of commitment to the high ideals of public office that make the transcripts a sickening exposure of the man and his advisers. He is preoccupied with appearance rather than substance. His aim is to find a way to sell the idea that disreputable schemes are actually good or are defensible for some trumped-up cause.

He is humorless to the point of being inhumane. He is devious. He is vacillating. He is profane. He is willing to be led. He displays dismaying gaps in knowledge. He is suspicious of his staff. His loyalty is minimal. His greatest concern is to create a record that will save him and his administration. The high dedication to grand principles that Americans have a right to expect from a President is missing from the transcript record.

Mr. Nixon's strategy backfired when he released the transcripts. It was also a strategic error for him to release the record of his income taxes. Both stripped the man to his essential character, and that character could not stand that kind of scrutiny. Both miscalculations demonstrated an essential Nixon defect—an insensitivity to the standards of ethics and morality that Americans expect of their leaders.

He thought disclosure of the records would help him. He has had a demonstration that his countrymen are not that tolerant.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

And it should be noted here that the transcripts and the income tax statement were not the fabrications of his enemies. These were self-created instruments of destruction.

His decision Tuesday to disclose no more information leaves the record as it now stands. And as it stands that record leaves no doubt that he lacks the qualities that could edify and inspire his countrymen with confidence in these difficult times.

The statement of his counsel, James St. Clair, that the President is ready for a confrontation with Congress and his own special prosecutor is ominous.

The balance among the coordinate branches of our government—Executive, Judicial and Legislative—is fragile. It has been established on rather comfortably loose terms by nearly 200 years of experience in practicing the special virtues of American government.

The limits of executive privilege, of congressional power, of judicial authority are not rigidly fixed. We would not relish the prospect of forcing the Supreme Court to make hard decisions in the distorting heat of partisan controversy. This is one confrontation this country does not need and we pray Mr. Nixon will not insist on it.

The President is right in urging a quick end to the Watergate affair. His country needs a swift and merciful termination of this agony.

Two roads are open. One is resignation. The other is impeachment. Both are legitimate and would satisfy the need to observe due process.

Resignation of the President would be quick and simple and a qualified successor stands ready to assume office.

Impeachment is the judicial process prescribed by the Constitution for removing a President. The House can, and probably will, vote a bill of impeachment quickly. A trial in the Senate would be, and indeed should be, long and deliberate. No suggestion of haste or mob justice could be tolerated. The White House could be expected to seize every opportunity for challenge and delay, and the final outcome might be two years in coming.

The objection to resignation that has been raised—and we have raised it ourselves—is that it would not resolve the issues. It would not answer many of the questions about the President's behavior and degree of complicity. It would leave at least a suspicion that the President had been persecuted instead of properly prosecuted out of office. To some he might remain a martyr. To many it would seem a miscarriage of justice, an example of political exorcism.

The transcripts have changed all that. They make clear Mr. Nixon of direct complicity in the Watergate burglary and the early stages of the coverup, nobody of sound mind can read them and continue to think that Mr. Nixon has upheld the standards and dignity of the Presidency which he proclaimed himself as a candidate in 1960. He hoped that, if elected, a mother or father would be able to "look at the man in the White House . . . and say, 'Well, there is a man who maintains the kind of standards personally that I would like my child to follow.'"

We do not share the White House belief that impeachment requires evidence of a specific crime. We believe a President may be removed simply for failing to do his job, or for so discrediting himself that he loses public respect and, with it, his ability to govern effectively.

It is true that this vagueness may tempt opponents to seek to remove a President for political or otherwise inadequate reasons, as they did with Andrew Johnson. But that risk must be accepted. The ultimate arbiter in this matter must be the public, and the public reaction today is clearly one of revulsion.

Republican politicians are defecting in droves. The evidence against Mr. Nixon is in his own words, made public at his own direction. There can no longer be a charge that he was railroaded out of office by vengeful Democrats or a hostile press. The fundamental questions have been answered. Filling in the gaps in the transcripts can only make the case against the President stronger.

And so the objections to resignation have largely vanished.

Since the President has rejected this course, we urge the House to act quickly on a bill of impeachment. As the impeachment process progresses, as public opinion becomes clear, and as Mr. Nixon sees support dwindling in the Senate, he will have to reconsider his stand and recognize that resignation will spare the country the ordeal of a trial.

AND THE COST OF INACTION

There are three urgent reasons for turning the reins of government over to a new President who can concentrate on his job, and for doing so quickly.

First, without decisive leadership in either foreign or domestic matters, the country will drift along aimlessly during one of the most critical periods of history. In country after country, governments are being toppled and threatened because of popular frustration over inflation, hunger, the energy shortage, and the apparent inability of governments to deal with them. It would be a tragedy for the richest and most powerful country in the world to stagger along, immobile, during such a period.

Second, Mr. Nixon has become a liability to his political party as well as to the Republic. The longer he remains in office as a symbol of Watergate and all it stands for, the more likely it is that the Republican Party will be incapacitated for years to come. The health of our two-party system depends on separating the Republican Party from the evils of Watergate and the character of the President.

Third, it is equally important for the future of the Presidency itself that it be separated from the man who now holds it. We must return to the day when people can shiver with pride instead of shudder with embarrassment when they see the flag or hear "Hail to the Chief." Many of the prerogatives of the Presidency are essential to the country, including secrecy when properly justified for reasons of national security or executive privilege. These principles have been prostituted in order to preserve Mr. Nixon himself and those around him. The longer this goes on, the more likely these prerogatives are to be forfeited—in the public mind if not by act of Congress.

It is saddening and hard to believe that for the first time in our history, it is better that the President leave office than to fight to keep it. But things have reached such a state that Mr. Nixon's departure, one way or another, is the best course for the Presidency, the country, and the free world. To perpetuate a state of confrontation between the Executive and Congress—in order to define the limits of power which are probably better undefined—will be tragically costly in the eyes of history and the world.

GASOLINE CONSERVATION STILL VITAL

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1974

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the scene of mile-long lines in front of gas pumps which gripped much of the east coast during the latter part of February has

become a dim and almost unreal memory for many of us. The lifting of the oil embargo combined with refinements in the Federal allocation program have resulted in a sufficient supply of gasoline.

While we have met and overcome this immediate crisis, it is important to remember that we are still confronted with a basic shortage of energy resources; that a resumption of unrestrained demand could possibly place us in the same dire straits as earlier this year. Mr. Sawhill, the new Federal Energy Administrator has recently indicated that the Nation

faces a petroleum shortage of 4 to 6 percent unless conservation practices are continued.

The American people reacted in a remarkable fashion with voluntary conservation practices when the request was made of them. They willingly reduced their thermostats and curtailed use of automobiles. It was their efforts which were largely responsible for us being able to survive the embargo period with minimal disruption of our Nation's economic system and our daily lives. Their efforts were truly credit worthy.

I think that it is extremely important at this point in time that the American people be informed of the true nature of the oil situation facing our country and that they be encouraged to continue their conservation efforts. We all have to realize that the days of unlimited energy resources are over and that we will have to curtail unnecessary uses of these vital resources. It is my contention that if we grow lax concerning our conservation efforts, we are guaranteed of seeing a recurrence of long gas lines and low fuel supplies.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, May 13, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Marvin I. Bash, Arlington-Fairfax Jewish Congregation, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, protect the men and women of this Chamber and grant them health of mind and body, happiness, and long life. May they be guided by Thy infinite wisdom, so that their deliberations will be marked by reason and compassion, clear thinking and charity, righteous judgment and understanding.

We ask of our representatives a dedication to the highest ideals of justice and equity. May they lead us in the building of a democratic society in which none will be privileged and none will be disadvantaged—but all men will have a chance to realize their full potential for themselves and their families.

O Lord, bless our country and those leaders who strive to uphold her noblest ideals, in thought and in deed. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13998. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3062) entitled "An act entitled the 'Disaster Relief Act Amendments of 1974.'

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 514. An act to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 411. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to certain rates of postage, and for other purposes; and

S. 3009. An act to provide that moneys due the States under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, derived from the development of oil shale resources, may be used for purposes other than public roads and schools.

The message also announced that Mr. CANNON and Mr. DOMINICK were appointed as additional conferees on H.R. 12565, supplemental military procurement authorizations.

998. Under the new language added by the recent amendment the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is given the authority and discretion to terminate a quorum call in the Committee when 100 or more Members appear. The rule provides that if, during the quorum call, a quorum does appear, the Chair may announce to the Committee that a quorum is present and declare a quorum constituted. If the Chair makes this determination and announcement—and it must be pointed out that the Chairman does not have to follow this procedure—the new rule then provides that further proceedings under the quorum call shall be considered as vacated and the committee shall not rise but shall continue its sitting and proceed with business. When this discretionary authority is exercised by the Chair no names either of those Members responding or of the absenteers will be printed in the Record or the Journal and no announcement of the number which has responded will be recorded.

Under the present bell and light system the advent of a quorum call in the Committee of the Whole (or for that matter in the House) is announced by 3 bells and 3 lights. Five minutes later the three signals are again activated.

Under the revised procedure now being promulgated the three bells will continue to signal the beginning of a regular quorum call.

If the Chairman announces in advance—at the time a quorum call commences in Committee of the Whole—that he intends to exercise his discretion and will vacate proceedings under the quorum call when 100 or more Members have appeared—then one long bell will precede the three regular bells at the start of the quorum call and three lights will be illuminated.

Thereafter when the Chair does exercise his discretion and announces that a quorum is constituted one long bell will be rung to indicate that further proceedings will be vacated and the three lights turned off. If a quorum has not appeared at the expiration of the first five minutes one long bell followed by three regular bells will again be rung to indicate that the "notice" quorum call is still in progress.

Thus under the so-called notice quorum call procedure one long bell followed by three regular bells will be sounded each five minutes unless one of two events takes place during the time period permitted under the rule:

(1) A quorum appears and the Chair vacates proceedings (as explained above this will be announced by one long bell and the extinguishing of the three lights); or

(2) A quorum not having appeared, the Chair at any time during the 15 minute period directs the ringing of the three regular bells to signal that a regular quorum call has commenced. Members who have not already responded under the "notice" quorum call

statement is as follows:

On April 9, 1974 the House adopted House Resolution 998 which amended the rules of the House in several respects. The provisions of that resolution took effect 30 days following passage and as of last Thursday are part of the rules of this body. The chair is taking this opportunity to advise members of certain modifications in the legislative call system which are required by these changes in the rules.

The chair would direct the attention of the Members to rule XXIII, clause 2. As amended by section 3 of House Resolution