

commerce, but only with respect to lotteries which are in the State in which conducted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 12444. A bill to authorize pay and benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such pay and benefits are authorized for other members of the Armed Forces and their survivors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. STEELE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mrs. MINK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. FRASER, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.J. Res. 883. Joint resolution: proclamation of Bilingual Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.J. Res. 884. Joint resolution: proclamation of Bilingual Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.J. Res. 885. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate April 30, as "Honor Our Nation Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETCHUM (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H.J. Res. 886. Joint resolution authorizing increased production of petroleum from the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.J. Res. 887. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the calendar week beginning April 21, 1974, as National Volunteer Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 888. Joint resolution asking the

President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that housing, housing assistance, and community development programs authorized by Congress should be carried out at levels at least equal to the levels prevailing in calendar year 1972, until such time as funds appropriated for such programs are exhausted or the Congress enacts legislation terminating or replacing such programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 798. Resolution to direct the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation of the causes and conditions of the current petroleum shortages; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DENT, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. RUTH, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri, Mr. TREEN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. GINN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. LENT, and Mr. ANNUNZIO):

H. Res. 799. Resolution declaring the sense of the House with respect to prohibition of extension of credit by the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MINTISH):

H. Res. 800. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 18; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STEELE:

H. Res. 801. Resolution expressing the support of the House for the formation of an Organization of Petroleum Consuming Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 12445. A bill for the relief of Valery Chalidze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 12446. A bill for the relief of Do Thi Nguyen Anh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOGGS:

H.R. 12447. A bill for the relief of Airlift International, Inc., and Slick Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 12448. A bill for the relief of Mildred Del Carmen Galtan Tijerino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 12449. A bill for the relief of Candido Badua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 12450. A bill for the relief of Mr. Sawkat Anwer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 12451. A bill for the relief of the Lockport Canning Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 12452. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Department under which the U.S. Coast Guard is operating to cause the vessel *Miss Keku*, owned by Clarence Jackson, of Juneau, Alaska, to be documented as a vessel of the United States so as to be entitled to engage in coastwise trade and the American fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

388. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Hon. Malcolm M. Lucas and the other active judges of the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, Los Angeles, relative to the report of the Commission on Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MY CHILDREN ARE ORDINARY

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is so often the nature of things that the aberrations of behavior grab the daily headlines, which tends to give a distorted view of events. It is for this reason that I am especially pleased to bring to the attention of this body an article which appeared in the January 6 issue of the *New York Teacher*, the publication of New York State United Teachers. This article was written by Ms. Judi Silverman, a teacher at public school 127 in the East Elmhurst section of Queens, New York City. It is heartening and warming.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY CHILDREN ARE ORDINARY

(By Judi Silverman)

You read about boys setting fire to a young girl, or stoning an old man to death. You hear about kids mauling their life away, or wasting each other in a gang fight.

My children are ordinary. They don't make headlines, or columns, or richly-financed studies.

Their names aren't Kool Sly, or Ace, or Hit Man. They have ordinary names, like Mark, Steven, Gina, and Lesley, Carole, Becky, and Tyrone. There were 50 names in all, and they made up the senior glee club of PS 127 in New York City.

These children decided to take their holiday show last month to a local hospital, and they took their show, their warmth, their youth, and their innocence to Creedmoor Hospital. Arrangements were made to visit the building where the aged were cared for.

My 50 high-spirited, wonderful children began in the ward on the eleventh floor. They sang four songs, smiling, but the smiles slowly faded as they looked around. Their faces were serious as they repeated the show

on the tenth floor. Their fists began to clench, and they huddled closer together.

They couldn't become accustomed to the human degradation they saw. They remained poised, though their throats were tightening and they were visibly shaken.

By the eighth floor, one of my girls broke down. On the seventh floor, our fifth show, Lonnie was singing in the sweetest voice, when the room was split with what can only be described as a shattering cackle.

My children continued without a falter, and wished the patients happy holidays.

When they were six floors below, the girls broke down and cried. They cried for the misery and suffering of others. They cried for people they didn't know, and would probably never see again. They cried for the sorrow of the forgotten, the aged and sick and lonely. They cried and they were beautiful.

I saw the school's toughest boy tenderly comfort a sobbing girl, while tears streamed down his cheeks. I saw children, black and white, Christian and Jew, cross every man-made boundary in a moment of complete empathy.

I was proud of them. I tried to tell them just how proud I was. I love these magnificent children, and I just wanted to tell you this story about them.

DEDICATION OF IMPORTANT
SAN ANTONIO HOSPITAL

HON. ABRAHAM KAZEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major boasts of San Antonio, a city for which I am proud to share representation in the House, is the high concentration and quality of medical care provided to the community and the State. Last month an important new facility was dedicated. Metropolitan General Hospital is the first new hospital to be built in the downtown area in 40 years. It rises seven stories high, contains 258 beds, and cost \$13,500,000.

It is also unique in that it is the first multifloor module unit hospital anywhere in the world, using construction methods developed by the H. B. Zachry Co. of San Antonio.

My friend and able colleague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, delivered the dedication address. I am grateful that Charles M. Sanders, president of the hospital, has provided a text of that address which I am pleased to share with my fellow Members:

DEDICATION REMARKS OF HON. HENRY B.
GONZALEZ

Mr. and Mrs. Sanders, Mr. and Mrs. Biggs, Canon McAllister, Rabbi and Mrs. Jacobson, all of the distinguished honored guests and everybody here. In a way, everyone is an honored guest because I think you share my sentiments that we indeed are honored today. The afternoon is beautiful. It is one of these typical beautiful, gorgeous San Antonio autumn days. I must admit that Washington was not too dissimilar yesterday, but I am here only because we have left the Senate to wrestle with the mistake of having to work on the Sabbath day tomorrow. But for awhile it looked as if the Speaker would compel us to stay in today, in order to complete work on what some claim is necessary before the government can continue to function properly. And that is the complete action on the so called "debt ceiling legislation." So I think we are all honored that we have this opportunity. We are honored because this new construction represents, and more than represents, it symbolizes a very great and a tremendous achievement.

I think that we are all aware that in San Antonio we have had as Mr. Sanders amply described as a joining of talent, of know-how, of facilities that have been worked into a magnificent co-operative delivery system for health care.

But we are just on the threshold of the future and this Metropolitan General Hospital is a really substantial contribution to this forward thrust in San Antonio.

I am sure we are all aware of the cost of this structure, some 13.5 million dollars. We may not be aware of the fact that it takes a lot of work, a lot of talent and a lot of faith to put that amount of money together for just the construction.

Remember in order to operate this hospital—an almost equal amount of money must be necessary annually, not one time, but every year to sustain the 550 employees and staff it will take to operate fully. The fact that you have the initial investment of 13 million dollars that will have to be paid for, the unique thing is that again San Antonio shows how utilizing the resources on the government level, on the private level, local, state and Federal levels you can do this and perform this achievement.

We are also honored and we are very privileged to have one of the outstanding construction and building men in the United States in the person of H. B. Zachry. I share a lot of things with Mr. Zachry, but mostly our initials "HB". I think we are aware that the figure perhaps of 13 million might have been greater if the techniques and the ingenuity of the mind of Mr. H. B. Zachry had enabled the use of techniques which were considered at one time impossible of achievement.

I think that it can very conservatively be stated that it reduced the initial cost substantially. But this building is inanimate. It consists of brick and stone mortar and the new technique, but in a few days, if not already, the thing that gives it life, are human beings that will be performing their duties, the nurses, the surgeons, the skilled physicians, the technicians and all the modern equipment that we know of. This is what is going to give life to this building. We know that we will be performing and seeing miracles performed. If we give birth today, almost 100% of it is done in an environment that we call a hospital. This was not true in my generation, here in San Antonio. Here will be fought, day after day and night after night, the battle of science for the right to life.

Certainly the citizens of San Antonio and Bexar County should be congratulated today. Out of this cooperative spirit I have described, we have for the first time in the Southwest, a hospital financed through a combination of FHA (Federal Housing Administration) and HEW (The Department of Health, Education and Welfare) this is in itself a unique and historical achievement. And again, it shows in this day and time, in which some days we feel it isn't possible of achievement, we can do things through co-operative spirit in and out of the government.

Out of the spirit within the community, out of your belief in the future, out of your concern for your fellow man has grown an institution which is a living monument to man's humanity to man. At this time when we are continually confronted with man's in-humanity to man this is indeed a most joyous occasion. As we look at this building today our thoughts are on the future. We should also be conscious of the great men and women in the past. Without their contribution we could not possibly be here to inaugurate this structure. And I am not only talking about the great men and women of science generally in medicine throughout the world, but, also those in San Antonio who again our history shows are exceptional.

Great men of medicine, names that we associate with the early period of this great delivery medical system in San Antonio. Names like Dr. Ferdinand Herff, names like Dr. P. I. Nixon are inextricably linked with the development and the pace of modern medicine in this area.

This is the site of an experiment held at the turn of the century with a dreaded disease in San Antonio—Smallpox. San Antonio was the site of the famous house where literally infected people, some of whom were fortunate to survive, but still participated in an experiment to achieve a breakthrough technique to try and control this dreaded disease. It was still in my generation, not far from this area, where it was customary to see the quarantine signs of the skull and crossbones posted on trees and telephone posts designating that neighborhood as a quarantine area because of somebody there either had Scarlet Fever, Diphtheria or, earlier than that, Smallpox. Our generation, thank God, isn't confronted with that. But we can't be smug. There are those who feel that a facility of this kind may be surplus. The truth is that it barely contributes to the giving of essential needs of this community must have in the way of hospitals and bed care.

This hospital invisions 258 beds but it is the quality of that care and its accessibility to it that means the contribution that we celebrate today.

When we review the contribution of these men and women in and out of San Antonio that have enabled us to enjoy these facilities we must then silently remember, recall and give a silent vote of thanks to these individuals. The hospital is what I said, a place to be cured in. It is a haven during critical periods in our lives, though, it is true, we may not suffer from such diseases as scarlet fever and pneumonia in a fatal way such as we use to take for granted. But we have equally other deadly developments in the maladies of mankind that we must still confront and hopefully overcome. It has not always been this way and for each brick of this building, as I said and repeat, there is at least one man or one woman who in our long history has helped to transform the early test houses where death was the only form of relief from suffering to the life giving institution of today. So I end as I began by sincerely congratulating all of the individuals who specifically contributed either with money, talents or services to the construction of this eminent facility.

I wish to thank you for your interest and your presence. And I wish to thank Mr. Biggs, Chairman of the Board and Mr. Sanders for his ever constant courtesy for making it possible for me to be here to share these minutes with you. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT'S PAGE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, American Bar Association President Chesterfield Smith, in the December 1973 issue of the association's journal, reiterates that organization's position regarding the need for truly independent prosecutors in our judicial system.

Mr. Smith's comments are certainly worthy of consideration.

PRESIDENT'S PAGE

(By Chesterfield Smith)

In 1937 President Roosevelt sought to make significant alterations in the size and composition of the Supreme Court of the United States. The American Bar Association took vigorous action in mobilizing opposition to what it perceived to be an unwarranted attempt to bend the judicial system to serve political expediency. Thirty-six years after its success in that matter, the Association is again involved in a great public debate which, in my opinion, is of equal significance and will be of equal historical consequence.

On October 20, 1973, the President of the United States discharged Archibald Cox from his office as special Watergate prosecutor. There followed promptly thereafter the resignation of Attorney General Elliot Richardson and Deputy Attorney General William French Smith. These events and those following have produced a constitutional crisis without parallel in our generation.

The publication schedule of the *Journal* requires that I write these words several weeks before you read them. Each new day is accompanied by new developments so there is risk that what I write now will be rendered out of date by subsequent events. Still, I am proud of what the Association has done. I believe its action rests on principles which do not change and which are not made

inoperative by circumstance, and I think it is important for you to know why the Association has done what it has done.

Elsewhere in this issue there is printed the complete text of a resolution adopted by the board of governors at an emergency meeting on October 27, 1973. There is appended to that resolution and made the official position of the Association as of the date it was issued a statement which I released to the news media on October 22. These documents speak for themselves. What is missing, perhaps, is a further exposition of the general principle which led to these actions.

During my professional life, it has always been evident to me that lawyers bear a special responsibility in our society for the preservation of a free and democratic government. As officers of the court and thus as guardians of the law, lawyers are peculiarly well qualified to protect the rule of law. Lawyers should above all others jealously defend and promote the rule of law against all assault. For this reason I called an emergency meeting of the board of governors on October 27.

The board debated at length and with a seriousness in keeping with the gravity of the subject. It considered the Association's Code of Professional Responsibility and its Standards for Criminal Justice. Behind the specific provisions of these policy statements there lies a general consensus of the function of the judicial system in this country.

The board considered carefully the facts as they were known, prior policy of the Association, and reached this consensus. The issues are novel and complex, yet in the final analysis the action of the Board is justified by a very few and, I submit, unassailable propositions.

First, the rule of law has universal application, and no person is above the law.

Second, the investigation and prosecution of crime under the rule of law requires that the investigation be completely free of the control of the subject, of the investigation and possible prosecution.

Third, independence of the prosecuting official means, at the minimum, that neither the appointment nor tenure of the persons conducting the investigation nor its scope on the lines of evidence to be examined should be controlled in any way by the subject of the investigation.

Fourth, any controversy relating to evidence is properly to be determined by the court and not determined unilaterally by the subject of the investigation.

Under these principles the board has called for a congressionally created office of the special prosecutor to be filled by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The board has not taken a position on executive privilege, and this is not necessary, for the court is well qualified to decide those issues. The legality of Professor Cox's discharge is not in issue, but the fact of the discharge underlines the necessity of the establishment of a special prosecutor whose independence of those under investigation is clear and absolute. In this respect, the board's action looks forward; it is constructive and positive.

On November 1 President Nixon appointed a distinguished past president of the Association, Leon Jaworski, as special prosecutor. On that day I was giving testimony to the Select Committee of Reform of Federal Criminal Laws of the House of Representatives. I told the members of that committee, and I write not without qualification, that I can think of no one better qualified to be special prosecutor by reason of his professional competence and experience and his unquestioned integrity than Leon Jaworski.

Notwithstanding this, I believe and it is the policy of the Association that the spe-

cial prosecutor, functioning as a presidential appointee, no matter who may fill that job, is not in the interest of a credible investigation or the interest of the country. The special prosecutor deserves to have a truly independent base of authority. The special prosecutor deserves to perform free from any prior understanding of what evidence is germane and appropriate. The special prosecutor deserves to do his work free from the possibility of discharge by one whom his duty requires him to investigate. The Association will do whatever it can to provide this opportunity.

REPRESENTATIVE SYMMS OPPOSES FUTURES TRADING ACT

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I enclose the following article from the Journal of Commerce of January 29, 1974, for information of my colleagues on important legislation that is now before the House Agriculture Committee:

REPRESENTATIVE SYMMS OPPOSES FUTURES TRADING ACT

WASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—Rep. Steven Symms, R-Idaho, this weekend said that he is opposed to any measures which would restrict free trading in commodity futures markets.

The Futures Trading Act currently being considered by the House Agriculture Committee, of which Rep. Symms is a member, would, in Rep. Symms' words, "bring futures trading under almost limitless government control."

Rep. Symms said he is actively seeking to kill the proposed legislation while it is in committee. If this bill is passed out of the committee, he promised he would do everything in his power to see that the bill is killed on the floor.

OFFER SUPPORT

Most trade representatives testifying before the committee recognize that the bill is not in the national interests, Rep. Symms said, but they think the legislation is inevitable so they offer support for the bill and attempt only to have the most restrictive clauses removed. Reiterating a statement he made before the Agriculture Committee Jan. 24, Rep. Symms said, "I'm just waiting for the day when American businessmen stand up and tell the government to mind its own damn business."

There appears to be a feeling among industry spokesmen that all of the committee members support this legislation, Rep. Symms said, and this isn't true. There are a number of the members who do not want to pass legislation limiting free trade on the futures markets, but they will vote in favor of the legislation unless industry spokesmen start opposing it, he said.

PREFER HOUSE VERSION

Some trade officials are supporting the House bill because they prefer the House version to the proposals that have been offered in the Senate by Hubert Humphrey, D-Minn., and George McGovern, D-S.D., Rep. Symms said. They must remember that any proposals passed in the Senate must get through the House Agriculture Committee before they can come up for consideration by the House as a whole. If members of the House committee do not pass the Futures Trading Act because it is too restrictive, Rep.

Symms said, they certainly wouldn't pass a Senate version.

Rep. Symms, an ardent supporter of free enterprise, called upon industry spokesmen to oppose the proposed futures trading legislation in the upcoming hearings. More hearings on the subject are scheduled for tomorrow.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL SERVICE DUE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Philippine Scouts—U.S. Army, a component of the U.S. Army, was established by the U.S. Congress in the Reorganization of the Army Act of February 2, 1901.

During the Bataan and Corregidor campaigns and at the height of those fierce and bloody battles, they were promised equal pay and allowances equal to those of the regular U.S. Army.

Such a promise was rightly made. We firmly believe in the concept of equal pay for equal service.

I feel that these men deserve the same benefits. I believe they are entitled to the same benefits. I believe that we are obligated to secure for them the same benefits give to the other members of the Armed Forces.

Today I am introducing legislation that will secure just benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts.

Mr. Speaker, a full copy of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to authorize pay and benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such pay and benefits are authorized for other members of the Armed Forces and their survivors

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Army shall pay to each person who served as a Philippine Scout after December 6, 1941, and before December 31, 1946, in a lump sum the difference between the basic pay which he would have received for his military service during that period if the rates of pay of the Philippine Scouts had been the same as the rates of basic pay for other members of the Army of the United States of corresponding grades and length of service, reduced by the basic pay actually received by such person.

(b) In the event a person entitled to payment under subsection (a) is deceased, payment shall be made to the persons, and in the manner, prescribed in section 2771 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 2. The retired pay of each former Philippine Scout shall be computed for periods after the effective date of this Act on the basis of the rates of pay prescribed for other members of the Army of the United States of corresponding grades and length of service.

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect as of the first day of the first calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

DRIVER OF THE YEAR

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Wilbur R. "Bill" Moore who has been chosen as Driver of the Year, Senator JOSEPH MONTOYA, Senator PETE DOMENICI, Congressman HAROLD RUNNELS and I wish to have printed as Extensions of Remarks the text of the enclosed letter:

JANUARY 28, 1974.

Mr. WILBUR R. "BILL" MOORE,
Albuquerque, N. Mex.

DEAR BILL: The New Mexico Congressional Delegation would like to take this opportunity to extend our heartiest congratulations and thanks for your many years of outstanding service to the Nation. Your experiences from the days of being a member of the United States Marine Corps, driving for Faria Brothers Trucking Company, Greyhound Lines, and the past 19 years with Pacific Intermountain Express Company, coupled with your acts of heroism on the road, have been recognized in the

past when in 1966 you were one of the few Pacific Intermountain Express drivers to make the Million Milers, in July 1968 when you were named California Driver of the Month, in June 1973 when you were named New Mexico Driver of the Month, and in 1973 when you were named New Mexico Driver of the Year.

We are all greatly proud, now, to be a part of the celebration of your selection as 1974 National Driver of the Year. Any man who can log 99,000 miles per year, for a total of 3,363,750 miles without major mishap, who can maintain an easy-going approach to life, who can handle twin rigs, put in 36 years of safe driving, can raise a fine family, enjoy his grandchildren, and maintain his hobbies and continue to help others, deserves everything this Nation can offer him.

In a time when uncertainty prevails in so many aspects of our lives, when more and more traffic fatalities occur each year, when there is a vital need to "move" our Country in a timely manner, and when we all too often lose sight of the true meaning of things, it is refreshing, gratifying, and noteworthy that a man like you is an American. It is especially gratifying to us, as well as a great source of pride, that you are a New Mexican.

Please accept our heartiest and most sincere congratulations on your selection as Driver of the Year, our deepest thanks for your years of dedication and devotion, and

our heartfelt best wishes for many, many more years of happiness and success.

Very sincerely,
Senator JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
Senator PETE V. DOMENICI,
Congressman MANUEL LUJAN, Jr.,
Congressman HAROLD RUNNELS,

VOTING RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN
JOEL PRITCHARD, 93D CONGRESS,
ROLLCALLS NOS. 521 THROUGH 726

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, last November, at the request of a number of constituents who have asked for copies of my voting record, I inserted my voting record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That voting record covered 520 rollcalls and quorum calls and indicated that I had an attendance figure of 94 percent.

Since last November, there have been 205 additional rollcalls and quorum calls, which concluded the 1st session of the 93d Congress. My voting record through the first session indicates a cumulative attendance figure of 95.1 percent. My voting record for the remainder of the year is as follows:

Roll-call	Date	Description	Member's response	Roll-call	Date	Description	Member's response
521	Oct. 12, 1973	H.R. 10203, on passage	Aye.	581	do	S. 1570, agreeing to conference report	Yea.
522	do	Quorum, call of the house	Absent.	582	Nov. 14, 1973	H. Res. 128, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.
523	Oct. 15, 1973	do	Present.	583	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.
524	do	do	Do.	584	do	do	Present.
525	do	S. 907, suspend rules and pass	Yea.	585	do	H.R. 11459, on passage	Yea.
526	do	H.R. 8346, suspend rules and pass	No.	586	Nov. 15, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.
527	Oct. 16, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	587	do	H. Res. 702, previous question on amendment	Nay.
528	do	H.R. 9590, agreeing to conference report	Yea.	588	do	H. Res. 702, ordering the previous question	Nay.
529	do	H.R. 9590, recede and concur in Senate amendment	Yea.	589	do	H. Res. 702, recommit with instructions	Aye.
530	do	do	Yea.	590	do	H. Res. 702, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.
531	do	H.R. 6691, agreeing to conference report	Nay.	591	do	H.R. 11333, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.
532	do	H.R. 10717, suspend rules and pass	Yea.	592	do	H.R. 11333, on passage	Aye.
533	do	H.R. 9681, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	593	Nov. 26, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.
534	do	H.R. 9681, motion to limit debate	Aye.	594	do	H.R. 11238, on passage	Yea.
535	Oct. 17, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	595	Nov. 27, 1973	H.R. 7446, agreeing to conference report	Yea.
536	do	H. Res. 601, on agreeing to resolution	Yea.	596	do	H. Res. 718, on consideration of resolution	Yea.
537	do	H.R. 9681, on agreeing to the amendment	No.	597	do	H.R. 11324, on passage	Yea.
538	do	H.R. 9681, on passage	Yea.	598	Nov. 28, 1973	H. Res. 719, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.
539	do	S. 2016, agreeing to conference report	Yea.	599	do	H.R. 11010, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.
540	Oct. 18, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	600	do	do	No.
541	do	H.R. 10397, on passage	Aye.	601	do	do	No.
542	do	H.R. 9639, concur in Senate amendment	Nay.	602	do	H.R. 11010, on passage	Yea.
543	Oct. 23, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	603	Nov. 29, 1973	H. Res. 721, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.
544	do	H.R. 10586, on passage	Yea.	604	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.
545	do	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	605	do	H.R. 11575, on agreeing to the amendments	Aye.
546	Oct. 24, 1973	do	Do.	606	Nov. 30, 1973	Quorum, call of the house	Present.
547	do	H. Res. 600, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.	607	do	H.R. 11575, on agreeing to the amendment	No.
548	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.	608	do	do	Aye.
549	do	H.R. 3927, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	609	do	do	Aye.
550	do	H.R. 3927, on passage	Yea.	610	do	H.R. 11575, on passage	Yea.
551	Oct. 25, 1973	H. Res. 655, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.	611	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.
552	do	H.R. 10956, on passage	Yea.	612	do	H.R. 11576, on agreeing to the amendment	No.
553	Oct. 30, 1973	H. Res. 656, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.	613	do	H.R. 11576, on passage	Yea.
554	do	H.R. 9456, on passage	Yea.	614	Dec. 3, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.
555	Oct. 31, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	615	do	S. 1191, suspend rules and pass	Yea.
556	do	H.R. 9286, reject sec. 817 of conference report	Nay.	616	do	H.R. 11710, suspend rules and pass	Nay.
557	Nov. 6, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	617	do	H.R. 9437, suspend rules and pass	Yea.
558	do	H. J. Res. 735, suspend rules and pass	Yea.	618	Dec. 4, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.
559	do	H.R. 5875, suspend rules and pass	Yea.	619	do	H. Res. 725, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.
560	do	H.R. 8219, suspend rules and pass	Yea.	620	do	S. 1443, agreeing to conference report	Yea.
561	do	H.R. 10937, suspend rules and pass	Yea.	621	do	H. Con. Res. 173, suspend rules and agree	Yea.
562	Nov. 7, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	622	Dec. 5, 1973	H.R. 8877, agreeing to conference report	Yea.
563	do	H. J. Res. 542, on Presidential veto	Yea.	623	do	H.R. 8877, recd. and con. in Senate amendment with amendment	Yea.
564	do	H. Res. 687, ordering the previous question	Yea.	624	do	H.R. 7130, on agreeing to the amendment	No.
565	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.	625	do	do	Aye.
566	do	H.R. 11104, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	626	do	do	Aye.
567	do	H.R. 11104, on passage	Yea.	627	do	do	No.
568	Nov. 8, 1973	H. Res. 688, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.	628	do	do	No.
569	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.	629	do	do	Aye.
570	do	H.R. 9142, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	630	do	do	Aye.
571	do	do	Yea.	631	do	H.R. 7130, on passage	Aye.
572	do	H.R. 9142, on passage	Nay.	632	Dec. 6, 1973	Quorum call of the House	Present.
573	Nov. 13, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	633	do	H. Res. 738, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.
574	do	S. 1081, recommit conference report with instructions	Nay.	634	do	H. Res. 735, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.
575	do	S. 1081, agreeing to conference report	Yea.	635	Dec. 7, 1973	H.R. 11459, agreeing to conference report	Yea.
576	do	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	636	do	H. Res. 673, on agreeing to the resolution	Nay.
577	do	H.R. 8916, agreeing to conference report	Yea.	637	do	H.R. 9107, on passage	Yea.
578	do	H. Con. Res. 378, on agreeing to the resolution	Nay.	638	Dec. 10, 1973	Quorum call of the House	Present.
579	do	H.R. 8877, recommit the conference report	No.	639	do	H. Res. 657, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.
580	do	Quorum, call of the House	Present.				

Roll-call	Date	Description	Member's response	Roll-call	Date	Description	Member's response
640	do	Quorum, call in committee	Absent.	684	do	H.R. 11450, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.
641	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.	685	do	do	No.
642	Dec. 11, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Do.	686	do	do	Aye.
643	do	H.R. 10710, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	687	do	do	No.
644	do	H.R. 10710, on agreeing to the amendment	No.	688	do	H.R. 11450, on motion to recommit	No.
645	do	H.R. 10710, on passage	Aye.	689	do	H.R. 11450, on passage	Yea.
646	do	H.R. 11088, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	690	Dec. 17, 1973	Quorum call of the House	Present.
647	do	H.R. 11088, call in committee	Aye.	691	do	do	Do.
648	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.	692	do	S. 1435, on motion to recommit	Nay.
649	do	do	Do.	693	do	S. 1435, agreeing to conference report	Aye.
650	do	H.R. 11771, on agreeing to the amendments	No.	694	do	S.J. Res. 180, suspend rules and pass	Yea.
651	do	H.R. 11771, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	695	do	S. 2482, suspend rules and pass	Yea.
652	do	H.R. 11771, on agreeing to the amendment	No.	696	Dec. 18, 1973	Quorum call of the House	Present.
653	do	H.R. 11771, on passage	Yea.	697	do	H.R. 9256, agreeing to conference	Yea.
654	Dec. 12, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	698	do	H. Res. 746, on agreeing to the resolution	Yea.
655	do	do	Do.	699	do	S. 2166, suspend rules and pass	Nay.
656	do	H. Res. 744, on agreeing to the resolution	Aye.	700	do	S. 2316, suspend rules and pass	Yea.
657	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.	701	do	H.R. 11714, suspend rules and pass	Nay.
658	do	H.R. 11450, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	702	do	H.R. 11763, suspend rules and pass	Yea.
659	do	do	Aye.	703	Dec. 19, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.
660	Dec. 13, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.	704	do	H.R. 11576, on motion to recommit	Yea.
661	do	H.R. 11450, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	705	do	Quorum, call in committee	Present.
662	do	do	No.	706	do	H.R. 11510, on agreeing to the amendment	No.
663	do	H.R. 11450, on motion to limit debate	No.	707	do	H.R. 11510, on passage	Aye.
664	do	H.R. 11450, on agreeing to the amendment	No.	708	Dec. 20, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Absent.
665	do	do	No.	709	do	S. 1559, recommit conference report	Nay.
666	Dec. 14, 1973	Quorum call of the House	Present.	710	do	S. 1559, agreeing to conference report	Yea.
667	do	H.R. 11450, on agreeing to the amendment	No.	711	do	H.R. 11575, recommit conference report	Yea.
668	do	do	No.	712	do	H.R. 11575, agreeing to conference report	Aye.
669	do	do	Aye.	713	do	H.R. 11771, agreeing to conference report	Yea.
670	do	H.R. 11450, on motion to limit debate	No.	714	do	S. 1983, agreeing to conference report	Yea.
671	do	H.R. 11450, strike enacting clause	No.	715	do	H. Res. 754, suspend rules and pass	Aye.
672	do	H.R. 11450, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	716	do	H.R. 9142, agreeing to conference report	Nay.
673	do	do	Aye.	717	do	H.R. 11576, agreeing to conference report	Yea.
674	do	do	Aye.	718	Dec. 21, 1973	Quorum, call of the House	Present.
675	do	H.R. 11450, motion that committee rise	No.	719	do	H.R. 11333, concur in Senate amendment	Aye.
676	do	H.R. 11450, on agreeing to the amendment	Aye.	720	do	H. Res. 759, motion for a second	Nay.
677	do	do	Aye.	721	do	H. Res. 759, suspend rules and pass	Yea.
678	do	do	Aye.	722	do	H. Res. 760, suspend rules and pass	No.
679	do	do	Aye.	723	do	H. Res. 761, suspend rules and pass	Yea.
680	do	do	No.	724	do	H. Con. Res. 411, on agreeing to the resolution	Nay.
681	do	do	No.	725	Dec. 22, 1973	Motion to adjourn	Not voting.
682	do	do	Aye.	726	do	Quorum, call of the House	Present.
683	do	H.R. 11450, motion that committee rise	No.				

IS THE UNITED STATES BUILDING COMMUNIST CHINA'S MILITARY MACHINE?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, efforts of the Nixon administration toward Communist China have resulted in a number of different reactions, from unqualified approval to almost total opposition. I have criticized these moves, pointing out many of the misconceptions that have arisen therefrom and the dangers of this policy.

Expanding trade with Communist China has also gained plaudits from some and criticism from others. Even those who are in favor of expanding trade with the Red Chinese I doubt are in favor of building the military capabilities of Mainland China. All must recognize that the national interests and the goals of the United States of America and the Peoples Republic of China are in opposition in a great number of areas, including the Middle East, Africa, Southeast Asia, and Eastern Asia. The Communist Chinese have given both vocal and military support to guerrillas fighting against our ally Portugal, to terrorists in the Middle East, and to the Vietcong and North Vietnamese, to mention only a few. The Communists still speak of "liberating" Taiwan.

In the December 24, 1973, issue of U.S. News & World Report an article reported that the M. W. Kellogg Co., has announced contracts to build in mainland China five fertilizer-ammonia plants valued at a total of \$130,000,000. Of

course, historically the Chinese have been short of fertilizer. This would lead many not to see any problem with American firms building fertilizer plants for the Communist Chinese. However, one factor is overlooked. The ammonia and other products that are manufactured in such fertilizer plants are also an important ingredient in the manufacture of explosives. As knowledgeable observers realize, fertilizer plants are easily convertible into explosive plants. The question then arises: Is the Kellogg Co.'s construction program in Communist China a program for the construction of fertilizer plants or explosive plants? Of course, once these plants are built it will be the Communist Chinese and not us who will be making that determination.

I seriously question if building such plants whose end use can be military is in the national interest of the United States or of the American people.

At this point I include in the RECORD the short article from the U.S. News & World Report entitled ". . . While China Seeks Trade Lift."

The article follows:

. . . WHILE CHINA SEEKS TRADE LIFT

Mainland Chinese trade officials are to visit the U.S. in 1974 in response to a bid from a group of American business leaders during a trip to Peking.

It would be the first commercial delegation from Communist China to travel to America.

The invitation, extended by the Washington-based National Council for U.S.-China Trade comes when the flow of goods is weighted heavily in favor of American exports. Of an estimated two-way trade in 1973 of 900 million dollars, U.S. imports account for less than 70 million.

Observers say this imbalance stems largely from continuing Chinese purchases of Amer-

ican technology and equipment, especially in the field of farm fertilizers.

The M. W. Kellogg Company, for example, announced in late November new contracts to build in China five fertilizer-ammonia plants valued at a total of 130 million dollars. These agreements, together with three previous awards totaling more than 70 million, are said to give Kellogg—a Pullman, Inc., division—the largest dollar volume of business with Peking of any U.S. firm having commercial links with the People's Republic of China.

In a related deal, Domain Industries, Inc., has sold 10 heavy-duty packaging systems to China. These are to be used for bagging fertilizer. Eighteen additional units were purchased by a Japanese firm that is building a fertilizer plant for the Chinese.

THE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last year was a very frustrating one for those who have a strong interest in, and feel a responsibility toward housing and community development legislation.

The housing assistance programs were suspended by the administration and this was followed by a similar action in community development programs.

Communities across the country have worked long and hard to develop projects, only to find that funds for these activities were no longer available, even though legislation for these programs is public law.

The impoundment issue is now in the courts, and the cases decided to date

have been against the actions of this administration, but I feel that Congress should take a stand to assure the American people that we are not turning our backs on them, and that it is the intent of Congress that funds authorized and appropriated for housing and community development should be spent until such time as they are exhausted or Congress terminates or replaces them.

We cannot reenact housing and community development legislation which has been enacted and signed by the President. Nor can Congress administer the housing and community development programs, which it has enacted; that is left to the President and agency heads.

Today I am introducing a resolution which expresses the sense that Congress wants the funds authorized and appropriated to be used unless we say otherwise, and I hope that the American people will be convinced that Congress continues to be committed to the goal of decent housing and a suitable living environment for all, even though the administration does not seem to have this same commitment.

ON FORMULATING AN APPROACH TO IMPEACHMENT

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, former Special Watergate Prosecutor Archibald Cox has written an excellent article entitled "On Formulating an Approach To Impeachment." It appears in the *New York Times*, of January 24, 1974, and I insert it in the *RECORD* for the interest of my colleagues:

ON FORMULATING AN APPROACH TO IMPEACHMENT

(By Archibald Cox)

The impeachment process now under way poses novel and unusual difficult challenges to lawyers, to men in government and other forms of public life, indeed to all of us. We write upon an almost clean slate. Little law or political precedent is available to guide the hard decisions. Yet, regardless of the outcome, the value of the proceeding will depend on whether the process is so conducted that the country perceives it as a fair and legitimate measure for restoring integrity to government.

If President Nixon should be impeached and convicted, the question of legitimacy will be paramount. If Mr. Nixon is acquitted, the country will still need assurance about the integrity of that conclusion. Whatever the event, we may fairly ask that the leadership build better for the future than its predecessors at the impeachment of Andrew Johnson.

The central challenge is to formulate the principles, the general standards of conduct, by which a President is to be judged in a proceeding that vacates, without direct expression of the popular will, a choice made by the people—in this case overwhelmingly made by the people—in the regular election only a few years before.

Too much discussion, public and private, has been concerned either with loose gener-

alities about the ultimate question of impeachment or with the excitement and speculation stirred by particular disclosures. Too little hard debate has focused upon what should be impeachable offenses—upon why some wrongdoing should be grounds for impeachment while other misconduct is left to popular judgment at the polls.

I am convinced that the legitimacy of the final conclusion in the view of the American people will depend upon the success of counsel and other public men in formulating general standards of conduct fairly applicable to any President, and in educating the public upon their meaning and legal and moral base. For Democratic Senators and Representatives to keep silent upon the ground that impeachment is a Republican problem and for Republicans to keep silent while they test the political winds is to deny the country the debate necessary to educated self-government and the development of governmental institutions.

We might give two polar meanings to the "high crimes and misdemeanors" for which a President, a judge or any other civil officer may be impeached: anything that satisfies the Congress of the day, or at the other extreme only violations of the criminal law. Convincing historical materials exclude both these poles and leave us with a third view: that the phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors" covers some but surely not all political offenses—"political" in the sense of governmental.

Reaching this conclusion moves us along, but it is only the beginning of the challenge. What are the wrongs against the people, the body politic, for which a President may properly be impeached?

The Gallup poll and like measures of public opinion report that a very large majority believes that President Nixon is guilty of covering up wrong-doing, but of those expressing an opinion a majority opposes removal by impeachment. The difference, in my opinion, is attributable to a fear of impeachment not unlike the fear of regicide and the horror of the regicide once accomplished during the time of Cromwell and King Charles I.

Of course, impeachment cannot be wholly illegitimate—the Constitution provides for it—but I think that the country has a deep, intuitive understanding that impeachment is extraordinary, radical surgery, legitimate only upon some equally fundamental wrong, doing such grave injury to the nation as to make any incumbent's further continuance in office unacceptable even though his previous entitlement was based upon popular election.

Surely any wrong so fundamental as to require setting aside the results of one election without holding another must be one that can be stated in general terms plainly applicable to any President at any time. The need is to quiet the fear that impeachment may be or become a partisan substitute for a premature election. Political opposition, emotion, dislike, distrust and lack of public confidence (which may be temporary even when mixed with suspicion of some kind of wrongdoing) are not enough.

Equally surely, in my opinion, any general standard of political conduct the violation of which would support impeachment must have a broad and generally accepted moral base, understood by the country, so that again the same rule would apply to any President, so that we should not be resolving questions of public policy by impeachment. Nor should we be making up new rules of conduct as we go along. Of course, it is unnecessary to draw up a complete code of Presidential conduct. Mixing pragmatism with principle is one source of much of the creativity in Anglo-American law and government.

We work eclectically up to a point, passing judgment upon particular sets of facts, but we also test our judgment by asking whether it rests upon reasons that we can articulate and apply to other situations having the same essential elements, with enough generality both in scope and continuity to give guarantees against caprice, prejudice, self-interest or unreasoned emotion.

So here, the articulation of minimum acceptable standards of conduct for any President or high executive officer can begin with facts proved or assumed.

It is fair to say that evidence may be available to show that President Nixon's lawyers and accountants, without deliberate misrepresentation, zealously sought every loophole and cut every corner in an effort to avoid or minimize the payment of taxes; to show that others acting on his behalf likewise stretched every possible point to add to the convenience and comfort of Key Biscayne and San Clemente at public expense; and, finally, to show that in some cases they claimed more than the law allows.

Bad taste? Surely. Avariciousness? Yes. Bad leadership? Again, surely. Morally shabby? I think so, even though the same shabbiness infects thousands of tax returns and expense accounts. Grounds for impeachment? I wonder.

We are hardly prepared to say that any officer of the United States who, without concealing or misrepresenting material facts, claims a tax deduction not due should be removed from office. If not, does my phrasing omit some essential element in President Nixon's situation? Would convincing proof of material misrepresentation make a decisive difference?

Let us try again. Is it tolerable or a high offense against the liberty and security of a whole people for a President to approve in principle electronic surveillance, mail covers and burglaries for the purpose of gathering domestic intelligence, over the objection of the established agencies to set in motion a small force of his own irregulars—the Caulfields, Ulasewicz, Liddys and Hunts—who will operate from the executive office outside all the regularizing rules and procedures of the established agencies in order to effectuate Administration policy and political objectives and to hamper inquiry into their activities?

Move to a third area. The President's duty is to see that the laws are faithfully executed. Is it an impeachable violation of this responsibility for him to refrain for months from any form of personal intervention when there is, first, suspicion and later at least some evidence that his highest personal aides and party officials are obstructing justice by covering up criminal misconduct, for him to withhold disclosure and refuse evidence when investigation leads to papers taken into his files, and for his aides, apparently with his approval, to cooperate with those seeking to avoid indictment and conviction?

I do not imply answers to these questions, nor do I suggest that my factual predicates represent the actual facts. The evidence may show more, or less.

The point I wish to emphasize is that it is past the time for all those deeply concerned with our Government to bend some of their time and effort away from the excitement of factual disclosures to the very arduous task of formulating and thus creating a substantive law of impeachment where now there is none. Whether the present proceedings help to rebuild confidence in our system of government or push us further down the slope to cynicism and despair will depend upon the ability of the House Judiciary Committee to sense the as-yet-unstated moral intuition of the country and articulate it in operative principles by which President Nixon's conduct can be judged.

FACELESS CASUALTIES MUST NOT
BE FORGOTTEN

HON. CLAIR W. BURGNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, last December 10, the San Diego Evening Tribune published an editorial concerning the plight of our men who are still missing in action in Southeast Asia. I believe that the sentiments expressed in this editorial have a special significance in light of this week's visit to the Capitol by many of the wives and parents of some of our MIA's. I ask that the text be printed at this point in the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of every Member of the House:

"FACELESS CASUALTIES" MUST NOT BE
FORGOTTEN

The miseries of the fuel shortage, high prices and general national unrest cast a pall over the entire nation during this season that traditionally is one of joy.

But in 1,200 American homes, the distress is compounded by grief and uncertainty over the fate of loved ones described by one San Diego family as "faceless casualties of war."

Ten months after the signing of the Vietnam peace agreement in Paris, more than 1,200 servicemen and civilians—once listed as prisoners-of-war or missing in action—remain unaccounted for.

And the question that nags anxious and lonely wives, children and parents during this Christmas season is: "Are our men alive in Communist hands?"

It is possible, of course, and concerned relatives feel understandably that they have been betrayed by North Vietnamese leaders who pledged release or accounting of all Americans in Southeast Asia. They believe they have been neglected by a U.S. government that has failed to pursue vigorously fulfillment of the pledge.

The Paris agreement calls specifically for all parties to the pact to "help each other" obtain information about the missing, to determine the location of graves of the dead and to facilitate the exhumation and repatriation of remains of the dead.

To date, not one body of the 60 Americans reported to have died in captivity has been returned. There has been no effort to reconcile discrepancies in respect to men known to have been captured but unaccounted for at the time of the prisoner exchange. American search and rescue teams have been denied access to areas where most of the missing disappeared.

The American government has been reluctant to press the issue. Only one formal protest has been made to the North Vietnamese government and that under prodding of the National League of Families, which has dedicated itself to ripping down the curtain of cruel silence.

The families of the missing men have not forgotten.

Neither should the millions of Americans who so recently gave a hero's welcome to each of the prisoners-of-war released from prison camps in Southeast Asia.

And neither should our elected representatives in Congress, the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department or our embassies abroad.

Those brave men who put their lives on the line for us remain, dead or alive, the concern of each and every compassionate American.

IOWA STATE SCORES AGAIN

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, scientists and investigators at Iowa State University have from time to time, over the years, been the inventors and developers of every significant and far reaching program, chemicals, drugs, and machines. Dr. Speeding headed the program which was an important part of the Oakridge atomic project; numerous superior metals for the space program; building materials made from corn stalks or wastewood shavings; many inventions incorporated in farm machinery; stilbestrol; and many other contributions to mankind were products of Iowa State; and now it has been established that Vincent Atanasoff, a former Iowa State physics professor should be recognized as the true father of the important computer industry. Probably nothing else has changed our lives more or contributed to producing on a mass basis more than computers. Computers are hooked up to machines of production, they are used to store, memorize and retrieve important statistics and information. The limit of their use is still not known. The head of the Washington Bureau for Cowles Publications, Clark Mollenhoff, has documented the fantastic story of Dr. Atanasoff's part in the development of the computer industry.

Now that it has been legally established that Dr. Atanasoff is the true father of the computer, I assume Iowa State may want to extend appropriate recognition and justly point with pride to the fact that one more of a long list of important inventions is directly related to this University which has contributed so much to our scientific and technological advancement. Following is the story as related by Clark Mollenhoff:

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Jan. 27, 1974]

COURT: COMPUTER IOWAN'S IDEA

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

MONROVIA, Md.—More than 35 years after his initial work on the theory of development of a computer at Iowa State College, Dr. John Vincent Atanasoff has been recognized as the true father of the multibillion-dollar-a-year computer industry.

The affable, 70-year-old former Iowa State College mathematics and physics professor and his Iowa-born wife, Alice, have "little bitterness" and "few regrets" over the tardiness of the recognition.

In fact, they take some consolation that the lengthy Minneapolis federal court trial that brought forth the facts has solidified the record of Dr. Atanasoff's contribution in a manner that is seldom achieved.

The federal court record that established Dr. Atanasoff as "the Thomas Edison" of the electronic digital computer also establishes just as clearly that essentially all of the pioneer work was done in the shop and basement of the Old Physics Building of the campus of what is now known as Iowa State University at Ames.

REVAMPED MACHINE

"J.V.", as the handsome grey-haired scientist is called, said last week that it was

in Room 52 of "Old Physics" where he mulled over the extensive and frustrating problems of graduate students in the early 1930s, and in 1934 revamped an IBM punch-card machine into a crude mechanical device for solving complex mathematical equations.

The young associate professor's tinkering outraged the IBM serviceman and resulted in a letter of criticism from the company for that first try at a mechanical means of getting around the tedious calculations involved in the advanced experiments of his doctoral candidates.

Dr. Atanasoff relates that it was in a basement room in "Old Physics" that he and Clifford Berry, an assistant, worked between 1938 and May, 1942, in putting together the prototype and then the ABC (Atanasoff-Berry Computer) machine that the court opinion now recognizes as containing most of the principles in ENIAC—generally accepted as the world's first automatic electronic digital computer.

ENIAC (the acronym for Electronic Numerical Integrator and Computer) was completed in 1945, the creation of Dr. John Mauchly and Dr. J. Preser Eckert, who have been generally acclaimed in the industry as the original thinkers of the computer industry.

INDUSTRY FOLKLORE

In the folklore of the industry and in its textbooks, Mauchly and Eckert were treated as the originators of the ideas in the ENIAC computer. The patents of Sperry Rand were based on the legend that the basic ideas in ENIAC flowed from meetings of Dr. Mauchly and Dr. Eckert over a sundae and a cup of coffee in a Philadelphia, Pa., restaurant.

Conveniently forgotten was that Dr. Mauchly had visited Dr. Atanasoff in Ames in 1940, had been his houseguest, and had been given access to Dr. Atanasoff's papers and the machine then under construction.

He had even asked if he could take with him a copy of a 35-page study that incorporated the ideas of "regenerative memory" and "logic circuits," but Dr. Atanasoff rejected the request, feeling that he had been sufficiently hospitable in free discussions and permitting Dr. Mauchly to read the paper.

On Oct. 19, 1973, U.S. District Judge Earl H. Larson, ruling on a \$200 million patent infringement suit brought by Sperry Rand against Honeywell, Inc., made a finding that Dr. Atanasoff's work was the source of most of the ideas in ENIAC and invalidated the patent rights.

Had Dr. Atanasoff felt compelled to challenge the Mauchly-Eckert legend, it is doubtful if he could have afforded the long court struggle with such a corporate giant as Sperry Rand.

8-YEAR FIGHT

But, as the financial interest of one corporate giant denied Dr. Atanasoff his proper recognition, the financial interest of another giant—Honeywell, Inc.—created the conditions for an 8-year court fight over patent rights.

That fight ended with Sperry Rand's ENIAC patents declared invalid. Sperry Rand then made a \$3.6 million settlement with Honeywell.

The court verdict is based upon thousands of pages of pre-trial depositions and an extensive 135-day trial on the patent rights that cost both firms millions of dollars for investigations, legal fees, and court costs.

Dr. Atanasoff was a key witness for Honeywell, gave extensive depositions as early as November, 1968, and testified for nine days in June, 1971.

It was the opinion of Judge Larson that Dr. Mauchly obtained the ideas incorporated in ENIAC from Dr. Atanasoff during the 1940 visit to Ames.

NO SECRET

"The discussions Mauchly had with both Atanasoff and Berry while at Ames were free and open and no significant information concerning the machine's theory, design, construction, use or operation was withheld," Judge Larson stated.

The Minnesota judge noted that "prior to his visit to Ames, Mauchly had been broadly interested in electrical analog calculating devices, but had not conceived an automatic electronic digital computer."

Judge Larson commented that he found the testimony of Dr. Atanasoff "to be credible." He found Dr. Mauchly's lack of memory to fall short of "a finding of willful and intentional fraud" but declared it was filled with "various derelictions" on the initial representations to the patent office.

Mauchly said that he still takes the position that the Atanasoff-Berry Computer was "just a crude little machine that wouldn't really do anything" and that ENIAC was "a highly sophisticated and operational machine."

"Dr. Eckert and I wish that the Sperry Rand people would have appealed this, because it does leave us in a bad position because of the misunderstanding of the court," Dr. Mauchly said.

Dr. Mauchly told The Register that he admitted having gone over all of Dr. Atanasoff's material in 1940.

"I don't think I learned anything from his papers, and I was merely trying to help the guy in case Iowa State didn't want to finance him," Dr. Mauchly said. "I really don't know what the judge's decision means from a standpoint of the individual patents on ENIAC because I haven't had time to review it yet."

Dr. Mauchly conceded that it would be difficult to get a more thorough dredging for evidence than in a lawsuit involving the corporate giants of the computer world, but that in this instance Judge Larson "didn't take into account some very important technical evidence."

Although Dr. Mauchly and representatives of Sperry Rand visited Dr. Atanasoff at his farm during the litigation in an effort to get him "to testify for them, and to just not have as good a memory on some things as I had," Dr. Atanasoff said, "they gave up when I told them the nature of some of the documentation I had."

LETTER TO J.V.

One of the documents was a Sept. 30, 1941, letter to "Dear J.V." from John W. Mauchly that was unsigned. Dr. Atanasoff said that Sperry Rand lawyers indicated that they would challenge it as evidence until Honeywell lawyers indicated that they had done considerable research on distinctive defects in the type.

In the letter Dr. Atanasoff was asked: "Is there any objection, from your point of view, to my building some sort of computer which incorporates some of the features of your machine . . . For the time being, of course, I shall be lucky to find time and material to do more than merely make exploratory tests of some of my different ideas, with the hope of getting something very speedy, not too costly, etc."

"Ultimately, a second question might come up, of course, and that is, in the event that your present design were to hold the field against all challengers, and I got the Moore school interested in having something of the sort, would the way be open for us to build an 'Atanasoff Calculator' (a la Bush Analyzer) here?"

Mauchly admitted to The Register that he had written the 1941 letter to Atanasoff.

At this point in history, Dr. Atanasoff is "more disappointed than bitter" about his dealings with Dr. Mauchly, and he says he has "very little bitterness" toward the men and corporations who fought for years to deny him his rightful place in computer history.

Nor is he particularly regretful of the funding uncertainty of Iowa State College officials and lawyers who failed to file the proper patent applications in the early 1940s.

"I would have received half the money Iowa State received from the sale of the patent rights," Dr. Atanasoff said. "But from a practical standpoint, they probably wouldn't have sold for anymore than \$25,000 to \$50,000. I tried several times to get IBM and others interested in the late 1930s, and I have their letters expressing no interest or saying they saw no practical use for such equipment."

LEFT IN 1942

The energetic scientist left Iowa State in late 1942, shortly after completion of the computer, and although he remained a full professor in absentia until 1945, he did not return.

During the war years he worked in the Naval Ordnance Laboratory in Washington, and became chief of the acoustic division where he directed the Navy's FUZE program and served as chief scientist of the U.S. Army field forces.

Absorbed in his war work, Dr. Atanasoff lost touch with the details of computer developments.

After the war, he turned down an opportunity to return to Iowa State as head of the Physics Department.

When he left government in 1952, he established his own consultant firm known as Ordnance Engineering Corp., a firm that "was financed with the help of some of my old friends from Iowa" and that "teetered on the brink of bankruptcy" in its first years.

Dr. Atanasoff studied accounting methods for two days before setting up the accounting for his corporation with the help of his wife, the former Alice Crosby of Webster City, whose only prior accounting experience was "as a cashier in a five and dime at Webster City" in 1941 and 1942.

Dr. Atanasoff, who speaks enthusiastically about "all of the talents of my Iowa farm girl," made Alice the secretary-treasurer of the corporation and she handled the books after some initial guidance from him.

BRIEF HINT

To learn the law necessary, Dr. Atanasoff spent a concentrated month of study before drawing up the papers that drew the admiration from the lawyers for Aerojet General when he sold Ordnance Engineering to that major defense corporation in 1957.

Before he sold the firm to Aerojet General, Dr. Atanasoff had only one brief hint that his work on the Iowa State computer with Berry might be linked to the development of ENIAC by Dr. Mauchly and Dr. Eckert.

In 1954, lawyers for IBM came to him to inquire about his early work on the ABC computer and his dealings with Mauchly. Initially, they indicated that the information Dr. Atanasoff had given them might be enough to break the Sperry Rand patents.

"But they went away and did not come back, so I assumed that the investigation by IBM failed to prove the case against Sperry Rand's patents," Dr. Atanasoff said.

He didn't learn until midway in the trial of the Honeywell suit that in August, 1956, IBM and Sperry Rand had entered into an agreement to provide for a complete cross-licensing of patents in vital areas, and "a complete sharing" of equipment which was criticized by Judge Larson as "an unreasonable attempt" to "solidify their monopoly in the EDP (electronic data processing) industry."

But Dr. Atanasoff was too busy with the sale of his consultant firm to Aerojet General to be chasing the will-o-the-wisp of a possible patent suit against the giants of the computer world.

He received Aerojet General stock for half of the value of the purchase price, and as a result of a 10-for-one stock split within three years, he realized more than a million dol-

lars out of the sale. He eventually became a vice-president of Aerojet General.

UNIQUE HOUSE

He retired in 1963 at the age of 60 and immediately embarked upon construction of a unique cement slab farm house on his 195-acre farm in the rolling countryside near Monrovia, Md.

Although aware he had made a substantial contribution to the pioneering on computers, Dr. Atanasoff had no occasion to make deep inquiry into the substance of Sperry Rand's ENIAC patents until early 1967 when lawyers for Control Data contacted him, followed shortly by lawyers for Honeywell, Inc.

Both Control Data and Honeywell were involved in patent disputes with Sperry Rand, and were interested in breaking Dr. Mauchly's claims of a patentable right in key features of ENIAC. Dr. Atanasoff soon came to a conclusion that "anything that was worth a damn in ENIAC had been in the papers I'd gone over with Mauchly in 1940."

With that realization came the desire to produce all the evidence that would set the record straight for himself and for his late friend and assistant, Cliff Berry.

"I had most of the initial mathematical concepts, but it was largely Cliff's hands that made the parts in the shop and his ideas on how to get things done that were vital in putting the machine together," Dr. Atanasoff said. Berry died in 1963, four years before the serious litigation started.

VITAL CONCEPTS

Although the court record is filled with accounts of Dr. Atanasoff and Berry wrestling with the problems of computer development at "Old Physics," it is related that the vital concepts of "regenerative memory" and "logic sequence" came to J.V. in the cool quiet of an Illinois tavern on a night in the winter of 1937-38 after a 200-mile drive.

He had gone to Room 52 in Old Physics after an early dinner. Frustrated and trembling with an idea that would not be born, the young mathematics and physics professor got in his Ford V8 to go for a ride. He drove east on Highway 30 to Cedar Rapids, and at some point dropped down to Highway 6 and crossed the one Mississippi River bridge then in existence at Davenport.

"I drove two or three miles, saw the lights of a tavern on a hill to my right and turned in," Dr. Atanasoff recalled last week. "I don't know whether I could find the place, and I don't know whether it still exists."

In testifying about the incident at the trial, Dr. Atanasoff related that he was in the tavern for at least two or three hours, had "a couple of drinks" and at some point removed a heavy coat he was wearing.

"Suddenly, I was calm and my thinking was clear and the concepts of a regenerative memory and a logic sequence fell into place, and I knew it could be done," the mathematical genius said.

He left the tavern, got in his car and drove back to Ames, arriving sometime after 3 a.m., and went to bed without putting his ideas on paper.

"I might have scratched some little notes on a piece of paper at the honky tonk, but I didn't need that once the thoughts fell into place," Dr. Atanasoff said. Sometime "in the next few days" the young professor put those ideas on paper for the first time. But with a heavy teaching schedule, he did not get back to a serious attempt to execute the plans until 1938.

A \$650 GRANT

In 1939, with the help of Dean R. E. Buchanan, who was then dean of the College of Agriculture and dean of the Graduate School, Dr. Atanasoff obtained a \$650 grant to launch his computer project. Most of the money went to pay Berry for the work done on the computer project, and the rest went for the purchase of material for parts.

"You see this was not something you could go out and buy parts for, because there were

no mechanisms in existence to do the things we wanted to do," Dr. Atanasoff said.

The prototype was completed in the fall of 1939, and even before it was finished Dr. Atanasoff and Berry moved into the construction of the first operational computer, which was completed in the spring of 1942.

In December, 1940, Dr. Atanasoff first met Dr. Mauchly while attending a meeting in Philadelphia of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and they engaged in discussion of the computing machine that was under construction at Iowa State.

A few weeks later, Dr. Mauchly went to Ames, lived with Dr. Atanasoff for several days, talked with Berry, read Dr. Atanasoff's 35-page analysis of the computer problem and made an unsuccessful effort to obtain a copy to take back to Philadelphia.

The fact that Dr. Atanasoff "hasn't received a dime" from his pioneer work on computers is cushioned by the fact that other contributions he has made to scientific leadership have been coupled with business success that provides a comfortable retirement in rural Frederick County, Maryland.

QUIET LIFE

"Our life has been satisfying, and we like our life style," Dr. Atanasoff said. It is a quiet life in the country, with a "farm room" for the two huge deep freezers that store the frozen foods Alice prepares from the big garden that J.V. loves to tend when he isn't busy in his workshop.

J.V. has appropriated a part of Alice's farm room for some electrical experimentation, and has moved into her huge kitchen with a wine-making project.

The same drive, energy and brilliance that Dr. Atanasoff put into the development of the first computer go into every project he tackles.

"If there is a book written that tells how to do it, J.V. knows he can do it," his wife says.

And he is just as admiring of Alice, nearly 20 years his junior. He praises her accomplishments as a business manager, as a professional draftsman, as a social companion, as a voracious reader, and "for the great thing she has been to my life."

He relies upon Alice to call his attention to things he should read, and for the ready knowledge of the details of testimony in the computer patent suit, the names of people he has met in connection with the suit, or on their 1970 trip to Bulgaria where Dr. Atanasoff was honored for his contribution to the computer science field with a decoration by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

IRONIC TIMING

Ironically, the decoration with the order of Cyril and Methodius, First Class, which is the highest award for science in Bulgaria, came at a time when the scientific world in America was still caught up with the ENIAC myths.

Dr. Atanasoff was born in Hamilton, N.Y. His father had been born in Bulgaria, and Dr. Atanasoff makes light of the award with a quip that "Bulgarians wanted to believe that someone of Bulgarian blood was a pioneer in the field of computers, and so they were eager to find evidence that I was a pioneer."

But he added that while the Bulgarians "had a special interest, they did a quite thorough job of research."

LOYALIST REALISM

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

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

LOYALIST REALISM: THE BOAL INITIATIVE

(By Fred Burns O'Brien)

Approximately one year ago, I wrote an article on the benefits of regional government in Ireland that in my opinion would be the solution for the crisis that confronts Northern Ireland. At that time my corollary theories were premised on the proposal initiated by the Provisional Republicans led by Ruairi O'Bradaigh and Northern Republicans led by Frank McManus, M.P. The feasibility of this plan still holds true and in addition to it, a parallel formula has been devised by a member of the Loyalist Community.

The idea of a federated or amalgamated Ireland is the structure constructed by Mr. Desmond Boal, Q.C., a Protestant Loyalist, who foreshadows the future in an Irish nation with qualifications to be negotiated for Ulster that will assure Loyalists a continuance of their way of life, but with ultimate authority now held by the British in a federal Irish parliament.

His plan has the backing of the IRA, UDA and UVF, three paramilitary organizations formed to protect communities with Northern Ireland. This fact can guarantee peace, something the British Government and Southern Irish Government cannot implement. In addition it would be the construction of an entirely new Irish nation without interference from Britain. The Boal Plan is a compromise between the Regional Plan of Sinn Fein as espoused by O'Bradaigh and McManus and the call for an independent Northern Ireland as suggested by Mr. John Taylor, Mr. William Craig and the Reverend Ian Paisley. It has a basic appeal to the various factions mentioned and without the support of all, nothing can work in Ireland.

Loyalism

The appellation "Loyalist" at one time designated the connotation of loyalty to Britain, but in reality the Loyalist is true to the State or Province of Ulster. This would have the overtones of an Irish connection rather than the strict British implication. This loyalty to Ulster is based on a tradition rooted in Ireland by Irish Ulstermen, taking its rightful place with other Irish traditions in full equality.

A new or rejuvenated pride in Ulster is a healthy sign and a foundation upon which to build a unified province and a nation. All people, Nationalist and Loyalist, can be a part of a New Ulster which will be a significant part of a New Ireland. Regional pride can be emitted from all regions of the proposed federal state and be pertinent to a particular area with a specific history that might differ from others, such being the case in Ulster. It appears that an attitude of Ulster loyalty is the basis for Mr. Boal's initiative and a concrete base far superior to the recent British designations culminating in the Sunningdale Agreement which stipulates a far distant British base.

A new destiny

Desmond Boal, like many Loyalists has come to the realization that Britain does not have the best interests of the people of Ulster in her policy making and that the future lies in the attainment of self-determination within a proposed structure of a federated Irish state, with strong regional parliaments. With the ambiguities of Sunningdale visible, regionalism becomes more a necessity and it is the impetus of Mr. Boal's suggestion as he seeks to establish the best possible governmental power base for the inhabitants of Ulster. Due to his impeccable credentials, Mr. Boal cannot be taken lightly; he speaks for a substantial portion of the Loyalist population.

This writer has on previous occasion alleged that the British Government utilized the Protestant Community as a pawn in re-

taining control over the Province of Ulster by polarizing the major religious communities. The British have played on religious myths and fears that could be diffused if the people were left to guide their own destiny. Desmond Boal apparently seeks that destiny by his overtures to all the people of Ulster and Ireland in general.

Connection Dissolved

It is Mr. Boal's contention that the British connection has been severed by Britain's Sunningdale scheme, and the matter of pledging allegiance to the Crown is no longer a relevant issue. He is dutifully concerned with the fate of Northern Ireland and its people and desires to negotiate the most rewarding political settlement which is a federal Ireland. He feels that Ulster's life is best served by the creation of a strong Stormont Regional Parliament with allegiance to a federal state.

Two noteworthy achievements would be realized under Desmond Boal's design; Ireland would be rid of British control, the dearest desire of Republicans and Northern Ireland would control its own destiny (within an amalgamated Ireland) the urgent need of the Loyalists. Specific details of Boal's federated state and the Republican's regional state are negotiable and not so strict as both sides adhered to in the past. The most significant aspect of the Boal Initiative is that it accomplishes the impossible as alluded to by outsiders.

Britain has been undeserving of Ulstermen's loyalty evidenced by the imposed solution of Sunningdale and the elusive Council of Ireland. She has manipulated Loyalists to her own designs and only people "blind to the significance of recent history" are unaware that the British Government no longer seeks to assure that Loyalists can retain a power base.

Any Source Acceptable

Gallantly, Mr. Boal rejects the allegations that a federal Ireland be denied recognition because it has been proffered as well by the Provisional IRA. He will not denigrate an idea due to its source, unpleasing to most Loyalists. He cites his plan as assuaging Protestant fears and terminating Provisional violence and this has credence, especially in light of the further contention that it would curtail any violence initiated from the Loyalist side.

We who want Ireland molded to one nation with peace and justice amongst all factions plead with all Irish men and women to pay heed to Mr. Boal and Frank McManus as well as others who aspire to see Ireland as one with many strong contributing areas: The federal theory confronts reality four-square, while the illusions of Sunningdale postpone it.

WE NEED A NEW MINIMUM WAGE BILL

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, in recent newsletters and speeches, AFL-CIO President George Meany has been bemoaning the veto of the minimum wage bill. I would like to address myself to Mr. Meany's complaint:

The minimum wage bill, so George Meany complains, Should not have been vetoed, the veto not sustained.

In part, he is right, I, for one, would agree,
 Too long some have waited a raise to see.
 The bill, though, was laden with bad as well as good.
 The people said, "Do better," and the House agreed we could.
 In his heart, George knew the features that were bad;
 But, having been the author, he got very mad.
 So, forsaking those poor folks, while prices do go up,
 Big George commands Congress: Don't you dare fill their cup!
 His tactic, I'm sure, does not escape or miss you:
 If he can't have his way, he prefers an issue.
 What he forgets, although he is very wise,
 Is that good laws always come from compromise.
 Come now, you scoff, he is but one man;
 Does Congress wait 'til he says, "You can!"?
 'Tis sad, but true; and as proof I note
 Seven other vetoes got another vote.
 What then, you ask, can be done about this fellow?
 Is there a flicker of hope that he might mellow?
 We must keep trying, not give in to skepticism—
 George can't be so bad Congress needs an exorcism!

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice has decided not to ask the Supreme Court to review the decision by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia which invalidated the oath of allegiance on the passport application form. Because of this, applicants for passports no longer will be required to affirm any support for the Government of the United States and the Passport Office will not be able to question those who apply for passports, even though their disloyalty or avowal of anti-American causes may be a matter of public knowledge.

This raises serious questions which, in my opinion, Congress should deal with before absence of action may be interpreted as approval.

The District Court's decision came on June 26, 1972 and it was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on October 26, 1973. Thus, the question has been at issue already too long a time. Prior decisions of the Supreme Court held, in 1952, that the oath of allegiance was a valid requirement, and that the Secretary of State must resolve the question of allegiance before a passport could be issued, in 1958.

The most recent decision raises the question of where this places the Government in having any degree of control

over the foreign travel of its citizens. Although the oath, in and of itself, would not be the determining factor, elimination of this requirement certainly makes the task no easier if a national emergency should arise.

Aside from the philosophic reasons which might be brought to bear, one is caused to wonder what strain of conscience there would be in ascribing to the passport oath. Is there objection to oaths in general or to this one in particular? Is there objection to the authority of the Government to require an affirmative act on the part of its citizens? If so, the same complainers must cringe at the thought of paying income taxes, securing an automobile driver's license and a host of other things which the Government commands of its people.

Affirming faith and allegiance to the Government, whether it be on a passport application, in a salute to the flag or in transaction of business involving Government contracts should not be an incumbrance in the minds of the loyal. It should cause no great problem to the political theoretician, for somewhere along the way he is going to have to affirm his support of some function of Government if he expects to survive in today's scheme of things.

I hope Congress will move to clarify the situation.

POSTAL SERVICE EXPERIMENTS WITH GASOLINE-WATER MIXTURE

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, a fuel experiment of particular interest is being conducted at Norman, Okla., by the U.S. Postal Service through its Maintenance Technical Support Center located on the campus of the University of Oklahoma.

Four delivery trucks at the Norman post office are operating on a mixture of water and gasoline, using an emulsified fuel, in which water is suspended in gasoline, developed by Prof. Walter J. Ewbank of the University of Oklahoma faculty.

Tests using 13-percent water have been underway since approximately November 26, Blair M. Wildermuth, Director of the Maintenance Technical Support Center, says. Two one-fourth ton postal vehicles at the Norman office have been used, and since early this month two one-half ton trucks.

Thus far the 13-percent water emulsion has shown good efficiency and fuel economy, as expected, but it is too early for the Postal Service to attempt a comprehensive estimate of the success of the demonstration.

John Shurr, a reporter for the Norman Transcript, gave additional information on the experiments in an article that appeared soon after they got underway. The full text follows:

BUT VEHICLE STILL WORKING ... WATER,

GAS MIXED UP

(By John Shurr)

If University of Oklahoma Prof. Walter J. Ewbank's formula for mixing water and gasoline proves to be workable, the American motoring public may no longer have to worry about the current gasoline crisis.

Tests, begun only a few weeks ago, are under way on U.S. Postal Service delivery vehicles in Norman in an effort to determine the long-range effects of burning the mixture in engines which are designed to run only on gasoline.

Ewbank, a professor of aerospace, mechanical and nuclear engineering at OU, has been working since 1965 on an emulsified fuel which will cause water to suspend in gasoline.

Although it has been believed that higher octane fuels are the answer to complete fuel combustion, Ewbank maintains that the answer is to combine gasoline with water.

"It's a more efficient fuel and a lot cheaper," he says. "I've been convinced of that since about 1967."

In order to test whether the mixed solution is indeed as efficient as Ewbank believes, the Postal Service's Maintenance Technical Support Center (MTSC) in Norman is conducting extensive tests.

Since the latter part of November, MTSC engineers have compared the gasoline-water fuel's efficiency with that of regular gasoline. Most of the testing has been done at the Postal Service's facility where exhaust emissions and combustion efficiency are measured.

The director of the technical support center, Blair L. Wildermuth, says the tests already conducted have shown that the amount of carbon monoxide and other exhaust emission contaminants are reduced by using the mix.

Although only one delivery truck is being used for the current tests, four test vehicles will be put into operation around Norman by the end of next week.

"We want to see what the driveability is," he says. "If we can't get them started in the morning or they stall going from box to box, then we'll know the formula will have to be improved."

So far, Wildermuth says, the tests have shown that the truck using the 13 per cent water and 87 per cent gasoline mix get better gas mileage and lower gasoline emissions.

"We haven't found a single harmful side effect yet," he said. "Ewbank has been running tests on his three cars for a year and has had no problems."

The Postal Service is planning to test the four trucks over a six-month period—three months using the 87-13 per cent (gasoline to water) mixture and three months using a 70-30 per cent mixture.

"The only problem with the higher water mixture," Wildermuth says, "is that we have to do a little more to the engine."

He said that with the 87-13 per cent mix, the MTSC mechanics only have to adjust the truck carburetors. However, when using the higher water concentration, the carburetor's must be modified slightly.

"If the tests are successful after six months," Wildermuth says, "the entire Norman postal fleet will be changed over to using the mixture."

Wildermuth says the concept of using water and gasoline was developed during World War II when water injection systems were used in aircraft engines. These systems, however, involved supplying water and gasoline to the engine separately.

He said the use of water with the aviation gasoline resulted in "better cooling and combustion efficiency."

Ewbank, who has demonstrated the feasibility of the mixture before Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Chrysler Motor

Company officials, says motorists using the combination fuel would receive more miles per gallon.

He says that when the emulsion used to combine the water and gasoline is made on a larger scale, the cost per gallon of the mixture will be about the same as that paid for gasoline.

The mixture process Ewbank has developed allows water and gasoline to combine in a suspended state. Without suspension, gasoline, which is lighter than water, would separate from the mixture and rise.

BILL TO ROLL BACK PRICES ON CRUDE OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a bill relating to price rollbacks on crude oil and petroleum products which I introduced on January 28, 1974. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 12306

A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by inserting in section 203 the following new subsections:

"(k) Immediately upon the date of enactment of this subsection, the President shall issue an order to establish a ceiling on prices of crude oil and petroleum products at levels not greater than the highest levels pertaining to a substantial volume of actual transactions by each business enterprise or other person during the fourteen day period ending January 19, 1974, for like or similar commodities, or if no transactions occurred during such period, then the highest applicable level in the nearest preceding fourteen day period.

"(l) The ceiling on prices required under subsection (k) shall be applicable to all retail prices and to wholesale prices for unfinished, finished or processed goods.

"(m) As soon as practicable, but not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the President shall by written order stating in full the considerations for his actions, roll back prices for crude oil and petroleum products to levels no higher than those prevailing in the seven-day period ending November 1, 1973, in order to reduce inflation. Price increases announced after November 1, 1973, and made retroactive to dates prior to November 1, 1973, shall not be considered as having been in effect prior to such date for purposes of this subsection. The President may make specific exceptions from the rollback by written order to compensate for increased costs for crude oil and petroleum products produced or refined outside the United States, but in no event shall such exceptions allow more than a passthrough for increases in the costs of such commodities. Such orders shall state procedures and adequate public notice of any price exceptions and shall disallow any profit margins on any crude petroleum or petroleum products in excess of the margin applicable in the seven-day period ending November 1, 1973.

"(n) The President may, by written order stating full the considerations for his actions, make such additional exceptions and variations to the orders required under this section as may be necessary to prevent gross

inequities and hardships, and to encourage and preserve the competitive viability of branded independent marketers, small refiners, nonbranded independent marketers, and independent refiners, as refined in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-159).

"(o) The President shall, by written order, issue rules to insure that all corporations or other entities engaging in sales of crude petroleum at the refinery level or petroleum products at the wholesale level reflect, in sales to any purchaser, the average costs of its foreign and domestic crude oil and petroleum products.

"(p) Section 406 of Public Law 93-153 is hereby repealed.

"(q) For purposes of this section 'petroleum product' means gasoline, kerosene, distillates (including Number 2 fuel oil), LPG, refined lubricating oils, or diesel fuel."

A CHECK ON THE PRESIDENCY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, James L. Sundquist, senior fellow in the Brookings Institution governmental studies program, has some sensible remarks about the need for a workable check on the powers of the Presidency in an article which appeared in the fall 1973 issue of the Brookings Bulletin, based on his remarks at an October 1973 conference at the Washington Journalism Center:

NEEDED: A WORKABLE CHECK ON THE PRESIDENCY

(By James L. Sundquist)

The Presidency puts too much power in one man. That proposition is heard increasingly these days, for a decade of war in Vietnam and now the Watergate affair have revealed a vast potential for abuse of the enormous power that is entrusted to a single human being. And the realization has come as something of a shock. After all, this was exactly what the Founding Fathers, reacting against the tyranny of George III, were supposedly striving to prevent. We were brought up to believe that the unique American contribution to the art of government was "checks and balances."

We were lulled into complacency because we thought the system of checks and balances was more pervasive than it is. The deadlocks we have so often witnessed occur in a particular process of government—the legislative process—and what applies to the legislative power does not necessarily apply to the executive power. Legislation is a shared responsibility; both the President and the Congress have a veto. But once a law is enacted, the power to carry it out is not shared between President and Congress, for the Constitution vests the executive power in the President alone.

The assignment of executive power to the President does not mean that the other branches of government do not exercise some checks. They do get involved in the execution of the laws, in half a dozen ways. But these checks, taken altogether, have always been severely limited in their practical effect.

The courts can check the President and often have, as when they ordered Harry Truman to return the seized steel plants to their owners. But this power is limited to cases of actual lawbreaking; the judicial process imposes no check on presidential actions that are merely unwise or improper. Moreover, in the broad area of national

security and foreign affairs, it is difficult to find cases that can be taken into court.

Impeachment can be seen as an extreme form of judicial process; as such, it has at least as many limitations as court proceedings. "High crimes and misdemeanors" must be proved. In today's meanings of those words (which are the meanings the Congress acts on, though a case can be made that the phrase carried a looser meaning when it was written into the Constitution), a President who has simply lost his capacity to lead and govern because of bungling, betrayal by ill-chosen subordinates, or any of the other weaknesses that can lead to misuse of presidential power, cannot for that reason be relieved of power.

The Senate's power to confirm appointments is not an effective check, for the obvious reason that the Senate cannot know in advance which presidential appointees are going to abuse their power. When the names of John Mitchell and Maurice Stans were presented for confirmation, no one could have foreseen that they would be indicted four years later. If the Senate could *unconfirm* appointments, that would be a real check, but such power—for good reason—was not granted by the Constitution.

If the President does something the majority in Congress disapproves, it can amend the law to prevent the President from doing it again. But this possibility is more theory than fact. The President retains the power of veto, and if he wants to go on doing what the congressional majority objects to, a minority of one-third plus one of either house is sufficient to sustain his veto. Nor can an amendment usually be made retroactive to force a reversal of what the President has already done. Moreover, to curtail the executive power by law is liable to prevent the President from accomplishing ends that in the congressional view are still desirable.

Nor is the power of the purse an effective check. Since appropriation bills are only a form of legislation, attempts to control the President through the budget encounter the same difficulties as in attempting to control him through amending substantive law. He can veto bills carrying unpalatable riders, and his vetoes will usually be sustained. To cut funds is no corrective for maladministration.

Lastly, in order to legislate and appropriate, the Congress through its committees may obtain information on how the laws are carried out, using subpoenas if necessary. Through this process, senators and congressmen can kibitz, entreat, heckle, and threaten, and these methods are often effective. But they cannot compel a determined President to change his course.

A common weakness of almost all these checks and balances is that they operate after the fact, often long after. The Congress has been able to exercise a review power in the case of both Vietnam and Watergate—and in the Watergate affair judicial checks have been operating too—but only long after the damage has been done. The one exception, Senate confirmation, operates only before the fact, sometimes long before. None of the checks and balances operate during or close to the fact, which is when the abuse of power needs to be prevented.

THE EXPANDING GOVERNMENT

These checks and balances, weak as they have been throughout our history, have been further weakened by several trends that for the most part are not reversible. While the federal government's budget has increased by 500 percent in a quarter century and the government has been thrust into a multiplicity of new activities, the capacity of the Congress to check executive operations has not increased on anything like the same scale. Nor can the Congress be expected to keep pace, no matter how much it improves itself through reorganizing, strengthening its staff, electing stronger leaders, or at-

tending to its duties with greater diligence. No matter how it changes its practices, its checks and balances will still have to be exercised through difficult, demanding work by individual members, acting mainly in committees. As the size and scope of government expand, the attention of committees, subcommittees, and devoted individual members is inevitably spread thinner and thinner.

Partly because of the incapacity of the Congress to cope with an expanding government, the line separating executive from legislative power has been shifted in favor of the executive. In part, this shift has been made with congressional consent: the Congress has willingly and repeatedly delegated power to the executive. Thus it has recognized, in the case of price and wage controls, that measures to curb inflation must be left to executive discretion. Similarly, major decisions to cope with the energy crisis have been delegated. In other cases, the shift has occurred without express congressional consent but with its acquiescence. In foreign affairs, much of what used to be done through treaties, which require ratification by the Senate, is now done through executive agreements, which do not. Above all, the effective power to declare war, which was granted to the Congress by the Constitution in clearest terms, has passed to the President. Even after Vietnam the Congress has not seriously considered taking back the power to put the country into war; it has only required that after the President has done so, he submit his decision for approval.

The Congress has yet to accept any general principle that the President should be free to impound appropriated funds, but it has repeatedly let presidents do so without rebuke, providing the precedent and the encouragement for President Nixon to go further in this direction than any of his predecessors. Indeed, while congressmen have protested the President's impoundment of appropriated funds, in 1972 both houses voted to grant him broad authority to do exactly that. One day, it can confidently be predicted, the power to adjust tax rates within defined limits will also pass to the President so that fiscal policy can be "fine tuned" to cope with inflationary or recessionary trends.

Congressional checks also have been weakened by the trend toward secrecy, with claims of executive privilege and "national security" extending ever lower into the executive branch. The courts are now reviewing the scope of what can be withheld from Congress and from the courts themselves, and some retreat on the part of the President may be forced. But it is difficult to imagine that the long-term trend toward increasing secrecy will be decisively reversed.

Despite demands that the Congress "reassert" itself, there has been no action yet that would rectify the imbalance even to a slight degree. And it is difficult to see how the balance can be shifted much. The government is not going to become smaller or easier for the Congress to oversee. The speed with which domestic and foreign problems arise and grow is not going to slow down even to the pace of a Congress aroused and streamlined, should that ideal condition ever be attained. Diplomacy will continue to be carried on as every other country carries it on: by the executive in secret. The Congress cannot control inflation or cope with energy shortages or establish tariffs except through delegation of authority to the executive. The presidential rights of impoundment and executive privilege may be curtailed a little, but that is about all. Even with the fullest "reassertion" of its powers, the Congress cannot reassert authority it has never had: Its powers will remain those of a confirming body before the fact, and a reviewing body after the fact, with no means of preventing the abuse of executive power when it is taking place.

THE DECLINE OF THE CABINET

If presidential power has been suddenly aggrandized, it is not only because power has flowed laterally from the Congress but also because it has flowed upward from the Cabinet. The decline of the authority of cabinet members has been perhaps the most fundamental of all the forces affecting the power balance in the national government.

In the early days of the Republic, the Cabinet usually included the principal leaders of the President's party and covered the spectrum of the party's composition. Presidents often named to their cabinets men who had been their principal rivals for the party's nomination. Prominent members of the Senate were commonly appointed, along with political leaders from the major states. Men like Clay and Calhoun, Webster and Seward, Sherman and Bryan sat in presidential cabinets because they had independent power bases that demanded, or deserved, recognition. And cabinets were used as consultative bodies. Presidents could still ignore or overrule them, of course. Lincoln could say, "Seven noes and one aye; the ayes have it." But at least he asked for his Cabinet's opinion, and he took a vote.

Now, all this has changed. Replacing the Cabinet as the President's consultative group has been a presidential-level staff composed of appointees who have no outside power bases and hence no independence. This staff formulates policy for the President, issues orders on his behalf, and supervises and coordinates their execution. It has enabled the President to assume command of the executive branch in a sense that is truly military. As in an army, so in the executive branch it is now the headquarters staff that decides; the cabinet officers, reduced to the status of field commanders, execute.

In the old days, the President had to rely on his Cabinet; its members were all he had to run the government with. Now, with his modern management apparatus, the President need no longer even talk with them. Nor has he time. No President since Eisenhower has used the Cabinet even as a consultative body. It meets pro forma, if at all, as a convenient way for the President to give pep talks and issue instructions. With the Cabinet's decline in status has come an inevitable change in the character of its members. The nineteenth-century tradition that the President appoint strong political leaders with independent power bases has withered away—a trend that has reached a kind of culmination in the present administration.

The last thing an ambitious presidential staff wants is department heads with independent power bases. Such men have the strength to be defiant and cause trouble. What such a White House staff wants is, in the words of one former Nixon aide, men "who will, when the White House orders them to jump, only ask 'how high?'" To make doubly sure that department heads would be compliant, the White House has systematically placed in subcabinet positions, as under secretaries or in lesser posts, trusted political and White House aides.

But the flow of power from the departments to the presidency, like the shift in the congressional-presidential balance, has not been the product of pure willfulness. Here, too, the trend has had a basis in the realities of modern government. The executive branch does need central direction and coordination; it cannot be treated as a cluster of independent satrapies, each responsive only to its clientele. There must be a coordinated budget. Departments do have to respond to common policies established by officials responsible to the people through elective processes—and the only such official in the executive branch is the President. These needs, too, are affected by the greater complexity, the faster tempo, and the closer interrelationships among governmental ac-

tivities. In domestic fields, as in war and diplomacy, the government must be able to marshal its resources and act decisively and consistently whether the battle is against inflation or pollution, a recession or an energy shortage.

The answer to the problem of misused presidential power is not to try to disperse the essential components of that power among semi-independent agencies within the executive branch. That would only reintroduce the problems of conflict and administrative weakness that compelled the centralization of power in the first place. Besides being unwise, such an approach would be essentially unenforceable. The Congress could probably find ways, through its appropriation power, to reduce somewhat the size of the White House and Executive Office staffs, but the Congress has shown no wish to interfere with a President's way of doing business to the point of trying to dismantle the presidential office. Short of such a step, there is no way to enforce a new set of President-Cabinet relations. A President can hardly be compelled to appoint strong and independent political figures to the Cabinet and to repose power in them if he prefers to rely on White House aides. The organization of the executive branch is, by its nature, an executive function.

DID THE FOUNDING FATHERS ERR?

If the power of the presidency cannot be reduced very much—and if, in a fast-moving and complex world, it probably should not be—then how does one solve the basic problem of too much power in one man? I suggest that most current analysis of the problem has been misdirected because it concentrates on the first three words of that phrase; *too much power*. I submit that the solution is to be found by looking, instead at the last three words: *in one man*.

An institutional principle applied almost universally in the English-speaking world is that major decisions should be made not by one man acting alone, but by a collective body of some kind. In the United States, legislatures are all plural bodies. So are juries, the higher courts, and the regulatory commissions. Corporations and voluntary service organizations, school systems and universities are run by plural boards of directors who select and supervise the managers. In political parties the ultimate authority lies in conventions and committees. The one great exception to this principle is the executive branch of the United States government (along with the executive branches of the state governments and some city governments that are patterned after it).

In other English-speaking countries, even such exceptions do not exist. Executive power rests in plural cabinets, as it does in most non-English-speaking democracies as well. Even in the nondemocracies, power is often lodged at least formally in plural bodies such as the Politburo in the Soviet Union.

This pattern is not accidental. Rather, it embodies a wisdom that has evolved over centuries of experience with human organization. Societies have learned again and again that to entrust power to one man is inherently dangerous. He may be erratic or impulsive or obsessive in his judgments, or arbitrary and unfair. He may be incompetent, a bungler. He may be lazy, negligent, or corrupt. He may pervert the ends of the organization for his own benefit, whether to gain money or punish enemies or reward friends, or simply to perpetuate himself and his followers in office. Hence, in almost every organization the restraint of collective decision-making is forced upon the leader. He is made subordinate to, or required to act as a member of, a plural body of some kind. It may be called by many names—commission, council, board, committee, senate, house, cabinet—but its members have a degree of independence of the leader.

Plural decision-making has its own drawbacks, obviously. It can cause delay, undue caution, and resistance to innovation. Those who seek spectacular progressivism are more likely to find it in presidents and governors than in congresses and legislatures, for the single leader can march without having to be in lockstep with anyone. But the experience of centuries has weighed the disadvantage against the merits and given its verdict—that the plural body, not the single leader, is better to be trusted. When a single executive is needed to dispatch the execution of a collective body's policy, he is made responsible to and is supervised by that body. Never is he left free to act unchecked, responsible only to the general membership of the organization and to himself.

If this be the folk wisdom, one must ponder how the Founding Fathers came to stray so far. They were sensitive to the danger of concentrating power in any institution, but in their day it was the prospect of too much power in the legislature that concerned them most. They feared that in a republic, the majority of the legislature would get out of hand and threaten the rights of the minority—and their fear seemed borne out by the experience of the states in the decade before the Constitutional Convention. As men of property, they feared the mob, the levelers. So the question was whether the President would be strong enough. Nevertheless, the vote for a one-man presidency was not unanimous. The Convention debated whether the head of the executive branch should be one man or three; seven states preferred the single executive, three states the plural. Had the Founders foreseen how the system of presidential election they designed would change—how the power of selection would pass from a judicious electoral college made up of leading citizens to a popular process resting largely on the vote of citizens in primary and general elections—one can wonder what the vote on a plural presidency would have been.

A POSSIBLE SOLUTION

Could the presidency be pluralized? No proposal to scrap the institution and begin anew could be seriously considered. What is needed is a remedy that could be grafted onto the existing system with the least possible disruption of its basic structure.

The simplest device that might serve to introduce an element of collective judgment into the exercise of executive power may be the one by which the executive in a parliamentary system is controlled. That is the device of dismissal of a government through a parliamentary vote of "no confidence," which could be added to the American system by a simple constitutional amendment.

This provision would have both a direct and an indirect effect. The direct effect would be to make possible the removal of a President who, though not guilty of the provable "high crimes and misdemeanors" that are the basis for impeachment, has lost the capacity to lead and inspire and unify the country—in short, the capacity to govern. On more than one occasion in the past, a President whose effectiveness had been destroyed through incompetence, gross negligence, egregious errors in foreign or domestic policy, or crimes and misdemeanors committed by those who had intimately shared his confidence and acted in his name, has remained in office until the end of his allotted four years—and nothing could be done about it. No other democratic government leaves itself so vulnerable.

If the "no confidence" procedure were introduced into our Constitution, a President to keep his office would have to do more than keep himself free of indictable crime. He would have to satisfy the Congress—and therefore the people, for the Congress would hardly act in such a matter in defiance of the people—with his conduct of the govern-

ment. And what could be more consistent with democratic theory than that?

The probability, of course, is that the power to vote "no confidence," like the power to impeach, would be rarely used. Consequently the indirect effect would be more important. Though by no means wholly predictable, the indirect effect would probably be to introduce some elements of plural decision-making at the presidential level.

A President who was forced, under the Constitution, to maintain the confidence of the country and of the Congress would find it necessary to consult with congressional leaders in the exercise of his executive powers. He would not dare to do otherwise: it would be dangerous to flout them and risky to keep secrets from them. To retain their confidence, he would have to take them into his.

What would happen at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, on Capitol Hill? The result, one may speculate hopefully, would be a rejuvenation of congressional leadership. The President obviously could not consult with the 535 members of Congress. He would have to share his confidences, and his power, with the leaders chosen by the Congress—the leaders of his own party if they were in the majority, the leaders of both parties if the opposition party controlled the Congress. If the electorate had chosen a President of one party and a Congress of the other, as seems to be its wont these days, there would have to be a degree of bipartisan collaboration. But that has its advantages as well as disadvantages; it has proved fruitful on many occasions in the past.

Working out the mechanics of the simple basic idea would not be easy. The first requirement would be to make sure that the remedy of a "no confidence" vote would be used sparingly. No one would want to introduce into this country a system like that of France's Third Republic or of Italy today under which governments can be toppled every few months for partisan or trivial reasons. Therefore, the proposed power to remove a President should be accompanied by a restraint also present in many parliamentary systems—the provision that the members of the legislature, if they vote "no confidence," can also be forced to face a new election. In other words, senators and congressmen would have to submit their action to the approval of the voters. New terms for everybody—the President and members of Congress (with senators' terms staggered for two, four, and six years)—would begin with the new election. In the meantime the Vice President would head a caretaker government.

The new election presumably should be held as soon as possible, and that would not be easy to square with our system of regular elections held on designated calendar dates. But there is no magic in regular elections beyond the convenience they offer the student in memorizing history in neat four-year blocks. Other countries have done very well with systems of elections that occur at odd times, in any month of the year, whenever a government loses confidence and a new government with a fresh mandate must be formed. When that occurs, those countries have found that it makes little sense to wait a year, or two, or three, as we do, until the calendar rolls around to an appointed month. Yet if the holding of elections in April, June, or even September would violate the criterion of "least possible disruption," the new election could be scheduled for the next November after the vacancy occurred, for new full terms or merely for unexpired terms.

In any case, the purpose would be served. The President would have to level with congressional leaders on matters like Vietnam and make certain they went along. If burglars were discovered in the headquarters of the opposition party, the President could hardly

dismiss it as a "bizarre episode." The leaders of Congress would be in a position, on crucial matters, to make demands and say "or else." Major decisions would come to be taken in consultation. The executive power that the Founding Fathers reposed in the President alone would be on its way to being shared—checked and balanced, as it were. The fundamental danger of rash or corrupting decisions taken by a lone President would to that extent be reduced.

RECYCLING GARBAGE AS AN ENERGY SOURCE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in response to the energy crisis, many agencies have begun research and experimentation programs to develop new energy sources. There is reason to remind these agencies, however, that other long-established groups do exist, which already have valuable energy research programs in effect. These groups have done much pioneer work which need not be redone by other agencies.

Recently, I have been made aware of the work accomplished by the Forest Products Laboratory of the University of California at Berkeley, under the direction of Mr. Fred Dickinson. In particular, the University of California pyrolysis combustion process, which is used to create energy from wood pulp, has been found to be very efficient.

Mr. Speaker, the text of a letter explaining the work achieved by Mr. Dickinson and his coworkers and the text of an article appearing in the Santa Rosa Press Democrat on January 12, 1971, describing their work follows:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY,
Richmond, Calif., December 21, 1973.

HON. JEROME WALDIE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALDIE: A week or two ago I noticed an article in the trade press stating that the Bureau of Mines is intending to build a pilot plant near Albany, Oregon, to produce gases and oils from wood residue, presumably to develop a process which will aid in meeting the energy crisis. The brief description indicated that a pyrolysis process is to be used.

Here at the University's Forest Products Laboratory we have been investigating the pyrolysis of wood and other ligno-cellulosic materials for a number of years and have developed a high level of expertise in this field. This work has been supported by State funds (University of California regular budget funds for the Agricultural Experiment Station) and federal funds (Public Health Service, Bureau of Solid Waste Management and Environmental Protection Agency). Under the first two grants we studied the pyrolysis of solid waste and pulping liquors and under an E.P.A. contract, which is just terminating, we have developed the process of pyrolysis as a chemical recovery process for the kraft pulping of wood which eliminates odors associated with the usual recovery furnace. This process is essentially ready for commercialization. The University of California Pyrolysis Combustion Process is efficient, capable of producing energy, and chemicals (both organic and inorganic). The attached article appearing in the Santa Rosa

Press Democrat, January 12, 1971, essentially describes our studies to that date.

My purpose in writing is to inform you of our research and to indicate that we have both the know-how and the physical plant to conduct studies leading to commercialization of pyrolysis to produce energy. It would seem a waste of dollars and of time to establish another experimental unit to cover the ground which we have already covered. Also as a substantial amount of Federal funds have gone into our studies, it would seem only reasonable that further investigations by Federal Agencies take advantage of the expertise of the Laboratory staff and facilities which have developed as a result of these expenditures.

I would appreciate any assistance you could give us in bringing this to the attention of the proper persons in the Bureau of Mines as well as other bureaus and agencies that might be interested.

Very sincerely,

FRED E. DICKINSON,
Director.

[From the Press Democrat, Jan. 21, 1971]

A BREAKTHROUGH ON GARBAGE DISPOSAL
(By Bob Wells)

RICHMOND.—Dr. David L. Brink, professor of forestry and forest products chemist at the University of California Forest Products Laboratory here, is a proper scientist who would be a bit shocked if anyone said he is "fomenting a revolution."

But that phraseology comes to mind on hearing what he is doing about solving some of the major problems in re-cycling or eliminating wastes—domestic, commercial, industrial—his efforts may have some substantial influence soon on how mankind tackles these problems.

"Fomenting" is a wrong word, of course. The right term is pyrolysis—combustion, described as "Chemical decomposition of organic materials heated in an environment having insufficient oxygen for combustion." A kind of "fire without flame."

And of course the "revolution" is not the bullets-and-barricades sort but one of those long-time, painstaking, scientific struggles that sometimes pay off in major benefits for millions of persons.

Dr. Brink wouldn't say it like that of course. A greying, slender man who likes bow ties and a 12-hour working day, he explains that he is actually working on two processes to handle wastes, both of which originated with experiments relating to wood.

Inside the laboratory he and his assistants are working with an experimental plant using the "wet oxidation" principle which can handle waste materials by oxidizing them in a sealed chamber with oxygen injected from a compressor system.

P-C PLANT

The pyrolysis-combustion setup is behind the laboratory sitting on a concrete pad, and can be called the P-C plant for short. It looks something like a small feed mill with some complex plumbing.

A university publication on sanitary engineering noted the experiment recently, saying the P-C process has been known a long time, being used in wood distillation and coal coking for years, and now in petroleum refining.

The process is being developed "with the ultimate goal of reclaiming a large fraction of organic material from organic wastes and turning them into useful products for fuels for energy."

There is a lot of meat hanging on that bare-bones scientific lingo.

Working with Dr. Brink on the P-C system is Dr. Jerome F. Thomas, a member of the Sanitary Engineering Research Laboratory at the Berkeley campus. That is his primary assignment, but in practice he and Dr.

Brink do some work at Berkeley and the Forest Products Laboratory.

Dr. Brink said they started putting the plant together about three years ago. There has been some federal financial aid from the U.S. Public Health Service's National Air Pollution Control Administration and the Bureau of Solid Waste Management.

It is impossible to say how much money has gone into P-C by now. Professors and graduate students have put in a lot of time on it, plus the more prosaic labor of constructing the plant itself.

"At this point," he said, "we are gathering engineering data, demonstrating technological and economic feasibility." This will take perhaps a year to complete.

Then this data can be talked over with interested parties—districts, lumber mills and other plants with a waste problem—anyone with a serious interest.

BEGAN WITH PULP

Dr. Brink stresses that this all began with a study on black kraft liquor, which is the major cause of bad odors around pulp mills. Kraft liquor was run through the P-C process concentrated to 50 per cent solids.

This led to studies in processing other materials so Dr. Brink now is confident that a wide variety of wastes can be processed and "there could be a substantial profit."

These can include "any organic matter of plant origin" which opens up a lot of doors:

The kraft liquor has been noted, Dr. Brink commenting that "One of our major hopes for this is that it will eliminate production of malodorous products."

Other lumber industry residues, like bark and sawdust, may be run through. "We are not disposing of these materials," he commented, "but utilizing them."

Also in the lignocellulosic family are field crop residues, straw from rice, wheat, oats and barley, rice hulls, orchard clippings, grass, cannery wastes, paper, manure, and sludge from sewage treatment plants.

GARBAGE

Here the "revolution" manifests itself, as the applications are something to goad the imagination.

Garbage can be run through the P-C system, possibly with enough profit from derivatives and by-products to pay for the cost of collection.

Dr. Brink won't predict the system could eliminate sewage treatment plants, as handling sewage involves so many elements. However, the P-C could handle sludge, one of the largest disposal problems faced by cities and other agencies.

"This system could be designed as an integral part of sewage treatment plants," Dr. Brink said.

The importance to agriculture is vast, as P-C could solve many problems such as pollution by agricultural burning which is coming under a new set of state laws regulating the practice.

(University experiments with chopping up prunings and working them into the soil have proven inconclusive; such prunings, particularly the larger pieces, carry diseases over for a year or two. Disease control is a prime reason for the burning.)

The P-C experimental plant is fired with natural gas for the reason this is a "constant" or known point of departure, a base for development of data on the process itself.

When fully explored, the system will produce its own gas supply, which will provide heat to carry on the P-C process and excess gas which can be diverted to other uses, such as producing electricity via a steam-driven generator.

POWER SOURCE

This opens up many more possibilities. The nation is running out of electricity so to speak, as shown by the vast blackout in the East some years ago and periodic dim-outs

marked by appeals from power companies to conserve power.

In this area, the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. maintains this will not occur. The geothermal plants at The Geysers will help stave off a shortage.

Nuclear power? The supply of fuel is limited, and scientists say we have used up one per cent of the source already—and have barely started nuclear plant development.

There is talk of a "self-breeding" electric plant which would need no fuel but this is years away at least.

Obviously if the mountains of waste materials could be utilized in part for generating electricity the prospects are immense.

Why didn't someone develop this P-C system before Dr. Brink and his associates? It's something like the Wright Brothers and the Dallas Cowboys—they "put it all together."

There are a few ground rules: The P-C plant can't digest metal, glass, brick, stone—These have to be removed mechanically by means already known.

Also the particles can't be too large. They would have to pass through a screen up to an inch in diameter. Generally, the smaller the better.

FIRST STAGE

The plant has a bottom-feed system with a hopper and fan. Then comes a first stage, in which hot gas is shot up, in a carefully metered flow, and pyrolysis starts. This first reactor is stainless steel with high corrosion resistance.

Temperatures range from 700 to 1,400 Fahrenheit.

The second stage probably represents the key factor in the development. This reactor is lined with "alumina castable ceramic material" which can stand high temperatures, the process requiring from 1,400 to 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit.

This is necessary to handle the kraft liquor, minimizing production of undesirable products. No metal could withstand the temperature and corrosion at this point.

In the first stage, the solids are dried and steam goes off. In the second stage, several gases are produced such as hydrogen, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, methane, and small amounts of propane, acetylene, propylene and some others.

These gases, most of them useful can be separated by a "stream" system and "scrubbed" to take out particles and other air pollutants.

Then the useful gases are stored, to be used partially to heat the process (as the natural gas is doing now) and partially to produce steam for electricity production.

NO AIR POLLUTION

But what about air pollution? In layman's language, the P-C produces no smoke and no stink.

In Dr. Brink's language, the unit "can be as pollution-free as a power plant that burns what is known as producers' gas. It is clean to the extent that you can burn gas."

This means that in the final stack potential pollutants are injected to be burned before they can enter the atmosphere. (Something like this is done to cut odors from rendering plants and other facilities.)

This article can't very well trace the route of all these materials through the P-C setup, but Dr. Brink says he is "highly optimistic" that it is all going to work—both technically and profitably.

And why has this not been well publicized, aside from the inner university network? It would appear that Dr. Brink and his fellow "fomenters" would be of keen interest to those wishing to preserve the environment—which some doggedly persist in calling the ecology.

Also, it seems that the P-C process would rate close attention from cities like Petaluma, now facing another multimillion dollar bond

issue to expand sewer facilities. And many other cities and districts with a waste problem. And counties with dumps.

Time will tell. It won't be long until the researchers here will have it ready to lay out for interested parties.

PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the events surrounding the Watergate break-in have raised many questions in the minds of the people. If any good can be said to have come from this sordid affair it is that we, in Congress, are finding out—most graphically—where the system has failed. For the further information of my colleagues I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point a cogent front page editorial from the January 4, 1974, Quincy, Mass., Patriot Ledger on just one facet of this scandal where legislation may be appropriate:

WHOSE PAPERS?

Amidst the controversy over whether President Nixon did or did not properly meet the requirements of the income tax law in claiming a half-million-dollar deduction for giving his vice presidential papers to the nation lies a more important question:

To whom do the papers really belong?

The documents in question were produced while Mr. Nixon was on the public payroll. Most of them were written in government offices, on government paper, with government pens, pencils and typewriters, all of which were paid for by the taxpayers. They concerned public business, and the market value claimed for them is based on their historic importance.

So why aren't they the public's papers to begin with?

The answer is, they should be, and we think Congress ought to change the law to make it so.

This is not to deny Mr. Nixon or any other public official his right to write memoirs based on documents, or to be allowed to assemble those documents in a library.

But the question of tax write-offs for the "gift" of the papers ought not to arise, because the papers should not be the officials' to give.

It is an affront to the public for an official to magnanimously "give" the nation documents that already belong to the public.

Congress took a quarter step in the right direction by limiting to \$50,000 the amount of tax deductions for donating official papers. However, that is still \$50,000 too much.

MAKING CONGRESSIONAL SENSE OF THE BUDGET

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of our more thoughtful colleagues, BARBER CONABLE, has authored concise and "to the point" commentary on the budget-reform legislation that the House passed last year.

It succinctly sets forth the need for the proposed reform and the events that make it necessary. Congressman CONABLE's article deserves our attention for it can help ward off any diminishing commitment to budget reform, should anyone be so tempted.

The article, as it appeared in the January edition of the Ripon Forum, follows:

MAKING CONGRESSIONAL SENSE OF THE BUDGET

(By BARBER B. CONABLE, Jr.)

Reforms are difficult to achieve. There is no more conservative institution than government, particularly about its own functioning, and representative government is the hardest to reform because there are always so many bases to be touched in preparation for change. Thus, while the American total system is dynamic and constantly changing, our government traditionally is a heel-dragging institution, refusing to acknowledge even internal changes long after the need for accommodation has become painfully apparent.

No better evidence is available than the reluctance with which Congress has moved to deal with functional necessities occasioned by the fiscal explosion of the mid-sixties. Any casual observer could see the proliferation of categorical grant programs which escalated domestic expenditures upward even more impressively than the Vietnam War escalated military expenditures. The Great Society, with its great greedy heart, could not conceive of a national need for which a centrally controlled grant program could not be quickly assembled. During the 1960's federal categorical grants expanded five times to \$37 billion. As these programs soared past a thousand, some of our governmental departments became not so much administering agencies as a collection of cubbyholes. Partly as a result, Congress could not even count on good policy advice from the Administration about how to differentiate among the forms of largesse. Every program had its vested interest, its unmet need, its bureaucratic defenders, and hence its expectancy.

The typical congressman—never very skilled in oversight capability but increasingly skilled in the techniques of political survival—found it more and more dangerous to try to sort out the relative importance of these myriad programs. The easiest and safest course was to consider each program as though it existed in a vacuum rather than saying "this" was more important than "that," thus offending all the friends of "that." It was hoped that somebody, somewhere, was keeping track of it all and preventing the whole process from getting too much out of control. But since that "somebody" was the budget director and the "somewhere" was the executive branch, thoughtful congressmen began to realize there was a connection between these budgetary practices and the erosion of congressional power.

In a government based on checks and balances, power seems to belong to those who control the negatives. The Office of Management and Budget increasingly performed this function as Congress refused to take responsibility for keeping it all within a manageable whole. Congress could and frequently did quarrel with OMB's priorities; but Congress couldn't quarrel with the need for priorities, nor could it expect to remain a significant part of the government, unless it made the effort to establish its own priorities. Put another way, Congress couldn't effectively argue about OMB's measure if it didn't get a yardstick of its own.

That's what it's all about. The Budget Control Bill passed by the House in December will be before the Senate this year and could

take effect in 1975. When the bill becomes effective, Congress will have to set ceilings on outlays and revenues each year, prepare its own budget proposals, return to the Appropriations Committee control of forms of spending which are not now subject to such review, and extend the fiscal year (to begin on October 1 rather than July 1) so that all spending can be compared at one time to the earlier Budget Committee targets. The ceilings set earlier in the year can be reviewed and revised all at one time in September, but every step in the process has to be related to every other step. The process is cumbersome and is not a panacea. It is intended to provide a discipline within which the congressional will to govern can be rediscovered.

In the end, whether the process works or not may depend on competitive factors. The pressure for this reform diminished perceptibly after the Watergate events reduced the effectiveness of the presidency. Congress may resent and circumvent the cumbersome budget procedures the reform embodies if it does not feel threatened by the presidential fiscal alternatives.

It is noteworthy that the budget reform proposal was couched in the House with a measure automatically reversing presidential impoundments by veto of either House. One wishes that congressional responsibility would rise as the effectiveness of the presidency declines. But in the competitive world of politics, this writer fears that strength is needed to inspire strength, and that discipline is the response to discipline. In any event, congressional fiscal reform is well worth the effort and constitutes "system maintenance work" of worthy purpose.

DR. DAVID BEEMAN

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. David Beeman, professor of speech at Olivet Nazarene College in Kankakee, Ill., wrote to me expressing his concern for the speech and hearing handicapped. Dr. Beeman offered his time and assistance in developing legislation and communications with these people. We agreed to meet during the Christmas recess to set up some plans.

But Dr. Beeman and his wife Sudie were killed in a plane crash on December 23, and I never had the opportunity to visit with him. My lost opportunity was minor compared to the loss felt by those who knew him well, but I cannot help but feel a personal loss nonetheless.

Dr. Beeman was diligent in his work at Olivet Nazarene College, and spent many, many hours giving of himself to those less educated and privileged than himself.

The Daily Journal in Kankakee wrote a moving editorial about Dr. Beeman and his life, and I am offering it for your consideration today.

[From the Kankakee (Ill.) Daily Journal, Dec. 26, 1973]

BEEMAN'S SERVICE

Devoutly religious people face an ageless dilemma: staying true to a demanding faith while remaining hard at work in an imperfect world. Dr. David S. Beeman, killed in a plane crash Sunday, was one of those few human beings who successfully meshed their spirit-

ual commitment with vocation, avocations and community service.

We remember the time that a guest speaker, anxious to establish rapport with members of a civic club, asked about the vocations represented at the luncheon meeting.

Any college professors here?

Beeman raised his hand.

Any media executives here?

Beeman raised his hand.

Any preachers here?

Beeman raised his hand.

Well, any car salesmen here?

By this time, the speaker was watching the Olivet Nazarene College professor and Beeman had not raised his hand. As guffaws rose from the audience, Beeman drawled, "If the gas shortage doesn't ease, I may turn into a used car salesman just once."

Dr. Beeman was orthodox in his Nazarene religious convictions but somewhat unorthodox in his teaching and civic activities, endeavoring him to Olivetians and the general community. "I'd work with anyone, regardless of his creed, if he shares a common goal for a better community," he once told us.

He had, in recent years, served as acting dean of the college, registrar, professor of speech and chairman of the speech department, and faculty manager for the college radio station, but still found time to assist special reading programs at Pembroke, adult education at Kankakee Community College, and be an active member of the Exchange Club.

An ONC student tells of the time that, while completing an examination, he forgot the proper use of Roman numerals and switched to Arabic numbering. The student justified himself with the scribbled note: "Give those back to the Romans."

The graded paper was returned with Beeman's imprimatur: "O.K. with me."

The loss of Dr. and Mrs. Beeman is a tragedy to the college and to the community but we would remind those who grieve that the Beemans believed strongly that the tragedies of this world were small compared to the eternal promises of God. May we all take solace in their faith.

INFLATION

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, during all of 1973, we here in Congress spent quite a bit of time on how and where we should be spending our Federal tax dollars in order to achieve a more sensible economic policy. In fact, most of what we have seen, heard and read in the news media seems to point out one overwhelming concern: Our constituents are worrying about the fiscal situation that is facing our country today.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the American public is starting to ask themselves, "when is Congress going to act responsibly to the fiscal needs of the country?" The public's attitude on this matter has been heightened in light of the spiraling increases in food prices and the skyrocketing prices of home buying, credit, clothes and the other necessities of life.

I believe it is long past due that Congress be honest with itself and put the blame where it belongs—on Congress itself and its apparent approval of the Government's deficit spending programs.

The word "inflation" is on the mind of every person in this country and we here in Congress have nurtured and fed the economic disease for the past 30 years. During this span of time, Congress kept approving higher and most costly programs in the name of social progress and spending billions upon billions of the taxpayer's money to countries abroad for the sake of friendship.

Now the heavy-burdened American taxpayer is tired of it all and is simply asking us to help solve some of his fiscal problems; problems that we, in Congress, have created for him by our wasteful neglect throughout these years.

In the 30 years past, Congress has continually passed appropriation bill after bill without the slightest regard to the Government's income. This type of practice is not economically healthy. In fact, it is deadly.

I do not have to tell you of our spending habits in the fifties or sixties because all one has to do is look at what we have been doing in the past couple of years. For instance, in 1972 we had a total budget of \$248 billion yet we managed to overspend \$22 billion. In 1973, the budget was \$280 billion and yet we managed to overspend almost \$25 billion. Last year the budget was increased to almost \$290 billion and the latest figures reveal that we will have overspent the budget by about \$14 billion.

Now the 1975 budget is being asked for and it will total a whopping \$310 billion. How much will be overspent on this one? If a business or individual family followed the same spending practice as does the government it would soon face economic disaster.

The United States is now approaching a debt of almost \$500 billion. In more personal terms, that amounts to almost \$2,500 for every man, woman and child in this country. Yet, over the vehement objections of many of us, the majority in this Congress has been on a wild and reckless spending spree that consistently forces the Treasury to borrow more money in order to pay the bills.

We are obligated to every citizen and taxpayer of this country to see that their money is not being wasted on programs that have brought failure—be it programs here at home or abroad. We cannot afford, financially or morally, to continue this way. I am urging every member of this body to give serious thought to this problem and to give it top priority in all decisionmaking. We must begin to mend our ways now—we cannot afford to wait any longer.

AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an amendment I intend to offer to the Federal Energy

Administration Act during debate under the 5-minute rule:

H.R. 11793—FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

Page 36, line 6, strike out "one year" and insert the following: "three months."

THE AMERICAN WEST EXHIBITION

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, JIM WRIGHT, of Texas, was recently present at the opening of the American West Exhibition in Warsaw, Poland. This exhibition was made possible under the auspice of the National Museum of Art working with the Amon Carter Museum of Western Art in Mr. WRIGHT's native city of Fort Worth, Tex.

I felt that his introductory remarks in honor of this cultural event would be of interest to my colleagues. His remarks not only stressed the historical bonds between Poland and the United States, but also emphasized the continuing ties between these two great nations as demonstrated in the cooperation that existed in the organization and promotion of this great exhibit.

I trust that this will be of interest to my colleagues.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JIM WRIGHT, AT OPENING OF THE AMERICAN WEST EXHIBITION

Mr. Minister, Mr. Ambassador, Distinguished Guests: Thank you for your warm and hospitable reception here today. It is for me a matter of pride to be present at the opening of this important exhibition, entitled *The American West*. This is a truly significant occasion in the history of cultural relationships between our two countries.

It is fully appropriate in many ways that this exhibition of original 19th and 20th Century American Paintings, the first of its kind ever shown in Poland, should be held here at this prestigious national museum in this historic city. The City of Warsaw, as all men know, symbolizes through its very history the indomitable spirit of man. To all the world this capital city epitomizes the enduring strength of men who would rather die on their feet than live on their knees.

I am told that one of the very few buildings left standing after the systematic devastation of this great capital was the one in which we now are assembled. Perhaps it is the appreciation of this very spirit, symbolically represented by this justly famous museum and national collection, that most of all makes today's opening uniquely significant. For in a very real way, this exhibit is the cultural representation of a similar but slightly different expression of the same indomitable character of men who braved the raw and primitive dangers of a vast unknown territory, with not much more than bare hands and an invincible will to civilize a wilderness.

I am proud to represent the United States as well as the State of Texas on this memorable occasion. I sincerely hope that the people of Poland, who have been so gracious to us in their hospitality, will enjoy these paintings and the rich story they tell. In this way, perhaps you will be able to gain a deeper insight into the true spirit of our West

which is inseparably woven into the fabric of American life and thought. I need not remind you that many of the men who helped us win and finally tame the West were born here in Poland. Poles have always played a distinguished role in every aspect of American history. This is one of the deep natural bonds which bring our peoples together.

No American could be unappreciative of the strong and durable Polish ores which went into the cauldron of our national history to form the alloy of our national character. The names of Kosciuszko and Pulaski occupy places of special honor in the struggle for American independence, and several American cities proudly bear their names.

In the Congressional committee on which I serve, I sit side by side with a great American named John Kluczynski, the principal legislative architect and champion of our Interstate Highway system, surely the most extensive public works undertaking in our Nation's history.

He is descended directly from Polish antecedents, as are Senator Edmund Muskie, the Democratic Party's nominee in 1968 for the Vice Presidency of the U.S., and such other important contemporary American lawmakers as Clement Zablocki, the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Thaddeus Dulski, the Chairman of our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and other colleagues of mine who bear such names as Derwinski, Rostenkowski, Pucinski, Nedzi and Dingell.

There also is an American legislator named O'Konski, but he may be an Irishman.

There is no need for me to describe or explain these paintings. You can interpret them as well as I. Painting, like music, speaks a universal language which transcends the petty barriers that man in his folly has erected between himself and his neighbor.

Today we build together a bridge rather than a wall. The exhibit we are about to see has been made possible through the generous cooperation of the Polish Ministry of Culture and the National Museum of Art, working with the Amon Carter Museum of Western Art in my native city of Fort Worth, Texas, as well as several other American museums and private collections.

The mutual cooperation demonstrated here exemplifies the growing spirit of cooperation not only in culture but in many other areas of human endeavor as well which now exists between our two countries. The presence of this exhibition in Warsaw today also demonstrates a growing mutual awareness on the part of the peoples of our two countries for the respective national culture of the other. This fact alone gives rise to feelings of great pride and satisfaction for myself and my countrymen.

Permit me, then, to extend my personal thanks and very best wishes for continued success to the organizers and hosts of this important exhibition.

ICE ENGINEERING FACILITIES

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, this week it was my pleasure to tour the new ice engineering laboratory complex of ARCTEC, Inc., in Columbia, Md. This facility is one of the most advanced of its kind in the country and includes a large model towing basin, a hydraulics laboratory, and a refrigerated flume. The facility contains all the requirements for the Nation's basic and applied investigations of ice

phenomena related to oceans, rivers, lakes, harbors, and other navigable waters.

At the present time the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is in the planning stages of developing an ice engineering facility to be located at the U.S. Army Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory in Hanover, N.H. The price tag of this new facility has not yet been ascertained, but it is possible that a request for authorization will be contained in the budget for the next fiscal year.

It would appear that the Government is about to duplicate a facility that already exists and is doing about 60 percent of its business with the Federal Government now. I would hope that the planners in the Corps of Engineers, who recently visited ARCTEC, will take into consideration the existence of this outstanding extant facility and realize that a laboratory already exists which is fully capable of meeting their requirements.

REV. FATHER HUGH GRAHAM'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY AS A PRIEST

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of a proclamation presented to Father Hugh Graham, of St. Rose of Lima Roman Catholic Church in Massapequa, N.Y., in recognition of his 50th anniversary as a priest.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Father Hugh Graham has so diligently and with love and devotion served as a Roman Catholic Priest for 50 years, and is on Sunday, December 16, 1973, celebrating his 50th Anniversary in the service of God; and

Whereas, before coming to St. Rose of Lima in 1959, he served as a Curate at St. Brigid's of Brooklyn, and as a Pastor of St. Anne's of Brentwood and St. Mary's of Long Beach; and

Whereas, he has also served as Chaplain at St. Joseph's Academy in Brentwood and Pilgrim State Hospital, and as a member of the Board of Visitors at Kings Park State Hospital; and

Whereas, under the spiritual guidance and dedication of Father Graham, the growth of St. Rose of Lima has gone from a small-town parish to one of the largest Roman Catholic churches on Long Island, and his encouragement, involvement and example have played an important role in the planning and building of the St. Rose of Lima school, convent, rectory and church; its aesthetic appearance and functional layout are not by accident; and

Whereas, the priests, sisters and parishioners of St. Rose, both young and old, look to Father Graham not only for spiritual guidance, but also leadership, learning, counsel and inspiration. In St. Rose there is a true example and demonstration of Christian love, which he has helped to foster.

Now, therefore, we, the Town Board of the Town of Oyster Bay, do hereby extend to Father Graham, one of our outstanding residents, our most sincere congratulations on this milestone in his life and the life of the community, and thank him for the vital

interest he has taken not only in the affairs of the church, but in the surrounding community and in his fellow mankind.

FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION ACT

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would create a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. Primarily the Corporation would be responsible for the exploration for, development, and production of natural gas and oil resources on Federal lands. While the legislation will not be a one-step solution to the energy crisis, I feel that it would be a vital component of our Nation's energy program.

For the past several months I have been acutely concerned over the impact of the energy shortages on my congressional district. With Flint, Mich., the principal city, my district is the home of 11 General Motors plants. While other areas of the country have suffered increased unemployment, the latest reports for the Flint area indicate 12 percent unemployment due to plant layoffs.

Meanwhile, the debate over the role of the oil companies in the current energy situation continues to grow. Investigations of the major oil companies have revealed huge profits in the past year while the consumers must bear short supplies and soaring prices. In part, the American consumer is paying billions of dollars for oil because of the control the Mideast oil-producing countries have on prices. Last month the oil ministers of a handful of small countries determined an unprecedentedly high price of oil—\$17 per barrel compared to the highest price of oil the year before of \$3.60 per barrel.

In addition to setting the prices of world crude oil, the OAPEC—Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries—states placed demands on countries importing oil from them in terms of their foreign policies during the Arab-Israeli war. The United States cannot afford to sacrifice its independent foreign policy position to meet the demands of oil-exporting countries.

Looking at the domestic oil market, again it appears that the market is "rigged." According to the Federal Trade Commission staff study released last summer, the eight major oil companies control 50 percent of U.S. domestic production of crude oil, 58 percent of the Nation's refining capacity, and 55 percent of the gasoline market. Reports from my district and across the country show that while the top 20 oil companies are making record profits, independent jobbers and retailers are going out of business. One study indicated that 3,000 gasoline retailers were forced to close this year.

Despite the daily toll in terms of independents closed out, workers laid off,

skyrocketing fuel prices, and widespread shortages, the energy crisis continues to baffle the country. Despite warnings from many expert sources, the administration did not adequately anticipate the energy crisis and so far has come up with no coherent plan for dealing with it.

While there are many bills now pending before Congress designed to create means of solving our short- and long-term energy problems, I believe the bill to establish a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation is among the most promising. First, the proposed Federal oil and gas corporation would open up to the American people a vast wealth of reserves which they already own. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that over 50 percent of the 500 billion barrels of proven and potential oil reserves and of the 2,400 trillion cubic feet of proven and undiscovered gas reserves are under Federal lands. The Corporation would undertake exploration and development of these oil and gas resources on Federal lands.

To date, only 2 percent of Federal oil and gas bearing lands have been leased for exploration. However, to insure that the Corporation does not place the private oil and gas companies at a great disadvantage, they would be entitled to not more than 20 percent of the Federal oil and gas rights offered for lease at any single time.

Second, the operation of the Corporation would give the Government a much better idea of what the real costs of exploring for and developing oil and natural gas resources are. This complete and accurate information would greatly aid Congress in developing base pricing and regulatory policies for private corporations. Such information is vitally needed and, at the present time, virtually unavailable.

Third, the additional fuel generated by the Corporation would be an important contribution to meeting our energy needs. While the Corporation would be primarily engaged in exploration and production, the Corporation could sell its products if it were necessary to insure competitive conditions within the industry.

Fourth, the profits of the Corporation would return to the American people. Returns on the production of fuel from Federal lands would go to the Federal Treasury. Large dividends to the American people are expected from the development of our country's natural resources. While the bill authorizes up to \$50 million for the Corporation each year for 10 years, some feel only a small fraction of these funds will be necessary.

Finally, the Corporation would provide a competitive force in an industry that seems to need such input. The bill is in no way a forerunner of the nationalization of the oil and gas industry. From our experiences with the Tennessee Valley Authority, the involvement of the Government in such an enterprise can have significant and positive ramifications for private power production. Similar Government-owned or controlled oil corporations exist in many countries around the world—for example, Britain, France, Argentina, and India.

And in each, the private industries have thrived along side the Government-owned industries.

In conclusion, I am encouraged by the interest that has been shown in the concept of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation and join my colleagues in the House and Senate who have also introduced legislation to establish such a corporation. In face of the serious problems which our Nation is facing, and in view of the functions of the bill as outlined above, I feel that this legislation could play a critical role in our country's future and urge immediate and serious attention to the proposal. A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to secure adequate and reliable supplies of natural gas and oil at the lowest reasonable cost to the consumer, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this title may be cited as the "Federal Oil and Gas Corporation Act".

SEC. 2. The Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 34. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

"(1) the Federal Government must become directly involved in securing and developing sources of natural gas and oil to assure adequate supplies of these fuels to American consumers at reasonable and competitive prices;

"(2) the Nation's need for energy supplies is so great that there is an urgent need to stimulate new competition in the production and sale in commerce of natural gas and oil and products refined and derived therefrom;

"(3) the people of the United States through the Federal Government own substantial lands which could be developed for the production of natural gas and oil;

"(4) American consumers would benefit if the forces of competition operated to a greater extent than at present in the world oil and gas market;

"(5) publicly available data on the cost of natural gas and oil production and reserves is needed to assure competition and fair regulation in the public interest; and

"(6) a corporation owned by the Federal Government, engaged in the development and sale of natural gas and oil, could provide competition in the energy industry and, through research and development, assure adequate supplies of these fuels without harm to the environment.

"(b) The Commission is directed to establish, in accordance with the provisions of this section, a corporation to be known as the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation').

"(c) (1) The Corporation shall be administered by a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'). The individuals appointed as members of the first Board shall be deemed the incorporators of the Corporation. The date of incorporation shall be held to the date of the first meeting of the first Board at which a quorum is present.

"(2) The Board shall consist of five qualified individuals who shall be selected by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate the Chairman. All members of the Board shall be individuals who believe and profess a belief in the feasibility and wisdom of this Act, and who believe and profess a demonstrable belief in environmental protection and the purposes of the antitrust and

consumer protection laws of the United States.

"(3) The terms of office of the members of the Board first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of selection, one at the end of the first year, one at the end of the second year, one at the end of the third year, one at the end of the fourth year, and one at the end of the fifth year following the date of incorporation. A successor to a member of the Board shall be appointed in the same manner as the original members and shall have a term of office expiring five years from the date of expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. Any member of the Board appointed to fill a vacancy in the Board occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(4) Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting the business of the Corporation.

"(5) The Chairman of the Board shall be compensated at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule pay rates (5 U.S.C. 5313); the other members of the Board shall be compensated at the rate provided for level IV of the Executive Schedule pay rates (5 U.S.C. 5315), to be paid by the Corporation as current expenses. Members of the Board shall be reimbursed by the Corporation for actual expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Board by this section.

"(6) No member of the Board shall, during his term in office, be engaged in any other business, nor may he have any financial interest in any business entity which is engaged in the exploration, development, production, transportation, or sale of natural gas or oil.

"(7) All members of the Board shall avoid all contacts with any person which may tend to create actual or apparent conflict of interest with the Board member's duties and responsibilities under this Act. Each Board member shall refrain from any action which may actually or apparently impugn his stated belief in the purposes of this Act. To further assure the independence of Board members, their compensation shall be continued for a period of one year at a level equal to three-quarters of their compensation at the end of their term.

"(8) Any member of the Board may be removed from office at any time by joint resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"(d) (1) The Board shall, without regard to the provisions of civil service laws applicable to officers and employees of the United States, appoint such officers, managers, employees, attorneys, and other personnel as are necessary for the transaction of its business (including personnel to perform temporary and intermittent services), fix their compensation, define their duties, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and provide a system of organization to fix responsibility and promote efficiency. Any appointee of the Board may be removed at the discretion of the Board.

"(2) All contracts to which the Corporation is a party and which require the employment of laborers and mechanics in the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of facilities authorized under this title shall contain a provision that not less than the prevailing rate of wages for work of a similar nature in the vicinity shall be paid to such laborers or mechanics as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. 276a). In the determination of such prevailing rate or rates, due regard shall be given to those rates which have been secured through collective agreement by representatives of employers and employees. The Board shall not enter into any such contract without first obtaining assurance that required labor

standards will be maintained on the construction work. Health and safety standards promulgated by the secretary of Labor pursuant to section 107 of the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. 333) shall be applicable to all construction work performed under such contracts. Where such work as described in this paragraph is done directly by the Corporation the prevailing rate or rates of wages shall be paid in the same manner as though such work had been let by contract.

"(c) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, the Corporation—

"(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

"(2) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

"(3) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

"(4) may make contracts, as herein authorized;

"(5) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws;

"(6) may purchase or lease and hold such real and personal property as it deems necessary or convenient in the transaction of its business, and may dispose of any such personal or real property held by it;

"(7) shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers herein specifically conferred upon the Corporation;

"(8) shall have the power to explore for natural gas and oil on Federal, State, foreign, or private lands: *Provided*, That exploration on State lands shall be in accord with leasing or other State land disposition or utilization programs.

"(9) shall have the power to develop and sell natural gas or oil discovered by exploration, or otherwise obtained by sale, lease, purchase, exchange, or contract, and to build and operate all those facilities necessary for the development or sales of such resources, as herein authorized;

"(10) shall have the power to explore, develop, acquire, or sell natural gas and oil alone or on a joint or cooperative basis with any private or other public entity or entities: *Provided*, That no joint or cooperative basis is authorized if there is any likelihood that exploration, development, acquisition, or sale jointly or cooperatively with another entity or entities may adversely affect competition, restrain trade, further monopolization, or violate the spirit or content of any Federal statute respecting trade or commerce;

"(11) shall have the power to engage in research directed toward the development or utilization of abundant and nonpolluting supplies of energy, from whatever source, and may build, own, and operate research testing, or demonstration facilities, alone or on a joint or cooperative basis with private or other public entities; and

"(12) shall have the power to build, lease, purchase, or otherwise obtain and operate facilities necessary for the sale, purchase, transportation, or delivery of natural gas or oil: *Provided*, That no facility may be constructed or operated unless such facility meets and complies with all of the requirements of any Federal statute relating to environmental quality, or any regulation issued under such statute. As used herein, 'environmental quality' means those aspects of life and those objectives which are delineated in section 101(b) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331(b)) and which it is the purpose of such Act to protect.

"(f) (1) The Corporation is empowered to incur debt for capital purposes. Such debt may be incurred in the form of bonds, debentures, equipment trust certificates, conditional sales agreements, or any other form of securities, agreements, or obligations (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'obligations').

"(2) Payment of principal and interest on

obligations issued by the Corporation under this subsection is guaranteed by the United States. Such guarantee shall be expressed on the face of the obligation. The Corporation may also incur debt not guaranteed by the United States. Proceeds realized by the Corporation from issuance of its obligations and the expenditure of such proceeds shall not be subject to apportionment under the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665).

"(3) Obligations issued by the Corporation under this subsection may be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated therein and shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as shall be determined by the Board.

"(4) At least thirty days before selling any issue of obligations other than obligations having a maturity of less than one year, the Board shall so advise the Secretary of the Treasury in the greatest possible detail, including the amount, proposed date of sale, maturities, terms and conditions of and the expected rate of interest on such issue. If the Secretary of the Treasury so requests, representatives of the Corporation shall consult with him or his designee with respect to the proposed issue: *Provided*, That the issuance and sale of obligations of the Corporation is not subject to approval by the Secretary of the Treasury. If the Corporation determines that a proposed issue of obligations cannot be sold on reasonable terms, it may issue interim obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury, which such Secretary is authorized to purchase. Such interim obligations of the Corporation issued to the Secretary of the Treasury shall mature on or before one year from the date of issuance. Such obligations shall bear interest at a rate or yield no less than the current average yield on outstanding marketable securities or obligations of the United States of comparable maturity, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. For the purpose of any purchase of obligations of the Corporation, and to enable him to carry out the responsibility relating to guarantees of obligations made pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are extended to include any purchases of the obligations of the Corporation under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell, upon such terms and conditions and at such price or prices as he shall determine, any of the obligations of the Corporation acquired by him. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of the obligations of the Corporation shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

"(5) The Board may—

"(A) sell its obligations by negotiation or on the basis of competitive bids, subject to the right, if reserved, to reject all bids;

"(B) designate trustees, registrars, and paying agents in connection with obligations of the Corporation and the issuance thereof;

"(C) arrange for audits of its accounts and for reports concerning its financial condition and operations by certified public accounting firms in addition to audits and reports required by the Government Corporation Control Act;

"(D) invest, subject to any covenants contained in any obligation contract, the proceeds of any obligations and other funds under its control in any securities approved for investment of national bank funds and deposit said proceeds and other funds, subject to withdrawal by check or otherwise, in

any Federal Reserve bank or bank having membership in the Federal Reserve System; and

"(E) perform such other acts not prohibited by law as it deems necessary or desirable to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"(6) Obligations of the Corporation issued under this subsection shall contain a recital to that effect which shall be conclusive evidence that the underlying obligation is in compliance with the provisions of this title and valid. Obligations of the Corporation issued under this subsection shall be lawful investments and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of any officer or agency of the United States and shall be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The limitations and restrictions as to a National or State bank dealing in, underwriting, or purchasing investment securities for its own account, as provided in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), and section 5(c) of the Act of June 16, 1933 (12 U.S.C. 335), shall not apply to obligations guaranteed under this subsection.

"(7) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to pay the principal and interest on notes or obligations issued by him as a consequence of any guarantee under this subsection.

"(8) In the event of any default on any guaranteed obligation, and payment in accordance with a guarantee by the United States, the Attorney General shall take appropriate action to recover the amount of such payments, with interest, from the Corporation or other persons liable therefor.

"(g) (1) The Corporation may request the right to develop natural gas or oil which is or may be located on any Federal lands, including offshore rights, to the extent necessary to carry out its authorized activities: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall not request nor be granted more than 50 per centum of such rights as are offered at that time for sale or lease to other qualified persons.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection, any Federal agency or department having authority to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of Federal lands or rights to natural gas or oil which is or may be located on Federal lands, including offshore rights, shall, upon the receipt of a request of the Corporation under paragraph (1) of this subsection, grant the Corporation such right to develop without payment within 90 days after the receipt of such request. Rights to develop under this paragraph shall not be subject to any other Federal statute or regulation governing the lease, sale, or other disposition of any such lands or rights by any Federal agency or department.

"(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 641 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense, acting for the Secretary of the Navy, shall transfer possession of certain properties inside the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves, which are subject to such Secretary's jurisdiction and control, to the Corporation in accordance with this paragraph. Within one year after the date of incorporation of the Corporation, the Secretary of Defense shall prepare and submit to the President a report which specifies the petroleum and oil shale reserves which he finds are necessary for retention to accomplish the purposes of such section 641. Within six months after receiving such report, the President shall designate those petroleum and oil shale reserves which are necessary for retention under such section. Such properties may not be transferred to the Corpora-

tion, except on such terms and conditions as may be set by the President.

"(4) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any Federal lands or rights within any national park, wilderness, seashore, or wildlife refuge area, or to any lands held by the United States in trust for any Indian or Indian tribe.

"(5) All rights granted and properties transferred to the Corporation shall be explored, developed, and produced in the most rapid manner practicable without excessive risk of losses in recovery in accordance with the purposes of this title and subject to the authorized powers and limitations of the Corporation under subsection (e) of this section.

"(h) (1) The Corporation shall build, lease, or purchase refining facilities for the crude oil it produces or otherwise obtains only if it is unable to make sales of such oil in a manner which will promote competition among suppliers of crude oil.

"(2) The Corporation shall build, lease, or purchase transportation facilities for the natural gas or oil it produces or otherwise obtains only if it is unable to arrange for delivery of such natural gas or oil in a manner which will promote competition among suppliers of natural gas or oil.

"(i) (1) Sales of natural gas or oil by the Corporation shall be made at fair and reasonable prices designed to promote competition among suppliers of these energy resources.

"(2) Sales and transportation of natural gas or oil by the Corporation shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission to the same extent and subject to the same requirements as sales and transportation of these energy resources by other supplies.

"(3) In selling natural gas or oil, the Corporation shall give price, supply or delivery preference to States, political subdivisions of States, cooperatives, and independent refiners.

"(j) Whenever the Corporation owns land, facilities, equipment, or other items, which would normally be subject to taxation by a State or political subdivision thereof, the Corporation shall pay an amount to such entity in lieu of such taxes on the same basis and in like amount as would be paid in the form of taxes by a private owner.

"(k) (1) The Corporation shall make available, by license or otherwise, on a nonexclusive basis, upon payment of a reasonable royalty, and without territorial limitation, the use of any patent, trade secret, and copyrighted or other information obtained or developed by the Corporation in the performance of any of its activities under this section. In appropriate cases where the purposes of this title would be served, the Board may waive the payment of royalties.

"(2) Copies of any written or oral communication, document, intelligence, report, or other information received, prepared, or sent by the Corporation or any of its personnel and, in the case of oral communications, reduced to writing in whole or in summary, shall be made available to any interested person upon receipt of a specific and identifiable request in writing and payment of fees except that nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to require the release of any information required by law to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy; personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; or information pertinent to a pending negotiation or transaction until the completion thereof.

"(1) Except for compliance with Federal statutes which may be administered by the States, the Corporation shall be exempt from State and local statutes or controls which would impede its ability to perform the activities authorized by this title: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall submit a prior

report, together with reasons therefor, to the Commission and the Congress with respect to each incident of noncompliance with any State or local statute or control.

"(m) The Corporation shall transmit to the President and the Congress, annually, commencing one year from the date of incorporation, and thereafter on February 1 of each year, and at such other times as it deems desirable, a comprehensive and detailed report of its operations, activities, and accomplishments under this section, including a statement of receipts and expenditures for the previous year. Copies of such reports shall be sent to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations and Commerce, and the reports also shall—

"(1) contain the Corporation's statement of specific and detailed objectives and relate these objectives to those in this title;

"(2) include statements of the Board's conclusions as to the effectiveness of the Corporation in meeting the stated objectives, measured through the end of the preceding fiscal year;

"(3) make recommendations with respect to any changes or additional legislative action deemed necessary or desirable;

"(4) contain a listing identifying the principal analyses and studies supporting the major conclusions and recommendations; and

"(5) contain the Corporation's annual evaluation plan or plans for its activity through the next fiscal year and the following five years.

At the time of such annual report, the Corporation shall submit a statement of the amount of financial assistance needed, if any, for its operations and for capital improvements, the manner and form in which the amount of such assistance should be computed, and the sources from which such assistance should be derived. The Corporation shall make this annual report readily available to the public.

"(n) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Corporation, upon its request, any information or other data which the Corporation deems necessary to carry out its duties under this section.

"(o) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for each of the next ten succeeding fiscal years \$50,000,000 for the Corporation to carry out its activities under this section. All funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

"(p) When the annual revenues of the Corporation exceed the amounts necessary to satisfy, in accordance with customary business practices, the obligations and expenses incurred by the Corporation and to maintain the financial reserves necessary for Corporation activities, the Corporation shall pay its remaining funds to the United States."

Sec. 3. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 846) is amended by (a) striking out "and" in the last clause thereof; and (b) striking out "at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following new clause: "and Federal Oil and Gas Corporation."

A SERVICEMAN PRAISES THE U.S. MARINE CORPS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to insert in the RECORD a copy of

a letter I received recently from a constituent from Reading, Pa., who is proud to serve our great country. I feel that Pvt. David M. Gabrielli, U.S. Marine Corps, should be commended for his positive attitude and sense of responsibility.

The letter follows:

U.S. MARINE CORPS,
December 5, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YATRON: I have just completed my basic training with the United States Marine Corps at Parris Island, South Carolina. Presently I am at home on leave prior to reporting to my next training assignment at Camp Pendleton, California.

I feel it's my obligation to write to you in regards to the Marine Corps especially at a time when many people are condemning the armed forces as a whole. I can't speak for the other branches of the service, only for my own branch, the Marine Corps.

Speaking for myself, I feel the Marine Corps has spent the last thirteen weeks of training me to be a competent, reliable Marine. The Marine Corps preaches morality, pride in one's self, pride in being part of the finest military service in the world, pride in being an American. They have taught me self-discipline, to work as a team, honesty, and integrity.

I feel the United States is wise in having an organization like the Marine Corps. When the Marine Corps advertises for "A Few Good Men," they mean a few good men. I am not bragging, only thanking the Lord who has guided me through so I could achieve my final goal. When the government spends its money on the Marines, I feel it's spent very, very wisely.

I have learned in the past few weeks that I could do things I didn't believe were possible. But the Marine Corps showed me I could.

So when I hear people say, "They aren't like they used to be," I challenge that remark. We are as good as "they used to be," maybe better.

So I've taken time out to write you a letter praising, not condemning, the Marine Corps. When we are needed, we'll be there! The people of this country should be proud of their armed forces, and I get mad when they criticize the service without justification.

Thank you for taking time to hear the opinion of a nineteen-year-old private in the Marine Corps.

May I wish you and your family a Very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.
Sincerely yours,

Pvt. DAVID M. GABRIELLI.

A FITTING TRIBUTE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of North Jersey's legendary sports figures, the late Stanley A. Piela, former athletic director of Lodi High School, has been honored for his contributions to the school system and community. The Lodi Board of Education recently decided to name the new Lodi High School gymnasium in honor of Mr. Piela.

This gesture is a fitting tribute because for many years this man was one of New Jersey's finest scholastic coaches. Coach Piela, who died in 1962, coached cham-

pionship teams in football, basketball, and baseball. However, more important than the excellent record his team amassed through the years, is the fact that many of the young athletes who played for him have gone on to become well-respected citizens dedicated to their own communities. As Stanley Piela built winning teams, he also built men of character.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share an article with my colleagues which appeared in the Lodi Messenger recently concerning Mr. Piela. The article gives us further insight into a man whose hard work and determination inspired the lives of countless students. The article follows:

GYM DEDICATION IN HONOR OF PIELA

The late Stanley A. Piela, former Athletic Director of Lodi High School, will be honored for his dedication to the school system and the community. By naming the new Lodi High School gymnasium in his memory, the Lodi Board of Education and the people of Lodi are paying tribute to Piela's more than thirty-five years of devotion and service.

A Dedication Ceremony was held at the new gymnasium on Tuesday, January 15 at 7:30 p.m., prior to the start of a scheduled league basketball game between Old Tappan and Lodi High School.

Piela, who died on December 31, 1962, amassed a record of outstanding achievements in all the major sports in which Lodi High School participated. Although local sports fans consider his entire career as among the most successful of any area coach, old timers will especially recall the era of 1937-39, when the great Stan Piela's boys fielded a superb baseball team which won the Tri-County (Bergen, Passaic, Hudson) Championship in 1937; rolled over their football opponents with an undefeated, untied and unscored upon team in 1938; and captured the State Group Three Basketball Championship in 1939.

STRIPES FOR SKILLS

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it was just 1 year ago that the draft and the Vietnam war ended. Since that time it has been the goal of the Army and of Army Secretary Howard "Bo" Callaway to enlist a viable all-volunteer force. Such an ambitious program has required many innovations and initiatives on the part of the Secretary and the rest of the Army.

This past December the Army initiated an enlistment program whereby a young man or woman with a civilian skill can enter the Army, not as an E-1, but with rank commensurate to that individual's ability.

This is a most interesting program and it should assure the Army of qualified volunteers.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a speech made by Secretary Callaway which outlines this lateral entry program:

U.S. ARMY LATERAL ENTRY PROGRAM

On 1 December 1973, the United States Army implemented a comprehensive enlist-

ment program to attract qualified men and women of the civilian community who possess a civilian acquired skill required by the Army.

The program, entitled "Stripes for Skills," consists of over 160 skills which have either a direct or closely related civilian counterpart. Stripes for skills is designed to increase enlistment of qualified Army applicants with a civilian acquired skill, increase job satisfaction, improve the Army's personnel classification while maintaining skill performance standards and reduce training costs.

Unlike the Army's previous lateral entry program, which consisted of approximately 50 skills, the expanded program offers applicants who meet skill criteria immediate appointment to grade E-3 upon enlistment. Additionally, the member is also given the option to select a unit of choice with a period of stabilization with that unit guaranteed. After successful completion of required initial training, the new enlistee is sent to the unit selected. After eight weeks successful job performance in the skill, the member is appointed to grade E-4 or E-5. The actual appointment is contingent upon the demonstrated skill proficiency possessed by the enlistee. This method of appointment has an added benefit of having built-in motivation for the new soldier to excel in that accelerated appointment to grades E-4 or E-5 is not guaranteed.

The skill criteria required for applicants to participate in this program is designed to acquire highly trained members for the Army. As an example, to be eligible for appointment to grade E-4 the applicant must have undergone a minimum of two years formal training and/or experience in the skill. For grade E-5, the applicant must have a minimum of three years formal training and/or experience in the civilian acquired skill. The Army's lateral entry program is designed to fill hard skills required by the Army, in addition to skills perceived by applicants to be attractive. As an example, the stripes for skills program contains hard skills in the communications and electronics field; law enforcement; and electronics maintenance.

While the Army's program has just been initiated, the Army feels that stripes for skills will attract highly qualified, more mature, and career minded applicants to fill its ranks.

GOVERNMENTAL LAWLESSNESS: AN IMPORTANT ISSUE

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, Congressional Black Caucus hearings on governmental lawlessness were held in June 1972, which now turns out to have been a very appropriate time for such a conference, for it was then we first saw the beginning of the thread that has led to the unraveling of the greatest example of systematic governmental lawlessness in American history.

The participants in that conference justifiably feel vindicated by events. The theme of the hearings—irresponsible abuse of power—has come forward to the center of public debate. Yet two of the conclusions of the conference have not become so well known: That governmental lawlessness is not just a matter of individuals, but is structured into the whole political process, and that law-

lessness exists at all levels of the Government, not just at the top.

For these reasons, reform requires a direct legislative attack, not just calls for renewed dedication. My staff and I have developed the Bureaucratic Accountability Act (H.R. 6223) in response to the conditions uncovered by the conference. The aim of this legislation is to strengthen the levers by which law-abiding administrative decisions are produced. Hearings on this bill are now being scheduled, and other legislation strengthening congressional oversight capabilities is being developed at this time by my staff.

Yesterday the Washington Post ran an article by Colman McCarthy that put this problem in perspective. It points out the pervasiveness of governmental lawlessness in areas that directly affect all of us. I am sure that Mr. McCarthy's article will contribute to a wider appreciation of this issue, and I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

GOVERNMENT LAWLESSNESS

(By Colman McCarthy)

The Watergate explosions continue: a new burst of facts one day, a loud clapping of suspicions the next, and always the banging of denials from the White House. A problem in watching these explosions closely is not that they blind but that they make it harder to watch the behavior of the rest of the government. A peripheral vision is needed, a constant shifting of the eyes, watching in one line the nimble positionings of Richard Nixon while simultaneously eyeing an assistant secretary in charge of reporting to Congress on lead paint poisoning, or a deputy assistant running a housing program, or a director of a bureau concerned with inner-city reading problems. The latter are not usually the spectacular figures of government but they are important because they are charged by the citizens with upholding and enforcing the law. In recent months, a run of examples of government lawlessness suggests that contempt for the law is hardly confined to the Watergate figures. A pattern of official lawlessness has emerged, whether the laws are being ignored, broken or defied.

The better-known examples of recent government lawlessness are easily recalled: the illegal dismissal of Archibald Cox, the illegal appointment of Howard Phillips to OEO, the more than two dozen illegal impoundment cases. All of these cases went before judges, but recently the White House didn't even bother with a trial: it merely announced as illegal Pat Nixon's \$138-a-day job to a voluntary action council. The administration's lawlessness does not go unnoticed by its once loyal servants. When William D. Ruckelshaus recently spoke before the Environmental Defense Fund, The New York Times reported: "Mr. Ruckelshaus told the audience of 150 that he found it odd to be addressing a group that had sued him and the Environmental Protection Agency several times and won each case."

These examples are in the open, well reported by the press, even though, as the trend of lawlessness continues, new examples tend to be less newsworthy. Less noticed, though, are countless other examples, still important because they affect people's lives. In late January, the AP reported: "Four months and 18 days beyond the date required by law, the Agriculture Department has filed with Congress the government's goal for the development of rural United States." The Washington Post reported that the Food and Drug Administration broke the law last year by banning the growth hormone DES from cattle feed. The Wall Street

Journal reported that a U.S. district court ruled that the Forest Service broke the law by allowing a West Virginia national forest to be clear-cut for wood. These three cases are from but a one-week period in January; other examples are easily found for the other weeks of January, even the other weeks of every month. The lawlessness in government is not confined to Washington; on the state level there is Agnew's Maryland and among cities Addonizio's Newark.

It is hard for Americans to comprehend the awesome idea of a government that breaks laws. Murderers, robbers and rapists are the law-breakers, we think, not well-paid officials who are sworn into office on Bibles and live in clean neighborhoods. Even when a high official is caught and convicted—which is rare (what clear-cutting officials in the Forest Service will be fined or jailed for breaking the law?)—it is called "obstruction of justice," not committing a crime. Our unwillingness to see government lawlessness may be explained by the expectations of honesty we have for the government; to replace this brightness with the dark shadows of crime—an image we reserve for the back alleys where street criminals are ready to jump us—suggests our own stupidity, a thought as unacceptable as government crime. Yet, citizens are as much victimized—even more victimized in many cases—by the crimes of their government as by neighborhood thugs, even though it is the latest FBI "crime rate" statistics that scare us.

Citizen reaction to official contempt for the law is discussed in "How the Government Breaks the Law" (Stein and Day) by Jethro K. Lieberman. "When the Government breaks the law . . . the psychological reactions are far more complex (than in low-life crime). The community is split. No one need defend a criminal, but 'our government'—as opposed to the 'bureaucracy'—must be sustained and defended; illegal activity, when committed by the Government, quickly becomes fuzzy and political, thus salvaging the conscience of some, since staunch and 'sincere' political beliefs are highly prized. And when the political activity is illegal, it can put even the most fair-minded citizen in a terrible dilemma, for he is part of the citizenry that nurtures the Government. Thus, whenever the Government takes some action, part of the populace—whether a larger or smaller part depends on this issue—will automatically support it simply because it is action taken in the name of Government."

Occasionally attention in Washington is given to government lawlessness. In June 1972, the congressional Black Caucus held hearings on the subject. After four days of learning the details of the crime wave, Rep. Charles C. Diggs (D-Mich.), said: "To say that we have the existence of government lawlessness would be a supreme understatement. To say that it is even larger than we ever anticipated is also an understatement . . . One thing seems evident: we are seeing a war right here in America, a real war, waged between government officials and agencies who openly refuse to follow statutes and regulations and those citizens who should receive the benefits of those programs and who have to fight like hell to get them, and many times they don't." The Black Caucus hearings received almost no coverage in the media. Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.) recalls that "at the time of the hearings a Democratic party credentials fight was going on across town, and the media and the politicians convinced each other that this was the important news of the day. Yet, for me, the hearings on government lawlessness were the most explosive ones I ever heard." As for the agencies whose lawlessness was detailed by witnesses and confirmed by facts, the hearings were as easily ignored as the law itself.

What is the solution? For the moment, none appears evident, especially when so

many in the government refuse to admit there is a problem. How can a criminal be rehabilitated if he is deluded he has done nothing wrong? The attitude is pervasive, not only in cases the government loses in the highest courts but even in traffic violations. The day after Attorney General William B. Saxbe was sworn in, he was stopped on the street and received a citation because his Cadillac had an illegal sticker. Saxbe first tried to talk his way out of it; but that tactic failed. Then the nation's top law official tried the do-you-know-who-I-am argument in an effort to bully two of the nation's lowest law officers. But the latter gave their mighty boss a ticket anyway. Two days later, a news story said the Attorney General "joked about the incident." Perhaps that is the solution to government lawlessness—enjoy a good laugh. If so, it would be logical at a time when the law is being treated as a joke anyway.

BELLEVILLE, ILL., LIONS CLUB SPONSORS PROGRAM TO ELIMINATE DEAFNESS

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Lions International are well known for their valuable work in conservation of human sight, but the Belleville Midtown Noon Club in Belleville, Ill., is the first in our Nation to dedicate itself to elimination of deafness.

The Midtown Noon Lions Club celebrated its charter night on August 25, 1973, with an inaugural ball and dinner.

The charter officers of the club are Lion Jack Wottowa, president, Lion John A. Bock, first vice president, Lion James Radden, second vice president, Lion Al Profant, third vice president, Lion Al Schneider, secretary, Lion Dale Park, treasurer, Lion Charles Steuer, lion tamer, Lion George Gundlach, tail twister, and Lions Les Fischer, Quentin Huber, Art Klein, and Mel Becherer, directors.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a Lions Club principally concerned with deafness brings with it the promise of greater progress in this important field of health. Undoubtedly this initial step in Belleville will be only the beginning. Other clubs similarly dedicated will spread across the Nation.

Let us salute the Lions of the Belleville Midtown Noon Club for taking the initiative in bringing to a new field of endeavor the already famed dedication of the Lions international.

RENEGING ON AID

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the House defeated H.R. 11354, a bill to provide for increased U.S. participation in the International Development Association. I regret this decision because I have always felt it important that the United States assume its fair share of

the burden of worldwide development assistance. Encouraging world development will ultimately be to our own benefit through the stimulation of new markets for American products and technology. Far from being a "giveaway" program, the International Development Association can be an effective economic tool to promote our own prosperity by encouraging development abroad.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert into the RECORD a recent editorial from the Washington Star-News commenting on the House defeat of this bill.

RENEGING ON AID

One can only surmise what motives inspired the members of the House in voting down the American contribution to the World Bank's International Development Association by a whopping margin of 248 to 155. But World Bank President Robert McNamara is right in saying that the action is "an unmitigated disaster for hundreds of millions of people in the poorest nations of the world." And beyond that, the refusal to authorize the contribution of \$1.5 billion over the next four years is an act of shocking irresponsibility.

There are plenty of reasons, of course. "Foreign aid"—whether on a bilateral basis or channeled through international agencies—has never been politically popular with the electorate, particularly in view of the persistent and bitter criticism of the United States from most of the recipient countries. In its present distracted state, furthermore, the administration does not seem to have put nearly as much pressure behind its request as it should have.

No doubt also, the current oil crisis had something to do with it. Loss of development aid is by no means the greatest of the unmitigated disasters to have struck the underdeveloped world in recent days. The aid funds represent, in fact, something less than one-fifth of what these countries will be forced to pay for imported oil at the new, vastly increased prices. In this situation, the \$4.5 billion in proposed IDA financing by the richer countries becomes almost irrelevant.

Something, however, will surely be done about this. Some of the Arab nations themselves are talking in terms of a two-tiered pricing system to benefit the poorer nations of Africa and Asia. It is also conceivable that they may be induced to use some of their new-found riches to get into the aid business themselves—though so far they have shown a preference for a somewhat heavy-handed buying up of governments, rather than in development aid.

None of this, however, relieves the United States of its obligations as a leading—and the richest—world power to bear its fair share of the very basic and essential projects which the IDA supports. The other developed nations have been increasing their share of the burden. Japan had agreed to triple its share of the IDA loan pool, Germany's contribution was to have more than doubled. The action of the House—unless it can be speedily reversed—places all these agreements in the greatest peril.

WHERE IS THE ADMINISTRATION'S BALANCE-OF-POWER DIPLOMACY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have been persuaded to ac-

cept our balance-of-power diplomacy in the Middle East on the theory that soldiers of some of the Arab countries are trained and supplied with combat arms from the Soviet Union.

Yet in another of our administration's strange double standards in southern Africa, our policies coincide with the Communists in their attacks against Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, and the Republic of South Africa.

A report by the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London confirms that the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese are supplying money, weapons, and training to the terrorists seeking to overthrow the governments in those countries.

The report also states:

African recruits have been trained in Moscow (the Political and Intelligence School), Simferopol (the Guerrilla Warfare Training School) and in the Crimea (the Sabotage and Demolition School).

Additional support for the revolutionaries comes in direct grants and aid from the World Council of Churches and the Organization of African Unity, which was recently given nonprofit, tax-free status for its operations in the United States.

It just does not make political or economic sense to use the forces of the U.S. Government, spend money and waste equipment to stop alleged Communist aggression in northern Africa, while we join in league with Communist-armed guerrillas to fight non-Communist nations in southern Africa.

I insert the following newsclipping and excerpt from a booklet by Father Arthur Lewis at this point:

GUERRILLAS BACKED BY MOSCOW, PEKING
LONDON, Jan. 26.—A warning that white rule in Rhodesia is unlikely to survive a protracted guerrilla war is sounded in a report just published by the International Institute for Strategic Studies.

The paper, by Anthony Wilkinson, a former Rhodesian now with the London School of Economics, gives a comprehensive breakdown of the insurgents' supply and training facilities.

It says the Soviet Union has been the largest source of finance, weapons and training since the early 1960s. In addition to large quantities of small arms, the Soviets have recently supplied 122-mm. rocket launchers with a range of more than seven miles and the one-man SA7 ground-to-air missile.

African recruits have been trained in Moscow (the Political and Intelligence School), Simferopol (the Guerrilla Warfare Training School) and in the Crimea (the Sabotage and Demolition School). Recruits also have been trained in Algeria, Egypt, North Korea, Cuba and Czechoslovakia.

But, says the report, the recent improvement in the abilities of the insurgents is believed to reflect the growing Chinese involvement both in the supply of small arms and in training.

The study says that with a heavy white-to-black population ratio and a chronic foreign-exchange problem, Rhodesia can afford only a small defense force. The problems of equipment obsolescence have been accentuated by sanctions imposed by the United Nations, the report says.

Rhodesia is facing a revolt not by primitive warriors, nor even a Mau-Mau type of revolt, confined to one tribe, but "the prospect . . . of a war of national liberation fought by guerrillas recruited from many tribes increasingly well trained, armed with modern weapons and enjoying the moral or material support of most countries," the report continues.

Examining future possibilities, the IISS study says that as long as the level of violence can be contained within Rhodesia, South Africa will probably continue to provide military and economic assistance to the white administration.

On the other hand, it is conceivable that in the event of an uncontrolled conflict across the Zambezi River—especially if the level of fighting threatened to draw in any of the major powers—South Africa, rather than risk further escalation, would be prepared to countenance and assist in a controlled implementation of majority rule in Rhodesia in return for a restoration of majority rule in Rhodesia regional security.

In this case, a Rhodesian government already heavily dependent on South Africa both economically and militarily, would hardly be in a position to dictate any terms.

RHODESIA LIVE OR DIE

(By Father Arthur Lewis)

THE TRUE NATURE OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

It is not suggested that the World Council of Churches is wholly bad. Apart from the grants already referred to, the Council's reconciling work in the Sudan deserves high praise. Yet on balance the evil far outweighs the good.

The true nature of the W.C.C. can be judged from its leaders and its actions.

Until recently the General Secretary of the W.C.C. was Dr. Eugene Carson Blake. In 1967 he was awarded a Lenin Peace Prize. Other recipients of this prize have included Fidel Castro of Cuba and the communist Ahmed Ben Bella! In April 1972 Dr. Blake denounced the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam. He had not denounced the brutal invasion of South Vietnam which had occasioned it.

The present General Secretary is the West Indian Dr. Philip Potter. In his 1972 Christmas message he said: "The liberation movements are the expressions of the cries of the people—our cry—for salvation, liberation." In the March 1973 issue of the "Canadian Churchman" a description of Dr. Potter is given by Archbishop Ralph Dean, Metropolitan of British Columbia and an Anglican delegate to the most recent W.C.C. conference. "Philip Potter equates salvation with social justice. When he talks of salvation he leaves the Bible behind after ten minutes. At times he is a bitchy West Indian cursing the bloody English. But Potter is in Geneva because the English were once in the West Indies." (The W.C.C. headquarters are at Geneva).

The overwhelming bias of the W.C.C.'s activity is in a secularist, anti-Christian and pro-communist direction. In the 1962 Cuban missile crisis a W.C.C. statement expressed "grave concern and regret" at the "unilateral military action by the U.S." It said nothing at all about the Soviets' unilateral military action in putting the missiles in Cuba in the first place. At the time the W.C.C. was calling for boycotts against Rhodesia and South Africa it was demanding an end to the boycotts against communist Cuba!

The English "Church Times" (December 11th 1970) reported a W.C.C. appeal for \$90,000 "to help American draft-dodgers and deserters." A special edition of the W.C.C.'s youth magazine was entitled "Just Men Desert."

The Council has provided funds (£3,500 in September 1970) for the West Indian Standing Conference in Britain—"to create a strong black power base in the United Kingdom." It has given money for the "political education" (not general education) of Australian aborigines. Among the grants to the British Anti-Apartheid Movement was one of £2,000 in gratitude for "getting the South African cricket tour cancelled." (The quotations are from the W.C.C.'s own handout.) The current 1973 handout lists another grant to the same body and enumerates its activities. The Movement:—

"lobbies the Government directly and indirectly, and campaigns in and through the trade union movement, political parties, universities and the public generally for an end to all forms of collaboration with the Southern African white minority regimes and for support for African resistance to them:

"urges a ban on emigration to South Africa;" and

"presses for economic sanctions: in particular to prevent South Africa continuing to maintain the illegal Smith regime in Rhodesia."

One is hardly surprised to learn that the W.C.C. opposes the Portuguese Cabora Bassa scheme which will benefit millions of Africans; supports the U.K. Institute of Race Relations which investigates "white racism . . . in Britain" and encourages "the articulation of minority response to white racism;" makes grants to the Malcolm X "black power" university in the U.S., and is organizing a boycott of over 650 business concerns and banks having dealings with Southern Africa. Nor that a recent W.C.C. "constituent" supported "Puerto Rico's long struggle for independence" and pledged solidarity with the organizers of a boycott of non-union lettuce from the western U.S.! (My source for the last two items is the "Church Times," January 26th and March 16th, 1973.)

THE "PROGRAMME TO COMBAT RACISM," THE BANGKOK CONFERENCE—AND RHODESIA

If I labour the leftist political activism of the W.C.C. it is because it has consequences in our own country and implications which affect every Christian everywhere.

The notorious "Programme to Combat Racism" followed the Uppsala Conference of the W.C.C. in 1968 and a special gathering of radicals at Notting Hill, London, in 1969. The latter proposed revolutionary violence in Southern Africa, and if its wording was later toned down by the Central Committee this was only after funds had been distributed to terrorist organizations. Following the normal practice member-Churches were not consulted: they were informed of the Programme after it had started.

It was announced in Frankfurt in 1970 that an initial U.S. \$200,000 had been set aside from W.C.C. funds for the P.C.R. From this sum U.S. \$130,000 went to nine African groups—\$105,000 to groups operating in Southern Africa and dedicated to the overthrow of our governments by violence. The financial assistance has gone on ever since, and has included the banned Rhodesian movements ZAPU and ZANU.

A South African beneficiary is the Pan-African Congress which exists (in the words of a 1973 W.C.C. document) to fight "for the overthrow of white domination" and "to unite and rally the African people into one national front on the basis of African nationalism." A Portuguese beneficiary is the G.R.A.E. ("Angolan Revolutionary Government in Exile") of the self-confessed communist Holden Roberto, whose guerrillas in 1961 tied their live victims, black and white, to a moving plank and ran them through a sawmill.

But if the W.C.C. has departed from the Gospel of reconciliation it has also reversed Christian teaching. The Declaration of Barbados in March 1971 wrote of Latin America: "We conclude that the suspension of all missionary activities is the most appropriate policy." Our Lord said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark 16.15).

What was begun at Barbados was completed at the W.C.C.'s Bangkok Conference on "Salvation Today" in December 1972 and January 1973. "All round the world," said the official press-release, "people are seeking deliverance from political and economic oppression, racial and social injustice. They are also concerned about their personal destiny." Before the conference the delegates were told to prepare themselves for "an exercise in group dynamics." Professor Peter Beyerhaus,

an eminent theologian of Tubingen University, has recalled how the conference was heavily weighted with official consultants and advisers and has described it as a "masterpiece of manipulation." He explains in detail the processes of conditioning used to obtain the predetermined end—processes including the forceful prevention of public debate and a refusal to bring a dissenting motion to a vote. ("American Church News," Lent 1973.)

The result was simple: a call for a "moratorium" in sending missionary personnel and funds to the Third World: i.e. the abandonment of Christian missionary work as hitherto conceived. The Director of the W.C.C.'s Commission on World Mission and Evangelism, Emilio Castro, spoke of "the end of a missionary age and the beginning of World Mission." This has nothing to do with evangelizing the world or belief in the uniqueness of Christ: it is specifically stated to mean "partnership and dialogue" with other faiths and ideologies. The suggestion was made that the money saved should go to "liberation" movements.

Could any departure from Biblical Christianity be more complete? This is the wolf of communism in the sheep's clothing of Christianity.

Such then is the W.C.C., to which most of the Christian Churches in Rhodesia belong. Many of the churchmen who support it are innocent and well-meaning dupes of a conspiracy they do not even suspect. Rhodesians cannot afford to be so gullible. Nor can any Christian who takes seriously the historical religion of Christendom and the teaching of Christ himself.

MALVIN ROSEMAN'S SPECIAL GIFT TO VETERANS

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, every year this Nation pays tribute to the American veteran whose bravery and patriotism helped to create this country and to maintain it as the greatest free republic in the history of the world.

The city of Birmingham, Ala., which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, annually offers an outstanding Veterans Day program.

I would call to the attention of my colleagues an unique project undertaken by Mr. Malvin Roseman and other members of B'nai B'rith in Birmingham to underline even more strongly our appreciation for the efforts of American veterans and our concern for their welfare.

Under Mr. Roseman's leadership, members of B'nai B'rith distribute gifts on Veterans Day to individuals who were in the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital and who could not, therefore, participate in other Veterans Day activities. This is a commendable idea and one which groups in other parts of the Nation might well wish to adopt.

The following letters and newspaper articles reflect the appreciation of city and Federal officials as well as that of patients of this program and I commend them to my colleagues:

B'NAI B'RITH, COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY AND VETERANS SERVICES,

Washington, D.C., November 9, 1973.

Mr. MALVIN ROSEMAN,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR BROTHER ROSEMAN: I have just had the great pleasure and I also may call it an honor to read your scrapbook that you have sent us showing your activities both in B'nai B'rith and in your community for the past year. I say I'm honored because I go through it wishing more people would give of themselves as you have. To be sure, if we had more people like Malvin Roseman there is no doubt there would be a better world.

Mal, wherever you go you brighten the lives of many. Your involvement in the Help One Another Club, of course, your outstanding leadership in Veterans Hospitals, and the countless other organizations that benefit from your caring make all of us at B'nai B'rith proud. You give the most precious commodity, even greater than money, your self. Your time and energies, as shown by the letters of appreciation, are recognized as they should be.

Under separate cover I am returning your scrapbook, and as I said earlier it was a privilege and an honor to have had the opportunity to see all that you have done. Keep up the good work and do keep us informed of your great involvement.

With all best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT SCHWARTZBERG,
Assistant Director.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
Birmingham, Ala., November 14, 1973.

Mr. MALVIN ROSEMAN,
VAWS Representative,
B'nai B'rith,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MR. ROSEMAN: B'nai B'rith did an outstanding job with the first Veterans Day Program. The patients were all very happy that someone took the time to remember them on this special day.

I hope you will express our appreciation to all the folks who worked so hard to make this a success.

Sincerely,

LEON MILLER,
Chief, Voluntary Service.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
Birmingham, Ala.

Mr. MALVIN ROSEMAN,
VAWS Hospital Representative,
B'nai B'rith,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MR. ROSEMAN: The gift program that B'nai B'rith conducted on Veterans Day was an excellent way to pay tribute to hospitalized veterans. Your group's thoughtfulness and concern on this special day were sincerely appreciated by our staff and patients.

B'nai B'rith has always been an outstanding example of dedicated assistance in caring for veteran patients. We are very grateful for their help and your leadership in this program.

Sincerely,

C. G. Cox,
Director.

VETS DAY BONUS

As a (recently discharged) patient at Veterans Hospital here in Birmingham where I underwent surgery, my stay at the hospital included National Veterans Day.

Everyone can be proud of Birmingham's National Veterans Day program. It is number one in the nation. We can also be proud of an addition to the program—namely the

visitation of a group of B'nai B'rith, that presented gifts to each patient at the hospital. There was a package for each veteran, which contained a minimum of 20 personal items (socks, handkerchiefs, combs, stationery, books, candy, gum, peanuts, toothbrushes, etc.).

This idea of making Veterans Day a day for the veterans in the hospital, was originated by Malvin Roseman.

Service organizations throughout America will be contacted by Mr. Roseman to further this plan.

WILLIAM P. BRAY.

VETERANS DAY GIFTS BEING PREPARED

Gifts already are being prepared for presentation to patients at the Veterans Hospital in Birmingham in conjunction with this year's Veterans Day activities Oct. 22.

Malvin Roseman, chairman of the Veterans Day Gifts Committee, announced B'nai B'rith will sponsor gift packages to patients of the 500-bed hospital.

"I am very proud of the City of Birmingham holding these Veterans Day activities each year," Roseman said, "but Veterans Day is for the veteran so this year we will be at the hospital to present each veteran a gift, which will include 22 personal items."

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1973.

MALVIN ROSEMAN,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MR. ROSEMAN: I would like to extend my personal congratulations to you and the Birmingham chapter of B'nai B'rith on a unique and commendable Veterans Day program.

It was heartwarming to watch you and the ladies of B'nai B'rith distributing gift parcels to all the patients in the Birmingham Veterans Administration Hospital. You are remembering men and women who are too often forgotten on "their" day.

Veterans Administrator Donald E. Johnson has asked me to add his personal appreciation for your efforts.

I am keenly interested in your endeavor to make this program a national B'nai B'rith effort every Veterans Day in hospitals from coast to coast. Call on me if I can be of assistance. The reaction of the patients and VA Hospital staff Birmingham is proof that such a project is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND J. MCHUGH,
Special Consultant, Office of Administrator.

NATIONAL VETERANS DAY,
Birmingham, Ala., November 20, 1973.

Mr. MALVIN ROSEMAN,
Chairman, Veterans Hospital Committee for Veterans Day, Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MALVIN: The combined veterans organizations sponsors of National Veterans Day in Birmingham, wish to express their deep appreciation of the outstanding job which you and your committee did in honoring the patients at the Veterans Hospital on the evening of Veterans Day, October 22nd.

Mr. Ray McHugh who represented the Honorable Donald Johnson, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, at the event was most impressed with the planning and the impressive manner in which the program was accepted by the patients and the hospital administrators.

The B'nai B'rith organization which took the lead in this successful project has our heartfelt thanks for their great community contribution in honoring our veterans. We know that what you and your committee has done will receive deserved consideration for

the coveted Leadership Award in the direction of service to veterans.
 With kindest personal regards, and best wishes from all of us, I am,
 Very sincerely yours,
 RAYMOND WEEKS,
 Director.

TITLE XVIII OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a brief bill today that would greatly benefit all kidney disease victims, as well as save substantial amounts of Federal dollars. The bill is a simple amendment to title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow Federal coverage of hemodialysis treatment performed by a nurse or health aid in the patient's home. This would grant the same coverage that now applies to in-hospital hemodialysis treatment, but would eliminate the inconvenience to patients and the additional cost of a patient taking up hospital bed space and receiving hospital care.

The additional costs of hospital treatment versus in-home treatment are significant. Presently, routine hospital hemodialysis costs average between \$25,000 to \$30,000 annually; while in-home treatment costs average between \$4,000 to \$7,500. It is the same treatment, normally done twice a week, but presently in-home nurse assistance is not covered under the Social Security Act while hospital care is.

This unnecessary cost and inconvenience should be stopped.

There are approximately 8,000 new kidney patients each year that are able to adapt to the successful hemodialysis treatment. There is no point in forcing them into hospitals for care if they could receive it at their homes with some assistance from a nurse or health aid. But that is not how the present system works.

The statistical information indicating the cost differences of hospital care versus in-home care are included in a publication "Kidney Disease and Artificial Kidneys," published in November 1973 by the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, 1 of the 10 institutes of the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting part of my research on this problem is the way it began. While in my district over the recent congressional recess, I met with some members of the Kidney Hemodialysis Patients Organization of Northeastern Pennsylvania. The patients themselves explained their problems. For instance, the normal procedure involves the spouse without the disease learning how to operate the hemodialysis equipment and thus treating the other spouse at home. But should the spouse without the disease die, then the patient's choice is either to pay for the nurse or health aid herself, which she can often ill afford, or go to the hospital for free. The

choice invariably leads to the hospital. But hospital treatment certainly is not free. It is only covered under the Social Security Act while home care is not.

I have discussed this anomaly with the Social Security Administration and found general concurrence with the assessment I have given. Yes, home treatment is less expensive. Yes, it is far more convenient for the patient. No, it is not covered under the present interpretation of the Social Security Act.

The bill I have introduced today is an important one and a sensible one. I hope it will receive prompt attention.

LOWELL, MASS., HOUSING AUTHORITY

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, for many, a job begins at and ends at 5:30, revolves around a desk, and seems never to involve others. However, in the time I have worked with Armand Mercier, the executive director of the Lowell, Mass., Housing Authority, I have found that the opposite situation to these rules apply. He has consistently extended himself for the good of the residents of Lowell. I would like to commend this article to you as a fine example of the efforts of Mr. Mercier on behalf of the people of Massachusetts:

[From the Journal of Housing magazine, November 1973]

LOWELL AUTHORITY FOLLOWS UP FOR RESCUED TENANT

The Lowell, Massachusetts housing authority made "human interest" news and the community was given a glimpse of the kind of vigilance and readiness to help that goes into low-income housing management when The Lowell Sun, in its September 6 edition, carried the photograph reproduced on the Journal cover this month. The story accompanying the photograph related that LHA Executive Director Armand P. Mercier, driving by the North Common Village public housing project, noticed smoke curling from a third-story unit. On rushing in to check the situation, he found himself just on time to assist elderly tenant, Mrs. Martha Griffin, from her burning three-room apartment.

Mrs. Griffin was uninjured but the apartment suffered smoke, heat, and water damage to the tune of \$1400. The contents of the apartment, of unascertained value, were almost totally destroyed. Authority departments and city agencies mobilized for emergency help to Mrs. Griffin; she was offered relocation to another unit; the authority social services department sorted the contents of the unit, stored what was salvageable, and disposed of the rest; the maintenance department took over the repair, repainting, and refurbishment of the unit, including installation of a new tile floor, replacement of sections of wiring, replacement of glass windowpanes, and deodorizing to get rid of the fire stench the social services department stepped in again to assist Mrs. Griffin in filing for a rent rebate for the no-occupancy period (she had preferred to live with a relative, rather than accept the proffered temporary unit) and in securing new furniture a Lowell model neighborhood organization contributed money for the purchase of new clothing for Mrs. Griffin.

On October 5, one month to the day from the date of the fire, Mrs. Griffin moved back into her apartment.

North Common Village, built in 1937, with initial occupancy in 1941, is the oldest federally-assisted public housing project in Massachusetts. Both families and elderly tenants occupy its 536 units. Its brick construction and fire doors helped to confine the damage from the September fire.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XVI

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, a 16-year-old high school student was shot dead by one of his friends who used a .32 caliber pistol. Described as "about as fine a kid as there was," the boy joined the ranks of the thousands of good citizens shot each year by relatives, friends and acquaintances. By allowing the public to have handguns we make it easy to kill.

The attached article appeared in the Washington Post, January 30, 1974:

WOODBIDGE YOUTH KILLED, FRIEND HELD (By Ron Shaffer)

A 16-year-old Prince William County youth described as "about as fine a kid as there was" died on the way to the hospital Monday night after being found in a roadside ditch near Dale City with a gunshot wound in the chest.

A 17-year-old youth known as a close friend of the dead youth turned himself in to Connecticut State Police at Westport yesterday afternoon and told of being involved in the shooting, police reported. He was charged with being a fugitive from justice.

Dead is William Joseph Mulgrew, of 1478 California St. in Woodbridge. He was an 11th grade student at Garfield High School in Woodbridge, where he was a "B" student and a first string player on both football and baseball teams. He was found by a passing motorist lying beside Minniville Road near Dale City.

Connecticut State Police Lt. Edward Leonard said the 17-year-old suspect turned himself in at the Westport state police barracks yesterday after driving north on Interstate 95 Monday night, sleeping at a gas station off the New Jersey Turnpike and then continuing north into Connecticut.

Police said that they could not discuss possible motives while the investigation is in progress. The father of the dead youth said he had no idea why his son was killed.

Lt. Leonard said the suspect turned over a gun he had in his possession, which Leonard identified as a .32 caliber automatic pistol. An extradition hearing is scheduled for this morning in the Stamford, Conn. Circuit Court, and the suspect is currently being held without bail.

Mulgrew's death left many of the school's 2,800 students "in shock . . . in disbelief" over the slaying, said Garfield football coach Robert Pruett. "If ever there was a 'good kid' he was it," said an assistant football coach, James Artz. "He was never in trouble, was always where he was supposed to be, doing what he was supposed to—a real good citizen."

Mulgrew's father, William Sr., told a Post reporter yesterday that his son's car had broken down Monday and he had gone to work with a friend.

The dead youth's father is a postal carrier; his mother is a service representative for the Commonwealth Telephone Company in Prince William County. They live in the the Marumscoc Woods section of Woodbridge.

"The policeman came to the door (Monday night) and I thought Bill was involved in an accident," Mulgrew said from his home yesterday.

"I went with my wife and the policeman to the emergency room and the doctor came over to me. I thought he would tell me my son was involved in an automobile accident. Then he said Bill had been shot and was dead. I don't remember much of anything after that."

WILL THE UNITED STATES RELY ON SOVIET CHROME?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, the Senate voted to repeal the Byrd amendment and reinstate the Soviet Union as the virtually exclusive supplier to the United States of high grade metallurgical chrome. This action, if duplicated by the House, poses a threat to the national security and domestic economy of the United States.

Chrome ore is a vital material in our defense industry. It is an essential ingredient in many of our military weapon systems, including long-range missiles, nuclear submarines, and jet aircraft.

In addition to our defense needs, chrome plays an important role in our domestic economy. Specialty steel makers—stainless, alloy, and tool steels—are particularly dependent on chrome ore. Stainless steel cannot be made without chromium, as there is no other element which can be used as a substitute.

Rhodesia has the largest reserves of metallurgical grade chromite—the only grade economically suitable for steel-making applications. In terms of estimated world resources of metallurgical chrome, Rhodesia possesses 67 percent of the total. According to a report of the National Materials Advisory Board—

Of the free world's supply of high grade ore, 70 percent of the reserves in this quality are found in Rhodesia.

South Africa has almost one-fourth of the free world's resources of metallurgical grade chromite. Only about 6 percent, however, is high-quality ore. Turkey, which has the third largest free world reserve, possesses only 2 percent of the world's share. In addition, Turkey recently signed a long-term contract to supply a majority of Turkish production to Japanese firms.

As can be seen from the above breakdown, exclusion of Rhodesia as a chrome source would force the United States to rely on the Soviet Union. The likely result of this dependency is a sharp increase in chrome prices.

Howard O. Beaver, president of Carpenter Technology Corp.—a major producer of specialty steels—has predicted that repeal of the Byrd amendment would result in a 20- to 30-percent increase in ferrochromium prices.

Beaver pointed out that, during the last sanctions between 1967 and 1971, the price of chrome ore from the Soviet Union—the major U.S. supplier during Rhodesia's exclusion from the market—to domestic ferrochromium producers increased from \$31.50 per ton to well over \$60 per ton.

Even more serious than rising prices is the threat of a complete cutoff in chrome shipments by the Soviet Union. This threat has been discussed in the December 24 issue of the New York Daily News.

If the U.S. cuts off Rhodesian imports of this vital defense-related metal, that will make this country almost wholly dependent on the Soviet Union for supplies. Hasn't Arab oil blackmail shown our peerless leaders how dangerous it is to be at the mercy of an unreliable source for essential materials? And Russia is about as un dependable as they come.

I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments of the New York Daily News. It would be foolhardy for the United States to rely on the Soviet Union for a material vital to both our national defense and our domestic economy. American security and American economic strength must come first.

THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE INDEPENDENCE

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 56th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, a nation of 48 million now under the control of the Soviet Union. Ukraine declared its independence early in 1918 and 2 years later the Soviets overran it. Since then the Ukrainians have known almost every form of suppression, from political to religious.

Today, with all our hopes for détente and a world free of international tension, it is easy to forget that these millions still live under a totalitarian regime which stands opposed to any kind of free expression. In describing Ukraine some may find it somewhat misleading to use the word "captive." But there can be no more outrageous captivity than that which thwarts the exchange of ideas, discourages the worship of one's God, and muffles words of national independence. A nation whose people are subjected to these injustices is no better off than if they dwelled behind true bars of iron.

Mr. Speaker, as long as men and women live under such conditions, there can be no real freedom for any of us. For we share their frustration, and we join with them in resisting the forces which have destroyed a nation's independence.

Fortunately, no bars, real or hyperbolic, can stifle the true spirit of freedom, and for this reason I remain confident that the Ukrainians can regain their independence. But it will be all the more difficult if they are forgotten by their friends in the West. Let us take the occasion of their independence day to remind the Ukrainians that they do not stand alone.

RIO GRANDE VALLEY'S LAST SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERAN PASSES

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas sent some 10,000 men to the front during the Spanish-American War. The famous Rough Riders, commanded by Col. Leonard Wood and Lt. Col. Theodore Roosevelt, were organized at San Antonio.

There are not many survivors of that war, which seems so long ago. One of them, Henry J. Ramsey, the last Spanish-American War veteran in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas and past-post commander of the Spanish-American War Veterans of the Valley, died this month at the age of 99.

Mr. Ramsey was a valued citizen of the south Texas district I represent. He came to the valley 47 years ago from Mississippi. Prior to this retirement some years ago he was in the contracting business and constructed many of the downtown buildings and residences in the city of McAllen.

This fine gentleman is survived by his wife, 4 sons, 2 daughters, a sister, 10 grandchildren, and 6 great grandchildren. One of the daughters, Mrs. Henry Erdmann, is a resident of McAllen. To her and the other surviving relatives I simultaneously extend my sympathy and my congratulations on an ancestor of whom they can well be proud.

OUR NATION SALUTES THE HONORABLE D. STANTON HAMMOND III, OF NEW JERSEY, INSPIRING EDUCATOR AND HISTORIAN OF AMERICA'S HERITAGE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the eloquence and elegance of America's heritage is fostered and nurtured by our Nation's teachers and kept alive and vibrant by the historians of our time. Today, I would like to call to the attention of you and our colleagues here in the Congress the inspiring lifetime of outstanding service rendered to our people as a teacher-historian by a most distinguished member of our community and good personal friend, the Honorable D. Stanton Hammond III.

Dr. D. Stanton Hammond III, has truly inspired and enriched the lives of many of our people through his teachings and writings and even today, at the young age of 86 years, he continues to actively pursue his dedication and sincerity of purpose on behalf of our people as an esteemed commissioner of our Pascaic County Park Commission and industrious learned consultant on historic and educational endeavors of vital impor-

tance to the dynamics of our destiny and the quality of life for all of us.

Dr. Hammond, the son of Daniel S. and Helena M. Scott, was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., on September 22, 1887. He is a graduate of Ridgewood, N.J., High School—1903; the Trenton Normal School—1905; and received his B.S. degree in 1912 and J.D. degree in 1923 from the Washington Square College and Law School, respectively, of New York University. He married Mary Catherine Davison on July 9, 1919, and they were the proud parents of three children: Daniel Stanton, P.E., of Arnold, Md., division engineer, Federal Highway Administration, District of Columbia Region III; Eugene Davison, deceased; and Lois Eva—Mrs. Robert V. Kirkendoll.

In his teaching profession, before retiring in February 1954, he excelled on the faculty of New Jersey schools at Mortvale, Ridgewood, and Paterson; served as principal of the Hunterdon County school at Flemington; an superintendent of schools at Englishtown and Norwood.

Dr. Hammond has surveyed and prepared official tax maps and mapped and published provincial patents in old Hunterdon County, N.J. Among his many civic endeavors, he has received many commendations for his work with the New Jersey Historical Commission as secretary at George Washington Headquarters, Dey Mansion—1928-31; historian, Washington Bicentennial, Paterson Commission—1932; historian, Passaic County 100th Anniversary—1937; Paterson 100th Anniversary—1951; and Passaic Great Falls for U.S. Registered Landmark—1967; treasurer and president, Passaic County Park Commission—1963-73; president, Passaic County Commission for New Jersey Tercentenary at World's Fair—1964-65; member, Passaic County Heritage Commission—1966-77; and vice president, Passaic County Commission for U.S. Bicentennial—1971.

Having served 30 years as the president of the Passaic County Historical Society, he was appointed as honorary life trustee of this most distinguished historic preservation organization which he founded in 1926.

Dr. Hammond is held in the highest esteem by all of us who have the good fortune to know him. He has been publicly cited for many of his exemplary achievements and is most proud of having received in 1964 the MacArthur Silver Medal, Sons of the American Revolution, and in 1971 the SAR Gold Medal for patriotic State service.

He has been affiliated with the National Education Association where he holds lifetime membership since 1930; his historical society memberships included his active participation in the many noble programs of the New Jersey, Bergen, Passaic, and Hunterdon Counties societies and Genealogical Society of New Jersey. He is a member of the law fraternity of Phi Alpha Delta, prominent member of the Republican Party—secretary of the Hunterdon Republican Club in 1912—and a highly respected parishioner of the Presbyterian faith.

Dr. Hammond will long be remembered for many of his outstanding writings in

historical journals, but his most publicized contribution to our local community is his compilation of Erskine and New Jersey Provincial County maps.

All of the members of our congressional district also applaud Dr. Hammond for his most commendable performance in contributing to our cultural and recreational enjoyment as commissioner of the Passaic County Park Commission from 1963 to 1973 where he has just completed a highly successful year as president.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing highlights of the exemplary lifetime of devoted expertise that Dr. Hammond has imparted to his fellow man only scratch the surface of the standards of excellence and highest order of performance that one man could give in a highly successful career which has truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. I am pleased to seek this national recognition for all of Dr. Hammond's good works and know that you will want to join with me in saluting him and extending our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to him and his family for continued success and happiness. The Honorable D. Stanton Hammond, we are proud to say, is truly a great American.

RICHARD NIXON IMPAIRS CONDUCT OF PRESIDENCY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, along with many Americans, I have wondered how the scandals and threat of impeachment have affected President Nixon and his conduct of the duties of his office. A recent article by Washington Post reporter Lou Cannon suggests an answer which, while not surprising, is disturbing.

According to Mr. Cannon and the White House aides with whom he has talked:

Mr. Nixon is unable to sleep;

He is more reclusive than ever, on many days seeing nobody but Alexander Haig, Ronald Ziegler, Bebe Rebozo, and his secretary and family—none of whom have demonstrated competence as Presidential advisers;

He is sometimes unable to carry on coherent policy discussions;

His feelings of persecution are even more pronounced than at other points in his career;

He has turned the conduct of domestic policy over to Alexander Haig, a man with no background or demonstrated competence in this field;

He is disturbed when the weather appears to be against him;

His staff has fallen into thinking of the Presidency as an institution, rather than of the man who must act in behalf of the American people.

In short, the conduct of the supreme office of the executive branch is not going well. And we all know, conduct at the next highest level is also going badly,

with unprecedented turnover of Cabinet and other top level positions.

Mr. Nixon would have us believe he is too busy dealing with the problems of the Nation to think about his threatened impeachment. This may be. Perhaps the condemned man does not think about the electric chair. But I doubt it. I believe Mr. Cannon is correct, and the prospect that he will be the first President in history to be removed from office by impeachment weighs heavily indeed on Mr. Nixon. It would be surprising if this were not so.

For the good of the Nation, this state of affairs should not continue. We cannot and should not abandon our impeachment proceedings; the corrupt acts of Mr. Nixon and his administration demand that he be impeached and removed from office. But I believe it is necessary for us to move ahead as quickly as we can. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee has spoken of reporting his findings to the House by April; in my view, close adherence to this schedule would be desirable.

I say this for neither ideological or partisan reasons. I expect I will disagree with the policies of GERALD FORD as frequently as I disagreed with those of Richard Nixon. And there is no question that the longer Mr. Nixon remains in office, the better my party will do at the polls. But I cannot ignore the fact that the conduct of the affairs of the Nation requires a President whose integrity is above suspicion and who can operate with full effectiveness. Mr. Ford meets these requirements; Mr. Nixon does not. So I urge that we do our unpleasant duty, and do it expeditiously.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the article by Lou Cannon entitled "Nixon: a Restless and Sleepless Man in the White House," from the Washington Post of January 28, 1974:

NIXON: A RESTLESS AND SLEEPLESS MAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Lou Cannon)

He has always been a restless man, this President of the United States, and those who have seen him closely say that he is more restless than ever.

His aides remain loyal to Richard Nixon, or at least to the institutions of the presidency. But in their quiet moments some of these aides talk guardedly about his insomnia and about his preference for flying at night when he could more easily fly by day. They talk, too, of his penchant for retreating from the retreats he has chosen for himself and of his strange habit of changing the subject matter and of abruptly denouncing the "thems" he believes are out to destroy his presidency.

One symptom of this presidential restlessness is Mr. Nixon's present aversion to any detailed discussion of domestic policy. He has never been a man who suffers detail gladly, but he now refers almost all substantive domestic discussions to his chief of staff, Alexander M. Haig.

When Budget Director Roy Ash arrived in San Clemente for an announced and important discussion with the President on the impending budget, Mr. Nixon turned the meeting over to Haig and never saw Ash at all. On most days the President saw only Haig, Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler, secretary Rose Mary Woods, his wife and daughter, Tricia, and the ever-present confidant, Bebe Rebozo.

Despite his disavowal of detail, the President made it clear that he was running the show. Though the White House has a long-standing agreement with the news services to inform them of presidential travel, Mr. Nixon gave strict orders that they were not to be informed of his many driving trips with Rebozo at the wheel. He also bluntly warned aides not to make predictive discussions of presidential policies for 1974.

One aide who had engaged in such a discussion subsequently corrected a newsmen who had reported his prediction. The aide said he still felt the same way but added: "That's not what El Supremo thinks."

Mr. Nixon's restlessness is most troubling to the Secret Service, which doesn't care whether or not he notifies the press of his travels but is increasingly concerned about his personal safety.

One Secret Service agent, usually the most resolute of professionals, complains that the President's sudden whims to "drive somewhere, anywhere" makes protection difficult.

This agent goes on to state another troubling aspect of Mr. Nixon's embattled presidency: When the President goes anywhere, the placards and the shouts of "crook, crook" are never far behind.

More and more, within the White House, there is talk of "The Scenario." These words are the code words used to describe the method by which Mr. Nixon will leave the office, as in the sentence: "I do not now see The Scenario for impeachment."

This last sentence and many like them vaguely accept the premise that Mr. Nixon may indeed leave office before his term finishes. No one will say how or when, but it has not escaped the attention of White House aides that Mr. Nixon says he will remain in office as long as he is "physically able."

There is no reason to suspect that his health is poor, and there has been no recurrence of pneumonia which forced him to the hospital for nine days last July. But Mr. Nixon abruptly canceled his annual physical examination in December, and he has not rescheduled it. The question is a daily staple at White House briefings, and it is always turned aside by spokesmen.

Those who have seen Mr. Nixon closely say that he was often ill at ease during his recent 18-day stay in San Clemente but they blame it on the stormy, windy weather that plagued the trip.

Both White House aides and the reporters covering the President are as superstitious as ball players about the weather. It is a persistent belief in the presidential entourage that Mr. Nixon is hexed by stormy weather. The weekends in 1973 are recalled when the President was stormed on in San Clemente and in Key Biscayne while the alternative sites were enjoying the balmy weather.

It was no different the last time. The worst storm in a century and the highest tides in 300 years battered Mr. Nixon's oceanside villa for seven days. The skies cleared and the waters calmed when the President left in a motorcade for the greater isolation of the Annenberg estate in Palm Desert.

But Mr. Nixon's problems are worse than the weather. Even in less troubled times he liked to play the piano in the middle of the night, and he has always possessed a restless driven intelligence that makes sleep difficult. There is a persistent belief at the White House that sleep has become even more difficult. Mr. Nixon's Jetstar flight back to Washington was made in the middle of the night, although the plane had been waiting for him all day at Edwards Air Force Base. "What's the difference," said an aide. "He wasn't going to sleep anyway; he might as well not sleep on the plane."

Officially, all of the above is steadfastly denied. An aide who recalled that Mr. Nixon had said he would remain in office as long as physically able was pressed on the issue by

a reporter. The President looked hale and hearty at his 61st birthday party, the reporter said. Do you really think there is anything wrong with him?

The aide shrugged, and permitted a long pause. "Of course not," he said. "There is nothing wrong with the President."

It is in the latter sense that some aides have substituted their loyalty to the presidency for their personal loyalty to Richard Nixon. The Committee for the Re-election of the President, with its institutional slogan of "Re-Elect the President", is finally gone but Mr. Nixon is rarely "Mr. Nixon" to the men who work for him. The incantation of the institution has a magic sound, a magic that does not as easily survive when the President is thought of as a man. There might just possibly be something wrong with Mr. Nixon; all is well with the President.

All is not well. On the California trip the prevailing mood was that this was the last trip to San Clemente. The Laguna Beach press center is being torn down as part of a restaurant remodeling project, and those close to the remodeling say a new one will never be needed.

Aides talked about the way it once had been when President Nixon's administration seemed bright with promise. Others made jokes about "future President Ford."

Few are yet convinced that Mr. Nixon will resign. Many talk vaguely of him not finishing his term but are unwilling to speculate on the method of his removal. Some believe that the subject must never be discussed or the possibility of impeachment admitted.

Mr. Nixon can still be warm and even witty in person, as he was last month at a private party in Washington for his physician, Walter Tkach. He is still capable, aides say, of behaving like the self-styled "coolest man in the room" when he is discussing foreign policy with Henry Kissinger. But he is a man under pressure in the crucible of the White House. The picture painted by those close to him who are willing to talk about it is of a private person surrounded by adversaries. He is depicted as constantly restless and increasingly troubled.

"Anyone would be troubled, really if he couldn't go out anywhere without attracting hostile pickets and impeachment signs," said one aide. "Nobody likes to hear himself called a crook, least of all the President of the United States."

FEDERAL ELECTION FINANCE ACT: FULL FEDERAL FUNDING, PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS BANNED

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the lack of an effective Federal campaign finance law did not cause Watergate, but the sordid mess of the past year and a half certainly points out that American politics are virtually controlled by the flow of money.

To remedy that situation I have introduced the Federal Election Finance Act—H.R. 12157—a bill which provides for full public funding of all Federal election campaigns.

I do not consider sacrosanct the concept that the right to give unlimited campaign contributions is basic to our democratic system. To me, claims that the \$10 donor is treated the same as the \$10,000 contributor are hypocritical. The

large contributor invariably obtains access to their representative—and, in many cases these contributions are the cement of a quid pro quo relationship. In contrast, the small contributor receives a form letter reply.

When that double standard prevails, the majority of citizens are not represented; but, rather—through this political auction—the wealthy and elite are well catered. Studies of past elections have shown that candidates able to raise the most money not only stand the best chance of winning, but in a vast majority of cases do win.

For me, that too, is undemocratic, since it means that most candidates come from the ranks of persons either independently wealthy or willing to prostitute themselves to various well-heeled interest groups.

We are long past the day when most of our leading politicians—and most often here in the House—are able to rise from among the "common citizens," yet we still grandly expound that ideal. And as long as unlimited private financing of elections—no matter how stringent the reporting or restriction laws—remains the foundation of our electoral process, the goal of a democratic system of government will be thwarted.

I have studied the various public financing proposals before Congress and discovered that although many of them aim for increased Federal funding, none goes all the way to eliminate completely direct private contributions and to have the Federal Government underwrite all campaigns. That dual objective is met in the Federal Election Finance Act.

It brief the measure:

Establishes a National Election Finance Commission of seven members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Commission members serve 6-year terms; each political party is limited to two members on the Commission. The Commission would serve as the single, central repository for all campaign reports. Commission powers would be to:

Prescribe rules and regulations for all Federal election campaigns;

Regulate dispersal of campaign funds; Conduct investigations, subpoena witnesses, compel evidence, initiate civil actions against violators and impose civil penalties of up to \$10,000 for each violation of the act.

Establish within the Treasury a special Election Campaign Finance Fund for the control of the funds.

Establishes eligibility requirements for candidates:

Major party candidates may receive 50 percent of the allocated disbursement after depositing with the Commission funds equal to 10 percent of the total entitlement; upon receipt of an additional 10 percent, the candidates gets the remaining 50 percent;

Candidates without major party backing can receive their funds by two processes—the system described above for major party candidates, or by transmitting to the Commission signatures of 20 percent of the registered voters who reside in the geographical area in which the election is held;

Eligibility contributions are limited to \$10; personal contributions by a candidate and relatives for the candidate's own expenses are completely prohibited, as are all other private contributions, other than those for the eligibility deposit. A list of contributors to the security deposit must be submitted to the Commission; if a candidate receives less than half the eligibility deposit total, those funds are turned over to the Commission, which then returns them to the contributors. Contributions by political committees and all subsidiaries and affiliates within the scope of political committees are completely prohibited.

Sets expenditure levels for respective individual campaigns:

For the House of Representatives, \$125,000—\$50,000 for primary or runoff; when held; \$75,000 for the general election;

For the Senate, \$350,000—\$150,000 for the primary or runoff; \$200,000 for the general election;

For the Presidency, \$20 million—\$7 million for primaries, \$13 million for the general election.

When a candidate is not involved in a primary or runoff election, or in States where there are no primaries or runoffs, candidates will only receive funds allotted for general elections.

In addition to the campaign finance provisions, the Federal Election Finance Act contains major reforms of the subsidized political mailing and media availability regulations. Candidates would be provided a specified number of low cost political mailings, in both primary and general elections. Presidential candidates would all receive 10 half-hour blocks of low cost guaranteed television time.

As for possible objections to this system:

"It is too expensive." Too expensive compared to what? My calculations show that even under the worst of all possible conditions—in this estimate, 5 primary and 2 general contenders for all 439 House seats; 5 primary and 2 general election opponents for one-third of the Senate who are up for election every 2 years; and 3 Presidential candidates—I calculate that per capita annual cost would be around 60 cents. Add on administrative costs and that figure would be around 70 cents. Seventy cents a year is not expensive by any possible measure.

"It is too cumbersome." True, this is not the easiest method because it forces potential candidates to garner massive community support before they are eligible for funding, but I question whether the imposition of requiring broad support will deter any interested citizens from becoming candidates.

If a potential candidate cannot find 20,000 backers either to sign a petition or contribute \$10, then that candidate has no chance of winning anyway, since my research indicates that no primary candidate for the House has won with less than 30,000 votes in recent years. And any less stringent eligibility requirement might be an incentive for persons to enter political races just to receive the cash allotment—even though the

proposed act does contain a stringent oversight provision which mandates that candidates must report to the Commission not later than 30 days after the election an accounting of how funds were spent.

"It's undemocratic." Nonsense. What really is undemocratic is the current election financing system. This proposal gives all citizens an equal chance to run for office.

And, finally, "it's biased against incumbents." Possibly, because it would force incumbents to get out among their constituents more often in order to raise the eligibility deposit, but is that so bad?

I am convinced that our Nation cannot afford—both literally and figuratively—any longer the current inequities and problems of the existing Federal election funding system. The Federal Election Finance Act would be the best answer to those problems, and I urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to this proposal.

JULIET KING

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, Juliet King is the mother of 10 children, a wife taking care of a handicapped husband, and a domestic worker in Joliet, Ill., my hometown.

She is also an outstanding vocalist who has earned the acclaim of thousands as a result of her concert performances throughout America and all over the world.

My purpose today, however, is not to recite a tale of the sadness of poverty, nor to celebrate a musical talent. The point of my comments, rather, is to tell the truly inspirational story of one woman's faith and determination. With every excuse for giving up, Juliet King made stumbling blocks into stepping stones and bitterness into betterment.

An abiding religious faith was her driving force and constant companion. Her story of courage has been published in the February issue of *Guideposts*. I am placing this story in the *RECORD* for all to admire:

SOMETHING TO SING ABOUT—WHAT COULD THE FUTURE HOLD FOR A DOMESTIC WORKER WITH 10 CHILDREN AND A HANDICAPPED HUSBAND?

(By Juliet King)

I don't know what I would've done that night 21 years ago if it hadn't been for the little golden stars. I had got out of bed to check the potbellied stove that heated our four-room shack.

I threw in some chunks of railroad coal, went back into the bedroom and sat on the side of the bed. The soft sighing of my five sleeping children blended with the heavier breathing of my husband. He tossed and murmured. Charles was a construction worker, weather permitting. And lately the weather had been all bad.

One of the boys coughed hoarsely and my heart jumped. His cough was getting worse and that meant seeing a doctor. But I was

afraid to take him. We owed doctors so much already. We owed everybody.

I unconsciously reached for the worn Bible near the bed. As a child I had always carried the Bible with me to Sunday school. The pages fell open and little golden stars glittered in the moonlight. I smiled. They were pasted there by my teacher, next to each verse I had memorized.

The book had opened to the Psalms. I switched on the bedside light and began reading. "Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine by the sides of thine house; thy children like olive plants round about thy table." "My help cometh from the Lord which made heaven and earth."

Even though I'd memorized those verses years ago it now seemed as if the Lord Himself were saying them to me. I bowed my head, and the bitterness seemed to drain from me. I realized I had been looking to my husband for everything. Now I looked to God.

The days that followed were like a blue sky following a rain squall. It was the difference in my attitude. Our shack had become a home.

I remember stepping out on our raggedy porch early one evening to watch the clouds. My uncle came by, looked up and called, "Child, if I didn't know you, I'd say you were drunk."

"Uncle," I said smiling, "I've just decided to be somebody."

He stopped. "How's that?"

"I've been asking God and He is going to help me." He laughed and shook his head.

I got to thinking about what I could do best. All the folks praised my cooking. In school I had studied commercial catering. My sister worked for a doctor. His family needed a cook, so I applied and was hired. One evening just as I was getting dinner on their table, Aunt Florence, who looked after my children while I worked, telephoned. "Honey, you'd better come home; Jeffery is sick."

The doctor overheard and said, "Don't worry. I'll go look after your boy." From then on he took care of all our medical needs.

I worked hard—cooking, cleaning and scrubbing. It was good being able to help fill my family's needs, since we now had ten children.

Sometimes I'd get discouraged. Then I'd just think about that woman who touched the hem of Jesus's garment. He said, "Your faith has made you whole." And I had faith.

As I worked I'd keep looking up to Him and it got to be like we were having conversations. One day I asked, "Lord, I wish there was something I could do that would give me pleasure."

Inside me welled this strong desire to sing. When I was small, mama had encouraged my love of music. And a lady came to teach me on our old parlor organ at 50 cents a lesson. When I told Charles about my desire, he laughed me to shame.

But my first evening off from work I went to Joliet Musical College. I had heard of a voice teacher there, Lucille Gowey. She asked me to sing something. I stood there and sang *Deep River*. When I finished, she gave me a strange look. Inside I shriveled.

Months later I learned that when she got home that night, she told her father, "I have found a voice."

Miss Gowey kept her studio open for me at night twice a week so I could study under her. I paid \$1.50 a lesson. But Charles was having difficulty finding work and I owed Miss Gowey \$83. I was horrified. But she insisted that I come back. "People have helped me," she said. "I'll help you." She wouldn't let me give up.

Then tragedy struck. Out on a construction site, my husband was injured and lost a leg. God helped him through his misfortune, though money became even shorter.

After five years of voice lessons, Miss Gowey said it was time for me to sing in public.

I heard that Mount Olive Baptist Church needed a strong soprano for their Easter sunrise service which was to be held in a cemetery. I applied. I sang my first public solo out among the tombstones. I'll never forget that morning sun breaking through the clouds as I sang Lift Up Your Heads.

Later I was invited to the Central Presbyterian Church where I have been soloist ever since. The people at Central Presbyterian encouraged me to continue my studies under Professor Norman Gulbrandsen of Northwestern University.

Friends at Central Presbyterian and other Joliet people helped with scholarship funds. I began giving concerts at the church. And I still kept up my domestic work.

Concert offers began coming in from other parts of the country. I sang at the American Baptist Convention and at the National Convention of Church Women United.

Last summer I went on a European concert tour. It was wonderful to sing in such places as Westminster Abbey. But I most enjoyed singing for American boys at the big Army bases in Germany, for I had five sons in service.

At the end of the tour we were visiting Brussels and a friend took me to an interesting little church. Inside, the sounds of the street were muted; candles glowed before the altar. I felt a warmth, a close presence of God, and I sank to my knees, feeling unworthy of all He had bestowed on me.

Suddenly the years flew back and once again I was sitting on my bed talking with Him. The candles flickered and as I looked up at them, my eyes misted and the flames seemed to become golden stars.

FETUS IS DOMINANT PARTNER

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has been much debate recently as to whether a fetus in the womb has the same rights as any other human being. Indeed, proponents of abortion would have us believe that the fetus is not a live human being at all. They say that a woman should have the right to control her own body, but lose sight of the biological fact that it is the fetus, not the woman, that is firmly in control throughout the pregnancy. In the following paper, presented before the Royal Australasian College of Physicians, Dr. Albert W. Liley, of New Zealand, reveals the fetus as the dominant partner in the relationship. He describes how the unborn child independently dominates among other things, fetal position, amniotic fluid regulation, maternal body function, immunological success, and the initiation of labor.

The pro-abortionists also confuse the issue by trying to convince us that denominational religious considerations are the prime motivation against abortion. Nothing could be further from the truth. Dr. Liley makes a scientific, not religious, argument and demonstrates that the fetus has an independent life in control of the prenatal environment. Science and ethics are not incompatible. Lest anyone doubt his scientific qualifications, Dr. Liley is known throughout the world as

the "Father of Fetology" for developing the intrauterine transfusion to treat unborn children afflicted with Rh disease. A fellow of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Dr. Liley is the research professor in perinatal physiology at the postgraduate OB-GYN School of the National Women's Hospital in Auckland.

The paper presented by this eminent research scientist follows:

THE FETUS IN CONTROL OF HIS ENVIRONMENT

(By Albert W. Liley)

My subject, the foetus in control of his environment, is concerned not primarily with the pronouncement of a few facts which are easily come by and soon forgotten but with the more difficult task of presenting a concept—that the foetus is not a passive, dependent, nerveless, fragile vegetable, as tradition has held, but a young human being, dynamic, plastic, resilient and in very large measure in charge of his environment and destiny. The traditional attitude is understandable because for many centuries the only serious students of the foetus were accouchers and embryologists. The accoucher was concerned primarily with mechanical problems in delivery, so that the only aspects of the foetus which mattered were the presenting part and its diameters in relation to the diameters of the birth canal. For proof of this contention we need only reflect that, apart from Semmelweis, the great and famous in obstetrics are those who worked out better ways of delivering breeches or posteriors, better ways to design and use forceps or how to do caesarean sections. No one can deny the tremendous benefits conferred on humanity by these men, but their work left untouched the whole of foetal life and development. The embryologist studied dead, static tissue and attempted to deduce function from structure—no easy task when we remember that there are physicians still practising today who recall being told as medical students that the pituitary gland was a vestigial structure with no known function. The embryologist's wildest surmises fell short of the dynamic realities of foetal life. But in the meantime, the attitude had become fixed; that apart from some aimless kicking which began in the fifth month, the foetus was a placid, dependent creature who developed quietly in preparation for a life that started at birth.

The legacies of this attitude are not hard to find. Birth is the crowning achievement of motherhood. Women speak of their waters breaking or their membranes rupturing, when they really belong to the foetus. The deep symbolism attached to cutting the cord, separating the baby from his mother, is entirely lost when it is realized that cutting the cord really means simply separating the baby from his own organ, the placenta, which he no longer needs. We could dismiss these misconceptions as harmless folklore but for some rather sinister infiltration of these ideas into the law. By legal definition the baby only acquires proper status as a member of the human race when, *inter alia*, the cord is severed and he has independent circulation, a requirement which sublimely ignores the fact that he has had an independent circulation for the whole pregnancy.

We may feel that we have outgrown these fallacies, but the terminology and the viewpoint stubbornly prevail. The sebaceous retention cysts and witch's milk of the neonate, the labial development and withdrawal bleeding of the baby girl are explained in a dozen textbooks as the effects on the foetus of exposure to high levels of maternal hormones, when really it is the mother who is exposed to high levels of foetal hormones. Because the medicine of adults preceded the medicine of the infant, neonate and foetus a tendency has grown up in fields

from surgery to psychiatry to start with adult life and work backwards. And since the standard of all that is normal in medicine has been the fit young adult male, any function in the baby which differs from this standard has been considered as immaturity, and by inference inferiority. The net effect has been to consider the foetus and neonate as a poorly functioning adult rather than as a splendidly functioning baby. Neonatal kidney function provides a ready example; for, by adult standards, the baby lacks the ability to concentrate urine. He handles a water load well but cannot cope with a large solute load, or least not unless he has plenty of water to handle it with. Both before and after birth the baby lives on a diet with a very high water content which he must convert to relatively anhydrous tissue. From an osmometric point of view he lives in constant danger of drowning, but his asymmetric kidney function is precisely what he needs to cope with this situation. It is only misguided adults who embarrass this function by failing to give artificially fed babies additional fluid in situations of high water loss—for instance, heat waves. Left to himself, on demand feeding, the baby would not get into this plight. We do not regard the foetal cardiovascular system as one big heap of congenital defects, but rather as a system entirely appropriate to his circumstances, and there is little reason to regard his "immature" kidney function in any different light.

The foetus lives in a very warm and very wet environment. He is neither in stupor nor hypoxic coma. By electroencephalographic studies he shows cyclical activity, the lighter periods of which correspond in the neonate with a drowsy wakefulness from which he is readily aroused by external stimuli. He is disturbed by flashing lights on the abdominal wall and responds to sound, human voices included, from as early as twenty-five weeks. He is aware of pain and discomfort. The foetus responds with violent movement to needle puncture and the intramuscular or intraperitoneal injection of cold or hypertonic solutions. Although we would accept that these stimuli are painful for adults and children and, to judge from his behavior, painful for the neonate, we are not entitled to assert that the foetus feels pain. It would seem prudent to consider at least the possibility that birth is a painful experience for a baby. Radiological observation shows foetal limbs flailing during contractions, and if one attempts to reproduce in the neonate by manual compression a mere fraction of the cranial deformation that may occur in the course of a single contraction, the baby protests violently.

It is the purposeful search for comfort which determines foetal position *in utero*. Getting comfortable presents little problem in the first half of pregnancy when he is relatively small and in a globular cavity. He has no position of stability and moves freely and rapidly. Occasionally these conditions still prevail in late pregnancy, for instance in the presence of polyhydramnios or with the uterine cavity truncated by a placenta praevia or fundal placenta. Normally in the second half of pregnancy the uterus is no longer globular but ovoid, with the lower pole narrower, and the foetus elongates more rapidly than the uterus. However, amniotic fluid volume reaches a maximum at 28-32 weeks, and up to this time the foetus, although normally restricted to a longitudinal lie, is by no means cramped or under any obligation to lie well-flexed. As amniotic fluid volume diminishes from 32 weeks to term, comfort becomes more difficult to achieve. If the foetus elects to flex his legs at the knees, he will fit in best as a cephalic presentation, since his head forms a smaller pole than his back, thighs, calves and feet. If, however, he elects to extend his legs at the knees, then

he will usually be most comfortable as a breech, since his tapering lower trunk and thighs form a smaller pole than his head, calves and feet. Variations of uterine contour, abnormal size or location of the placenta, and the presence of another foetus may all present further challenges to comfort and ingenuity and result in stable malpresentations.

Foetal position, whether he lies with his back anterior, posterior or lateral, is determined by other influences, notably the tone of the mother's uterine and abdominal wall, the shape of the maternal lumbar lordosis and changes in maternal position, Braxton-Hicks' contractions and external palpation, all disturb the foetus and may provoke him to seek a new position of comfort. He purposefully seeks to evade the sustained pressure of a phonendoscope of knuckle on prominences.

Although the very early embryo develops in flexion, beyond this stage there is little evidence to justify the traditional assumption that flexion is fundamental in foetal musculoskeletal development. In midpregnancy, with plenty of room, the foetus can move as he pleases. Nearly buoyant and with intervertebral discs virtually synovial joints, he can assume postures difficult or impossible for the child or adult. In late pregnancy, when the foetus elongates more than the uterus, he must fold to fit in. Commonly the attitude is again one of flexion, but sometimes he elects to lie with neck, limbs, or trunk extended, and sometimes grossly hyperextended, a preference he continues to express as his position of comfort after birth if nursed naked in a warm environment.

The realization that the foetus himself determines the way he will present in labor by making the best he can of the space and shape available to him puts the practice of version in new perspective, and nowadays fewer obstetricians assume that they know better than the foetus how he will be most comfortable. Of course, in selecting a position of comfort in late pregnancy, the foetus may have chosen a position which is hazardous or impossible for vaginal delivery. In this regard he may be said to lack foresight, but this is a trait not unknown in adults.

The foetus is responsible for the regulation of his own amniotic fluid volume. The foetus does not need his kidneys to regulate his body water and electrolytes, his placenta handling this task; but he does need his kidneys for maintenance of amniotic fluid volume. A patent and functional gastrointestinal tract is also required. That the foetus drinks his amniotic fluid is readily demonstrated, and the rate of drinking averages out at about 25ml per hour. Foetal swallowing is important because it appears to be the major, if not the only, significant route by which the osmotically active colloids of amniotic fluid can be removed.

The foetal swallowing regulates amniotic fluid volume raises the question of what regulates foetal swallowing. Whereas foetal micturition does not contribute to foetal hydration, foetal swallowing does appear to contribute to foetal nutrition, for babies who cannot swallow amniotic fluid (e.g. in oesophageal or duodenal atresia) are smaller, maturity for maturity, than normal babies. This evidence raises the possibility that foetal hunger in fact regulates foetal swallowing. Traditionally it has been considered that hunger is a powerful and brand-new experience for the baby after birth, and that before birth an obliging mother and faithful placenta have supplied all baby's needs. But does the foetus really live in a metabolic Nirvana? We know that fluctuations in maternal blood-sugar levels and many other substances are reflected transplacentally, and the sight of babies who have been mainourished *in utero* makes it difficult to believe that the foetus has

been a stranger to hunger before birth. Have we perhaps a clue to the polyhydramnios of the pregnancy in the diabetic mother or the oligohydramnios of toxæmic pregnancy?

The foetus has much greater ambitions, however, than simply the control of his immediate confines. For the duration of pregnancy he rules his mother's body, for it is the foetus who induces all the changes which make his mother a suitable host for him. From soon after conception, neither maternal pituitary nor ovaries are necessary for successful pregnancy; the newly conceived supplies all the hormones necessary for maintenance of the decidua. The effects of foetal rule are seen most strikingly in changes of maternal excretory function. It is progesterone produced by the conceptus which induces the hyperventilation and mild respiratory alkalosis of pregnancy. Since the foetus lacks external surface of his own for heat dissipation, he must use his mother's skin as a radiator. The expansion of the mother's plasma volume necessary for vasodilation and a high skin circulation is induced by oestrogen made by the foetus. Changes in maternal kidney function are the least satisfactorily explained, although in part at least the dilution of plasma protein contributes to the increased glomerular filtration and the fall in haematocrit to the increased renal plasma flow.

These changes, induced by the foetus, in maternal excretory function appear somewhat extravagant and overdone. They are well established before the conceptus is of any significant metabolic size, and even at peak foetal excretory demand greatly exceeds his needs. On the other hand, from the mother's point of view the additional renal osmotic work required is quite modest, just as the 20-25% increase in cardiac output is quite modest in comparison with effects of even mild exercise. Traditionally, pregnancy has been considered a time of metabolic stress, of increased metabolic rate for the mother's body. In fact there is little evidence to justify this view. The measured increase in oxygen consumption in pregnancy is neatly accounted for by foetal oxygen consumption, a state of affairs mirrored by the increase in maternal haemoglobin mass, which both in time and magnitude matches foetal growth and oxygen consumption. Mother's personal oxygen consumption in pregnancy is virtually unaltered; and since certain structures, notably uterus and breasts, are metabolically more active, it follows then that other tissues must be less active. This quiescence is seen in the diminished muscle tonus, the diminished peripheral thyroid activity and the relative insulin resistance of pregnancy. In summary, the foetus organizes his mother so that she shows an increased acquisition of nutrients, some increase in storage, notably fat and possibly calcium, and a general metabolic quiescence so that nutrients are deflected for foetal needs.

Another type of foetal control, and perhaps his most dazzling achievement, is seen in his command of a parabolic situation. In an outbred population, mother and foetus are inevitably immunological foreigners, and yet for successful pregnancy they must be made to accept each other as mutual homografts. (The baby is immunologically foreign to the mother as the frequently rejected heart transplant is immunologically foreign to the recipient.) The magnitude of this homograft problem and a measure of its successful solution is the fact that it is quite possible for a woman to bear more than her own bodyweight of babies during her reproductive career. Early explanations of this mutual acceptance of a homograft attempted to give the mother credit for the performance. However, the uterus is certainly not an immunologically privileged site, and

the conceptus can grow in sites other than the uterus—for instance, tube or peritoneum. There is no evidence of any but the feeblest weakening of immunological reactivity in the mother during pregnancy. On the other hand, we cannot plead the old parrot cry of immaturity in the foetus. It is now known that transplantation antigens appear very early in embryonic life and that the human foetus is immunologically competent by at least as early as 12-14 weeks, so that clearly the homograft problem is a two-way affair. Nevertheless it is a component of the foetus which ensures the immunological success of pregnancy. This component is the trophoblast, which not only forms a continuous barrier between the circulations of mother and foetus but also fails to express any transplantation antigens itself. The trophoblast acts as an immunological barrier or buffer between mother and foetus so that each is completely indifferent not only to the transplantation antigens of the other but even to a specific sensitivity of the other against its own antigens.

Throughout pregnancy it is the mother, not the foetus, who is passive and dependent. Therefore it might be fitting if we could ascribe to the mother a positive role in ending pregnancy, in initiating labor, just as she had a positive role originally in allowing conception. Older theories generously gave the mother this privilege, but one by one these theories have been found inadequate. The idea that labor is an eventual immunological rejection of the foetus fails to explain labor in isogenic strains. Theories invoking cervical distension cannot explain labor with transverse lies. Uterine distension appears plausible in view of the premature labors with polyhydramnios and multiple pregnancy but founders badly on advanced extra-uterine pregnancies where "false" labor is a common presenting symptom. Despite the fact that oxytocin infusion may produce an excellent clinical labor, theories involving maternal oxytocin and oxytocinase are becoming harder to accept with an increasing body of evidence that oxytocin has little if any part in spontaneous labor. The possibility that it was the foetus who determined when labor should start was inherent in theories of hormone, especially progesterone, withdrawal, for it is the foetus who makes the hormones. However, the role of the foetus has been made even more unequivocal by the studies in foetal surgery and endocrinology of my colleague, Dr. G. C. Liggins. His work may be summarized very briefly—no foetal pituitary, no labor! Since even a hydratidiform mole has a labor of sorts, it is evident that the natural tendency of a uterus to expel any object distending it provides a backstop, but it appears inescapable that normally the onset of labor is a unilateral declaration of independence by the foetus. This conclusion puts concepts of term and postmaturity in new perspective and suggests that in deciding on induction of labor the obstetrician should have good reason to believe that he knows better than the baby when it should be born.

These five topics I have discussed—foetal position, amniotic fluid regulation, maternal body function, the homograft situation and the initiation of labor—demonstrate the physiological dominance of the foetus in pregnancy. The list of topics could be expanded, but always the conclusion is the same—it is the foetus who is in charge of the pregnancy. This of course is not news to any woman with an unplanned pregnancy, but it is a relatively new concept in obstetric physiology and the implications are far-reaching. No longer can we accept the foetus as a placid vegetable, growing structures and maturing in blind anticipation of a life to begin at birth. Instead, from as early as we can recognize, development of structure and development of function go hand in hand.

The foetal visual machinery is bombarded by and responds to photons; it has been shown that flashing lights applied to the maternal abdominal wall produce fluctuations in the foetal heart rate. The foetal auditory system is bombarded by and responds to sound; sudden noise in a quiet room startles the foetus lined up under an image intensifier. Although we do not know if the flavor and taste of amniotic fluid vary much, the great Dutch obstetrician de Snoo demonstrated that the foetus drinks more amniotic fluid if it is sweetened with saccharin. Conversely the foetus swallows very little if the amniotic fluid is injected with the contrast medium, Lipiodol—an iodinated poppy-seed oil which tastes foul to an adult or child and which causes a neonate to grimace and cry. Because the foetus often lies with his face in close proximity to his hands and feet, it is not uncommon in obstetric radiology to detect the foetus sucking thumbs, fingers or toes, and thumb-sucking has been photographed as early as nine weeks. The foetal larynx works at its primary phylogenetic task as a respiratory tract sphincter. All the foetal endocrine glands have their task *in utero*. The foetal gonads might appear exceptions, and certainly the foetal ovary awaits an assignment, but the foetal testis is necessary for male sex differentiation. It is true of course that the task some foetal structures perform is not the same and/or not for the same purpose as they will have after birth. Particular examples are the adrenal glands, which produce large quantities of estrogen precursor for the placenta and the liver, which for much of pregnancy is a major haemopoietic organ.

These multifarious activities of the foetus challenge the obstetric physiologist because clearly we cannot understand the physiology of pregnancy if we remain in ignorance of the physiology of the dominant partner in this relationship, the foetus. Just as nowadays we would maintain that the responsibilities of the obstetrician may start before conception, so we would maintain that the responsibilities of the pediatrician may start before birth—that no longer should pediatricians accept with a resigned fatalism what time, intra-uterine life and the obstetrician present them with at birth—or, worse still, forty-eight hours after birth. The list of foetal maladies which can be diagnosed and managed in one way or another grows steadily. Indeed in some conditions we can accurately diagnose and hopefully treat the foetus as a patient as early as seventeen weeks, a time when the reformers of abortion law would cheerfully maintain that he is not yet human. Nowadays, apart from parents, it is only lawyers, administrators and astrologists who attach any significance to the date on which we were born. From a medical standpoint we are looking after the same person before and after birth, and it may be entirely fortuitous whether he be born under Capricorn or Pisces.

There is room for practitioners of adult medicine to show a little more respect for pregnancy and its master, the foetus. We should reserve the right to consider heart disease as a complication of pregnancy rather than take the medical textbook view that pregnancy is a complication of heart disease. Recently, a surgeon friend of mine remarked how fortunate we were at National Women's Hospital in that we dealt with expendable organs. But these expendable organs are the means of creating a new human being, the greatest responsibility and the only immortality most of us will ever know. Not only the obstetrician and immunologist have something to learn from the foetus. He heals fractures much more readily than adults, shows a much more prompt and efficient haematological response to haemorrhage than adults, and his ability to heal experimental burns would be the envy of a plastic surgeon. In many respects it would be more

appropriate to consider the adult as a poorly functioning foetus than the foetus as a poorly functioning adult.

In antenatal education the effect of animating the foetus is most dramatic. Fascination with foetal development and life not only takes a mother's mind off all the minor miseries of pregnancy but, most important, leads parents to accept that the baby is not a by-product of pregnancy but the end-product; in fact, he is the pregnancy, and yet the one party who did not enter into the arrangement by choice.

Not all of us will live to be old, but we were each once a foetus. We had some engaging qualities which unfortunately we lost as we grew older. We were supple and physically active. We were not prone to disc lesions and were not obese. Our most depraved vice was thumbsucking, and the worst consequence of drinking liquor was hiccups. We ruled our mothers with a serene efficiency which our fathers could not hope to emulate. Our main handicap in a world of adults was that we were small, naked, nameless and voiceless. But surely if any of us count for anything now, we counted for something before we were born.

REUSABLE RESOURCE STUDY ACT OF 1974

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is inconvenienced by fuel shortages, and threatened with a food shortfall. Possible shortages in other areas can be prevented by thoughtful Federal legislation. Recycling of waste material and returning it to the economy—returning waste into a usable resource—and thereby alleviating some of the drain on our environment and natural resources is just such a move.

Legislation which I have introduced would determine what materials can and should be recycled and what products should be composed of recycled materials. A committee would be established to study the Federal Government's capacity for using recycled materials.

The bill is limited to Government use of materials for two reasons. First, it will allow a comprehensive study to be accomplished within a reasonable time with minimum expense. Second, the findings of this experimental study can be applied to many other facets of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer look only at our natural resources to provide us with all the materials we need. We can only "go to the well" so often before it runs dry. Our ingenuity must now be tested to help us carry on and maintain our present levels of consumption; my bill recognizes this necessity. Government has a responsibility to lead the way.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my bill follows:

H.R. 12370

A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to conduct a study relating to the procurement and use by the Federal Government of products manufactured from recycled materials

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds that—

(1) there are many products and materials which, after they have been used or damaged, are discarded or scrapped as waste matter;

(2) the accumulation of this waste matter presents a danger to the health and welfare of the citizens of the United States;

(3) many products and materials (otherwise discarded as waste matter) could be recovered and reused as the raw material for new products and materials;

(4) such recovery and reuse of such waste matter will abate the noxious and dangerous accumulation of such waste matter and will aid in the effort to conserve our scarce natural resources; and

(5) the Federal Government has the responsibility to lead in the effort to utilize recycled material by procuring, using, and recycling, to the greatest extent possible, those products and materials which have, as part of their composition, recycled or recyclable material.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines, and the Administrator of General Services are authorized and directed to jointly conduct a full and complete study of (1) which products and materials procured or used by the departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the Federal Government could be required to have, as part of their composition, recycled and recyclable material while meeting the use specifications of such departments, agencies, or instrumentalities, and (2) the feasibility of recycling wastepaper from all Federal offices. For the purposes of this study, wastepaper means any paper which (A) has served the purpose for which it was originally manufactured, (B) has been scrapped or otherwise discarded as an element of solid waste, and (C) can be recovered in whole or in part and reprocessed into a new raw material used in the manufacturing process of new paper.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services, in carrying out the joint study under this Act, are authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government any information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary and the Administrator, upon their joint request.

(b) For the purposes of securing the necessary scientific data and information the Secretary and the Administrator may jointly make contracts with universities, research institutions, foundations, laboratories, and other competent public or private agencies to conduct research into the various aspects of the problem of using products and materials which have, as part of their composition, recycled and recyclable material. For such purposes the Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services shall report to the Congress, from time to time, the findings and results of the study conducted under this Act. The final report shall be made on or before the expiration of the twelve-calendar-month period following the date of enactment of this Act. Such final report shall include the findings and results of the study, and specifically—

(1) recommendations as to the necessary and proper legislative, administrative, or

other actions that should be taken in order to insure that the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government procure and use (whenever possible) products and materials which have, as part of their composition, recycled and recyclable material; and

(2) the feasibility, economically and otherwise, of recycling wastepaper from all Federal offices.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this Act, the term "recycled material" means any product or material completed for sale or use which has been scrapped, used, damaged, or otherwise discarded; and—

(1) recovered in whole or in part and reused as all or part of the contents of any new material or product; or

(2) the salvageable wastes or byproducts of post-consumer use which are recovered and reused as all or part of the contents of any new material or product.

(b) As used in this Act, "recycled material" does not include any waste or byproduct that results from the production or manufacture of goods intended for sale or use.

SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

FINANCING THE SOVIET UNION: U.S. EX-IM BANK GIVES A HELPING HAND

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while the U.S. House of Representatives has passed legislation prohibiting credits to the Soviet Union, the U.S. Export-Import Bank continues to grant credits at subsidized rates to the Soviets. The Journal of Commerce of January 21, 1974, reports that the Ex-Im Bank has authorized four more credits totaling \$37.7 million for the Soviet Union. These credits will help finance purchases of U.S. machine tools and other capital goods.

Mr. Kearns, the former President of the Ex-Im Bank has previously expressed caution on the expanding granting of credits to the Soviet Union. He has now been joined by Mr. Malcolm R. Currie, Director of Defense and Research Engineering in the Department of Defense, who states that:

He is very concerned about exports in high technology areas which have both civilian and military application.

Mr. Currie further states that:

They [the Soviets] apparently see that they can neither close pivotal gaps in a military capability nor gaps in a general economic growth—domestically and worldwide—until they acquire a manufacturing technology comparable to ours.

The Eximbank is enabling the Soviets to close those pivotal gaps. There has been no evidence that such aid to the Soviets is in any way in the national interests of the United States. Rather, the evidence lies completely on the other side. Aid to the Soviet Union, which has been miscalled trade, harms the security and interests of the United States. The U.S. Eximbank and many

American industries are continuing to enable the Soviets to build their military might as I have continued to point out in numerous speeches in this House and throughout the country.

It is suicidal for the American people to be subsidizing the U.S. Export-Import Bank while at the same time that institution subsidizes credits to the Soviet Union. For this reason I have cosponsored a sense of the Congress resolution which would deny loans, guarantees, insurance, or credits by the Eximbank to the Soviet Union. The Eximbank should immediately cease and desist from the granting of any further credits to Moscow. At this point I include in the RECORD and article from the Journal of Commerce of January 21, 1974, entitled "Eximbank Grants More U.S.S.R. Credits." I also include in the RECORD the text of the resolution that I cosponsored.

EXIMBANK GRANTS MORE U.S.S.R. CREDITS

WASHINGTON, Jan. 20.—The Export-Import Bank has authorized four more credits, totaling \$37.7 million, to the Soviet Union, to help finance purchases of U.S. machine tools and other capital goods.

The loans bring to 10 the number of credits extended by Eximbank to the Soviet Foreign Trade Bank since last year. They total roughly \$158 million.

The largest of the four new credits—\$16.2 million—will go for iron ore pellet plant equipment, to be supplied by Allis-Chalmers Corp., Milwaukee. The equipment, valued at \$36 million, will be delivered starting the fourth quarter of this year. Private U.S. sources are expected to lend an additional \$16.2 million to the Soviet bank for the project.

An \$11.8 million Eximbank loan will help finance sales by International Harvester Export Co., San Diego, of gas reInjection compressors to the Soviet Oil Ministry. Wells Fargo Bank, San Francisco, will also extend an \$11.8 million loan.

LaSalle Machine Tools, Warren, Mich., has sold \$15 million of transfer line equipment to the Soviet Union under a \$7 million Eximbank loan, with the French-American Banking Corp., New York, providing another \$7 million. The lines will be used for the manufacture of truck engine pistons.

A \$2.7 million Eximbank credit, matched by \$2.7 million from the Franklin National Bank, New York, will finance the Soviet Union's purchase of \$6 million of transfer line equipment for machining friction drums for farm tractors. Jones and Lamson Co., Springfield, Vt., supplied the line.

The loans are to be repaid over periods of seven to eight years, with grace periods varying from 10 months to more than three years. A 6 per cent interest rate will be applied to all four credits.

H. RES. —

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that, during the period pending consideration and action by the Senate upon the bill H.R. 10710, as introduced in the 1st Session of this Congress, cited as the "Trade Reform Act of 1973", and as amended and passed by the House, no loan, guarantee, insurance, or credit shall be extended by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to any nonmarket economy country (other than any such country whose products are eligible for column 1 tariff treatment on the date of the enactment of this resolution), and no such country shall participate in any program of the Government of the United States which extends credits or credit guarantees or investment guarantees, directly or indirectly.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 66

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last November, before the House adjourned for 1973, the Boston Globe published an article by Nathan Cobb describing Congress' activities on gun control legislation. The article documents a largely futile effort by the pro-gun control Members of Congress against the gun lobby, whose influence was strongly felt in many congressional offices.

In the second session of Congress, we will again have the choice of ignoring or promoting responsible bills to control handguns. If we do nothing to stop handgun availability, 10,000 people will die needlessly this year. Certainly, this fact ought to be adequate incentive for strong efforts to pass laws in this area.

The description of Mauri Salvia's death, from the January 1, 1974, New York Times, is included below, together with the November 18, 1973, article from the Boston Globe:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1974]

AUCTIONEER'S BUSINESS ASSOCIATE ACCUSED OF FATALLY SHOOTING HIM

CAMDEN.—Joseph A. Kaplan, a 26-year-old Israeli citizen, was arrested on murder charges this morning in the fatal shooting last week of Maurice Salvia, an Atlantic City Boardwalk auctioneer for whom he worked as a chauffeur.

The shooting occurred, the police said, on the night of Jan. 2 in Mr. Salvia's home in Cherry Hill. Mr. Kaplan had lived with the Salvia family since September.

He had been held by the Camden County Prosecutor's office and the Cherry Hill township police as a material witness in the killing since last Thursday.

The authorities said that Mr. Kaplan came to New York City from Israel two and a half years ago with a work visa and had lived in New York City before meeting Mr. Salvia and moving in with the family.

In addition to his chores as chauffeur, the police said, Mr. Kaplan was associated in the auctioneering business with Mr. Salvia.

In 1971, Mr. Salvia and Danni Marion, 40, of Cherry Hill, were indicted on loan sharking and extortion charges by Federal authorities. The Camden County Prosecutor's office said the Federal charges were pending.

A spokesman for the Prosecutor, Thomas J. Shusted, said that Mr. Salvia, who was 31 and Mr. Kaplan, had been associated in an auctioneering operation in Atlantic City and at the Pennsauken Mall.

[From the Boston Globe, Nov. 18, 1973]

STRONG U.S. HANDGUN CONTROLS STILL FAR FROM REALITY

(By Nathan Cobb)

The National Rifle Assn. (NRA) recently issued a call to arms.

"Face it," the organization warned its members—"a gun law fight by '74" was lurking on the horizon.

Considering the facts, this exhortation to do battle with impending Federal gun control legislation seems almost to have been written as a joke.

As the first session of the 93d Congress draws to a close, substantially stronger Federal laws pertaining to the possession of handguns in the United States are perhaps

as far from becoming reality as they have been at any time.

In the Senate, three stiff handgun bills have been in the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency since February. The chairman of the committee, Sen. Birch E. Bayh (D-Ind.) has indicated he will not act on any type of strong gun control laws because he prefers that action be initiated in the House.

In the House, at least 16 bills calling for a ban on handguns or a system of national registration of such weapons are resting quietly in the Judiciary Committee. This is the body currently dealing with matters related to Watergate, and it is not expected to shift its focus for several weeks or even months.

Even if tough handgun bills are approved in committee, there seems little likelihood they will become law. The trio of strong bills now in the Senate all were defeated in exact or similar form last year on the floor by overwhelming margins.

A major bill, proposed by Sen. Bayh, which did pass the Senate last year, banned the sale, importation and manufacture of certain small handguns. It was aimed at the new domestic manufacturers of so-called "Saturday night specials," but died in the House without reaching a vote.

A discouraged Bayh, whose staff spent a great deal of time and effort on the bill, now feels the Senate should not act until something is initiated in the House.

Rep. Robert F. Drinan (D-Mass.), a member of the House Judiciary Committee, confirmed this week that even if a strong bill were to reach the House floor it would stand virtually no chance of passage.

"Even if it did pass, the President would veto it," Drinan predicted. "With presidential leadership, all things can happen. But why go through thousands of hours of agony and have it defeated?"

Meanwhile, handguns and handgun crime continue to mount. Latest figures released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation show that handguns were used in 54 percent of the homicides in the United States last year, a 3 percent increase over 1971.

Last year, Americans spent as much money on handguns as on equipment to play baseball. There are an estimated 35 million handguns in this country, and figures from the US Treasury Dept. indicate that more than 2 million a year are being manufactured or imported.

In August, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice, Standards and Goals—made up of state and local law enforcement officials under the aegis of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)—recommended that all state legislatures pass laws prohibiting the ownership, manufacture, sale and possession of handguns by Jan. 1, 1983. It also recommended that penalties for committing crimes with the use of handguns be increased.

To date, LEAA has had no indication that any states have undertaken the commission's firearms recommendations.

Its report stated that the commission "believes that private use and possession of handguns infringes on the right of the American public to be free from violence and death caused by the use of handguns."

The report represented the fourth such national commission in the past six years to recommend substantially stiffer gun control laws.

After the LEAA report was released, then-Attorney General Elliot L. Richardson asked Justice Dept. lawyers to examine the question of gun control. But Richardson resigned on Oct. 20, and a spokesman for the department this week would state only that the investigation "is still going on, with no recommendations yet."

According to the executive director of the National Council For A Responsible Firearms Policy, Inc.—a small Washington-based lobby

which favors handgun registration but not confiscation—the blame for lack of stronger gun control legislation rests with the White House.

"The Administration has said it will send up bills pertaining to 'Saturday night specials' but it's never done so," Michael J. Steinberg asserted this week. "It's got nothing to do with Watergate, either. The inertia has always been there."

"We can have all the bills and all the hearings in the world," Steinberg added, "but in the end it's the Administration which has to do something to get the ball rolling."

Two of the strong anti-handgun bills currently in Congress ban all private ownership of handguns except by certain persons such as members of the armed forces, law enforcement officials and members of pistol clubs.

Several other measures prohibit civilian manufacture, sale and purchase of handguns, but allow those now held by the public to be retained. One of these was filed by 17 congressmen including Michael J. Harrington, Thomas P. O'Neill and John J. Moakley, all Massachusetts Democrats.

The remaining bills are a mixed lot. Seven call for handgun registration. Of these, at least two also set up manufacturing standards which would primarily limit the production of inexpensively made "Saturday night specials." One of these was filed by five senators including Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Claiborne D. Pell (D-R.I.).

A similar bill, filed in the House, would set the same criteria for domestic manufacture and sale of handguns as are now applied to imports. The importation of "Saturday night specials" is currently prohibited.

At the same time that prospects for stronger gun laws look dim, anti-gun control forces are hoping to subvert the 1968 Gun Control Act. This existing control deals primarily with interstate commerce and the use of the mails.

A dozen bills would repeal the entire Act. This is a step advocated by many gun enthusiasts, and one which was called for this year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) during its 74th national convention.

In all, 60 bills pertaining to changing the nation's gun control laws are in both branches of Congress.

The efforts of the "gun lobby" in squelching stronger laws—particularly the efforts of the NRA and the one million members it claims to be able to marshal—are given mixed reviews by legislative staff members who have worked on such measures.

"They tie it all up in masculinity, Communism and everything else," one staffer who helped prepare two strict bills commented this week. "They're very effective in dealing with emotion rather than reason, and it works."

Said another: "The 'gun lobby' is a myth to the extent of its collective power. But there are plenty of individuals out there who feel strongly enough about gun control that they will cast their votes on that one issue alone. Give them some credit; they make themselves heard."

AID AND TRADE WITH THE COMMUNISTS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, in 1967 Eugene Lyons published a small booklet on aid to and trade with Communist countries entitled "Operation Suicide: Those Strange Bridges to Com-

munist." Mr. Lyons, of course, is famous for his books "Assignment in Utopia," "The Red Decade," and "Workers Paradise Lost." Although the booklet was written nearly 7 years ago, its importance has grown as our aid and trade to the Communist nations have increased.

I would like to insert the booklet serially by chapter into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues on this vital matter. Permission for insertion has been obtained from the gracious publishers of "Operation Suicide", Twin Circle, 86 Riverside Drive, New York.

The first chapter, which follows, is entitled simply, "Operation Suicide."

OPERATION SUICIDE

A dispatch from Poland in a Hamburg newspaper on October 1, 1966 reported: "While on one side of the Stettin harbor American wheat is unloaded from freighters, on the other side of the same harbor weapons are loaded which are used against American soldiers."

This was not an exceptional day or an exceptional piece of news. For years the United States has been supplying Poland and other Iron Curtain countries not only with food but with hundreds of commodities that fortify their own and Soviet Russia's capacity to provide military and economic support to North Vietnam.

Even our so-called non-strategic goods enable those countries to divert facilities and manpower to military production for Hanoi. But hundreds of American exports to the communists lend themselves directly to use against Americans and their allies fighting in Southeast Asia. To make matters worse, a Presidential order on October 12, 1966 stuck some 400 items from the list of commodities which for 20 years had been banned for export to communists. But the nature of products cannot be altered by official fiat. Most of them—various metals and electronic components, for example—remain no less strategic than they were in the past.

Our shipments to Communist Europe have included radio-communications equipment, combustion engines, refrigeration compressors, synthetic fibers, computers, rocket engines, air-borne devices, synthetic rubber, containers for explosives, nuclear radiation and detection instruments. They include fertilizer chemicals, which Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has called "as important as bullets"; industrial processing control instruments, vegetable oils, medicinal supplies.

Directly or indirectly such items end up as ingredients in the Soviet-made anti-aircraft system in North Vietnam, one of the largest and most advanced ever constructed; in Soviet airplanes, surface-to-air missiles, rockets, radar and other implements now taking a toll of thousands of American lives and hundreds of American planes. In effect, we are passing the ammunition to the enemy while he is shooting at us.

SOPHISTICATED SCHIZOPHRENIA

To simple-minded observers handicapped by common sense, this may look like political schizophrenia. But official Washington sees it as a sophisticated policy under the newly fashionable rubric of "building bridges" to communist governments. The administration is ardently committed to wide-open trade, long-term credits, most-favored-nation tariffs for the European allies of Ho Chi Minh and his Viet Cong, plus all possible "accommodations" looking to a full detente or rapprochement.

To promote this so-subtle policy, beyond the grasp of unsavvy peasants throughout the country, the administration is most careful to say and do nothing that might offend the men in the Kremlin, no matter how

serious the provocation. When Soviet missile ships deliberately harassed a U.S. destroyer in the international waters of the Sea of Japan, the provocation was laughed off by Washington as harmless mischief—boys will be boys. An indication by the Soviet military attaché in our capital that Moscow was prepared to use Soviet pilots against American planes in Vietnam drew neither a protest nor a desist warning from the U.S. Government. The last teeth have been pulled from official and semi-official broadcasts to the communist-captive peoples. The magnitude of exports of strategic materials to the Soviet bloc is played down. Most disastrously, the fable is being spread that the cold war is over or about to expire, thus disarming our world psychologically in meeting the continuing challenge.

Americans who can't follow the logic of this conduct are assailed as "obsessed anti-communists"—and naive. One Congressman who favors long-term credit, Chester L. Mize of Kansas, said frankly and sadly during a House hearing: "You may think them naive, but I'm afraid a lot of our constituents look upon this as trading with the enemy." Only this "naïveté" at the grassroots, in fact, stands between the bridge-builders and the accomplishment of their grand design.

The Soviet-bloc dictatorships boast that they are the main suppliers against "American imperialist aggressors" in Southeast Asia. And they are telling the truth. The U.S.S.R. and its satellites, according to a study by the U.S. News & World Report (January 30, 1967), "are furnishing the real sinews for major and prolonged war" in Vietnam. Since then both Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Democrat, and Melvin R. Laird, a Republican leader in the House, have estimated that 80 percent of the war materials flowing into North Vietnam now come from the Soviet-bloc countries.

The classic example of economic support of an enemy is the sale of U.S. scrap iron to Japan. In that case, we were not yet at war and there was no certainty that the metal would be returned to us in bombs and bullets. But in the present situation we know as a grim fact that our exports are being translated into American casualties. Moreover, since most of this trade is on the basis of long-term credits guaranteed by the U.S. taxpayer through the Export-Import Bank, we are in effect subsidizing the expansion of enemy strength.

On October 3, 1966, the Soviet bloc announced in Moscow another vast enlargement of its material support of Hanoi. Only four days later President Johnson, in a foreign policy address in New York, said this about economic support to the Kremlin and its satellites.

"We do not intend to let our differences in Vietnam or elsewhere prevent us from exploring all opportunities," he said. But the chief differences are that we are on one side of a war, they on the other; that they are fomenting and arming communist revolutions in Central and South America, where we are laboring for peaceful progress.

The President went on to announce plans for "peaceful engagement" that "will help us build bridges to Eastern Europe." These included Export-Import Bank loans and guarantees of commercial credits, American financing of an Italian Fiat plant in Soviet Russia, most-favored-nation treatment of European communist states not yet enjoying these tariff advantages.

How did the communists react to this magnanimous offer, flawed by no hint that we expected any *quid pro quo*? Their response ranged from cold to insulting. The President's speech was virtually ignored by the Soviet press. In the puppet capitals it touched off new floods of anti-American bilge. Leonid Brezhnev, the Kremlin Party boss, haughtily declared that the U.S.S.R. would

not even consider U.S. proposals for accommodation until we removed our forces from Vietnam.

Since then the rebuffs to the President's plea for "peaceful engagement" have multiplied. On April 23, 1967, the U.P.I. reported from Moscow a new "declaration yesterday that American hopes for a United States reconciliation were vain as long as the United States troops remained in Vietnam." A few days later Brezhnev, in East Berlin, called for "unity of action" by all communist governments, Red China included, for "the active, many-sided and steadily increasing brotherly help of the Soviet Union against the United States in Vietnam."

But Soviet refusal to play the game cannot douse the zeal of the political bridge-builders. They wipe off the spit and say it is raining.

The communists, of course, desperately need American machinery, technology, and expertise—on long-term credits. Behind the scenes, possibly, they are encouraging our incredible plans to give it to them. Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, after a visit with President Johnson at the White House, went so far as to tell reporters that he thought America "sincere"—we are so grateful for a kind Soviet word that this momentous admission made news!

Publicly, however, we have maneuvered ourselves into the role of supplicants, in effect begging the communists to help themselves to our wealth and know-how. Washington, amazingly, has chosen to deny itself the advantage of a bargaining position, behaving for all the world as if they were doing us a favor in accepting American largesse. The mythical man from Mars, reading the record, would suppose that the U.S. was so starved for communist trade that it was willing to demean itself to get it.

While official Washington, in dread of "offending" the Kremlin oligarchs, is curbing its own tongue and preventing others from speaking forthrightly about Soviet conduct, how does Moscow repay this restraint? A few samples, out of the thousands available, give us the answer:

On November 21, 1966, readers of *Pravda* were told, in a review of Soviet books about America, that the United States is ruled by "a tight bloc of military and industrial magnates . . . representing in essence what existed in Hitler's Germany." On March 18, 1967, Moscow Radio informed its listeners that "teams of U.S. experts on bacteriological warfare" in Vietnam have inoculated thousands of rats with bubonic plague, causing "over 100 cases of plague in three coastal towns of South Vietnam." Why Americans would want to spread the horrible disease in territory where their own troops and Vietnamese allies are deployed was not explained.

Ironically, even *The New York Times*, so fervent in its propaganda for those "bridges," is not spared in the relentless anti-American barrage. Thus *Pravda* on November 3, 1966, charged this newspaper with opening its pages to "enemies of communism," purveyors of "tales . . . nonsense . . . deliberate falsehoods . . . rubbish." Some weeks later, on December 25, *Izvestia* accused the *Times* of "playing into the hands of those who are doing everything they can to worsen Soviet-American relations."

In the course of a floor debate in March, 1967, Senator Frank Lausche of Ohio exclaimed: "I want someone to show me one step—one meaningful step—the Soviet Union has taken toward a detente." None of the Senatorial bridge-builders did or could. At this point it is strictly a one-way love affair, with Uncle Sam cast in the role of the eager but rejected wooer.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

By this time no one denies that our exports and credits to the Soviet bloc help maintain the military vitality of North Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh could not maintain his ag-

gression for a month without the continuing flow of Soviet materiel and weapons. But the U.S. government and the "liberal establishment" are so persuaded of the wisdom of their "bridge-building" enterprise, that they will pay a heavy and embarrassing price to promote it.

In what they consider the long-term interests of peace, they are knowingly bolstering communist strength for the current war and for future "wars of liberation" on the Vietnamese model to which the Kremlin daily pledges all-out support, including armed force.

To justify itself, a policy so paradoxical and so costly in American blood and substance should be overwhelmingly convincing. It should be foolproof—supported by concrete evidence of its efficacy, as distinct from theorizing guess-work.

But the bridge-building brigades, unfortunately, rest their case on hopes, speculation, and conjectures related to supposed changes in the U.S.S.R. and its European empire since the passing of Stalin 14 years ago. They point, in the recent words of the State Department's chief ideologue of the strange policy, Dr. Walt Rostow, to signs of "pragmatism and moderation" in the communist camp which may open roads to "reconciliation and cooperation." Specifically they refer to alleged trends toward "liberalization" and "economic reform" and, in the satellites, pressures for "national independence."

The bridge-building theory holds that large-scale Western and especially American goods and credits would accelerate these trends, relieve cold-war tensions (if, indeed, there is still a cold war) and encourage the puppet regimes to break away from the country which created them, imposed them on unwilling populations and has defended them against their subjects.

Some even talk of "convergence" of the two worlds, ours moving toward democratic socialism, communists moving toward democracy and free enterprise, the two meeting in the center and living together happily every after. This fanciful prognosis, of course, is angrily rejected by the communist nations as a malicious capitalist fairy tale. It can't come true, Khrushchev warned us, until "shrimps learn to whistle."

Never before has a great and powerful nation based its world policies on such a flimsy foundation of wishful thinking geared to self-deception. Because the risks and the stakes are so enormous, at least two questions must be answered factually:

1. Is there any solid proof that the blue-printed bridges would in fact speed up political mellowing and national independence at the communist ends of the bridges?

2. Is the Washington estimate of what has happened in Communist Europe accurate, or is the administration reading its own hopes into developments there?

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO HON. FREDERICK L. KRAMER

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my great pleasure to have you join with me today in lauding the outstanding achievements of a young man who grew up in my congressional district and was recently projected into international prominence for his highly extensive, in-depth background research, most authentically

portrayed and historically accurate publication entitled, "The White House Gardens." On the eve of the 200th anniversary celebration of the founding of our country, this excellent, beautifully illustrated publication already looms in the forefront as a work of excellence and a work of art. Our heartiest congratulations and best wishes are extended to the Honorable Frederick L. Kramer who is the publisher and author of this collector's item on our American heritage.

All of us in my congressional district can point with pride to Fred Kramer and the excellence of his manuscripts on American art history. Many of us who had the good fortune to grow up with him as a good friend and neighbor are especially inspired by not only his exemplary writings but the warmth of his friendship and his quality as an individual. There is no question that Fred is a credit to himself, his family, and the people of America and underlying all of his great progress—and I am sure he would be the first one to agree—is the fine guidance and counseling of his mom and dad, the Honorable and Mrs. Harold Kramer, who enjoy the highest reputation and esteem of all of us who have the good fortune to know them. The sensitivity of the extraordinary achievement of the offspring is the reward of fulfillment from the love and compassion of the most distinguished parents, and Adeline and Harold Kramer exemplify the best and finest.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress a copy of a recent news article that appeared in the Passaic Herald News, one of New Jersey's prestigious newspapers, reporting on the formal ceremony held in the White House gardens commemorating Fred Kramer's presentation of the first copy of "The White House Gardens" to our First Lady, Mrs. Richard M. Nixon, who wrote the preface to this historic document and living memorial to the serenity and beauty of America's landscape. The news report is as follows:

AREA MAN WRITES TEXT, PUBLISHES DOCUMENTARY

Frederick L. Kramer, member of a well known area family, is the publisher and author of the text of a first historical and pictorial record of "The White House Gardens."

The book traces both the history of the most famous gardens in the United States from the time of John Adams to the present and gives detailed illustrations on how they are planned and what they look like.

For the past two years, Great American Editions, Ltd., has been working with the cooperation of the White House curator, Clement Conger, the White House florist, Rusty Young, and the head gardener, I. Williams.

For the first time, an artist was permitted to work on location making water colors of the various flowers in the gardens and those used for centerpiece arrangements for state occasions. He is the noted artist, Harold Sterner, son of the turn-of-the-century artist, Albert Sterner.

"The White House Gardens" is an authentic and original documentation of the American heritage. Included are 25 full color plate reproductions of Mr. Sterner's water colors; many pages of fascinating Presidential and

political anecdotes gathered by Mr. Kramer, and actual planting plans of the present White House gardener for spring, summer and fall showing in detail all the beds and various flowers. Also in full color done by Mr. Sterner on location are White House flower arrangements for the state occasions.

According to Mr. Kramer, the White House gardens have been as much a part of American history as the White House, itself.

In the preface written by Mrs. Richard M. Nixon, she says, "With the publication of "The White House Gardens," there is now available to all a comprehensive reference on the landscape that has evolved from a countryside terrain to a stately setting of flowers, shrubs and trees."

Mr. Kramer, who now lives in New York City, grew up in the Passaic-Clifton area. A writer and editor of American art history books he is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Kramer of Passaic. The text, which he has written for this book, represents extensive research.

The book was printed by the Hoechstetter Printing Co., Pittsburgh, and bound by A. Horowitz & Son, Bookbinders, Clifton.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to call to the attention of you and other Members of the House of Representatives this most significant accomplishment by an outstanding young man of my district and know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in saluting Fred Kramer and all of his good works with our best wishes for continued success and happiness as he progresses in his increasingly upward spiral in documenting the history of the American dream for the enjoyment of all of our people.

THE CURRENT CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Ms. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, Watergate revelations continue unchecked. In a recent letter of my constituents points out that he, as an attorney, would have a hard time avoiding disbarment if material evidence in the control of his office was destroyed during the pendency of a court proceeding. He says that:

The tremendous disrespect for the legal profession which has arisen as a result of the current Washington revelations is something that I am facing daily with my clients, my professional associates, and most importantly, with the jurors with whom I have so much frequent contact.

He goes on to note that:

My greatest concern probably arises from the searching inquiries that are made of me, supposedly for the purpose of obtaining wise responses, from my children aged 14, 16 and 18.

I think Mr. Harold Feder, as a citizen, a parent and a member of the legal profession, expresses well the concerns that have been voiced by many of my constituents in recent days.

Following is the full text of Mr. Feder's letter:

Re: Current Constitutional Crisis And Other Matters

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER.

DEAR PAT: This is probably my first communication with you since I visited with you briefly at the benefit affair held for candidate Alan Mersen at the Regency Hotel last year. A considerable body of traumatic factual events have occurred in government since our last visit, and it is those events which compel me to direct this letter of extreme concern at this time.

It will probably assist if I enumerate the things that concern me most about the present posture in which the President of the United States seems to find himself, at least according to published accounts:

1. As a concerned citizen I truly fear for the result of the government scandals which now are rocking our country. We tend to be a nation of those who believe that the least government is the best government. This can occur only when the citizens of the United States truly believe that the laws of the United States will be enforced fairly and impartially as to them and that, high or low, they will receive a fair hearing and a fair application of the laws. Recent public events have suggested that there are those in this country in high places who are above the law and cannot be touched by the law or the judicial process. This attitude will surely spell a breakdown in the self governing parameters of a large number of the American population.

2. As a practicing trial attorney involved almost weekly in the judicial process, I am flabbergasted at the posture which the President of the United States has picked for himself with regard to the judiciary and the judicial process. Should the charges that have now been made against the President be made against any practicing attorney before any bar of the United States, surely that attorney's license to practice law would not long endure. Which one of us could claim with impunity destruction of material evidence in a presently pending court case when that evidence was under the supervision and control of our office, and avoid disbarment proceedings? The tremendous disrespect for the legal profession which has arisen as a result of the current Washington revelations is something that I am facing daily with my clients, my professional associates, and most importantly, with the jurors with whom I have so much frequent contact. This indeed is a dark hour for the legal profession.

3. My area of greatest concern probably arises from the searching inquiries that are made of me, supposedly for the purpose of obtaining wise responses, from my children aged 14, 16 and 18. Sadly, they were just coming out of the no-peek patriotism "America Love It or Lose It" time frame, and they are now hard pressed for rational answers and explanations, and they do not relent. My statements have been an attempt at reassurance, a reassurance which is founded upon the principle that our precious gem of constitutional government *adequately provides* for a crisis such as this. Conviction of an accused by newspaper articles has never been particularly to my liking. On the other hand, at this juncture the presumption does indeed seem great. The test for my children of the truth of my statements to them of the power of our constitutional government will be determined by Congress in the near future.

It would be hard for me to describe which of the Watergate revelations has been the most difficult for me to cope with. I can only say that the recent article from The Denver Post of January 12, 1974, a copy of which is enclosed, serves somewhat to characterize my grave concern. I don't know whether it is the oil companies' influence for the Alaska pipeline, the Trans-Siberian gas transmission

line, or another crack at the Teapot Dome naval oil reserves which concern me the most. I don't know whether it is the ITT "contribution" or the milk producers contribution or the James Hoffa release from prison contribution or the Vesco contribution or the Hughes contribution, or whether it's maybe a compilation of all the contributions.

Whatever the cause, I feel deeply compelled as a citizen, an attorney, a father, as a former Naval officer and Korean war veteran, and as one of your constituents to suggest—no, not suggest, to urge—your support for impeachment proceedings to be brought at the earliest possible date.

I believe that the longer that this constitutional crisis wears on, the greater will be the damage to our form of government and the confidence of the people in their form of government and the very government itself. Soon, too soon, we all will become insensitive and cynical.

And so I write this letter before I have become insensitive and before I have become cynical to seek your assistance in bringing the matter of impeachment to bear quickly and in a forthright manner. Only through impeachment can the trial that I think we so desperately need be held. Only through this device can the cloud of suspicion which surrounds the President be dispelled, or if it is not to be dispelled, then the innuendoes and the charges will have an airing in a form which will allow their proof. As a citizen and a lawyer and a father, it seems that this is the only alternative, but it must be speedily undertaken.

For these reasons and many more too extensive to set forth in this brief transmission, I urge you to vote in support and in favor of impeachment proceedings. It is with heavy heart that I, a lifelong Republican and continual Nixon supporter, take this most severe step.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD A. FEDER.

GET OFF HIS BACK

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a recent radio broadcast by Mr. Doug Zepp of Pensacola, Fla., was called to my attention. You may or may not agree with his comments, but I think they are worth bringing to the attention of my colleagues. His speech does summarize the views expressed by a large number of my constituents, and I am sure, perhaps, of yours.

The speech follows:

GET OFF HIS BACK

The office of the President of the United States demand more time, energy, intelligence and mental fortitude than any position held by any man in the world.

Our President, in my opinion has done more for this country and under more adverse conditions than any President in my lifetime.

I think it's time we get off his back.

Our President has brought an end to the war in Vietnam.

He has brought all of our POWS home.

He has ended the draft.

He is the first President ever to visit Mainland China.

He has re-structured the Supreme Court for the first time in this century.

He has brought an end to compus unrest and violence.

He has traveled more miles abroad than any other U.S. President.

He was elected to the highest office in this great country by the biggest majority of this century.

Sure, he's made a few mistakes. Nobody's perfect. My Dad made some mistakes in his lifetime. But it didn't change my opinion of him. He was still a good man, and as any good man . . . he profited from his mistakes.

Let's stop talking about impeachment and Watergate and start thinking about the Pearly Gates. Let's show some love and compassion for our President and our country. He can't possibly know what everyone working for him is doing. The company I work for employs over five thousand people. Should the plant manager be judged for something one of his employees does?

I think its' time we started acting like the people who made this country great. . . . I think it's time we started talking about supporting our President not deporting him. . . . *I say let's get off his back* and let him do the job we elected him to do.

Sure, this country has problems. But it was not our President who created them. But he can help solve them.

We need to find a solution to the energy crisis.

We need to find a cure for cancer and heart disease.

We need to care for our senior citizens.

We need to reduce crime.

We need to fight drug abuse and alcoholism, plus pollution.

And there are many more things that need to be done. . . . *Yes we've got problems.*

But we must work together and get on with the business at hand and stop fighting among ourselves.

But running the President of the United States down and dividing our country won't solve them.

I urge all Americans to unite and pledge their support to the President of the greatest nation in the world . . . and I beg you . . . *Please get off his back.*

THE CONTINUING FLIGHT OF ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, for several years we have viewed a continuing controversy over the status of certain aliens who have entered the United States illegally and who have been subsequently exploited and threatened by unscrupulous employers, landlords, and creditors and have been unduly and unnecessarily harrassed and degraded by agencies of the Federal Government. As yet, however, no meaningful consideration has been given to the plight of these hapless men, women, and children—either to the misery they are forced to endure while living in a constant state of fear while in this country or the conditions in their native lands which have precipitated their departure.

An especially distasteful aspect of this situation is the fact that the term "illegal alien" has become a code word for Spanish-speaking and our community has been forced to bear the brunt of the Government's ill-conceived policies de-

signed to purge the land of illegals. As a consequence, numerous dragnets have been conducted in the Northeast and the Southwest in which anyone who may speak with a Spanish accent, who may appear to be of Latin background to some immigration inspector or who may otherwise present a "foreign" or Latin appearance is apprehended and is forced to prove he is an American citizen. Basic civil liberties, rights guaranteed by the Constitution and simple human dignity have been violated time and time again by these reprehensible practices.

In the February issue of the Progressive, Father Mark Day, a parish priest in Los Angeles, has written a timely and quite perceptive article on the plight of the illegal immigrants and the efforts which some have made to deal with the situation on a more humane, legal, and affirmative basis. The article not only attempts to look at the situation from the Spanish-speaking community's viewpoint but also focuses on certain repressive State and Federal legislation which only exacerbate the problem. I present Father Day's article herewith for inclusion in the RECORD and urge that our colleagues give it full and careful consideration. It is an issue which we cannot ignore and it seems to me that we have an obligation to act in a more responsible, compassionate and progressive manner than we have in the past.

The article follows:

ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS—A VIEW FROM THE BARRIO

(By Mark Day)

Marla Hernandez was changing her baby's diapers when U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) agents arrested her at a deteriorating East Los Angeles apartment house in February 1973. Marla, a Mexican citizen who had overstayed her visitor's visa in the United States, was hysterical when she arrived at the alien detention center in the basement of the New Federal Building in downtown Los Angeles. The young mother cried out desperately for her baby. The agents allowed her to recover the infant hours later, when he was found nearly suffocated in his excrement. The last I heard was that the baby was taken to the County Hospital with a serious case of pneumonia. When an attorney questioned INS officials about the incident, they told him that the child was born in the United States and was not under the jurisdiction of the Service.

The illegal immigrant issue, described by a labor leader in Los Angeles as a dilemma surrounded by an enigma, is one of the most complex social problems in the United States today. Government statistics show a dramatic increase in the number of immigrants deported each year. The majority are Mexicans, refugees attracted by a better standard of living in the United States. In 1972, of the 492,189 aliens arrested, more than eighty per cent were apprehended in the Southwestern states, some 94,000 in Southern California alone.

One method of control has been periodic sweeps of city streets and factors by the INS "It's a crime to have brown skin in this town," one of the members of a Mexican mariachi band told me. The band plays each Sunday at our church services. The congregation, whose membership is now almost totally Spanish-speaking, comes to life with blaring trumpets and cheerful hymns at these masses. More than sixty-five per cent of these church-goers at St. Joseph's in downtown Los Angeles are in this country illegally.

Matters worsened last June when the INS conducted a series of dragnet raids in Southern California to round up the illegal immigrants. Soon after the intensified raids began, churches, television stations, and community organizations were inundated with complaints alleging that the agents made unlawful arrests, broke up families, ignored the constitutional right of due process, brutalized and harassed brown-skinned people regardless of their status in this country, and created an atmosphere of terror—especially in the Chicano community. A class action suit on behalf of several plaintiffs was filed by the American Civil Liberties Union to "insure that the law enforcement officers would follow their own [Federal] law in making arrests." As yet no decision has been reached by the Federal court.

Chicano activist Bert Corona, the director of the Center for Autonomous Social Action (CASA) of Los Angeles, an organization working for reforms in immigration law and practices, claims that the present labor certification regulations are designed to keep out foreign labor. Yet, he points out, because the border is, in effect, open, foreign workers enter the country to work and are burdened by the stigma of illegality. Corona believes that many employers find this desirable, since they can pay the aliens lower wages and dispose of workers at whim merely by calling the immigration department—often just before payday.

Corona and a growing number of activists throughout the country disagree with the assertion that the aliens themselves are responsible for depressing wages and depriving local residents of low income jobs. They point to the shortages of workers in some industries such as garment manufacturing and add that local residents generally have a natural edge on the job market since they can speak English, supply references, and are familiar with local community resources.

The real culprits, say the defenders of the immigrants, are the employers who seek to employ these workers—whatever the source—who will work at the cheapest possible pay rates.

National attention focused on the problem of the aliens in October 1971 when INS agents rounded up several of them at a food processing plant belonging to Ramona Bafuelos, President Nixon's appointee as treasurer of the United States. Harry Bernstein, labor reporter for the Los Angeles Times who broke the Bafuelos story, also revealed that an illegal immigrant was working at the Western White House.

It came as no surprise to me that aliens worked for either Ms. Bafuelos or Mr. Nixon. There are from 300,000 to 500,000 such workers in Southern California, occupying menial jobs in places like food packing plants, factories, and restaurants, or pruning rose-bushes and trimming hedges on the grounds of most parks and suburban estates.

The concern of the California legislature led to the enactment of the Dixon Arnett law in November 1971. The law, fining employers for hiring illegal immigrants, was to have gone into effect in March 1972. It became a hotly debated civil rights issue, since it authorized employers to question the immigration status of predominantly brown-skinned people. The law was declared unconstitutional in February 1972 for two reasons: The field of immigration and naturalization is preempted by the Federal Government, and the act, with its criminal sanctions, was considered "too vague, indefinite, and uncertain."

The Arnett law was followed by a Federal bill (H.R. 982), introduced by Representative Peter Rodino, New Jersey Democrat. The House passed the bill, almost a carbon copy of the Arnett law, in May 1973. The bill, stalled in the Senate Judiciary Committee,

has strong support from many liberal legislators and much of the labor movement, though there is growing dissent within the unions on this issue.

Although farm labor leader Cesar Chavez never made a statement supporting the Arnett law, it is believed that he initially favored the measure. The United Farm Workers have always had the problem of aliens being transported to the fields to break their strikes, especially in the Coachella and San Joaquin Valleys of California. It would follow that any legislation restricting aliens from the labor market would be beneficial to his organizing activities. But Chavez undoubtedly saw the suffering that the Arnett law, even in anticipation of its going into full effect, caused Chicanos and other Latinos working in urban areas. He also wanted to avoid any damaging rift between rural and urban Chicanos, since his battle with the Teamsters was just beginning.

Therefore, when the House of Representatives passed the Rodino bill, Chavez condemned it. The UFW leader said that the bill "would not help either urban or rural workers in their common struggle against unscrupulous employers." His major objection was that the bill should have had provisions directed against labor contractors who recruit aliens as strikebreakers. The UFW statement also opposed the bill "for encouraging discrimination against brown-skinned people and for breaking up families who had long standing roots in this country, and who, for the lack of a piece of paper [a visa], are subjected to embarrassing and burdensome practices and rules enforced by government bureaucrats unconcerned with the plight of poor people."

Chavez referred directly to the detrimental effects of the Arnett law. Instead of the employers, it was the workers—both lawful and alien residents—who felt the brunt of the law. Months before the law was to go into effect, employers began to fire anyone suspected of not having proper documentation. Church and social centers, especially in the Los Angeles area, were flooded with hardship cases. Several immigrants told me they had married legal residents and had children born in the United States. Since they could not produce visas, their employers had laid them off. In some cases, Chicanos who were legal residents were turned away because of their skin color or their heavily accented English. On one occasion, a Puerto Rican worker asked me to write a letter for him in English, guaranteeing that he was from Puerto Rico and not from Mexico. His poor grasp of the English language led several employers to believe he was an illegal immigrant.

In a meeting with the bill's sponsor, Assemblyman Dixon Arnett workers complained that their employer, a large soup company, had demanded that all employees without documents put up a \$400 cash bond in case of a fine. Other workers complained that their bosses fired them, rather than newer workers, since they enjoyed seniority, paid vacations, and other benefits.

The simplest way for an employer to evade the law, we told Arnett, was by using a simple legalistic device. The boss asks the worker, tongue in cheek, if he is lawfully entitled to work. If the worker answers affirmatively, the employer has exercised his duty under the law. The worker, however, is now in a more dependent position than before because his boss has done him another "favor." Arnett listened carefully, but said that his law was the only way to handle the problems caused by the aliens.

A growing number of legislators fear that the Federal bill will create the same injustices as the California law. The opposition to the Rodino bill in the House was led by Representative Herman Badillo of New York and Representative Edward Roybal of Cali-

fornia, both Democrats. Badillo, whose ancestry is Puerto Rican, said that the illegal immigrant "has become one of the most popular scapegoats for our bankrupt economic policies and soaring unemployment problems." He disagreed with claims that aliens take jobs from U.S. citizens, increase welfare costs, and create balance of payments deficits by sending money abroad. Aliens, he said, take jobs that lawful U.S. residents do not want; they pay taxes, are consumers, and stay away from public assistance programs.

Badillo noted that the news media have been responsible for advancing erroneous figures on the number of illegal immigrants living in the United States. He was referring to stories such as the one that appeared in *The Washington Post*, November 12, 1971. The lead sentence read: "Up to one million New Yorkers may not be New Yorkers at all . . . instead, they are aliens."

According to the news story, an INS official claimed that there are more than 2.5 million illegal aliens in New York City, while Sol Marks, the local INS director, expressed doubts that there are even tens of thousands in the New York City metropolitan area. Other newspapers have published such figures without attempting to verify the facts.

Besides Cesar Chavez, other labor leaders have disagreed with the rationale behind the Rodino bill. At a recent rally in New York City, Henry Foner, the president of the Fur, Leather & Machine Workers Union, AFL-CIO, protested the dragnet raids conducted there by the INS. Foner told the group, composed mainly of Latin Americans: "As long as unions allow themselves to be deluded into believing that the illegal immigrant is their enemy—so long will they be demobilized in the important and necessary fight against their real enemies—the big business interests, the profiteers, and their corrupt protectors in government."

The Mexican-American Labor Council of Los Angeles, headed by Trinidad Flores, also has attacked the Rodino bill. In a letter to Andrew J. Biemiller, the AFL-CIO's chief lobbyist in Washington, Flores said that the Rodino bill "does not serve the best interests of the Mexican-American community nor that of labor."

Representative Roybal has suggested several positive solutions to the alien dilemma. As a means of reducing the number of illegal immigrants, Roybal proposes that the Western Hemisphere ceiling for legal admissions to the United States—which is now 120,000 annually—be increased to 170,000 to equal total admissions permitted from the Eastern Hemisphere countries (including Europe and the Orient); that the system which gives preference to reuniting families, now applicable to the Eastern Hemisphere, be extended to all Western applicants; and that immigrants from both hemispheres be permitted to legalize their status while remaining in the United States. As of now, some immigrants have to return to their country and wait more than two years before they can return. Unfortunately, these suggested amendments were killed during the House debate last May.

Bert Corona of CASA has suggested that workers who are not here legally but have jobs as well as roots in the community should have their status legalized. This, he believes, would drastically reduce the problems caused by the present vulnerability of their status.

Senator Edward Kennedy, a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, spoke sympathetically about the plight of the aliens on a television interview in Fresno, California, during last year's convention of Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers Union. Kennedy agrees with the UFW position that the Rodino bill would not effectively punish the unscrupulous employer who hires aliens to exploit them.

Another bill, sponsored by Representative Joshua Ellberg, Pennsylvania Democrat, stipulates that all immigrants will be allowed to change their status while remaining in the United States, a privilege which is now accorded only to Eastern Hemisphere immigrants. The House Judiciary Committee approved the Ellberg bill in October. Opponents of this bill argue that the measure limits annual immigration from any one country to 20,000 a year. Representatives Roybal and Henry Gonzalez, Texas Democrat, argue that the bill discriminates against Mexicans, cutting the present immigration quota from Mexico by one-half. Roybal and Gonzalez have supported an amendment to the Ellberg bill which provides for special preference for Mexican immigrants. They maintain that unique historical, economic, and social relationships between the two countries warrant this preference.

It is unfortunate that we have not yet learned to overcome the nativistic mentality in our country which continues to regard the foreign born as economically threatening, unclean, and "un-American." We still tend to hang labels on groups of people, then conclude that any means necessary can be used to get rid of them, including approaches that lessen our basic freedoms and make a mockery of the Constitution.

VIETNAM CEASE-FIRE ANNIVERSARY

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing the first anniversary of the cease-fire agreement in Vietnam. The agreement came about after much negotiating and it still remains a fragile agreement. Despite the predictions of critics that the Government of South Vietnam would collapse soon after the withdrawal of American troops, this predicted collapse has not occurred. As we view the American experience in Vietnam a year after the American withdrawal of military forces, we can gain a new perspective on our role in Asia. This significance was stated effectively in a column by Henry Huglin entitled "The Value of Our Role in Vietnam" which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on January 7, 1974.

A YEAR LATER—THE VALUE OF OUR ROLE IN
VIETNAM

(By Henry Huglin)

Just a year ago we were in the throes of the intensive bombing campaign of North Vietnam. This bombing sparked an uproar of criticism, but it was apparently the necessary and key act in finally getting the agreement last January—under which we got our POWs freed and were able to extricate ourselves from Viet Nam with some integrity.

How goes it now with Viet Nam, where we invested so much—our youths' lives, money, and agony? And what of the worth of our involvement from a year's perspective?

Well, the cease-fire has been a farce; fighting has continued sporadically between the South Vietnamese and the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong.

But there is political stability in South Viet Nam. Tho no democratic paragon, President Thieu has been skillful and effective;

and his government, the people, and the army have performed quite well, considering the difficult circumstances.

It is certainly evident that the South Vietnamese far prefer any government of their own to Hanoi or the Viet Cong, and will fight persistently for their independence.

On the other side, the Communists are following their pattern of the past. They are obviously still determined to control South Viet Nam, no matter what the cost.

The Communists have consolidated their hold on the areas of South Viet Nam which are under their control and they have tried to expand these areas, with little success. The North Vietnamese have also moved great quantities of weapons and many more troops into South Viet Nam—apparently preparing for another big military offensive.

If another great battle comes off, it will be a crucial test of the basic goal of our help to the South Vietnamese—strength and will to defend themselves.

Hopefully, the South Vietnamese will prevail in all the fighting and ultimately throw out the North Vietnamese and establish lasting peace for themselves.

Tho the fate of South Viet Nam is still uncertain, we can begin to bring into better perspective the worth of our sacrifices there—irrespective of our mistakes.

Certainly the last five years of our involvement deeply and adversely affected our domestic unity, confidence, and view of our responsibilities in the world.

But, in an international geopolitical sense, our fighting for the principle of self-determination in helping the South Vietnamese resist Hanoi's drive to take them over, has helped stabilize the world scene with long-lasting and incalculable benefits.

Had we not responded to the challenge posed in Viet Nam in the 1960s, the whole of Southeast Asia might by now have fallen under the control of the militant expansionist regime in Hanoi, with repercussions far beyond that region.

And, having got involved in Viet Nam, the way in which we extricated ourselves became very important—as Presidents Johnson and Nixon repeatedly and rightly told us.

Had we cut and run in Viet Nam, we would have had little credibility now in the Mideast with the Russians, Arabs, or Israelis. Hence, Henry Kissinger's vital, catalytic role in seeking an enduring, just Mideast settlement would have been impossible.

Further, at some stage, the key to peace in the Mideast is likely to be a commitment from us to insure the security of Israel and to help enforce whatever settlement is reached. Had we dropped the South Vietnamese when the going got tough, no one, least of all the Israelis, would have placed any credibility on such a commitment of ours.

It is ironic that many who were highly critical of our role in Viet Nam and wanted us to cut and run are now depending on us to play the key role in protecting Israel and bringing a lasting Mideast settlement—without acknowledging the linkage.

Reliability, credibility, influence, and effectiveness in the world are built up as the accumulation of policies and actions over years, even generations. And, in trying to be a responsible superpower, we have inescapable duties and commitments in the world. If we don't fulfill these responsibilities consistently, the fragile structure of what stability and peaceful progress there is in the world will be undermined.

As time goes by—and as agonies and divisions over Viet Nam fade—more of us will appreciate the long-term value of our involvement there—as a major step in our helping move the world community toward greater political stability and better chances for more enduring peace.

FORMER CONGRESSMAN ROBERT T.
SECRET OF CAMBRIDGE, OHIO,
IS HONORED

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 22, 1974, I had the privilege and the pleasure of attending a reception in honor of former Congressman, and now State Senator, Robert T. Secret, of Cambridge, Ohio.

The Honorable Robert T. Secret served 10 terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, 7 years on the Federal Trade Commission, and is now serving his fifth year as a member of the Ohio Senate. In addition, Senator Secret resigned his seat in Congress to serve in the U.S. Navy during World War II, and he earned his law degree by attending law school at night while he was a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Secret is one of the finest public servants I have ever known. I am proud to call him my friend. He celebrated his 70th birthday this month, and I know that I speak for all of my colleagues in the Congress who know him when I wish him continued good health, happiness, and success.

Mr. Speaker, I insert my tribute to Representative Secret in the RECORD at this time:

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT T. SECRET

Over 2,000 years ago the great Aristotle declared that "a man who aspires to any high office should have three qualifications: First, he should be prepared to support the constitution of his country; second, he should have a special aptitude for the office he desires; and third, he should have virtue and justice as they are understood by his fellow-citizens." Those qualifications, embodying the classical wisdom of our civilization, have found honorable expression in the life and public service of Robert Thompson Secret.

An aptitude for the responsibilities and obligations of public service and an abiding commitment to virtue and justice as guardians of liberty—these qualities have distinguished him whom we honor here tonight throughout his long life.

The celebration of a seventieth birthday, marking the biblical "threescore years and ten", is, indeed, a fitting time for his fellow-citizens to pause, to reflect, and to render grateful and deserving homage. We live in the midst of troubled times for America and for the world, times wherein the faith and idealism which has always sustained this land is called to fresh exertions of the spirit as together we restore the sense of public trust which must always animate free government if it is to endure.

In such a time the example of a man such as Robert Secret is especially inspiring and significant. In such a time an occasion such as this rekindles our faith and our hope in the abiding vitality of America.

It was in 1933 that Robert Secret first came to Washington—to serve in the 73rd Congress of the United States. He brought with him a rich background of experience in State and local government, in education and in law. He entered the legislative branch of our Federal Government in a time of grave crisis for America. He was—be it noted—reelected to the four succeeding

Congresses during one of the most significant eras in our history.

In 1942, with the advent of American entry into the Second World War, he resigned his seat to serve in the United States Navy, in which he was appointed a Lieutenant Commander. Later he was promoted to commander. He served his country faithfully, bravely, and well during that terrible conflict, in England, in North Africa, and in Italy. For a year he was also on the staff of Admiral Chester Nimitz in the Pacific theatre as a military government officer.

In 1946 he was released from active duty, and returned to his first and life-long vocation in politics, seeking his old seat in the Congress. At first unsuccessful in his 1946 campaign for the 80th Congress, he was engaged as a legal supervisor in the Library of Congress until his resignation in 1947 and his successful candidacy for the 81st Congress, to which he was elected in 1948. He served this time from 1949 to 1954 in the 81st, 82nd, and 83rd Congresses, resigning to accept a 7-year appointment by President Eisenhower to the Federal Trade Commission, a position he held down from 1954 to 1961. His being named to the FTC was itself a mark of the esteem in which he was held by his colleagues of both parties and within the larger community.

During most of 1962 he served as director of commerce for the State of Ohio. However, his first love could not be denied, and in that same year he again sought public office, and was elected to the 88th Congress, taking office in 1963. He was re-elected to the 89th Congress, but was unsuccessful in his candidacy for the 90th Congress in 1966. In January of 1967, with the close of the 89th Congress, he left Federal service only to turn his energy and ability to public service here in Ohio; in 1969 he was elected to the State Senate, in which he has served with characteristic ability and distinction.

During his years in the House Robert Secrest was a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, a post reflecting his life-long commitment to the needs and aspirations of Americans who have served their country in the armed forces. Himself a life member of AMVETS, the VFW, and the regular veterans association, he is also a former past commander and life member of the Senacaville American Legion Post 747.

I think you will agree with me that this is indeed an extraordinary record, the account of a man's tireless devotion to the public good and his unfailing concern for that goal, in war and in peace, in innumerable political victories and in occasional political defeats, in the legislative and in the executive branches of our Government, in elective and in appointive office alike.

His public career—like his private life—has been marked by integrity of purpose and honorable achievement in behalf of the people he has served. The roots of his loyalty have encompassed his community, his State and his Nation and have flowered in loyalty to God, the common Father.

You will hear much tonight of particular aspects of his career and his personality, but I direct your attention to the larger picture, which, as we look back over some four decades—decades of historic import for this Nation and for the world, moves all who have known him to heightened respect and gratitude for the example he has provided in these troubled days.

My friends, the meaning of a man's life can never fully be known, save to God. But when that life has been characterized by public service, then we may see more clearly the values and ideals by which he has lived. So it is with my friend and col-

league, whom it is our privilege and pleasure to honor at this testimonial dinner. In honoring him we are recognizing a life built upon public trust and fidelity to principle; in paying this tribute to his remarkable career we are affirming the validity of our American system of government in the face of the challenges and trials which history sends.

We salute him tonight, we thank God who has brought him and us to this day, and we pray for a renewal of that spirit of service to God and to country which he has demonstrated and which has ever been the mainstay of this Nation and its people in every age.

In the Hebrew Bible it is written that "Gold and silver make the foot stand sure; But counsel is esteemed above them both," and again, "To the counselors of peace is joy." To Robert Secrest, patriot and wise counselor in the affairs of Government, we wish both joy and peace.

A TAX BREAK

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, Congressman ROSTENKOWSKI and I are today reintroducing our legislation concerning "downside" income averaging. This bill provides a tax break for the individual whose income falls off abruptly due, for example, to a work layoff or other reason beyond his control. Plant closings necessitated by the energy crisis are leaving thousands of Americans out of work. A work layoff of this nature forces a family who has enjoyed a stable income to suffer a sharp drop in income during a given year. This bill provides this unfortunate individual with a tax break, when he needs it most.

We are pleased with the excellent response we have received so far concerning this bill and we are still welcoming cosponsors to join us in the reintroduction of this bill. At the present time, the following Members have joined us in the reintroduction of this bill:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Bella Abzug, Thomas Ashley, Les Aspin, Lindy Boggs, George Brown, Jr. (Calif.), Charles Carney, Shirley Chisholm, Cardiss Collins, Silvio O. Conte, John Conyers, Paul Cronin, Dan Daniel, Mendel Davis, John J. Duncan, William Ford, Edwin B. Forsythe, Michael Harrington, and Ken Hechler.

Henry Helstoski, James Howard, Richard Ichord, Albert Johnson, Jim Jones (Okla.), Barbara Jordan, Edward Koch, William Lehman, Ray J. Madden, Richard W. Mallery, Donald J. Mitchell, (N.Y.), Parren J. Mitchell, (Md.), Joe Moakley, Charles A. Mosher, John Moss, Morgan Murphy (Ill.), Robert Nix, and George O'Brien.

Claude Pepper, Bertram Podell, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Charles Sandman, Paul Sarbanes, Pat Schroeder, John Seiberling, B. F. Sisk, John Slack, Pete Stark, Frank Thompson, Robert Tiernan, David Treen, Jerome Waldie, Richard White, William G. Whitehurst, Charles H. Wilson (Calif.), Larry Winn, Jr., Lester Wolff, Gus Yatron, and Andrew Young (Ga.)

WHEN OMB SPEAKS, NASA ADVISORY COMMITTEES LISTEN

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the delay in submission of the President's fiscal year 1975 budget, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announced today in the Federal Register that a 2½-hour segment of tomorrow's meeting of its Physical Sciences Committee will be held in executive session instead of public session. The change is dutiful but silly.

The notice says that the material to be discussed in this closed session "includes the budgetary planning and levels proposed in the NASA submission for the Office of Space Science in preparation of the President's budget for FY 1975."

That makes the material preliminary, not final, so there is no question of breaking a release date on actual budget figures and no reason to close the session. It then explains:

Under instructions from the Office of Management and Budget, this material may not be disclosed publicly until the President's FY 1975 budget is submitted to Congress.

Maybe so, but there are at least three things wrong with this:

First. The Federal Advisory Committee Act does not recognize instructions from OMB, in and of themselves, as justification for closing a meeting. It says that advisory committee meetings shall be open to the public unless they are concerned with matters which the Freedom of Information Act exempts from mandatory public disclosure, and "instructions from OMB" is not one of those exemptions.

Second. Even if the reason were valid, the form of the notice is not. The law requires that a determination be made in writing that a meeting or portion of it qualifies for closure, and no such determination appears in the NASA notice.

Third. It is giving inadequate notice of the changed circumstances of the meeting. Though it is labeled, "Notice of Change of Agenda," the notice is not announcing that something has been added to or subtracted from the agenda. Rather, it is giving only 24-hour advance notice that a meeting NASA said last week would be open will, in fact, not be.

Finally, the excuse that budget material may not be "disclosed publicly" does not fit the facts of the case, since 13 of the 14 members of the Physical Sciences Committee are public members—that is, not Federal employees. How is it that preliminary budget material can be disclosed to these members of the public and not to others?

Mr. Speaker, the text of the NASA notice follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION

NASA PHYSICAL SCIENCES COMMITTEE

Notice of Change of Agenda

Due to the revised date of the President's FY 75 budget submission to Congress, it is necessary to make a change in the PSO meeting agenda published last week.

Agenda Item (7): *FY 75 Budget Request* scheduled from 2 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., 31 January 1974, is changed to read: *Executive Session*. The material to be discussed in this closed session includes the budgetary planning and levels proposed in the NASA submission for the Office of Space Science in preparation of the President's Budget for FY 1975. Under instructions from the Office of Management and Budget, this material may not be disclosed publicly until the President's FY 1975 budget is submitted to Congress.

The meeting is still scheduled to be held in Room 5026, FOB No. 6 commencing 9 a.m. Thursday, 31 January 1974. For further information regarding the meeting, please contact Mr. Guenter Strobel: Area Code 202-755-3647.

HOMER E. NEWELL,
Associate Administrator, National
Aeronautics and Space Administration.

JANUARY 23, 1974.

[FR Doc. 74-2359 Filed 1-29-74; 8:45 am]

THE SOUTH AND THE ENERGY
CRISIS

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the fall issue of *Southern Exposure*, a quarterly magazine published by the Atlanta-based Institute for Southern Studies, included a special supplement on Southern power companies.

In this period of an "energy crisis," there is great interest in the energy industries, and I therefore submit for the *RECORD* Southern Exposure's summary of its special supplement. The magazine's editorial and subscription office address is Southern Exposure, P.O. Box 230, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514.

The article follows:

SOUTHERN POWER COMPANIES

Every month millions of Americans drop a check for fifteen, or thirty, or even fifty dollars in the mail, addressed to their local power company. The light bill is as "normal" to us as the light switch. And the ubiquitous nature of both—and the lack of control over either—are a reflection of the immense influence the electric industry has come to have over our lives. That's one reason control of such a business by communities is so important.

There are more reasons: The quality of service, the chance for decent work opportunities, the use of huge amounts of cash and invested capital. It takes money to make money, and the utility industry takes more money to keep it going than any other business in America; it's the most capital-intensive industry, which means it consumes large amounts of capital (put into generating plants, transmission towers, etc.) to produce each dollar worth of electricity. In the South, where labor-intensive industries (like textiles, apparel and furniture) prevail, the

concentration of capital in the utility business is even more important. For example, the Georgia Power Company spends more each year on building new plants than do all manufacturing industries in the state put together. Thus, Georgia Power virtually controls the construction industry, and with it the wage scale of thousands of workers. The power to decide who gets the big contracts for a new \$150,000,000 generating plant is another good reason to bring control of the utilities closer to home.

The sums of money involved in the utility business indicate how they match the impact of having a US Steel or a Ford Motor Company spend all its money for world-wide expansion in a few southern states. In 1971, private, investor-owned electric utilities spent over \$12 billion in capital expansion (buying new equipment and building new plants), bringing the total net value of their plants up to \$90 billion. (Most power companies say they will double their investment in generating facilities in the next five years.) In the same year, the non-profit, rural electrical cooperatives and municipal power systems, which serve 22% of America's electric customers, spent \$1.6 billion to build new facilities.* By contrast, the big four auto makers spent only \$1.8 billion in 1971 for new equipment and plants, while the top eight steel producers invested \$1.2 billion for their expansion.

Relatively moderate-sized utilities like Arkansas Power & Light, Florida Power, or Carolina Power & Light spent more in capital expansion than did Chrysler Motors (\$114,000,000); and the bigger ones, like Virginia Electric, Duke Power, and Florida Power & Light, spent three times this amount. The Southern Company, holding company for utilities in four southeastern states, spent more in 1971 on capital expansion in those four states than did General Electric, IT&T or Ford Motor on a world-wide scale!

Because of the tremendous amounts of capital they require, electric utilities have historically been subject to the will of the Yankee money markets. They have to go to Wall Street to borrow their money, and Wall Street is adept at exacting a high price in return. The large banks, insurance companies and brokerage houses demand growing, ever expanding profits on each dollar they invest. In the past, the utilities have met this requirement by promoting the sale of more and more electricity and by making their plants more "efficient." There was little regard for what the consequences of such policies would be, except that they yielded the greater profits needed for more expansion. Today's energy crisis is the product of such private enterprise at work.

*There are 3,500 electric utility systems in the country. Some 450 of these are investor-owned, and of this number about 75 have annual revenues exceeding \$100,000,000. More than 2,000 systems are owned by nonfederal public agencies (primarily municipal governments, like Jacksonville, Florida's Electric Authority), about 1,000 are rural electric cooperatives, and 41 are federal government projects. Because of TVA, the relatively large portion of southerners living in rural areas, and the earlier movements for public ownership of utilities, the South has more than its share of the publicly owned utility business. With only 26% of the nation's population, the South has 54% of the residents served by rural cooperatives living within its boundaries, and 50% of the revenues of these firms. Because of the cheaper price of electricity in the South, brought about partially because of TVA and public power, the average resident in the region consumes more kilowatt hours than his northern counterpart, and pays a smaller bill.

The banks still demand growing profits, even though there is virtually no risk in investing in the power monopolies. But utility plants have reached their maximum efficiency, and the costs of new ones have increased astronomically. So the utilities are forced to go to the regulatory agencies and ask to charge the public more money for the same service it is already getting. Whining about increased costs and threatening blackouts, the utilities demand more money to give the bankers so they can continue their policy of expansion. There is no mention of curtailing growth, no rational discussion of a decent rate of expansion, no thought of simply cutting out the profits in the utility business altogether.

But there is one further rub. It turns out that the utilities are effectively owned by the very same banks and financial institutions which they say they must satisfy. It's bad enough to pay Peter a little extra so he can pay the increased interest charge of his creditor Paul, but when Peter is taking our money to pay off himself, that's absurd. The utilities call it "normal"—like your light bill every month.

The solution to all this is more complicated than bringing control back home from "the North" to "the South." Of course, it is important to recognize the degree of control exercised by Wall Street, and it is a valuable organizing slogan that revises the best of the Populist imagery. But there is little progress in just putting southern faces and southern banks in place of the Yankees. What is needed is a restructuring of the entire industry to cut out the profits, cut out the parasitic money market altogether, and put the reins of the company in the hands of people that care about decent service now and for the future. That means people who we see, who live in our neighborhoods, who work with us—people who we can yell at if we don't like what they're doing and who will have to listen. That's accountability.

There are models for such control of utilities, and Joseph Hughes in the following article describes their historical roots and their contemporary application. Two other fine articles that present even more detail can be found in the Spring issue of *People's Appalachia*, the magazine of the *People's Appalachian Research Collective* (see "Resources" on inside back cover for address). In the first article, Richard Simon and Roger Lesser provide an imaginative strategy for developing a region economically (for them it's Appalachia and involves financing all types of small cooperative businesses and service units) with the capital generated by popular control of the area's energy companies, especially the electric utilities. Also in *People's Appalachia*, David Whisnant explores the history of Public Utility Districts, their capacity to provide resources for community development, and the attempt to institute such Districts in Appalachia.

The Georgia Power Project in Atlanta has met with incredible success in organizing against rate increases and for public ownership of the local private utility, as Hughes explains here. Combining the assets of southern regionalism—the precedent of TVA, populist rhetoric and an instinctive disgust for Yankee bankers—the project has been able to raise crucial questions of community-oriented service versus private gain by the few, and at the same time home in on specific abuses of the company, especially racial discrimination, advertising costs, and regressive rates.

The second part of this special supplement is a research methodology guide for investigating your local power company. It is self-explanatory and is included as a resource. It is, of course, applicable to research and organizing of other companies. The particular method and madness grew out of Bob

Hall's research of the Georgia Power Company in connection with the Georgia Power Project.

Why utilities are important institutions in the South can be seen from the array of corporate affiliations representing local to international power structures, as well as in the impressive assets of these firms and the equally impressive use of their (the rate payers') money in self-serving and/or wasteful ways. The charts in the third section provide this data for each utility and utility holding company serving the thirteen southern states with electricity sales over \$100,000,000. The five utility holding companies each have two or more operating companies providing electricity to southerners.

The key at the beginning of the charts explains the meaning of various terms and the sources of the information. Of note are several items: the control by a few northern banks of a significant percent of each company's stock; the small amount of federal income taxes paid by many firms, even though the base rate is 48% of income over \$10,000; the discrepancy between the average price of a kilowatt hour of electricity when bought by a homeowner and by an industry; payment of large sums to firms that are also stockholders or interlocked with the board of directors of the utility; and a number of outrageous expenses, like Kentucky Power contributing money to New York University or Florida Power & Light buying football tickets with ratepayer's money, or the country club dues paid by Louisiana Power & Light or West Texas Utilities, or the millions paid for advertising by all the utilities to promote themselves and their product in a time when they say there's an unprecedented energy crisis.

SOVIET ADVANCES INTO SOUTH ASIA MUST BE WATCHED

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, while many in the West are being successfully wooed by the Soviet Union's conciliatory words concerning "détente," the actions of the Soviet Union tell a far different story.

Within the Soviet Union itself, a policy of re-Stalinization is being harshly applied. Within the Communist world, Soviet supremacy is more than ever being imposed. Most important, perhaps, is the manner in which the Soviet Union is continuing to pursue its aggressive policies toward non-Communist countries.

At the present time, one of the Kremlin's key goals is the establishment of a Soviet-dominated collective security system in Asia. During his recent visit to India, Soviet Party leader Brezhnev spent much of his time advancing this idea.

Discussing the current Soviet moves in South Asia, Klaus Natorp, writing in the distinguished West German newspaper, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, notes that:

The Soviet advance in South Asia deserves all our attention. Were India, a sub-continent of considerable size and strategic significance, one day to become fully dependent on the Soviet Union the resulting changes would have repercussions.

Mr. Natorp points out that within India's ruling Congress Party:

Communist infiltration . . . has already made substantial progress. There can be no

belittling the danger that this process will continue at an even faster rate. The Soviet Union has no compunction in shamelessly exploiting the relatively feeble . . . resistance of Indian politicians to material temptations.

While we believe that a "détente" is taking place, the Soviet Union is doing its best to expand and extend its own power and influence. Mr. Natorp reports that—

Soviet expansion in South Asia represents a challenge to the United States. From its outposts in Aden and Somalia the Red Fleet is slowly gaining ground in the Indian Ocean. It may not yet possess naval bases on the Indian subcontinent, but the right to berth in certain ports is a first step in this direction. If the United States proposes to maintain a balance in this part of the world it must take prompt action.

I wish to share this important article by Klaus Natorp from the December 7, 1973, issue of Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung fur Deutschland with my colleagues and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

SOVIET ADVANCES INTO SOUTH ASIA MUST BE WATCHED

Remembering how persistently the Soviet leaders pursued and eventually achieved their ambition of convening a European security and cooperation conference, it is hard to imagine the Kremlin slackening the pace until such time as it has achieved its equally determined ambition of establishing a collective security system in Asia.

During his recent visit to New Delhi Soviet Party leader Mr. Brezhnev recommended the proposal so enthusiastically that even some of his Indian friends felt ill at ease.

The Soviet advance in South Asia deserves all our attention. Were India, a sub-continent of considerable size and strategic significance, one day to become fully dependent on the Soviet Union, the resulting changes would have repercussions for this country too.

This stage has not yet been reached but Soviet influence in India has powerfully increased in recent years. Mrs. Gandhi will doubtless have had her reasons for reminding Mr. Brezhnev on more than one occasion in the course of his visit that her country intended to go its own way.

Admittedly, since the conclusion of the Indo-Soviet friendship pact in late summer 1971 India's ability to resist the tempestuous courtship of a Soviet Union bent on closer cooperation has been largely curtailed.

The Soviet leaders expect India to show gratitude for the political and military services rendered during the clashes between India and Pakistan in respect of the separatist movement in what is now Bangla Desh.

The friendship pact with the Soviet Union was highly praised in India two years ago. It gave New Delhi the much-needed backing for an armed settlement of the Bengali crisis. Now the other side of the coin is increasingly coming to the fore.

It not only restricts India's foreign policy leeway, making nonsense of non-alignment; it also creates domestic problems such as those occasioned by the Soviet desire to forge closer links between the ruling parties in both countries.

Congress could hardly resist an offer of this kind. India still has its Communists, when all is said and done, and this move would really embarrass them.

Yet at the same time New Delhi knows well enough how dangerous it is to cooperate with people who abolish democracy wherever they can, replacing it with totalitarian rule.

Communist infiltration of the Congress

Party has already made substantial progress. There can be no belittling the danger that this process will continue at an even faster rate. The Soviet Union has no compunction in shamelessly exploiting the relatively feeble, but in view of India's poverty understandably feeble resistance of Indian politicians to material temptations.

Such, then, are the domestic dangers that may ensue from the Soviet bear-hug of India, but they are nothing in comparison with the international political consequences of an unhampered Soviet advance into South Asia.

For years Communist China has been most upset by Soviet activities in this part of the world. For the Chinese the Soviet suggestion of a collective security system is merely another term for encirclement.

This fear may be exaggerated, but there can be no gainsaying that Soviet policy towards India has a strong anti-Chinese flavour. Peking can certainly be expected to try and foil Soviet attempts to canvass support.

Lending support to pro-Chinese revolutionaries already organised in India (and their numbers could readily be increased) would be but one way of putting a damper on Indian enthusiasm about the alliance with the Soviet Union.

Bangla Desh, a potential trouble spot par excellence, could be transformed into an inferno that might well burn India too.

Another possibility would be for Peking to refuse to re-establish normal ties with India. Relations have been chilly, not to say frozen, for many years, although New Delhi would like to see an improvement.

At the same time China might supply Pakistan with an arsenal of modern weaponry that Islamabad could be tempted to embark on fresh military adventures against neighbouring India.

Last but not least Soviet expansion in South Asia represents a challenge to the United States. From its outposts in Aden and Somalia the Red Fleet is slowly gaining ground in the Indian Ocean. It may not yet possess naval bases on the Indian sub-continent, but the right to berth in certain ports is a first step in this direction.

If the United States proposes to maintain a balance in this part of the world it must take prompt action, especially if the Suez Canal is reopened in the foreseeable future.

In the West a regrettably large number of politicians tend to dismiss India as unimportant. This factor has contributed towards the Indian tendency to seek refuge in Soviet backing. There is still time to counteract this growing Soviet influence.

KLAUS NATORP.
(Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung fur Deutschland, 7 December 1973).

PIONEER 10

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marquis Childs in the Washington Post of Tuesday, January 8, 1974, discusses the important contribution of Pioneer 10 to the knowledge of our solar system. As pointed out in Mr. Childs' article, the benefits of space research and of Pioneer 10 will have a long-term effect on our life here on Earth. Not only does it provide new knowledge of our universe, but it utilizes and nurtures the technology so essential to our national well-being. I

commend Mr. Childs' article to the reading of my colleagues and the general public:

PIONEER 10: ADVENTURES IN NASA'S WONDERLAND

(By Marquis Childs)

MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIF.—For an escapee from the muddled, maddening, quarrelsome atmosphere of Washington, it is an adventure to come here to NASA's Ames Research Center. The journey into space being directed from the center is thrilling evidence of America's scientific and technological leadership. It is a strength which, if sustained, can transcend the political frailties and foibles of the moment.

The Pioneer 10 spacecraft has been traveling for 21 months. Passing within 82,000 miles of the planet Jupiter only one minute off schedule, Pioneer sent back a mass of data about that planet with its radiation belt at least a hundred times greater than the Van Allen Belt around the earth.

While this was Pioneer's primary goal, it is traveling on in space with four more years of communication from a distance calculated to be close to two billion miles. Two years from now Pioneer will be passing Saturn, which is twice as far from the earth as Jupiter.

Nor is that the end of the journey. At one stage Pioneer will be passing Pluto, farthest out of the planets in the solar system. Then, for anyone interested in far-out statistics, for Pioneer traveling at 10 miles per second it is 8 million light years to Taurus. Project manager Charles Hall reports this in all seriousness, since in the frictionless atmosphere of outer space Pioneer can continue, if not with its own nuclear power then with interplanetary pulls, ad infinitum.

Part of NASA's mission under the charter is to explore the potential of intelligent beings living on other planets. On the inner face of Pioneer is a plaque etched in silver and gold plate of two naked humans, male and female, along with mathematical formulae indicating the wave length of our telecommunication system. The theory is that, if Pioneer should crash-land on a distant planet intelligent beings would find the plaque and set out to communicate with the earthlings.

The project science director, Dr. John H. Wolfe, believes that, in the galaxy of the Milky Way with its thousands of stars, beings far superior to earthlings may live with techniques of communication capable of spanning the light years of interstellar space. Wolfe, a distinguished physicist in the complex field of plasma physics, believes strongly in NASA's role in exploring for other life.

In this time of tight money and demands for federal help from every side, the skeptics ask why millions are spent on this fanciful bit. Wolfe has an answer. One of his specialties is the study of solar winds. He sees this as a vast laboratory related to thermonuclear explosions, a source of unlimited stores of energy. Whether it comes in 10 years or 100 years is anyone's guess, according to Wolfe.

Aside from any practical contribution, Pioneer is a great scientific achievement. Except possibly for highly experimental military satellites, Pioneer is the only spacecraft known to run on nuclear power. Four radioisotope thermoelectric generators developed by the Atomic Energy Commission provided 140 watts at Jupiter and should provide more than 100 watts five years after launch.

Pioneer 11, with a different approach to Jupiter, will be launched in April. Already on the drawing boards is Viking, designed to land on Mars and equipped to scoop up Martian soil, analyze it and send the results back to earth, giving clues as to whether life at any level can exist. The cost of Viking is already pushing a billion dollars.

Beyond that is a manned landing on Mars or, perhaps, on one of the satellites of Jupit-

ter—Ganymede or Callisto—where there is a solid base. Wolfe talks about these matters with the assurance of one who has mastered the incredibly complex language of physics and astrophysics.

The scientific brains that have gone into the Pioneer project are one of America's greatest resources. They underwrite the technological-scientific lead that is perhaps this country's greatest asset.

THE SCHOOLS DO MAKE A DIFFERENCE

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a period of reassessment and reevaluation of our national educational policies. Pessimistic voices have been raised to proclaim flatly that the schools are not doing the job expected of them, a reaction from the attitude of a decade ago that the schools would play a fundamental role in solving all the problems of our society. In finding their highest expectations unrealized, some educators and laymen have gone so far as to declare that our schools are not functioning at all.

Taking a more optimistic tack in this renewed debate is Dr. Alan Purves, professor of English education at the University of Illinois, who in the January 16 edition of the New York Times reported on the conclusions of a recent conference of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. In this meeting the association, which has been testing students in various countries for 14 years, found that the quality and emphasis of different types of schools does indeed have a measurable impact on the students' skills and perceptions.

The conference, held at Harvard University last November, did not ignore the role of home and community in the development of the individual, but the identifiable differences it found in such subject areas as foreign language and science underscore the pivotal role of education for the individual and for his society.

I insert Dr. Purves' article in full at this point to share with my colleagues the promising message it contains to support those of us who believe that support of our Nation's schools is vital to our future:

SOME OPTIMISM JUSTIFIED

(By Alan C. Purves)

During the last decade, there has been a continuing re-evaluation of the effectiveness of schools.

Before the nineteen-sixties, schools were thought of as places that produced scientists and patriotic citizens, that could close the arms gap and transmit the nation's culture to the young. Most particularly, schools were thought of as the entrance gates to higher incomes and social equality.

Parents looked to schools with hope and school people looked at themselves with pride.

But a series of reports, beginning with James S. Coleman's "Equality of Educational Opportunity" in 1966, seemed to con-

tradict that sense of pride. Now, from a mood of optimism about education, many people have become deeply pessimistic about whether schools can do anything.

As the assault on schools unfolded, a group of researchers from many countries formed the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. First nurtured by UNESCO, then forming a separate organization, the association believed that the evaluation of education had to be viewed in a broad perspective—across national boundaries.

From 1959 to 1973, the group worked at testing the achievement of students in different countries. The first report, on mathematics, was completed in 1967. But the major task has been a survey of achievement in six subjects: reading, science, literature, civics, English as a foreign language and French as a foreign language.

The initial newspaper accounts of these studies seemed to support the contentions of the pessimists. However, an analysis of the contents at a conference held last November at the Harvard University School of Education produced a consensus that a mood of cautious optimism about schools was more warranted than pessimism and that a great deal more sifting and thinking was needed.

The major findings of the association's reports might be summarized as follows:

There is a generally consistent relationship between the social class of a student and that student's relative achievement, particularly in reading.

The relationship between social class and achievement is not consistent from country to country or from age group to age group.

Students acquire much scientific knowledge, patterns of social attitudes, foreign languages and patterns of approach to literature in schools.

Differences in achievement between students from different social classes are paralleled by differences in achievement between industrialized nations and developing nations.

Whether a country has a selective school system like France's or an open one like that of the United States, the top students at the end of secondary school perform equally well.

With all the complex statistical mechanisms and refined data that is used, the association could find an explanation for only half of the variation between a good student and a poor student, between a high-achieving school and a low-achieving school.

Schools are very complex institutions that interact with the community and serve in complex ways that researchers do not fully understand.

SEVERAL MESSAGES FOUND

Throughout the Harvard conference, it was agreed that the results of the association's studies conveyed several different messages, depending on who was asking what. There are messages for students, for teachers, for curriculum-issuers, and for policy-issuers.

One series of findings will be of some hope to students. Schools that place great emphasis on memorizing literary works are schools whose students seem less able to read literary work with some perception. Similarly, schools that place heavy emphasis on patriotic ritual are schools whose students do less well on tests of knowledge of how government works and whose students demonstrate fewer "democratic" attitudes. A related finding in science indicates that, for older students, student-directed or initiated inquiry enhances student learning.

The first message for teachers is that, despite many of the slogans about schools not making a difference, the association's studies indicate that some schools do a better job than others in teaching students foreign languages, science, literature and certain aspects of civics.

Teacher training in the subject matter was particularly important regardless of the subject. This importance increases with the grade level of the students. Teachers need to know the subject they are teaching. In foreign language, the teacher's proficiency in that language enhances student learning, as does the teacher's use of the language in instruction. Concern and commitment to their profession on the part of all teachers also plays a part in the achievement of their students.

The final point for teachers is the truism that it is easier to deal with good students than with poor ones. The performance in literature and science of the top 5 per cent of secondary school students in industrialized nations is uniformly high. These students seem intelligent and interested and they have learned what it was intended for them to learn. They also tend to come from well-to-do homes and to be in academic schools.

At the end of secondary school in some countries, however, these are the only students still in school. In countries like the United States there are many others in school, and their performance on the tests represents a wide range of achievement. The lower half of the group seem to be uninterested in the subject or in school, and one suspects that too many in the school are uninterested in them.

At one remove from the teacher exists the group that decides what is to be taught and, in some instances, how the teaching is to be done. These curriculum-planners have for the last 20 years been on the as yet fruitless quest for some philosopher's stone that will give all children the skills and attitudes of an intelligentsia overnight or at least in six easy lessons. The association's studies uncover no philosopher's stone.

The studies pry loose some chips from that stone, perhaps. The biggest one is the operating curriculum (what actually goes on in the classroom). In science, for example, each country submitted a syllabus drawn from the reported practices of schools and teachers or ordered by some central agency. The tests were based on an aggregate. In each school teachers were asked whether their students had an opportunity to learn each of the items on the test. Often the teachers reported that students had no opportunity to learn topics that were part of the official syllabus. Needless to say, opportunity to learn predicts the students' achievement scores well. Regardless of what an administrator says is being taught, students only learn things that teachers actually teach.

In literature there is a similar result. Teachers and students were asked to select aspects of a literary work (characters, plot or mood) and critical approaches (historical, thematic, personal or evaluative) that they thought most important. At the age of 14, when most students are just beginning the formal study of literature, there were few clear patterns of choices of critical approach. By the end of secondary school, students in each country tended toward one or two sharply defined approaches preferred by the teachers. Students in Italy chose a historical approach; in the United States, a symbolic or moralistic approach.

As in science, there is a clear tendency for students to learn what is presented them in class more than what the official syllabus says are the goals of education.

This tendency is supported in the foreign languages, where students were tested in reading, writing, speaking and listening. It has long been advanced that if one teaches reading and writing, the oral skills will follow, or, more usually, if one teaches oral skills, reading and writing will also be picked up. The association's studies disclose that students taught with an emphasis on one set of skills will learn that set, but that there is little indication of a transfer of learning.

There is one clear message for those who make educational policy (governmental offi-

cial, school board members, voters and taxpayers): Despite all the gloom, there is no need to give up hope for the schools.

All of the association's studies point to the conclusion that schools do indeed "make a difference." As Marshall Smith (one of the collaborators with Christopher Jencks on "Inequality," the book that caused a sensation in 1972) said at the Harvard conference:

"Data from I.E.A. indicate that by the age of 10 or so almost all children tested can carry out the basic function of decoding and have some minimal comprehension skills. It seems reasonable to assume that schools play a role in transmitting such knowledge, and that without school opportunities to learn, it would be distributed with much greater inequality."

The effect of school is a cumulative one; earlier schooling is the foundation for later learning. Of particular importance is the length of time a student has had to study a subject.

There is, however, clear indication that many educational systems are socially biased. The percentage of students from professional and managerial families increases and that from unskilled and semiskilled workers' families decreases across the school years, so that by the end of secondary school in the United States the ratio is 5 to 1 in favor of middle-class families.

MANY EXCLUDED FROM THE TOP

Those middle-class students are the ones who do well. In many other countries only a small percentage of the 18-year-olds is even in school. Unlike the United States with its retentive system, these countries exclude many from the chance to rise to the top of the academic ladder. As Torsten Husen showed at the Harvard conference, the claims for superiority of the selective system are ill-founded because the best students in the United States do just as well as the best students in the selective system.

Even so, the relationship of achievement to social class, and particularly to parental education and such factors as the number of books in the home, persists in most subjects and at all age levels tested. This relationship applies not only to individual students but also to schools. The average performance of students in a school seems to be related to the socio-economic milieu of that school; in this country suburban middle-class schools have higher performing students than do inner-city or rural schools.

The relationship even extends to countries; the highly developed nations were uniformly superior to the developing nations (Chile, India, Iran and Thailand) that took part in the study. Within and between countries, the tests and the curriculums they represent favor the students who "have."

Another kind of educational discrimination appears. The association's studies in science and literature raised the possibility of examining the hypothesis of C. P. Snow that there have emerged "two cultures," scientists and humanists. In all of the countries that tested both subjects, it was quite clear that boys outperformed girls in science, and girls outperformed boys in literature, although there is little difference in reading scores.

The "two cultures" seem sex-linked, and hints that this result is not of genetic origin lie in the fact that the disparity between girls and boys increases during the secondary school years. Industrialized society seems to have engendered a sexual bias, and schools have either perpetuated it or done little to counter it.

Through all the studies there is one theme: Schools are a part of their social and cultural environment in two ways. The literature and civic studies show that students acquire patterns of criticizing literature and patterns of political attitudes. These patterns differ from country to country. Schools appear to be a major means of transmitting these patterns.

The schools also appear to interact with their environment, particularly in educating (or not educating) most children. If a nation is concerned with educating all, it must pay attention to all.

WIDE COOPERATION URGED

The association's findings indicate a need for school systems to cooperate with parents and other groups in the community to provide for the total education of the child. At the Harvard conference, Ralph Tyler, the dean of modern curriculum thinking, said:

"In most if not all societies, children and youth learn more of the behavior important for constructive participation in the society outside of school than within. This fact does not diminish the importance of school but underlines the nation's dependence on the home, the working place, the community institutions, the peer group and other informal experiences to furnish a major part of the education required for a child to be successfully inducted into society. Only by clear recognition of the school's special responsibilities can it be highly effective in educating its students."

The association's studies point to some of the school's special responsibilities; certainly they indicate that schools and community must work in concert. Cries that "the schools don't do anything" and that "we can't do anything if the children come to us like this" are fruitless and only hinder the potential education of children.

SAVE ENERGY—ELIMINATE COMPRESSED AIR WASTE

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the vice president and general manager of the fluid power division of the Scovill Manufacturing Co. is Mr. Donald W. Sickelsteel of Wake Forest, N.C.

In a letter to customers earlier this month, Mr. Sickelsteel offered advice on how to save vast quantities of oil, coal and natural gas by eliminating compressed air wastage in manufacturing facilities.

According to him, about 10 percent of compressed air used by industry is wasted, and this means an annual preventable loss of 100 million gallons of fuel oil, or 1.2 billion pounds of coal, or 15 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

Mr. Sickelsteel discusses at least five major causes of compressed air loss in his letter, which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD to acquaint my colleagues and others with his valuable energy-saving suggestions:

SCOVILL, FLUID POWER DIVISION,
Wake Forest, N.C., January 10, 1974.

DEAR CUSTOMER: We are all aware that the first concern of American industry today is how to make the best use of available energy and energy fuels. Not only is this good business and good corporate citizenship, but it could come down to a matter of sheer survival.

Anyone who knows how to stretch out available fuel supplies should share his knowledge. Accordingly, as a manufacturer of air control equipment used on automated production lines, we feel a strong responsibility to spread as widely as possible the awareness that improper handling of compressed air is a major source of loss of in-

dustrial energy and fuel, and to work for the minimizing of this loss.

Our experience, based on many plant surveys, shows that about ten percent of compressed air used by industry is wasted, one way or another. This translates into an annual preventable loss of 100 million gallons of fuel oil, or 1.2 billion pounds of coal, or 15 billion cubic feet of natural gas. We base these figures on a conservative estimate of 20 million horsepower compressor capacity in the United States.

The value to industry of compressed air is unquestioned, with uses in virtually all phases of manufacturing operations. Pneumatic energy can be stored for instant high demands; it is flexible; fire hazards are at a minimum; it is clean; it produces high power for its unit size, and it is safe—no one has ever been "pneumatically cut." Yet improper air handling can result in substantial dollar losses as well as fuel losses. Fuel alone represents about \$30 million annually at today's prices. And industrial air is anything but free, as you know, costing industry about 12 cents per 1,000 cubic feet at 100 pounds psi. Conversely, proper air handling means more efficient operation with corresponding reduction of capital outlay for worn-out equipment.

A survey of a plant's pneumatic system can uncover at least five major causes of compressed air loss:

(1) Leaks in pipes, couplers, hose fittings, packings and seals. A find-the-hiss leak hunt will turn up worn-out parts. A five-cent packing or seal replacement can pay for itself a thousand times in a year.

(2) Improper pressure for job requirements. When line pressure is 125-175 psi, and the job needs only 80 psi, the appropriate regulator will provide the air-saving adjustment.

(3) Improper component installation. The use of automatic valving permits air to be used only as needed, rather than steady, wasteful blasts.

(4) Excess condensation in lines reducing tool efficiency and encouraging purging of lines by air to remove water. Air line dryers and filters remove water from lines and prevent further condensation.

(5) Inadequate lubrication of equipment. This is overcome by installation and monitoring of air line lubricators which inject atomized oil into the air stream that properly lubricates valves and air tools.

There are other products designed expressly to effect savings, such as a blow gun with an aspirator nozzle that adds surrounding air to compressed air going through the gun, thus requiring less air volume from the compressor. Changes in compressed air systems can be made to obtain significant savings, such as by installing an extra regulator to return air cylinders at lower pressure to their starting point. Conceivably, such system modifications could result in as much as a forty percent air savings on a given installation.

We would be pleased to send you our selector chart for choosing optimum equipment for a particular job or to correct wasteful installations. And, of course, we can supply our specialized expertise for consultation. Just say the word. We'll be glad to reply.

Sincerely,

DONALD W. SICKLESTEEL.

THE NEED FOR REPRESENTATION OF THE POOR IN OUR NATION'S POLICYMAKING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, 1973, I sent a letter to President

Nixon asking him "Why those in his administration with responsibility for programs for the underprivileged in our society, such as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, have been excluded from the Special Energy Group you have established to plan the national response to the energy crisis?"

I feel that the inclusion of Secretary Weinberger, Secretary Lynn, and OEO Director Arnett are necessary so that those officials will have the opportunity to inform the President and his energy advisers of the need for special planning to assure that the economically disadvantaged people of this Nation and their special needs are represented in these energy policy meetings. Inner-city residents live in older homes and apartment buildings that are heated with fossil fuels by furnaces that are outmoded and inefficient. Insulation is often poor or nonexistent, ceilings are high, there are no storm windows. It thus takes more fuel to maintain a livable temperature in homes in the inner city during the winter than elsewhere.

Eddie N. Williams, the president of the Joint Center for Political Studies, speaks to the problem of inclusion of the poor in policy planning in a commendable article in the December issue of Focus, the center's monthly newsletter. I present this article with the hope that the directions indicated by Eddie Williams and the joint center will lead to representation of the interest of the minorities and poor of this Nation in policymaking at the highest levels of our Government.

PERSPECTIVE

(By Eddie N. Williams)

Playing catch-up is too often the vulnerable posture forced upon blacks and other minority groups on national policy matters. When problems have already been diagnosed, programs formulated, and policies outlined, our only remaining option is to react. Seldom do we find the openings to get in on the ground floor of policy-formulation or to make a systematic input before decisions are cast in concrete.

The result, of course, is that public policy debates seldom reflect intelligent minority perspectives (special revenue sharing and housing are good examples), and they often lead to programs which, if not detrimental to minority interests, run the unnecessary risks of alienating minorities, frustrating their will, and provoking their hostility and opposition.

In such circumstances, it is the public interest which suffers in the long run. This is true, notwithstanding the feeble arguments put forth that the minority perspective is taken care of in the broader considerations given public policy issues by the traditional white think tanks, task forces, university centers, and special interest groups. While such arguments beg many questions about the insidiousness of racism and discrimination, they also miss the real point. The point is not whether whites can speak intelligently and fairly about black or minority needs. Rather, it is whether informed minority perspectives, articulated by knowledgeable minority spokesmen, are important and ought to be considered as well.

The energy crisis, for example, despite its foreboding implications for the nation as a whole, is but the latest long-range issue which begs for a clear minority group perspective. Are President Nixon, Governor John Love, Melvin Laird, or the white think tanks

and special interest groups speaking for blacks and the disadvantaged on such issues as the following?

If a rise in national unemployment results from the energy crisis, blacks no doubt will be disproportionately affected. A gasoline tax would place a relatively greater burden on the poor than would rationing. If the price of fuel increases, would it be feasible to subsidize the poor's use of essential fuel? Is court-ordered busing to be a casualty of the energy crisis? It is one thing to appeal to Americans, on the basis of patriotism, to turn their thermostats down to 68 degrees, but it is quite another to appeal to those Americans who cannot afford to turn their thermostats up to 68 degrees.

Clearly there are issues inherent in this national problem, as well as others (housing, land use, communications, population redistribution, to name a few), which could be focused more clearly with minority group input. The question is why aren't we making a greater input.

Because of our lot, we have been forced to deal more with immediate, survival problems than with long-range issues which will impact down the pike. Another reason for our lack of input is that we seldom have the resources to amass the research and hard data which will arm our spokesmen and attract the attention of national policymakers.

The latter has always been a problem, but it is more crucial today with the impressive increase in the number of black elected officials. These leaders are on the front line of decision-making, and they must be armed with facts and figures which will help shape policies and programs while they are on the drawing boards. They need an early warning system which will alert them to onrushing problems, suggest to them what the basic questions are, from the standpoint of their constituents, and provide an underpinning for their attempts at problem-solving. What this suggests is that we must begin to encourage foundations and other funding sources to make substantial investments in the development of policy analysis programs in our colleges and universities and in our research-oriented centers and organizations.

On our part, the Joint Center plans to initiate a modest policy analysis program in 1974. If we can be successful in harnessing the creative abilities of black scholars and elected officials, we can help establish the basis for more systematic input of minority views during the early stages of policy development. At least we can help cut down our reaction time.

COMPULSORY ANNUAL PHYSICAL FOR COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as hospital and medical costs continue to spiral upward, there is increased impetus for a national comprehensive health insurance program. A number of different plans have already been proposed, and others will be forthcoming in the next few weeks.

An essential part of any such health program is preventive care, with emphasis on a yearly physical examination. The case for a mandatory annual physical is convincingly stated in the recent Statewide Senior Action Newsletter.

Editor Dwight H. Warren, chairman of the board and corresponding secre-

tary of the Council of Senior Citizens Clubs of Buffalo and Erie County, has personal knowledge of this, and I would like to include his remarks from the January 1974 newsletter:

STATEWIDE SENIOR ACTION NEWSLETTER

Attention: All Legislators—national, State, and local—An annual physical is an essential part of any comprehensive health insurance program.

CANCER

According to American Cancer Society, "If current rates continue 50,000,000 now living, one in four persons, will get cancer. As of now one out of three can be cured. It would be one out of two with early diagnosis and prompt treatment." Over 8,000,000 more lives could be saved by early diagnosis and treatment.

BLINDNESS

The National Association for the Prevention of Blindness states, "half of all blindness is needless." The most frequent cause of blindness is glaucoma. "1,700,000 American are being attacked by glaucoma. Yet for the most part they are doing nothing about it. 850,000 Americans could be saved from blindness by early diagnosis and treatment.

HEART ATTACKS, STROKES, AND KIDNEY FAILURE

According to an article in Readers Digest, "High blood pressure is the largest contributing cause of death in the United States today. It finally kills more than a million Americans every year thru heart failure, stroke or kidney failure. Impossible to treat? On the contrary—of all known risk factors for needless early death this is the one for which evidence is clearest that treatment can be lifesaving. The real problem is that most of the 24,000,000 Americans who have high blood—don't know they have it. The National Heart and Lung Institute has now mounted a massive campaign to find and treat sufferers.

What is true of the above most serious health problems is usually equally true of less serious ailments. The solution is a national health program insurance program which requires an annual physical checkup.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

We now have compulsory car insurance which requires keeping one's car in proper condition so that it may not do injury to others. Perhaps we can not compel a person to protect his health but if he would participate in an insurance program we do have that right in order that others may not be compelled to pay for his failure to protect his health.

Citizens must be educated to the need of placing emphasis on keeping well instead of being concerned only if they are ill. Selfish and ununiformed sources will continue to stress the cost of an adequate health program overlooking the fact of the tremendous savings in expense and elimination of needless suffering.

AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION

From the figures given above we can deduce the truth of the old adage, "An Ounce of Prevention is Worth a Pound of Cure". An annual physical with required remedial treatment would reduce considerably the cost of medical treatment, not to mention needless suffering. 83 billion was spent for medical treatment last year. This is a tragic waste of human resources.

I feel I have given adequate information as to the desperate needs of an annual physical as a means of reducing the 83 billion for medical care in the United States each year. Anyone who expects the government and society in general to pay the bill should take all necessary steps to remain healthy. A compulsory health examination should be a requirement of every health in-

surance program. The following personal observations of the writer are given as evidence such an examination should be made compulsory if a person desires health insurance.

CANCER

A doctor with whom my wife worked for years, recently told her with very bitter tears that his daughter died of breast cancer after a long and agonizing experience. Everything possible was done for her. He said her suffering and death could have been prevented if he had known it in time. She didn't tell him about the growth until it began to cause pain. Her father and brother are both doctors but they didn't know she had cancer.

STROKE

A garage mechanic who worked on my car is a semi-invalid for the rest of his life. Three years ago he was an active, energetic man of 49. Now he is a semi-invalid suffering from the effects of a stroke. He had high blood pressure and didn't know it. His own nephew is a doctor.

HERNIA

As a result of relating the following experience at least a few of my acquaintances have been alerted to the need to take remedial measures. A physical examination revealed I had a hernia. I did not realize the consequences of it until after it bothered me so much that I had it repaired some ten years later after it was first discovered. About a year later I suffered from internal bleeding resulting from those years of neglect. I was rushed to the hospital and almost bled to death. This too could have been prevented if I had been made aware of the consequences.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

I honestly believe the old adage is true, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Translated into dollars and cents that would mean a billion dollars spent in preventing disease might save 16 billion in terms of hospitals, nursing homes and long-term illness. It is up to us to insist that those in a position to do something about it, take action.

REPRESENTATIVE REUSS ON THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer here remarks I made on January 7, 1974, before a student convocation at the Utah State University in Logan, Utah, under the auspices of the Milton R. Merrill chair of political science. The presiding officer was Sherman P. Lloyd, this year's Merrill professor of political science and well remembered as our former colleague.

The remarks follow:

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

This is one of a series that my old friend and former colleague, Professor Sherman Lloyd has arranged to have a look at the economy of our country today, how was it last year in 1973, what is it going to be like this year in 1974. I understand that last Friday Senator Wallace Bennett was before you. One of the differences, I suppose, between Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, is that they can look at the same facts and draw different conclusions. Probably the observations I'm going to make today are somewhat different from those that were made last Friday. That's the point of a uni-

versity, and that's the reason for a series like this.

Looking back at 1973, and putting to one side some of the political horrors we've been through—the Watergate, wars in the Middle East, threats of war—just looking at our economy—the jobs people have, the price people have to pay in the market for the goods they buy, the interest rates people have to pay—1973, I'm afraid, must go down in history as pretty close to being a disaster.

What happened was that we had an absolutely horrible increase in the cost of living, by the time the year ended almost 9 percent, with particularly strong blows on the chin in just the commodities that the average person particularly needs—food (you've got to eat), fuel (you've got to keep warm and drive a car), medical care (you've got to go to the doctor from time to time) interest rates (you need to pay the interest on your installment purchase or on your home)—these are where the biggest increases in the cost of living occurred. And that meant that the average person, whose income was in the lower half rather than in the upper half of family income throughout the country, somebody with a family income of, say, \$13,000 a year or less, took it particularly on the chin.

These are the families under wage control. Salaries and wages were only increased 5½ percent on the average, whereas the cost of living went up 9 percent. That means that you end up 3½ percent behind the eight-ball, because your cost of living has gone up faster than your wage. Such is the unhappy lot of the average American.

As you get up into the upper brackets, of course, the food you buy, the gasoline you buy, show the same increase in price as for a less affluent person. But, since you use a much smaller part of your income on necessities, you come out with much less pain and hardship.

Now, having said that the big economic fiasco of 1973 was our 9 percent inflation, I don't mean to come here and tell you that if I had been running things, we would have had zero inflation, I would have liked to have had zero inflation, but given all the disturbances over the world, that was impossible.

But sensible policies could have held the inflationary sock on the chin that we all experienced to something like 3 or 4 percent. And if that had been true, then the wage-earner and the lower income salary-earner would have had a much easier time of it.

But what happened during 1972 and 1973? Well, food costs went up, for a variety of reasons. One of them was that the Department of Agriculture, for months and months, despite remonstrances from me and others, refused to let cattlemen graze their cattle in the 60 million acres in this country which had been idled under the agricultural program. As a result, fewer beef cattle came to market, and the price increased. Again, as recently as just a year ago, the Secretary of Agriculture was sending a bulletin out to the turkey growers of this country, advising them to keep down the increase in production of their turkeys, and to keep the price up. They took his advice and this Thanksgiving and this Christmas, a turkey cost per pound almost double what it had cost the year before.

Or take the case of milk and dairy products, of interest in my state of Wisconsin and of interest to the Cache Valley. The price of dairy products has of course gone up. And one of the reasons is, as you have read in the scandal section of your newspaper, is that the lobbyist for the milk producers wrote a letter to the President saying, "Look, we want the price of dairy products raised, we want import quotas maintained, and we've always done pretty well, President Nixon, under the Democrats, so we'd like to give you

a million dollars for your re-election campaign (this is before the 1972 election). So how about fixing us up with a nice price increase on dairy products?" There were several meetings, and lo and behold, and over the advice of some of the professionals in the administration, the request was granted, the money was paid, or at least \$300,000 of it. This is being looked at by the courts today. But, as a result, the American consumer of milk is now paying more than otherwise would have been the case.

Or take the fuel problem. Heaven knows our problems of energy are made worse by the blackmail and extortion now being practiced in the Middle East by the sheiks of Araby. But much of this was brought on by ourselves. The oil industry, in the 1972 campaign, was far and away the largest contributor to the President's re-election campaign; some of it in suitcases, some of it in envelopes, some of it taken down to Mexico to be laundered before finally delivered, some of it illegally emanating from the corporate treasuries of the oil companies. Put it all together, and when the great umpire has finally taken all the bodies of the players off the football, so you can see where the ball is, it turns out that almost five million oil dollars found their way into the Nixon campaign coffers. The oil industry wanted certain things. They wanted quotas kept on the oil imports into this country, and despite the recommendation of loyal administration figures like now Secretary of the Treasury Schulz, who advised modifying the import quotas in 1970, this wasn't done. It wasn't done until a few months ago, in fact. And so, instead of having a nice stockpile of Middle Eastern oil in this country against the days when the Arabs might want to cut it off, we had practically nothing. The price got a start toward getting higher and higher, as a result of these policies. So, because import quotas were kept on oil, refinery capacity in this country was not increased. And this, while not the sole cause of our energy crisis by a long shot, played its part.

I mention what was done in food and in fuel to back up my point that while part of the 9 percent inflation from which we are suffering is inevitable, a large part was man-made, and a large part is inexcusable, and the American people are now suffering for it. We're also suffering because of vacillation in Washington. Last January, just a year ago, the price-wage control program, having worked extremely well, for some reason never satisfactorily explained—maybe it was just because it seemed to be working well—was all but disbanded by the administration. Prices from last January started shooting up, and then, as so often happens, in May and June, the administration overreacted in just the opposite direction. Prices and costs had gotten way out of line. The President then slapped an across-the-board freeze on all prices. Of course this had disastrous effects, farmers quite understandably refused to bring their products, notably meats, to market. And shortages began to appear in dozens and dozens of commodities. So if you look at the whole history of inflation-fighting in the last year or so, you find that it was a series of bad judgments and a series of very questionable deals which led to so large a portion of it.

And then, 1973 neared its end, and we began to run into what has become to be known as the "energy crisis," matters, if anything, grew worse. The prices of commodities increased, and the ugly first symptoms of increasing unemployment came to be seen. TWA Airlines had trouble getting jet fuel, and so cut back on its flights, and that meant that hundreds and hundreds of stewardesses were fired. General Motors found that it could no longer sell all the huge gas-guzzling automobiles that it had planned to make, and so men and women were laid

off the production line, and unemployment has begun to nudge ominously upward.

Well, where are we now in the first month of 1974, and what is to be done? I can be sure of this: if we do nothing, if we persist in trying to sweep these problems under the carpet, if we say that all will work out in the end, I can assure you that the consequences will be very serious indeed. I'm very much afraid that our inflation is going to continue unbridled, that it could reach another 8 or 9 percent in this year of 1974, with even worse consequences than last year. Unemployment, despite lots of rosy-colored predictions out of Washington, could also become very serious, as bottleneck after bottleneck develops in the economy, and men and women are laid off because they either lack the raw materials or because due to the laying off of still other persons, there isn't a market for the goods and services they're producing. We have had before our Joint Economic Committee just in the last couple of weeks economists from all the great universities of the nation. Some of them testified that unemployment could be as high as 8 or 10 percent this year if nothing is done.

Having dangled these horrors before you, let me assure you that as far as I am concerned, something will be done. And there are many things that can be done to contain the inflation and to contain the unemployment that otherwise lies before us.

On inflation, I think the time is past when it is desirable to try to maintain a complete apparatus of price-wage control across the entire economy. That's simply too restrictive, and the "on again-off again" conduct last year has made that as impossible as it is undesirable. However, I think we do need to maintain some sort of a price-control apparatus, and there I like the idea proposed by Dr. Arthur Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, who suggests that there be a more or less permanent price-wage board to examine inflationary increases in those industries that are characterized by huge firms and huge labor unions. Roughly speaking, there we mean automobiles, petroleum, certain heavy chemicals, steel, aluminum—those industries, by in large, where just a handful of companies control the majority of production, and where huge unions are pretty well able to dictate their own wage terms and have those wages passed on in the form of increased prices of the end product. There, Dr. Burns thinks, and I agree, that we need a permanent board to examine existing and proposed price increases, to evolve guidelines, and if it comes down to a crunch, to actually issue mandatory orders.

A second thing which I think is very important: I'd like to see the federal government set up what you might call a "price ombudsman"—a fellow who represents the forgotten consumer, and does his best to see that prices are kept within reasonable bounds by making himself knowledgeable on the various industries, and doing whatever is needed to secure maximum supply and the lowest possible prices. If we had had an ombudsman in being, he would have gone to Secretary of Agriculture Butz a year or two ago, when Secretary Butz was keeping beef cattle out of the grasslands, and was telling farmers to raise fewer turkeys, to challenge the good Secretary on just that point, and maybe induce him to make a little more sense in his policies. An ombudsman, too, would go before the Interstate Commerce Commission, when the Interstate Commerce Commission seems to be up to its old tricks of actually raising freight rates, to try to get lower transportation rates. An ombudsman would see to it that our medical schools in this country are put in possession, through federal legislation, of the funds needed to expand their medical, nursing, and paramedical offerings, so that we can have enough skilled health personnel in this

country to meet the needs of the people. One reason you are constantly reading about some roentgenologist making \$300,000 a year out of Medicare is because there simply aren't enough of these specialists in the country, and thus there isn't enough competition. There ought to be.

The ombudsman would have a function, too, on the problem of gasoline and oil. We ought to have an independent figure serving the public in a government which is much too much dominated by the oil companies. Take a principle current issue: the Cost of Living Council, in Washington, last month allowed the American oil companies a dollar a barrel increase on their so-called "old" crude oil, not because they've had any cost increases, but simply, as the Cost of Living Council explained, because the Arabs were getting their extortionate rake-off over in the Middle East, so why shouldn't our oil companies be allowed to do the same thing? The answer I'd give, is: Sure, the oil companies need profits. Sure, they need an incentive to explore for new sources of energy. They already control not only the oil, but most of the coal, much of the uranium, much of the natural gas, but that doesn't mean we have to turn the United States of America over to them. It's enough, I think, if we give them absolutely no ceiling on the new oil that they bring in. That should be sufficient incentive to do all the drilling, and refinery building, and pipeline laying and new forms of energy researching and developing, that is needed. So I would hope that if there were some ombudsman, some Johnny Appleseed, some Mr. Represent-the-Public type around, that he would try to work for a policy in which domestic oil doesn't get an absolutely unconditional, exorbitant price increase. Heaven knows there are going to be enough price increases in oil products anyway, because of the import situation, and the need to discover, at higher prices, new sources. But that doesn't mean we need to go wholly overboard.

What of the Federal Reserve, and money? The Federal Reserve, as you economic students know, creates new money—checking accounts, and the currency in your pockets—by acting on the banking system. By and large, it is a sensible rule, I believe, for the Federal Reserve to create new money at a rate no greater than the economy can grow, 5 or 6 percent increase a year ought to be about the limit, because if at full employment you print up more money than that, figuratively speaking, you're going to make the wheels of the economy spin too fast, and instead of getting more goods you are just going to get higher prices. I'm very hopeful that in this year of 1974, the Federal Reserve will create about just the right amount of money, which I should think ought to be at the upper limits of the band of 2 to 6 percent new money. I have confidence, incidentally, in the present chairman of the Federal Reserve System, Dr. Arthur Burns. From conversations I have recently had with him, I believe that his view of Federal Reserve policy and my own are not far different and I would think that whatever may be the problems of our country in the year ahead, a crazy monetary policy will not be one of them.

Let's now turn to the remaining aspect of what makes for inflation or deflation in this country, namely, federal spending. My own view is that one wants to be very pragmatic about federal deficits if the country is in a recession. If factories and farms in this country are producing less than they are capable of producing, if we have plenty of raw materials, plenty of machinery, plenty of skilled manpower who aren't working, then running a deficit in the federal budget, far from being bad, is good. It's what you've got to do. You've got to create more activity, otherwise you are just going to have more unemployment. But that, unfortunately, is

not the situation which now confronts us. The situation which now confronts us is a situation where in many sectors of the economy, we're running at more than capacity. Partly this is due to the energy shortage, partly it is due to the hyper-thyroid economic development of just the last couple of years. Therefore, it does not make sense, and I say this as a liberal Democrat for whom spending is in no way a bugaboo, for the government in Washington to embark upon a wholesale spree of creating ever greater budget deficits.

So much on inflation. Now a word on jobs. As I have said, unless we do something, unemployment is going to increase very drastically. But I don't think the thing to do is to try to create a new general boom in this country by running a huge budget deficit, or by printing new money as if it were going out of style. But neither do I think it's a good idea that we just stand by and see unemployment grow. In the situation that faces us we must take active steps to see that men and women, old and young, aren't alienated from their society, and from their bread, by not having a job if they're ready, willing, and able to get one.

So I think what the government has to do is to embark upon a public service jobs program in which at the state and local level, people who don't have jobs are hired at decent prevailing wages to do work that needs to be done, in the field of health, in the field of education, in the field of public safety, in the field of conservation, in the field of redevelopment and humanization of our cities. To me it's just criminal that a medical corpsman, back from the wars in Vietnam, is walking the streets of my home town of Milwaukee today, looking for a job as a paramedical orderly at a hospital, and the hospital can't hire him because it doesn't have the wherewithal to do it. It's a crying shame that in all our big cities citizens walk in fear of their lives because there aren't enough old-fashioned police patrolmen walking the streets to see that law and order is maintained. Let young men and women walk the beat with a uniform, perhaps without a gun for a while, as a para-legal police personnel, and you'll find that the crime-in-the-streets rate will drop. The cost of this program is really remarkably low, because every dollar you spend goes directly into the pockets of someone who would otherwise be a welfare or an unemployment insurance case.

I'm talking about a program of, let us say, 500,000 public service jobs. Your parents will tell you that back in the depression, in the 1930s, the Civilian Conservation Corps, a public service employment program, just for young men, and just in the field of conservation alone, employed some three million young men. Today some of the greatest leaders in American life got their start as breadwinners, and got the feeling that they had a contribution to make to American society, because of the CCC. Congressman John Blatnik, who is now chairman of the Public Works Committee, got his start in life as a kid in the "Cs" back in the thirties. So, let there be a public service jobs program, accompanied by programs to develop new sources of energy, in home building, in conservation, and I don't think that we're going to have anything to fear from added unemployment. But if we do nothing, I can assure you that we have plenty to fear.

We are confronted with the stubborn fact: about one-half of the American people, our brothers and sisters, are alienated because they feel they're being ripped off by a society in which big government and big business looks out after its own interests and leaves to the average person, particularly the lower income average person the short end of the stick—grinding inflation, wage rates that are depressed, terribly high taxes which he's got to pay but which someone at the top of the

scale who can afford to employ a high-priced lawyer seemingly doesn't have to pay. And so what we need is a political program which has for its watchword: "God tempers the wind to the shorn lamb." The shorn lamb, you see, the family who's getting fleeced, is by and large, the average hard-working, church-going, tax-paying baby-having family in this country who belongs in the low- and middle-income brackets.

So we need to see that the price of essentials doesn't get out of hand; that our tax system, the price we pay for civilization, is fair and that the fellow at the top doesn't shake off and avoid his fair share of taxation; that the right of an American to a dignified job at a decent wage is preserved. We must not let the turmoil of the years ahead while we switch our way of life to the new energy situation to bring agony of mass unemployment to this country.

If we can temper the wind, I have no fear whatever for the survival of the republic, of the institution of the presidency, or of the American people.

You can count it as your good fortune that you are learning what makes the world go round at this university, at this, the most challenging and exciting time in American history. Great are the challenges, and great are the rewards.

MAYOR PRUETER OF PORT HUENEME, CALIF., RETIRES

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, the mayoralty election will once again be held in Port Hueneme, Calif., which is part of the district I am honored to represent in the Congress.

The name of Ray D. Prueter, the mayor since 1962, will be missing from the ballot for the first time. Mayor Prueter has announced his retirement, after 12 years of inspiring and dedicated service to the city he and his family know and regard with such deep affection.

He has indicated he desires to spend more time with his family, and to devote more attention to his business than he has been able to do in the last 12 years. His family and friends, I know, will welcome having more time with Ray, but the city of Port Hueneme will deeply feel his absence in an active capacity.

Ray's accomplishments, which go even further back than his first election as mayor, read like a virtual "Who's Who" in every area of civic concern and responsibility.

Ray took up residence in Port Hueneme in 1950. In 1951, he married the former Laura O'Donnell, and they have two children, Denise Lynn, and Diane Rae. Ray immediately became active in the Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce, and since 1953 has been a charter member of the organizational board of the Port Hueneme Harbor Days. Since 1954, he has been a member of the Port Hueneme Rotary and served as its president from 1955-56. From those years until now, he has managed to find the time and energy to serve as the Hueneme Elementary School PTA president;

the civil defense director; be a member of the Navy League, the Elks Lodge, the Salvation Army advisory board; to serve as an elder in the Westminster Presbyterian Church, and as a member of the Ventura County grand jury for a year in 1961.

Now if that is not enough, he went on to become a Port Hueneme city councilman, and was reelected twice, and was then elected mayor, and reelected four times.

He has since served as president of the Channel Division, League of California Cities; director of the League of California Cities representing the Channel Division; Oxnard Community Hospital director; a member of the Hueneme High School PTA; president of the Ventura County Mayors and Managers Association; a member of the Local Agency Formation Commission; first vice president of the Southern California Association of Governments; and at various times, president, first vice president, and second vice president of the League of California Cities.

To top it all off, Ray was elected co chairman of the \$150,000 fundraising drive for Hueneme High School's football stadium and lights, in 1970.

I realize that some people go around collecting titles, and put little effort into the job, but Ray Prueter certainly is not one of them. This man has done an exemplary job with every assignment he ever undertook, and put all of his energies into completing each one. The result has been a better government, and a better city for the people of Port Hueneme.

It is no wonder, then, that Ray was named Port Hueneme citizen of the year in 1959; was given Hueneme PTA life membership in 1960; was named honorary member of the Harbor Days Board, and honorary chamber of commerce adviser. He is also a life member of the Oxnard Community Hospital Board, and an honorary Navy Seabee and U.S. Marine—Ray served in the U.S. Army from 1943 to 1947 as a first sergeant. Last, but certainly not least, Ray is an honorary member of Hueneme Bay Kiwanis Club.

I know that everyone who knows Ray wishes him well in the days ahead, and hopes he and his family will have some well-earned relaxation. But knowing Ray as we all do, I have a feeling he will not be far away should anyone need his help. I am confident I speak for everyone who knows him when I say, "What this country needs is a million more Ray Prueters."

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP IS ESSENTIAL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL POLICY FAIR AND EQUITABLE TO OUR PEOPLE IN TODAY'S ENERGY CRISIS

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress fritters in its interminable verbosity and

indecision, the energy resources of our Nation are being drained from our country's economy and the great State of New Jersey is about to be brought to its knees. The spectrum on the horizon—or for that matter, already here—is wholesale unemployment, economic chaos, to say nothing of the health and safety of our people.

Last Thursday the entire New Jersey delegation in both the House and Senate petitioned the President and Federal Energy Administrator Simon calling for an immediate investigation and resolution to this critical situation in New Jersey in that it is abundantly clear to our congressional delegation that our State is not receiving its fair share allocation of available gasoline and home fuel heating supplies.

As we debate the pros and cons of the provisions of an Emergency Energy Act, it is essential that as the representatives of the people we seek a fair and equitable solution for our people. A lot has been said by the administration on what should be done based on the facts only to learn that we do not have the facts from the source of our oil, gasoline, petrochemicals, and home fuel heating supplies.

More mistakes are made from the lack of facts than from poor judgment and the only true facts we have to direct us as Members of Congress are the hardships and dilemma being expressed by the people in heart-rendering communications pleading for our help to eliminate the "no gas"—inadequate fuel and oil supplies—and inflationary prices that they are encountering in attempting to meet their basic fundamental needs for survival.

Extraordinary as it may be, the Federal Government literally has no substantive detailed data from the oil companies that would give us accurate and complete figures on fuel supply, demand and reserves and, needless to say, the Federal Energy Office is contributing generously to the confusion by publishing weekly supply and demand figures of the oil industry giving the illusion that the Government knows much more than it actually does.

The fact of the matter is that over the years the oil companies have practically been a government unto themselves and they have not been monitored in any substantive way whatsoever by our Federal Government. They have been given practically carte blanche to manage or manipulate the oil and gas resources in this country and throughout the world with questionable allegiance to the United States nor have they demonstrated any respect or fidelity to the needs of our people.

The price gouging, which is so obvious to all of us, makes a mockery of the so-called Cost of Living Price Control Board.

Although I realize that the oil companies are not totally to blame for our serious dilemma, it may sound as if I am coming down hard on the head of the oil companies and I mean to do just that. In the final analysis the oil companies, in large measure, have a virtual monopoly over our national oil and gas resources on public lands which truly is the estate of

the people and they should not be permitted total control over our energy resources.

The ruse they are attempting to foist upon the American people that the energy crisis is totally due to the position of the Arab nations cutting our supply of crude oil imports is, in large measure, a charade, at best. The fact that they are continuing to ship vast quantities of gasoline and oil products overseas further indicates that their contention just does not stand up against the recently published reports of the highest increase and enormous profits in the last quarter of 1973 reported by the oil companies. They say publicly that these enormous profits are necessary to capitalize added research and exploration for new supplies, while at the same time these bloated oil barons are voting themselves unconscionable dividends from windfall profits extracted from the pocketbooks of the people.

To correct this situation once and for all I have sponsored and vigorously pursued legislative action which would force the oil companies to divulge all of the information and needed facts to the Congress and the American people in order that we can work toward a resolution to this most serious crisis. As you know, the Senate is already holding these in-depth investigatory hearings at this time.

In view of what I believe to be "shilly-shallying" on the part of the administration, it is now up to Congress to furnish the long overdue leadership in the energy crisis. It is incumbent upon all of us as Members of Congress to accept the challenge and implement our constitutional rights on behalf of the people through leadership that involves facing the whole unpleasant truth and coming forward with a definite, consistent, and coordinated plan of action in an effort to avert individual hardship, economic recession and intolerable unemployment with the people being told the truth.

Based on the facts at hand, our country does not have nor have we developed an overall coordinated energy resources national policy which is obviously essential to the economic vitality and well being to the quality of our way of life.

LET'S LOOK AT THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much concern over the energy crisis. Two questions which have been raised continually include "Is there really an energy crisis," and "are the profits of the oil companies for 1973 unreasonable?" Mr. C. Howard Hardesty, Jr., executive vice president of the Continental Oil Co., presented a discussion of these two questions in a recent address to the 47th Annual Industry Convention of the Soap and Detergent Association. He also considered some major problems involving the free enterprise system, the en-

ergy crisis, and media coverage of the petroleum industry. I recommend Mr. Hardesty's remarks for your serious attention. His talk was entitled "Fuels, Feedstocks, and the Future."

The remarks follow:

FUELS, FEEDSTOCKS, AND THE FUTURE

(By C. Howard Hardesty, Jr.)

You should have invited the Shah of Iran to be your speaker. He has more money, more oil, and more credibility. The other day, he observed that the industrial nations should ban the burning of petroleum and reserve it entirely for petrochemical manufacturing. The high importance he recently attached to petrochemicals is one of the most sensible statements to come out of the Middle East. America's "burn-it-up" philosophy is coming to an end, but the present stringency will force us to continue burning—wasting if you will—oil and gas. For the moment we have lost our options on sensible energy usage. When we have intelligently developed alternative sources of energy, then the Shah's recommendation will have a chance.

The fates of the soap and detergent industry and the energy industry, for better or for worse, are closely tied. Unfortunately, at the moment, that means that most energy-industry problems flow downstream to you. When we're short of oil and gas, you are short of feedstocks. When the price of crude oil and feedstocks soar, detergent manufacturers are directly affected. There is no question that your industry must be allowed to buy competitively and pass these costs through to market. Without this right, you will lose out to other consumers of scarce materials.

In my original preparation for this visit, considerable thought was devoted to the details of the proposed allocation of feedstocks and projections of their availability in the days immediately ahead. Because, as economist Walter Heller said last week, "all forecasts are subject to change without notice", I concluded that our time together could more wisely be spent exchanging views on a matter of vital importance to all of us—preservation of the American economic system—some still call it the free enterprise system.

The very future of our free enterprise system is in grave jeopardy. It is my strong personal conviction that our present energy crisis is being seized upon, by some extreme elements in our society, as the vehicle to move aggressively toward nationalization. As I watch the attacks on the petroleum industry by Congressional liberals and media accelerate without regard to fairness or facts, I am convinced there is a conspiracy to exploit this period of hardship and confusion to destroy the industry.

The credibility of business generally, and the petroleum industry particularly, is at a very low ebb. Permit me, therefore, to place several burning national issues in factual perspective. Then, we can think aloud about possible solutions and answers. I refer to just two questions. First, is the energy crisis, real or contrived? Second, are the profit increases of the petroleum companies in 1973 unreasonable? If Americans understand the true nature of our nation's energy problems and are not fooled into thinking that their hardship and inconvenience are generating "windfall profits", calm thought will prevail and our democracy will respond intelligently. So far, calm thought is not prevailing.

First: Is the energy crisis real, or was it contrived in order to raise prices, overcome environmental restrictions and improve profits?

Last year, it seemed to us that the public was becoming aware of our energy problems. Surveys of public opinion bore this out. Even in Washington, the attitude seemed to be—"We have a problem. Let's get on with solutions." The conclusions of the National Fe-

troleum Council study were becoming more widely accepted. The President outlined the extent of the problem in his energy messages. A Federal Energy Office was established. A procedure for allocating scarce materials was proposed. A touch of realism began to creep into price controls. Authority to proceed with the Alaska Pipeline seemed imminent, and an accelerated energy research and development program was being formulated. The gears of democracy were meshing—slowly to be sure—to meet a national challenge.

Just when we seemed to be pulling ahead, we have been confronted with a rapidly deteriorating national scene. Suddenly, the effort to increase energy supplies is being superseded by a concerted effort to destroy private enterprise and institutions that have served this nation so well throughout its history. In their place a vast cumbersome government bureaucracy of agencies and restrictive regulations would be erected.

Why is a systematic, intelligent approach to a serious problem deteriorating into a national shambles?

First, the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East and subsequent crude oil embargoes telescoped the time frame for effective national response. The energy problems projected for 1975 or beyond were upon us in 1973.

Second, among many who had decried industry warnings, there arose a fear that the public would hold them responsible for the impending economic impact and attendant hardships. Those who stand for election become vulnerable when the electorate is disturbed. This led many in political life to embark upon an unrelenting crusade to find a scapegoat. Facts that are the basis of intelligent decision making quickly became subservient to fiction and distortion. As a natural consequence, confusion reigns.

Third, for many reasons, our problems at this moment are less severe than forecast. Instant authorities on the energy crisis are crying out in disbelief and anger, saying, "It can't be so. I still have a job. There is heat and light in my home. Those who projected shortages must have been deceiving us. It must be a fraud." And they seem sorry that the potential tragedy has momentarily been averted.

Well, our energy problems are real. They have not been contrived. They still exist and are the result of our nation's action and inaction during the 60's, the 70's—even into 1974. What errors have we made?

1. By regulation of prices, the United States encouraged demand for natural gas and discouraged aggressive exploration for reserves.

2. Environmental extremism has discouraged use of coal, offshore leasing, Alaska Pipeline construction, new refinery construction, deepwater ports and has spawned cars with ever increasing appetites for gasoline.

3. By discouraging development of domestic energy reserves, we have also increased our dependence upon foreign energy materials from sources over which we have no control.

4. Through price controls, we destroyed the ability of the free market mechanism to respond and develop additional supplies.

Economist Milton Friedman recently highlighted the situation when he wrote:

"The oil problem offers a particularly clear illustration of how the price system promotes both freedom and efficiency, how it enables millions of us to cooperate voluntarily with one another in our common interest. It brings out equally why the only alternative to the price system is compulsion and the use of force. It is a mark of how far we have gone on the road to serfdom that governmental allocation and rationing of oil is the automatic response to the oil crisis."

C. Jackson Grayson, Jr., who administered federal price controls and then got out, warns, in the Harvard Business Review, "The free market system is in danger of collapse under central economic controls."

Grayson is convinced that our economic system is shifting from a free-market economy to one that is centrally directed and under public control. The danger he sees in present wage-price controls is that the public forgets what profits are all about. Those interested in promoting a centralized economic system can use controls as a convenient stone for grinding political axes.

The true remedy? Grayson echoes Friedman when he says:

"... no one in any society has been able to come up with a central planning model that is more effective than the seemingly uncoordinated actions of the market-place... Why not return to the one planning system we have that works—the price system?"

The United States has the strongest economy in the world. In most circles, this nation is the most envied. We owe a good deal of that advantage to the years of cheap and abundant energy provided by the petroleum industry. Just how cheap has it been? The United States has only 6 percent of the world's population, but it consumes 30 percent of the world's energy. Industry critics rattle off these figures. But they do not mention that for 20 years we've used that 30 percent of the world's energy for only 12 percent of the world's cost of energy. This illustrates that the petroleum industry has served the country well. Historically, petroleum products have been the most stable element of our economy. At the same time, the very abundance of low cost energy masked its importance to our way of life. The minute scarcity arises, how the wolves come out of the woods!

The petroleum industry has not overstated the problems that face us. When the Middle East embargoes were announced, they were not difficult to compute. Industry and government had a firm fix on inventories, demand, and supply. If the flow of crude oil from the Middle East were cut back 25 percent; if the flow of refined products from the Netherlands, Italy and the Caribbean were reduced as announced; if demand remained constant; then substantial shortages would quickly occur. Personal and economic hardship would soon follow. There was unanimity in this conclusion. Shortages of 2 to 3 million barrels a day were forecast by industry and government. No one misled anyone. No one contrived the possibility of hardship. It could have been and still can be very real.

Fortunately, during the past 60 days this nation has been blessed by several fortuitous events. Not all Middle Eastern nations reduced their production by 25 percent. Not all Middle Eastern nations embargoed shipments to the extent originally threatened. The oil companies were able to reschedule the destinations of some crude oil shipments. It is generally estimated that between 700,000 and 1,000,000 barrels a day of embargoed oil have been made available to the United States. Is this a result we should complain about? Is there a culprit we should seek out? Wisdom dictates otherwise.

At the same time, demand for most products has been reduced as a result of allocations, voluntary conservation, greater efficiency in energy use, and also because we have had a much milder winter than normal—12.5 percent fewer degree days in the current heating season than last season. Should we complain and find the culprit, that did all these good things? Again, wisdom dictates that we congratulate, not condemn.

As Churchill said: "We have benefitted enormously from criticism and at no point have we suffered from any perceptible lack thereof..."

As an industry we don't mind being criticized except when the criticism is aimed squarely at our destruction. Coinciding with all of this destructive criticism has been a massive effort by industry to operate refineries at highest possible levels, maximize distillate production and to locate every barrel

of non-embargoed oil for the American consumer regardless of cost. I don't think this is wrong and I caution those who are conducting witch-hunts to take a few moments to think constructively rather than deliberately seeking to mislead the public about industry efforts.

Let me give you an example of the kind of distortion of facts that is occurring. Mobil opened a new refinery in Joliet, Illinois. This meant that it had an immediate sharp increase in refinery capacity. But a new refinery doesn't begin operating at peak capacity on Day One. So Mobil had a sizable decline in the percentage of its capacity that was operating—even though its total production was up. Yet this data was used in a report prepared by the staff of one of Senator Jackson's committees to "prove" that refinery production was not being maximized so as to create a shortage. You read the charge. Have you read the answer? It was in the fine print.

Incidentally, that same Joliet refinery made news for another Senator. Stevenson, from Illinois, recently chastized the petroleum industry for failing to expand refinery capacity, saying that the industry hadn't opened even one refinery. Somehow he overlooked a new one in his own home state. This is an obvious and I believe deliberate unfairness to the newspaper reader and T.V. viewer. No wonder they question our integrity.

I wholeheartedly welcome Mr. Simon's use of a team of auditors to examine industry data. Such an examination will prove their accuracy.

Now, what about petroleum industry profits? Every major T.V. network and liberally oriented newspaper and newsweekly has described—ad nauseum—oil industry profits as "high," "unconscionable," "fantastic," "unreasonable" or "windfall." Day after day, after day, after day, we read of increases of 240 percent; 150 percent; 90 percent; and so on. Most frequently these shockers are headlined along with a charge by some members of Congress, such as Aspin, Stevenson or Mondale, who refers to increases but never bothers to relate profits to investments, risk or comparison with other businesses. Even grade school textbooks on economics do that. Well, what are the facts?

The facts are that oil company earnings, measured by return on invested capital, have lagged behind all manufacturing industries for most of the last decade. During 1973, the petroleum industry has experienced sharp increases in earnings as compared to the prior year, 1972, a depressed year for the industry. *Business Week* surveyed petroleum industry earnings for the nine months ending September 30. That survey reflects that the composite rate of return on equity for the 31 oil companies was 13.2 percent. In the same nine months, 880 companies in 36 industries had a mean return of the same 13.2 percent—and 19 of those 36 industries had a higher return than that of the petroleum industry. So—in terms of return on investment, the petroleum industry was precisely at or close to the average level for all of American industry. And if that is unconscionable, then we are in good company—fully half of American industry is in the same boat. In the first nine months of 1973, oil industry profits were up 47 percent over 1972. The First National City Bank of New York reported that the average increase for all manufacturing during the same time was 35 percent. Iron and steel was up 89 percent. Nonferrous metals, up 75 percent. Paper and paper products, up 60 percent. Media, by the way, had a pretty good year themselves. ABC was up 45 percent and the Washington Post 57 percent. The New York Times had a whopping increase in earnings of 93 percent.

I cannot recall seeing a single New York Times editorial criticizing its own profits as "unjustified." I have not seen one T.V. spectacular rationalizing why there should be

strict controls over energy, but not over media prices and profits.

Incidentally, while Conoco was generating a miserly 38 percent increase in third quarter profits in 1973 over 1972, the Times was boosting its profits by 113 percent. And over the last 12 months, the Times has earned a 16.6 percent return on equity, while we at Conoco have had to get along on 12.3 percent. Is there any doubt in your mind about the relative risks of our businesses or respective needs for profits in order to expand capital investments?

A final note on profits. Conoco's profit growth has come principally from foreign operations because of one-time inventory adjustments to reflect increased values of inventory. Price controls have kept domestic oil and gas earnings increases to about 7 percent.

For many years, Conoco has conducted a very aggressive program to develop new supplies of oil and gas in many countries, with its greatest effort concentrated in the United States. In more recent years, we have undertaken programs to develop new supplies of coal and uranium in the United States, and these efforts have been larger than the average for the energy industry. These programs have required substantial amounts of internally-generated funds and extensive external financing. Our capital investment of \$1.4 billion in the last three years is about three times our earnings in this period. I'm proud of this record and I think that if the American public knew what we and other energy suppliers did with profits, they would understand and approve not only our profits but the magnitude of their reinvestment.

That leads me to my reasons for saying there has been a conspiracy to destroy the industry. If media were conveying an objective presentation of facts regarding the energy crisis, the public and government would not be responding negatively today. To the contrary, this nation would be responding in a constructive fashion to develop new sources of energy.

Apparently, many in media are not interested, for I have tried. On December 6, I appeared before the Haskell Subcommittee and testified as to concentration in the energy industry, presented an analysis of industry profits, and refuted allegations of contrivance and conspiracy. Although Morton Mintz of the Washington Post and the wire services were present during the testimony, and, although a press release was widely distributed, not one T.V. network or anti-business newspaper mentioned the rebuttal. That same newspaper had headlined every unsupported charge against the industry. Two weeks later, in a Ft. Worth speech, with widely distributed press releases, I repeated the facts and asked media generally to do a documentary or an editorial on why higher rates of return and profit increases are good for media, but bad for the energy industry. None took me seriously. I can only conclude that there is a large and important part of the communications industry that does not want the facts and both sides of this issue disclosed to the public. At the same time our critics in Congress continue their cheap shots while ignoring factual answers to their distortions.

Concern that media will not approach the energy problem objectively has prompted industry to resort to advertising to tell its side of the story. The same Congressional liberals, afraid that the facts would become widely known, suggested legislation and regulations which would prevent even this approach. Why are they so afraid of the truth?

This is a discouraging period. At Conoco, we are getting ready to begin, in 1975, our second century of service to the American people. Yet at the same time, we see our first century of endeavor, responsibility, citizenship and positive contribution to the American way of life forgotten overnight. Now, a

handful of misguided zealots threaten to deliberately undermine a responsible industry that has been alerting Washington to the dangers of inaction and pointing to the vital needs for a coordinated national effort.

The soap and detergent industry can't shake its head and say, "That's too bad, but it's your problem." It's more than that, for all industry and everyone in this nation would be hurt by an ill-advised and emotional anti-business response in Congress. If the petroleum industry is so crippled by taxes and regulations that it cannot aggressively expand energy supplies, your industry will be directly affected. If the marketplace is controlled and government is substituted for private industry, where will it stop? Who will be your supplier of feedstocks? Slowly the institutions that have made America great will be destroyed not by accident, but by design.

Further, it disturbs me deeply that legislative processes that have stood the test of time, and have permitted all sides of an issue to be aired, are now being eroded at a frightening rate. When legislation can pass Congress without critical committee analysis and review, then the democratic process has been bypassed. If tax measures can be passed without review by the House Ways and Means or Senate Finance Committees, then we have aborted an essential ingredient of a legislative process designed to prevent emotional and arbitrary action.

There are sensible and rational answers to this nation's energy problems. We can weather the storm without widespread hardship and economic loss if we respond intelligently. Adequate supplies of energy will not flow from the destruction of private industry. Rather, they will flow from a cooperative effort between government and industry, assisted and encouraged by the public. Let's capitalize on our strength, minimize our weaknesses, face our challenges as partners and be guided by the truth. It has been a successful formula in the past and it can resolve our present difficulties.

The Wall Street Journal, in an editorial entitled "The Great Oil Conspiracy", summed it up pretty well when it concluded:

"To us, all of this looks a good deal less like a conspiracy than like each company trying to cope on its own. Yet the conspiracy theory will no doubt thrive, nudging Congress to take all manner of punitive action against the companies, action that will prolong, not shorten, the energy crisis. We only hope that enough people can conceive that just as a nation's foreign policy can be distorted by believing in bogeymen in pin-stripes, so energy policy can be warped by visions of bandits in the boardrooms."

As my final note, allow me to repeat what, for months now, I have felt called upon to tell the nation: The only conspiracy I have witnessed is the one of industry critics who have consistently delayed and frustrated sensible energy programs for the past 10 years.

CORPORATE SECRECY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years we have seen the decision-making process of Government opened up to public scrutiny, and recent history emphasizes the need for still more openness. This history has shown how secrecy high in the Government decisionmaking process which affect the public interest can often be misdirected, criminal or un-

ethical. A first step toward a solution is disclosure.

We have seen how a few powerful and moneyed interests can subtly exert undue influence in Government and in political campaigns. Part of the solution, again, is disclosure, and in the case of political campaigns, complete financial reform.

And with the energy crisis at hand, we have seen the public interest fall prey to the secret manipulations of the oil companies. And again, part of the solution is disclosure.

In each of these areas I have been active: I have introduced legislation calling for complete disclosure of all lobbyist activity, campaign contributions, and income tax returns for public officials; I have cosponsored Federal campaign financing legislation; and I have introduced legislation establishing a National Energy Information System which would provide the Government with energy information it does not now have but which it needs to make proper decisions.

It would now appear that similar first steps need to be taken with large private corporations.

It would seem reasonable that the larger and more powerful a corporation is, the more people that it affects and, therefore, the more subject to public scrutiny it should be. However, a few of us know much about who votes stock in the major multibillion dollar corporations—entities whose wealth and influence are greater than that of many nations. Removed from the public eye, these companies often make decisions which rival, sometimes supersede in economic, social, and political importance actions taken by States or even the Congress.

The sum of the information which is currently available indicates that a few institutional stockowners are the key voters in many of the major corporations—it is generally considered in a widely held company that 5 percent of the voting interest is controlling, if the rest of the ownership is scattered, and that concentration of stock control has become an ominous characteristic of our economic system. A study done by the Securities and Exchange Commission on 620 representative companies showed that various combinations of from 1 to 3 of the Nation's 230 institutional investors voted at least 10 percent of the stock in a quarter of the companies. Some of the companies thus controlled included such giants as Ford, Chrysler, Gulf Oil, and Standard Oil of Indiana.

The 1972 reports filed by the airlines with the Civil Aeronautics Board showed that Chase Manhattan Bank is a major stockholder in most of the country's airlines: 6.5 percent of TWA, 9 percent of Eastern, 8.1 percent of National, and 7.5 percent of American. Other sources show that Chase owns 6.8 percent of Northwest, 7.26 percent of Western, and 8.5 percent of United.

The bank held this stock with "nominees," also known as "street names" or "straws" in the securities trade, to hide the true beneficial ownership for reporting purposes.

Safeway, the second largest food chain in the country, is another case in point—

nearly 50 percent of the stock was held last year by some of the largest insurance companies, banks, and trusts in the country. Chase again appears, voting and owning 10 percent of Safeway stock through its nominee, "Kane & Co.," an organization which exists only on paper.

In one of the most important of the Nation's industries, electric utilities, Chase, using four different names, appears among the top 10 stockholders of 42 utilities, including Pacific Gas & Electric; Morgan Guaranty Trust, using 12 different names, is among the top 10 stockholders in 42 utilities; and the list continues on to show that 14 banks are each among the top 10 stockholders in 10 or more utilities, indicating the horizontal influence of institutional investors across an entire industry.

The full extent and effect of corporate ownership concentration is not known. Corporate documents have never been public record; their transactions are private except for a few outside of the privileged "insider class." What this information means is that the control of many large corporations is in the hands of a small group of managers of investment portfolios, unknown and, as a result, unaccountable to the public. And corporate secrecy is perpetuating that control. Only recently, through the diligence of Senator METCALF of Montana, and Vic Reinemer, staff director of the Senate Subcommittee on Budgeting, Management, and Expenditures, could the general public find out that Fiveco, Forco, Octo, Oneco, Treco and Twoco are all code words for the Prudential Insurance Co., by consulting a nominee list now printed by the Government Printing Office. Even so, Federal regulatory agencies have a marginal record in battling through the maze of nominees to obtain ownership information, and many companies refuse to divulge the informa-

tion voluntarily. Indeed, as Ralph Nader stated during testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business in 1972:

Neither the SEC, the Civil Aeronautics Board nor the Federal Power Commission penetrates the veil of so-called nominee shareholders to determine who the actual owners are—corporate or individual—of the industries they purport to regulate.

As a result, law enforcement and Government regulation in critically important aspects of our economy—including energy, communications, antitrust, and environmental protection—are impeded because responsibility for illegal or unethical actions is not easily ascertainable. Regulatory agencies as well as the Department of Justice need the information for antitrust law. Congress needs, if we are to seriously cope with the energy crisis, current data on the oil companies, on their acquisition of coal companies, uranium companies, and mineral leases, as well as their connections with transportation interests. In 1971, it was determined that oil companies owned 30 percent of our coal reserves and 50 percent of our uranium reserves, the significance of which is apparent.

In addition to the veil of nominees shrouding corporate behavior, corporate power and control is increased through command over credit and interlocking directorships. For example, it was determined that Continental Oil has direct director interlocks with three banks, one insurance company and two coal companies. "Indirectly, these six companies have secondarily overlaps with seven of the country's largest insurance companies, two investment companies, two foundations, seven other oil companies, five banks, five of the largest utilities—two uranium companies, and two gas pipelines." Additionally, Congressman LES ASPIN has recently released a list of

interlocking directorships among oil and gas firms which may be in violation of the Clayton Act.

Mr. Speaker, no institution so critical to the people's interest can maintain accountability if its machinations are shrouded with secrecy. Recent events have accentuated the importance of opening to public view more of the Government's affairs, and steps are being taken. Similar steps need to be taken with large private corporations.

There should be easy access to the names and addresses of the individuals voting major blocks of stock in large corporations; principal creditors and amounts involved should be divulged; and the relationships and affiliations between officers of different corporations should be disclosed. The information should be continually updated and publicly available.

As Theodore Roosevelt eloquently stated in 1901 when calling for extensive disclosure of the financial affairs of large corporations:

Great corporations exist only because they are created and safeguarded by our institutions; and it is our right and our duty to see that they work in harmony with these institutions.

While the Judiciary Committee is understandably occupied with pending impeachment proceedings, I believe it should not delay any longer in commencing hearings and investigations to determine what changes may be needed in our commercial law to insure that major corporations function in harmony with the public interest. The Judiciary Committee should also investigate evidence which indicates widespread violations of antitrust laws by U.S. corporations, including oil companies and the Nation's institutional investors, with a resulting restraint of trade and illegal control of consumer prices.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 31, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Walter G. Nunn, First Baptist Church, Jasper, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for life, love, and light. Remind us again and again that we are always within the scope of Thy love and the context of Thy judgment. May we never forget that what we do has eternal consequences. Now we beseech Thee to guide these ministers of Thine, these makers of our laws, in their deliberations and decisions. May what they do reflect some measure of Thy will, and may we all be guided by the principles of integrity, fairness, balance, and understanding. Grant unto them, we pray, serenity, courage, patience, and a sense of Thy presence. Moreover, help us always to look unto Thee for guidance.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings 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 a bill and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2606. An act for the relief of Grant J. Merritt and Mary Merritt Bergson; and S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part I of the Senate committee print entitled "Confidence and Concern: Citizens View American Government—A Survey of Public Attitudes."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 92-484, appointed Mr. STEVENS to the Technology Assessment Board, in lieu of Mr. DOMINICK, resigned.

DR. WALTER G. NUNN

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I was honored today to have Dr. Walter G. Nunn, from my hometown, Jasper, Ala., give the opening prayer on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Dr. Nunn is pastor of the First Baptist Church, in Jasper, which I attend as often as my schedule will permit. He received his bachelor of arts degree from Mercer University, master of divinity degree from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and doctor of divinity from Samford University.

Dr. Nunn is presently a member of the Southern Baptist Executive Board Committee and the past president of the Alabama Baptist State Convention. He has received the Freedoms Foundation Award for the past 4 years and is a board member of the Alabama Association for Retarded Children.

In addition to his many clergyman's duties, Dr. Nunn works tirelessly for his