

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION—GENOCIDE CONVENTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session for the purpose of considering Executive O, 81st Congress, 1st session, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Ex. O (81st Con., 1st sess.), the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

RESUMPTION OF PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a resumption of the period for the transaction of routine morning business.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at the hour of 10:30 a.m. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11 a.m., with statements limited therein to 5 minutes.

At the hour of 11 a.m., the Senate will go into executive session and will resume consideration of the Genocide Convention. At 11 a.m. the debate on the motion to invoke cloture will begin to run and an automatic quorum call will occur at the hour of 12 noon. Upon the establishment of a quorum, a mandatory yea-and-nay vote will occur at about 12:15 p.m. on the motion to invoke cloture.

What happens thereafter tomorrow afternoon will depend to some extent at least on the outcome of that cloture vote.

I should also say that it may be possible that the conference report on the National Emergency Energy Act could be called up if, in the meantime, the conferees have completed action thereon.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, with the authority of the distinguished majority whip, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment in accordance with the previous order until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4:48 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 1974, at 10:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MOTHER JONES—BEFORE WL— WOMEN'S LIBERATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, no list of outstanding labor leaders is complete without the name of Mary "Mother" Jones, or, as she was called by the antiunion forces of the late 19th century, the "Chicago agitator."

"Mother" Jones entered the coalfields around Pittsburgh in the late 1890's and urged miners to protest their long hours and low pay.

Once the miners struck, she helped garner foodstuffs for their families and stiffen the resistance of the newly organized miners.

A recent article in the Pittsburgh Press Sunday magazine section tells the story of "Mother" Jones.

I would like to share that article with my colleagues:

MOTHER JONES—THE MINERS' STRIKING SPIRIT
(By Lois C. McLean)

Mary Jones stood on a speakers' platform at Turtle Creek and exhorted a crowd of 10,000 to fight for their rights.

Of medium height, hair tinged with gray and robust appearance, she spoke in a clear, distinct voice, calling the strikers "fellow slaves" and warning them against politicians who "hugged them closer than their wives" before election and then ignored them until the next time for voting. She derided the miners, telling them if they possessed true

manhood, their wives and children would not be wearing rags.

The time was not 1974, but 1897, and Mrs. Mary Jones—"the Chicago agitator"—was taking on the Pittsburgh district coal miners' cause as her own. In the process, she became nationally known as "Mother Jones, the friend of the miners."

PROBLEM OF FOOD

When 20,000 Pittsburgh area miners went on strike against a 10-12-hour day in which they dug coal at the rate of about 50 cents a ton, the immediate problem was how to provide food and supplies for them and their families.

Mother Jones approached farmers in the region and asked them to share their produce. She escorted them and their loaded-down wagons in a parade to "Camp Determination," strikers' headquarters near Turtle Creek, where the food was distributed.

Neighborhood women were invited to a "pound party" and asked to bring a pound of food or other supplies. Factory workers were invited by Mother Jones to come to camp meetings and donate to the cause.

DAILY SPEECHES

Working with strike leaders, she made almost daily speeches, encouraging the miners to keep up the fight. She visited their wives, and invited them to special meetings where she convinced them of their responsibility to back their husbands. She even enlisted their children to gain sympathy for the strike. One parade was led by a group of 50 little girls carrying homemade banners—one read, "Our Pappas Aren't Scared."

The dramatic highlight of another rally came when Mother Jones crowned a young crippled girl with a wreath of daisies and proclaimed her the "Joan of Arc of the strikers."

Through marches, meetings and personal contacts, Mother Jones was able to arouse and maintain in the miners an enthusiasm and determination to win. To their dull,

harsh lives, she brought excitement, action and purpose.

Finally, in January, 1898, agreement was reached by coal operators and union representatives, establishing uniform wages and price scales, an eight-hour workday and the Central Competitive Field covering Western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois.

Mother Jones went on to further identify herself with miners by appearing in camps throughout the nation and some in Canada and Mexico. She was known as "the angel of the miners" until her death in 1930.

At her request she was buried with "her boys" in the Union Miners' Cemetery at Mount Olive, Ill. In 1972, the cemetery was declared a national historic site.

From the National Labor Tribune, Aug. 26, 1897: "Of the subjects that have been discussed, the 'new woman' has received more severe raps than any that have been discussed in newspapers for many a day. While we do not approve of the 'new woman' that makes a show of herself cycling up and down the principal thoroughfares of a city in bloomers, we do approve of the 'new women' in affairs in which they, more than anyone else, are directly interested. The latest in this line are women as labor agitators . . . but the woman that we wish to speak of in this article is Mrs. Mary Jones of Chicago. She has done more missionary work for miners of the Pittsburgh district than any two of the officials and done it better. She seems to have the gift of talking in that forcible manner that interests you the moment she enters into a conversation with you. To her, more than any one else, the miners owe much of their success in this unpleasantness. She has 'roughed' it in this district for the last four weeks, and in all kinds of weather she is ready to take the field and use her persuasive powers on the men. Too much credit cannot be given to this 'new woman,' and her name will go down in history as one of the martyrs to the cause of humanity."

LEAD POISONING.

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, each year ducks and geese by the millions migrate southward across the Nation to their wintering grounds, and each year countless thousands, perhaps millions, needlessly die. The cause is lead poisoning—a fatal result of their scooping up lead shotgun pellets from marsh bottoms as they forage for food. Other thousands suffer from sublethal doses of lead pellets and experience anemia, muscular disorders, a high susceptibility to other diseases, and disoriented migratory behavior.

The seriousness of this problem has led the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife to consider phasing out the use of lead shot for shooting waterfowl by 1975. I have expressed my own concern by introducing legislation that would prohibit waterfowl hunters from using the poisonous lead shot. We can no more continue to degrade the environment of our waterfowl than we can afford to further pollute any other part of the environment.

Many questions have been raised over the extent of the lead poisoning problem, the reliability of various studies, the proposed banning of lead shot, and the suitability of nontoxic iron shot as a substitute. One of the best discussions of the entire subject appeared in Bob Brister's shooting column in the February 1974 issue of *Field & Stream* magazine. Mr. Brister is to be commended for the thoroughness of his investigations, and *Field & Stream* is to be commended for keeping its readers fully informed of all aspects of this intolerable threat to an invaluable wildlife resource. The article follows:

ANSWERS TO YOUR STEEL-SHOT QUESTIONS
(By Bob Brister)

By the time this issue reaches you, the U.S. Department of the Interior probably will have filed an environmental impact statement, the last legal step necessary before toxic lead shot can be banned from waterfowl hunting.

In anticipation of this step I have for months now been testing nontoxic shot for penetration, patterning, and actual killing efficiency in the field. I've researched behind the scenes, sometimes dealing with confidential data of firms working on nontoxic shot, trying to determine answers to hundreds of questions which have come in from readers since our October issue delved into the problem.

Some of the things I found may surprise you just as they did me. One ammunition company already has steel-shot loads which it says can be guaranteed (by replacement of the gun) against damage to barrels, not only single-barrels but doubles and over/unders as well. As for killing power, I have found that steel shot, in the identical charge weight as lead, can be made to perform quite comparably with ordinary lead loads, and for some shooters at normal ranges may even be better due to higher velocities.

I've fired some of the newest steel-shot loads for an entire waterfowl season in my area of South Texas where a daily bag limit of five ducks and five geese is not only possi-

ble, but was repeatedly accomplished. I've shot flighted shooting-preserve mallards at measured ranges with three different guns: a Perazzi over/under, a Winchester 101 over/under, and a Remington 1100 autoloader, none of which has shown damage of any sort.

These findings, I realize, do not seem to concur with reports of studies conducted by the Winchester Arms Company at Nilo Farms, Illinois. But much of the difference has been in interpretation. The Nilo Study has perhaps done more than anything else to provide basic data on duck killing for all companies and has created much of the interest in a national problem which first came to public notice more than two decades ago largely through the concern of "Mr. Winchester," John Olin.

New developments in nontoxic materials, loads, woods, and cases are moving faster than any individual or company can keep track of, and my attempt now is to try and put into perspective some of those developments and perhaps prevent some "panic" among hunters, many of whom (judging by my mail) are convinced they would quit waterfowl hunting rather than use "crippling" loads of nontoxic shot.

One of the most commonly asked questions has been, why the sudden rush toward nontoxic shot when biologists of many states say they observe no waterfowl lead-poisoning problem at all?

Dr. John Rogers, Chief of Migratory Bird Management for the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, says the main reason for the rush is the Bureau's just-completed nationwide tests of duck wings, a scientific procedure which is claimed to determine from wingbones almost precisely the lead levels the duck was carrying in its body. These tests, he said, have shown "frighteningly higher levels than were feared, even in areas where there seems little possibility for the birds to have picked up such lead levels from air or water pollution."

Ducks tested from the very lightly populated states of Idaho and Utah, for instance, showed alarmingly high lead levels. About one-third of the mallard wingbones tested from Utah showed near-lethal lead levels up to 20 parts per million and wingbones from Idaho showed 16.7 percent of mallards carrying similarly high lead levels. Interpretations of the tests, he added, indicate that some birds in these states are carrying practically no lead traces at all, which indicates through "median level" interpretations that the birds using heavily hunted areas are picking up extremely high lead content from spent pellets while others are getting almost none. He says this would seem to rule out the possibility that they are merely picking up lead from the environment.

Heaviest lead pollution in ducks was in the Northeast, notably in the general area between Washington and Boston where, Dr. Rogers said, lead emissions from auto exhausts have superimposed one form of lead pollution upon another, adding up to a critical situation.

As to why biologists in some states say they have observed little or no lead-poisoning deaths in ducks or geese, he said:

"This is not something you just walk out in a marsh and see. The well-publicized instances of many ducks dead or dying in one spot or area are not the real problem. The real problem is that a few ducks here and there in a marsh, day after day, are gradually dying from lead poisoning. Most of them are consumed overnight by predators or die in cover where they may never be seen—even by someone keeping a regular check on the area."

As for damage from steel shot, it has been widely publicized that the "peening" effect of steel pellets will bulge barrels, and could result in barrel and/or rib separation in thin-tubed doubles and over/unders. However,

these ideas were based upon facts made (for the most part) some time ago, and in the meanwhile one ammunition manufacturer, Canadian Industries Limited (CIL), has been running tests with more than 50 guns, including several double barrels and one over/under—which has had more than 30,000 rounds through it—with what was described as no damage to any of the guns.

Jacques Marquis of CIL's ammunition division in Brownsburg, Quebec, said the loads his company is working on cannot be discussed in detail as yet, but that they contain a specially designed "shot cushion."

"We are not really concerned about barrel damage after what we have seen," Marquis said. "We feel sure enough that as our steel shot loads go on the market we will be in position to back them up with a positive guarantee of replacing the gun if it is damaged by firing them. That goes for a Parker or Purdey or any other gun sufficiently good to be safe with lead loads. We have been field testing these shells under actual hunting conditions from one end of Canada to the other, and all I can say is that we are finding the bagging of ducks to be about the same with them as with our lead loads. We have had some top skeet shooters such as Barney Hartman (All-American Professional Team captain) and Paul LaPorte (last year's world skeet-shooting champion) testing these loads on targets and on ducks. Mr. Hartman has been hunting with them a lot and I think he likes them very much. They are high-velocity shells but with very light recoil."

If CIL's tests are an indication, steel-shot barrel damage may turn out to be another problem which will ultimately be solved by technology.

Tests by Remington Arms Company seem to indicate considerably less of a problem exists than is ordinarily believed. E. S. (Ted) McCawley, Remington director of public relations, said that after thousands of rounds of testing it has been determined that Remington 870 pumpguns and 1100 auto-loaders can be used with steel shot "without concern."

"We have observed minor changes in dimension at the forcing cone and choke of our Model 3200 over/under, but these did not apparently affect pattern to any degree," he said.

Federal Cartridge Company has been running tests with a number of over/unders, doubles, and single-barrels, according to Vice President William B. Horn.

"After 500 rounds each we observe no more change in barrel dimension than from the same number of lead loads fired through these guns," Horn said. "However, we are asking individual manufacturers to test our shells to see for themselves since we cannot possibly test every make and model on the market. Many of them are doing so now."

Despite my own tests and the increasing evidence that it may be much safer than believed previously to shoot steel shot, I am not advising anyone at this time to fire steel loads presently on the market through expensive, thin-walled doubles or over/unders. For that matter I could not advise anyone to fire modern shotcup wads in just any expensive, thin-walled double or over/under because I've also seen barrels bulged by lead shot. There are just too many variables of thickness and hardness of barrel steels, reactions to them at various temperatures, etc., to make positive statements about all guns.

This brings up the question of why can't the gun companies come up with barrels tough enough to withstand steel shot without any question of barrel damage?

I believe they certainly could do so, provided ammunition developments don't make such changes unnecessary. This area of research is almost virgin territory. One solution could be barrels either overbored or "prebulged" to a tiny degree behind the

choke, thus reducing the sudden impact of the shot load being forced into the steep constriction of present chokes. The so-called Russian choke principle I used in skeet guns which won the World Shooting Games and the Olympics, utilizes barrels "belled" behind the choke. This improves performance by shortening the shot string and also has the effect of reducing peening pressures at the choke. Another solution, which one manufacturer is now studying, is the use of extra-hard screw-in choke devices (similar in principle to the Win-Choke) which could withstand the peening effect of hard shot. Still another concept is the overboring of barrels from the forcing cone forward. Simply increasing the hardness of the steel used in barrel-making possibly would do the job. But the most important thing at the moment seems to be coming up with steel-shot loads which would work in existing guns without fear of damage, and CIL believes it has that. My personal belief is that with the larger, heavier shot charges of steel almost certain to be evolved for extra long range shooting, some sort of special barrels may be required for permanent protection against bulging behind the choke. But at the same time I believe that bulging and/or dangers of barrel separation may have been worried about much more than history will prove was indicated.

In the instance of single-barreled guns I think it would require more shooting than most hunters do in years to produce visible change in a barrel, and that even then—judging from tests made by Winchester and others—the change would not be in opening the choke or its patterns. According to the Winchester tests, neither safety nor pattern were compromised after thousands of test rounds with steel loads in single-barreled guns.

When it comes to killing power, hold on to your hat and keep an open mind. There is increasing evidence that steel shot can be made to perform as effectively as lead shot provided the right pellet size is used for the job.

Perhaps one of the most significant analyses of the modern shotgun was the \$1-million Nilo Report on Shotshell Efficiency. In this study, 2,400 live mallards were fired upon under scientifically controlled conditions at various shot sizes of lead, copper, and steel. Penetration, pattern cripples, kills—every factor was put onto computer tape. This data has now been assembled in the form of a "mathematical model" into which any load and range and velocity can be fed, and out comes the computer's answer to how many ducks would be killed or crippled at any yardage by any load or type of shot.

Recently I had the opportunity, under the supervision of Winchester ballisticsian Ed Lowry and the director of the Nilo Report, Dr. Ed Kozlucky, to feed into the Winchester computer what I considered to be a direct comparison of steel and lead-shot killing efficiency.

I picked one of the most popular U.S. duck loads, 12-gauge high velocity 4s, 1 1/4 ounces of shot with a muzzle velocity of 1330 feet per second. Since earlier tests have shown that a full size larger in steel is required to approximate lead's retained energy, I asked the computer for a comparison with 1 1/4 ounces of No. 2 steel shot moving the identical muzzle velocity of 1330 feet per second.

What came out, among other things, is that that the steel-shot load killed more ducks than the lead-shot load at every range all the way out to 80 yards. At 80 yards, where very little clean killing was done with either load, the steel and lead came out even, 11.4 birds bagged per 100 shot at.

How could steel shot do this, when everybody knows lead is heavier, and thus a better projectile than steel?

As best I can read the computer, the difference lay with the better patterning of the harder pellets. At 40 yards, from a full-choked barrel, the lead 4s (standard High Velocity without "Grex" cushioning) showed a 72 percent pattern from the Winchester test gun. The steel 2s showed a fantastic 84.8 percentage, possibly due to the big shot and the fact that the hard shot flies straighter and there are fewer deformed "flyers" in the load.

On the other side of the coin is the relationship of kills to cripples. According to Dr. Ed Kozlucky of Winchester, this is the most important index to the efficiency of the shot-shell, and in rough approximation steel shot not only killed a few more birds cleanly than lead, it crippled more, too, at all ranges except 40 and 80 yards. But in each case the difference was very small.

At 40 yards, lead shot killed 93.8 and crippled 5.5; steel shot killed 94.7 and crippled 5. Interestingly enough, at the most common of yardages used by duck hunters (40), steel shot outperformed lead in both categories, killing more and crippling less.

Certainly it is realized that the press releases from Winchester following the Nilo study did not indicate such a parity of lead and steel shot. But these tests were based upon 1 1/2 ounces of steel shot compared with 1 1/2 ounces of lead. Such a seemingly lopsided comparison of lead and steel shot material was done, as Dr. Kozlucky explained, for two reasons. One was because 1 1/2 ounces of steel and 1 1/2 ounces of lead happened to be the highest amounts (and most efficient killers) of the two types of ammunition available in standard 2 3/4-inch 12-gauge cases. The other reason was because in most lead loads, 1 1/2-ounces of steel has approximately the same number of pellets in a given shot size as 1 1/2 ounces of lead, this due to the difference in weight of the material. Having the same number of pellets was an important factor in producing the mathematical data upon which the computer can now function.

But the significant thing to me, all-around, was what would happen if it were possible to put the identical total energy payload into lead shells and steel shells and then compare their "killing power." When the computer did that it came up with a very evenly matched killing efficiency of lead and steel.

The Arcanum Corporation of Ann Arbor, Michigan, has been producing limited amounts of "sintered" shot, made by a process which chemically attracts a 50 percent content of fine, powdered iron to 50 percent of powdered lead to form round shot pellets (much softer than steel shot), which would have no damaging effect upon gun barrels. Helmut Stern, president of that company, said details have not been worked out as to definite cost nor exactly how soon sintered shot could be produced in large volume, and that it would be about nine months to a year before the company could get into real production.

"We believe sintered shot has advantages of higher density, will dissipate rapidly as the iron portion of the pellets oxidizes, and more of it can be loaded into a shell than steel shot because less wad cushioning will be required," Stern said. "We are licensed by the Canadian government as sole proprietors of its patent on the process, and are prepared to license anyone else to build the shot once we complete tests on the process."

I asked Stern about questions on the shot I've heard raised; that as its 50 percent content of iron rusts away, fine lead powder could be released into the environment, possibly to pose problems to wildlife as bad or worse than those now being created by lead pellets.

"We do not claim to have the answer" he said. "The sintered shot is not that much heavier than steel shot, a density of about 8.5 as compared with 7.8 for steel, and thus is still not close to the 11.3 for lead. I cannot say what would be the effect on the ecosys-

tem from the lead residue remaining from this shot when the iron portion oxidizes. We are not trying to rush anyone into accepting the new shot. We do think it will kill better than steel and will not harm guns."

Then he went on to add:

There is another kind of shot which could possibly be better than any of the non-toxics, and that would be lead blended with trace amounts of selenium. It has been shown that selenium in some way seems to make lead less toxic to ducks, and that only tiny amounts of it are necessary. But I cannot say yet that selenium lead shot would be practical."

For the present, the ban on toxic lead shot would apply only to waterfowl hunting. Last fall, when I wrote the article "The Decision Is for Steel," that was indeed the thinking at the Interior Department, and the "time frame," as they say in Washington, was for a lead ban on the Atlantic Flyway in '74 and the nation in '75. Then came developments in sintered shot by the Canadians which apparently convinced Assistant Secretary of Interior Nathaniel P. Reed to hold off and see more about the new shot. If it were indeed the best choice, more time would be required for manufacturers to test and develop it for the huge volume of shotshells needed by the nation's hunters. Interior Department thinking now, I believe, is in terms of '75 or even '76 for a ban on toxic shot, but any decision would have to be announced right away to give manufacturers time to get into production of an alternative shot.

Some wonder if the people in Washington have considered what might happen to the sale of duck stamps and excise-tax money for wildlife refuges if \$7-a-box nontoxic ammunition discourages Americans from waterfowl hunting?

Surveys show the average hunter would be spending only a tiny percentage more in his overall outlay to go hunting; ammunition is one of the least expensive aspects of the sport. What has proved to discourage hunters is shortage of game and curtailed bag limits. If nontoxic shot can reduce losses of game due to lead poisoning, future hunters should be encouraged, not discouraged. Right now I believe one of the most discouraging things in hunting is out-of-range skyblasting, and it could be that higher ammunition costs might cut down some of that wild shooting.

Perhaps the most dangerous aspects of the whole situation is the possibility that unless toxic shot is banned, conservation societies and groups would go through with previous threats to sue the Interior Department against "pollution" of the environment from toxic shot. Should that happen, the resultant discord and widespread publicity against hunting could do more damage than anything mentioned in this discussion.

The National Wildlife Federation has already publicly threatened to file suit unless the Interior Department "gets the lead out." I believe that is now exactly what Interior is going to do.

REPRESENTATIVE KEMP OPPOSES CONGRESSIONAL PAY INCREASES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a House resolution calling for the disapproval of the salary increase proposal for certain officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches as transmitted by the President to this

Congress in the budget for fiscal year 1975.

In accordance with provisions of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, these salary increases will take effect in less than 30 days from today, unless we express our disapproval of all or part of the increases.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are urging fiscal restraint upon every sector of the economy, I find such an upward adjustment of our own salaries to be totally lacking in thrift and proportion. I have warned for the past 13 months that fiscal responsibility begins here in this Chamber. If we do not have the self-discipline necessary to block a pay raise that will take effect through our own inaction, then I believe we will lose the initiative in restoring fiscal sanity to our economy. I, for one, would find it impossible to reconcile any budget cut made because of inflation, with our own personal role in institutionalizing this inflation.

If Congress is in need of a pay raise, let those advocates of such a raise bring their proposals before this House, and let each Member vote, on the record, for or against this raise. Until such time as congressional pay raises are handled in this manner, we must vigorously resist taking the easy way out of fiscal responsibility. What easy way out can we offer the consuming public, reeling from 8.8 percent increases in the cost of living last year?

Mr. Speaker, several Members have offered resolutions similar to my own. We must adopt this resolution immediately if our deeds are going to be consonant with our words.

THE PREJUDICED JURORS

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker I think all of us have a constitutional obligation to keep an open mind before making our final decision on the issue of impeachment.

I think it would be well for my colleagues to consider the thoughts expressed in an editorial from the Baltimore News American entitled, "The Prejudiced Jurors." We will each have to examine our understanding of our responsibilities in the light of the serious questions this editorial raises:

THE PREJUDICED JURORS

Suppose a man was called for possible service as member of a grand jury whose function is to consider evidence in a high crime and then decide whether a suspect should be indicted or not.

And suppose the same man, in advance of his prospective grand jury service, should go around telling newspapermen and television interviewers that he is convinced of the suspect's guilt.

Would such a man, with his opinion already formed and a matter of wide public record, ever be permitted to participate in a normal legal process which presumes innocence until evidence of guilt is presented? He most assuredly would not.

All members of the House of Representatives, in effect, are prospective grand jurors. If their judiciary committee decides to press impeachment proceedings against President Nixon, it will be up to the congressmen to weigh the evidence and vote or reject an indictment in the form of specific charges.

Will those congressmen who have been going around telling newspapermen and television interviewers they believe the President should be removed from office, or resign—which amounts to the same thing—will they be allowed to vote on the indictment in spite of their recorded advance bias? They most assuredly will.

And so will all the U.S. senators, who will be sitting as a trial jury if the house votes an indictment. Including, of course, those you have seen repeatedly on television solemnly insinuating guilt to a President being prosecuted on the unsubstantiated word of one discredited man, John Dean.

There is something dreadfully wrong in the prospect, something quite alien to the traditional spirit of American justice. Those members of Congress who have been going around prejudging the President are reminiscent of the outlaw kangaroo court posse which vowed a fair trial before the hanging.

At the very least, out of respect for the judicial process and its presumption of innocence until guilt is proven, at the very least they should keep their opinions to themselves or disqualify themselves as jurors.

OPPOSITION TO CONGRESSIONAL PAY INCREASES

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in the 93d Congress I rise to express my strong opposition to proposals for an increase in congressional salaries.

Under the Federal Salary Act of 1967, the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries is directed to transmit its recommendations for salary increases to the President every 4 years. Under the clever wording of the 1967 statute, once the President submits the Commission's recommendations to the Congress, they automatically take effect after 30 days unless either House enacts a resolution of disapproval. But there is no procedure in the House rules to force a vote on such a resolution, and it can therefore die quietly in committee.

Today I introduced such a resolution of disapproval, directed against the congressional salary recommendations transmitted by the President to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. These recommendations are contained on page 1030 of the Budget Appendix.

I do not believe that Members of Congress should enjoy a pay raise by such a back-door method. Therefore, on the first day of the 93d Congress I sponsored H.R. 971, amending the Federal Salary Act to provide an expeditious means of considering resolutions of disapproval against salary recommendations. My bill contains a parliamentary procedure to force Congress to a recorded vote on pay increases for itself, the Federal judiciary, and Government executives.

Not surprisingly, H.R. 971 has been

linguishing in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for more than a year now. Yet that same committee acted with astounding speed last July to approve a Senate bill which would move up the date for submission of salary recommendations to August 1973, instead of January 1974 as specified by law. If this bill had passed the House, Congress could have had its increase in a nonelection year, without a record vote, and thereby avoided the consequences of such action in an election year.

I rose on the House floor last July to blast this move as a sneaky, self-serving, and inflationary attempt to increase congressional and Federal salaries without being responsible to the American people for doing so, and I introduced a resolution which directed the Commission not to recommend any salary increases for Members of Congress. I noted that such an omission will relieve the Congress of the ethical burden of approving its own increases without a vote, and might also enable us to take a clear-eyed look at the need and expense of other recommendations made by the Commission.

Happily for the American taxpayer, a majority of Members of the House agreed with me on this matter and on July 30, 1973 voted down the rule allowing consideration of the Senate bill.

Now that we are faced with the statutory submission of the salary recommendations, my feelings on increases for Members of Congress remain the same. I stand on my words of last July about congressional salary increases:

Any such increase would be an insult to the American wage earner, to the senior citizen on a fixed income trying to make ends meet, to the disabled veteran or World War I and World War II soldiers who has his pension reduced by every increase in social security benefits. Surely this Chamber has more important questions to consider.

To this statement, I would further add that approval of the increase by sheer inaction is an abdication of legislative responsibility. A vote on my resolution of disapproval within a month would give every Member a chance to demonstrate his sense of fiscal justice and his willingness to stand the clear light of public scrutiny on this issue.

My own position in opposition to the increases is clear, and following is the resolution which I have introduced to back it up:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby disapproves all of the recommendations of the President of the United States, with respect to the rates of pay of offices and positions within the purview of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) of Section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 643; Public Law 90-206), transmitted by the President to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

GOODBY, MR. GROSS

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, the most unhappy item of news I have heard in re-

cent days was the announcement by my colleague from Iowa (Mr. Gross) that he would retire at the end of his present term in the Congress.

Though I understand my colleague's desire to ease up on his taxing schedule and return to his beautiful home district in Iowa, his decision remains a sad one for the House. Mr. Gross is more than a Congressman, he is a one-man investigating force dedicated to protecting the taxpayer's pocketbook. He is scrupulous, untiring, uncompromising, and dedicated to the public good.

Perhaps no better commentary on Mr. Gross' record of public service can be found than in a recent editorial in the Savannah Morning News, one of the leading newspapers in Georgia and the South. I would like a copy of this editorial, which appeared in the January 23 edition, printed in the RECORD at this point:

GOODY, MR. GROSS

It is with regret we note the announcement of Rep. H. R. Gross (R-Iowa) that he will retire at the end of his present term. The 74-year-old Gross cites his age as the reason for his decision.

The Washington Post described Gross as the "self-appointed miser for every taxpayer's dollar." Throughout his 25 years in the House, Gross has challenged the big spenders of government on every turn. His efforts have saved the taxpayer millions of dollars that would have otherwise been poured down a wide assortment of rat holes. He accomplished this saving by carefully scrutinizing almost every congressional appropriation. When necessary Gross does not hesitate to call any high spending House member to task in questioning the sponsors of legislation that he thinks unnecessary. Gross often begins the examination by asking, "How much will this boondoggle cost?"

The Iowa senator opposes all sorts of waste without distinction, but his favorite target is junketing by government officials, a practice that often amounts to little more than tax-paid vacations for the officials. Gross, who is noted for his sarcastic wit, once described the junket of one administrator as a "lush travel orgy."

In Congress today many express support of fiscal responsibility, but few who actually practice. H. R. Gross is one who does and we will certainly miss his influence.

HADDOCK WILL GROW EVEN MORE SCARCE

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, since my election to this body in 1972, I have emphasized the need for the U.S. Government to extend its fisheries jurisdiction to 200 miles. With each passing day this need becomes more acute. An article from the January 31, 1974, edition of the Lewiston Daily Sun, of my district, describes the serious fisheries problems we are facing as a nation. I urge my colleagues to take this unfortunate and economically disastrous history into consideration and to join with me in support of legislation which will prevent our other important

fish stocks from experiencing similar fates.

The article follows:

HADDOCK WILL GROW EVEN MORE SCARCE

BOSTON.—Haddock, which one Boston fish dealer says is "one of our best sellers" even when it is in short supply, is going to grow even more scarce in coming months, the federal government says.

Russell T. Norris, regional director of the National Marine Fisheries Service in Gloucester, Mass., said Monday that the United States—as well as 15 other nations including the Soviet Union—have virtually banned further fishing for haddock this year in the Georges Bank area off Cape Cod.

But the ban won't have too drastic an effect, Norris said. "Haddock are almost commercially extinct."

The international agreement to ban haddock fishing came out of last year's meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF).

Norris explained what has happened to the haddock—"the mainstay of the Boston fish industry"—over the years.

Between 1930 and 1960, he said, about 50,000 tons of the fish were caught each year in the egg-shaped Georges Bank area, a "very fertile" fishing ground some 200 miles long.

In 1961, foreign fishing fleets entered the area, and in 1965 and 1966 alone, Norris said, the Soviets caught 180,000 tons of the fish.

"Since then," he said, "There never has been a successful catch of haddock."

He said haddock fishing—for the few fish that remain—still is allowed primarily in waters off Newfoundland.

Future prospects are grim, Norris said. Haddock production will not increase "in the foreseeable future."

The situation will be "not much—and high-priced," he said.

METRIC MARCHES ON

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in the tide and crunch of great crises and changes our country is currently enduring, it is easy to forget more subtle—yet still crucial changes going on.

One of those is the change to the metric system. Contrary to popular belief, this is not something we will decide whether to do or not. The change is already taking place—in industry, in Government, and even creeping into our private lives. The only choice we still face is whether to let this change go on in a haphazard and costly way—and perhaps have it, too, on the crisis list down the road—or whether to make up our minds, and go ahead and orchestrate the change over a reasonable period and at minimal cost.

I think the latter approach would be the best approach for our Nation and I, therefore, urge a passage of the metric conversion bill which has been under consideration by this body for some months, and years.

The New York Times of this past Sunday had an excellent article which details some of what the change is all about. I would like to reprint it in the RECORD at this time:

THINK METRIC, OR YOU WILL BE KILOMETERS BEHIND SHORTLY

(By Linda Charlton)

Slowly, slowly, 2.54 centimeters by 2.54 centimeters, the United States is inching toward formal adoption of the metric system of weights and measures. Conversion to metrics would replace the random charm of our present "customary" system, which is based on such folklore as a Saxon king's girth, with decimal rationality.

The notion that metrics was an idea whose time had come has occurred, reoccurred and faded for more than a century. Now the United States alone among the industrialized nations clings to what is called a customary system, and is one of only a handful in the world to use a customary system at all.

The system we use now is based on no single concept, but on a rich mixture of inherited standards whose origins are sometimes uncertain and often fanciful.

Measuring and weighing things has been a human preoccupation at least since the Ancient Egyptians discovered that property lines were wiped out by the annual Nile flooding and came up with a system of measurements to make identification possible. Early units of measurement and weight were based on the familiar—on seashells, on kernels of grain, on the capacity of baskets or goatskins and on parts of the human body.

Thus the cubit, the biblical measure, was originally the distance from the point of the average elbow to the tip of the middle finger, or about 18 inches. The foot was just that, the length of a foot, probably that of the king. The inch was a thumb's length. And the yard, or double cubit, we are told, derived from the length of the sash around an Anglo-Saxon ruler's girth. The mile was originally 1,000 five-foot paces. This Roman measurement, like many others, was brought to Britain, whence we inherited it. It was the Romans, too, who later defined the inch as 1/12th of a foot.

The trouble with all of this was that each country had its own system of weights and measures, a hindrance to communication and an even greater hindrance to trade. By the mid-17th century, there were scattered proposals for a world-wide uniform system. But it was not until 1790 that the French National Assembly, wonderfully undistracted by the turbulence of revolution, decided that the Academy of Sciences should "deduce an invariable standard for all the measures and all the weights."

What the Academy created was a system in which measures of volume, weight and length were derived from the same single unit of measurement, a portion of the earth's circumference. The basic unit was called a "meter," from the Greek word for a measure, "metron." This meant that the three basic forms of measurement were related to each other in a coherent fashion, unlike a customary system such as ours, in which feet are divided by 12 to arrive at inches and ounces multiplied by 16 to convert to pounds. Beyond that, the French system was a decimal one: 10 was its basic number, so complicated calculations could be made simply by moving a decimal point.

The metric system is based on internationally accepted standards: the meter, for example, is now defined by science as 1,650,763.73 times the wave-length of the orange-red line of Krypton-86 under specified conditions (Krypton-86 is an isotope of Krypton, an inert gaseous element). And since 1893, the United States has used metric measurements to define and describe its own lunatic system. But it has resisted effort after effort to make the conversion official, even as more and more countries have deserted tradition for decimality.

RESISTANCE TO THE NEW

Some opponents have said, and continue to say, that conversion would be too expensive

and that it is not provably useful. Others contend that it would be a burden on industrial workers trained in the old ways. But much of the resistance seems to be simple apathy or a distaste for the new, as exemplified by the folksy comment of Howard W. Smith, then an 82-year-old Democratic Representative from Virginia and chairman of the House Rules Committee. In thumbing-down a proposal for a study of conversion to the metric system some years ago, he said: "I got my education in a one-room red schoolhouse. We took our degrees in the three R's. Just to make an honest confession, I don't know what the metric system is."

Just so have metrication proposals been rejected time and time again since the Secretary of State John Quincy Adams urged the Congress in 1821 to "adopt, in all its essential parts, the new French system of weight and measure." Finally, in August, 1968, Congress authorized what turned out to be a 12-volume, three year, \$2.5 million survey of metrication that concluded, once again, "that a metric America [is] a decision whose time has come."

The Administration recommended the change and now there are two very similar bills, one in each House, that are expected to be acted on this session. They would set up a Metric Conversion Board to plan a 10-year voluntary changeover to a system that would be "predominantly, although not exclusively metric."

We are already, almost without noticing it, occasionally metric. We describe camera lenses in metric terms; electricity is measured in kilowatts. Physicians write prescriptions, and pharmacies fill them, in milligrams, not ounces. Our Olympic swimmers compete at metric lengths and we buy metrically-sized skis. Most important, any number of large companies already design their export products in metric tons.

And it is in industry that the present impetus for metrication started. A number of the country's largest organizations, including General Motors, International Business Machines, International Harvester and Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing, have committed themselves to metrication, and many of them are already turning out both metric and customarily designed products. Part of the reason, according to Louis E. Barrow, the metrication man at the Bureau of Standards, is that all our major trading partners now are metric, particularly with the recent conversion of Japan and Great Britain.

Another factor is the growth of foreign competition. The country once eager to buy an American product, despite the fact that it was designed on an inch-foot-yard basis, now can buy metric products from other technologically sophisticated countries, and avoid costly parts and repair problems.

The giant companies, Mr. Barrow pointed out, are supplied by thousands of smaller companies, so that the pressure to have "metric capability" will spread in a ripple effect. "This change is going on," Mr. Barrow said, "and it is going to accelerate regardless of legislation."

"THE RULE OF REASON"

Still, legislation would certainly speed things up by making conversion a matter of national policy. This would mean that American school children would learn metrics. They already do in Maryland and California (currently, along with the customary system), and a number of other states are theoretically committed to teaching metrics.

But how about that mythic figure, the average citizen? Because the change is planned according "the rule of reason," which Mr. Barrow translates as "change where it's advantageous but for God's sake don't change for change's sake," there will be no overnight rule-making.

Within the 10-year changeover period, however, Mr. Barrow foresees that we will be buying our milk and our gasoline in liters, our bread in kilograms, figuring distances and speed limits in kilometers and determining how hot or cold we feel on the Celsius (formerly centigrade) scale.

This will inevitably mean a degree of retraining for everyone. And this requirement is one reason why the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations adopted a "cautionary" resolution at its latest national convention. Another reason, according to an AFL-CIO staff economist, is the expected replacement cost for tools for workers such as carpenters and machinists.

Dr. John L. Feirer, director of the federally-funded Center for Metric Education at Western Michigan University, disagrees with the labor organization's contention that the required retraining will be extensive and a possible barrier to promotion of some older workers. "If he [the worker] can make change for a dollar, that's metric," Dr. Feirer said. He estimated that, for example, a machine-tool operator would need no more than three or four two-hour training sessions to be at ease with the metric system.

Dr. Feirer, pressed for an example of the difficulties our nonmetric system creates, pointed to the joint American-Soviet space link-up project. The Russians designed their half in metrics, he said, and we designed ours by our system. The result was a whole tnat matches, but there was a lot of complex computation in "highly decimalized inches." Dr. Feirer added: "If we'd all been metric, it would be much more simple."

For some time, obviously, it will be difficult for most of us to conceptualize a meter or a liter or a kilo. We will have to translate the meter into a little more than a yard, the liter into just about a quart and the kilogram into 2.2 pounds.

But the structure of the metric system will make all sorts of calculations simpler. That is because it is based on the single unit of the meter (39.37 inches). To get centimeters, simply divide by 100; for millimeters, by 1,000. For kilometers, multiply by 1,000. And it is a coherent system: all forms of measurement, linear, weight and volume, have a similar decimal relationship.

Familiarity with the metric system will also make life easier for American travelers overseas—whether it is the couple wanting to know if a metrically-sized carpet will fit their 9 by 12 living room or a feverish tourist trying to figure out what her temperature is in Celsius so that a local doctor can prescribe by telephone.

As for clothing size, Mr. Barrow and Dr. Feirer agree that women's sizes, at any rate, are arbitrary and variable, differing between country and country. An international standard is likely to be adopted at the next meeting of the International Organization for Standardization. Sizes will come in centimeters, based on particular areas of the body such as waist and hips. This may not meet with universal approval: A 22-inch waist doesn't sound so lissom at 55 centimeters; and one man with fairly standard size shoes allowed as how it made him feel "a little bit like Emmett Kelly," the flap-footed clown, to learn that his metric shoe size would be 27½.

And then there are all those pleasant provverbs: "A miss is as good as six kilometers" or "all wool and a meter wide" don't have the same ring. Nor can one imagine poets hymning the "kilometers to go before I sleep." But Dr. Feirer is reassuring about what may be assumed to be a basic American worry: "You don't have to convert a football field. . . ."

BAN THE HANDGUN—XIX

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday two high-school students were wounded by pistol fire during an argument between two rival groups. One boy, a star basketball player, was left paralyzed and unable to speak. How many more boys must be killed or maimed, because of widespread availability of handguns?

The attached article appeared in the Washington Post, February 5, 1974:

ONE TEENAGER LEFT PARALYZED—TWO ALICE DEAL STUDENTS ARE SHOT IN FIGHT

(By Adam Shaw and Alfred E. Lewis)

Two 16-year-old students at Alice Deal Junior High School were shot yesterday, one of them critically, when an argument involving them and several other young people erupted in gunfire at 39th and Yuma Streets NW, metropolitan police said.

Police and hospital authorities said that James Everett Atkinson Jr., of 1819 Kilbourne Pl. NW, lay partially paralyzed and in critical condition last night at Sibley Hospital following the 1:30 p.m. affray during a school lunch break.

The second Alice Deal student, Arthur Byrd, suffered only a flesh wound in the chest and was released from Sibley a few hours after the shooting.

Police said their investigation indicated that the incident involved about five or six teenagers, and that some of them were students at Wilson High School. They emphasized, however, that the incident was an isolated one and did not indicate tension between the two student bodies.

Doctors said young Atkinson had been shot once in the forehead and the bullet lodged in the back of his head. In addition to paralysis, the incident apparently cost him his speech. Surgeons decided yesterday against an immediate attempt to remove the bullet.

Police said the shots were fired by an unknown member of the group. The weapon was not recovered, but is believed to be a small caliber pistol. No arrests had been made last night.

The fight began, young Byrd told a reporter, when a friend of his and Atkinson who attends Wilson came to Alice Deal during the lunch break and said he had been "beaten up" by a group of young men, and asked his friends to help find them to settle accounts.

Byrd said he, Atkinson, two other Alice Deal students and the Wilson student spotted a group of three young men standing on 39th Street a few blocks from the school. When they were approached, Byrd told the reporter, the youths retreated down Yuma Street and then shots rang out.

"When I heard the first shot, I thought they were kidding. No one thought it was a real gun or anything," Byrd said last evening. He was sitting in his home with a hand-sized bandage on his right chest where he had been shot.

"Then another two shots were fired," he said, "and that was when I and James were hit."

Paul Cassagnol, whose house is at the corner of 39th and Yuma Streets, said he heard shouts, but no gunfire.

"Then a very excited young man banged

on the door saying 'someone has been shot, someone has been shot,' " he said.

Cassagnol said he called police, then looked outside to see young Atkinson lying on the sidewalk under a stop sign.

Atkinson, a 9th grade star center for the Alice Deal basketball team, was paralyzed along his right side and unable to speak, hospital officials said. Dr. Charles Carroll, a neurosurgeon who operated on the youth for 1½ hours yesterday, said the bullet had lodged deep in the left rear of the brain.

"We didn't take the bullet out because it might kill him," Carroll said. "We'll just have to see how he does during the next 12 hours. His chances are slim."

Five hours after the shooting, Atkinson's parents and a score of relatives gathered in the hospital waiting room, and awaited the results of the surgery.

The father, James Atkinson, a research technician at the Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, said his son "loved to play the guitar very loud in the basement with his friends," and that he was "really no trouble to anyone, ever."

His wife, Mary, a practical nurse at Georgetown University Hospital, still in her white-and-blue uniform while talking to a reporter, said of her son that "he was an ideal fellow."

The parents sat quietly on a couch until Dr. Carroll came to tell them about the operation.

He knelt by a low wooden table and told them their son was half paralyzed, couldn't speak and was in "very serious condition."

When he stopped speaking there was a silence, Mrs. Atkinson started to cry, softly at first, then, standing up, she choked, "Why to him? Why to him?"

She was taken to the emergency room and was given a sedative as her husband sat by his son's bedside in the intensive care unit.

Atkinson's sister, Valencia, 14, also a student at Alice Deal, said she was called out of a home economics class to be told the news. "I don't know why it happened," she said, "he wasn't a fighter or anything."

Lyman Warner, principal of the junior high school, said Atkinson was "having his best year in school," and was in "fine academic standing."

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION BILL

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma County Bar Association on December 13, 1973, in support of the Legal Services Corporation bill, which passed the House on June 21 of last year:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Oklahoma County Bar Association has always supported the Oklahoma County Legal Aid Society and continues to give its support to the work of the Oklahoma County Legal Aid Society with annual financial support as well as contributions of volunteer time,

And, whereas, the Oklahoma County Bar Association believes that there is a continuing need for legal services for the poor in this community as well as nationally,

And, whereas, the Oklahoma County Bar Association continues to support the need for adequate legal services to the poor and

the need for vital and independent programs to provide this representation.

Now, therefore, it is resolved:

1. The United States government should continue funding of legal services programs to enable them to provide adequate legal services to eligible clients and to prevent deterioration of the quality and quantity of service.

2. Government at all levels and lawyers from both public and private sectors should take every step necessary to insure that legal services lawyers remain independent from political pressures in the cause of representing clients.

3. The Congress of the United States should enact a legal services corporation of a design consistent with the foregoing principles and the need to maintain full and adequate legal services for the poor, and providing that local bar associations maintain substantial representation on the local boards establishing the policies of individual legal services programs.

EL CERRITO CONSTITUENT SUGGESTS WAYS TO COMBAT ENERGY SHORTAGE

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to combat increasing energy shortages, numerous measures have been implemented—often hastily and without adequate consideration. In order to find ways that most economically and efficiently utilize existing sources, we must constantly be open to suggestions for improving or substituting shortage measures.

In light of these considerations, I wish to include in the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, a copy of a letter from Mr. Thomas J. Smithberger, of El Cerrito, Calif. Mr. Smithberger offers some valid criticisms of present efforts to combat the energy shortages, and suggests a number of steps that he feels ought to be taken to prevent the waste of natural resources. His letter follows:

JANUARY 28, 1974.

WILLIAM SIMON,
Administrator, Federal Energy Administration,
New Executive Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMON: Despite all the chicanery and deception practiced by the Administration and the oil industry, the energy shortage is apparently a very real one and seems certain to be with us for some time. Our fragile, highly artificial economy, which has depended all along on extreme over-exploitation and waste of natural resources, especially energy resources, is finally being shown for what it is. But I am not convinced the Administration, the Congress, and the Senate believe there is really a shortage and intend to deal with it rationally. And I will not begin to be convinced—

Until measures are taken to discourage human population expansion, which is at once both a result and a cause of over-use of natural resources;

Until the huge, habitual, and continuing waste of heat energy by manufacturing industries is stopped (plants routinely waste amounts of heat that could heat the homes of entire communities);

Until our entrenched disease of forced obsolescence—the intentional manufacture of absolute junk instead of lasting, durable products—is discouraged by legislation. (Remember, it requires energy, lots of it, to produce all this junk. Think for a moment of the enormous energy required, from raw material to finished product, to produce just one automobile. There is a rapidly increasing desire to pay more for something that is good and which will last rather than pay a cheap price for cheap junk that "sells". We are awfully tired of the whole phoney, wasteful game. There was a time when the U.S. was known for the high quality of its manufactured products.);

Until trucking of goods stops being encouraged and favored over rail transport;

Until prices of fuels are allowed to move at least somewhere toward their real value and thereby encourage more rational use;

Until there is a steeply rising tax, above a certain level, on horsepower or engine displacement in private autos and trucks (trucks, as well as most cars, are overpowered);

Until over-use of electricity and gas by large users is discouraged instead of encouraged, as it is now, by our mad rate structures!! (In more rational countries, this has been done for a long time. Even in Norway, with the most abundant supply of electricity per capita in the world, even the small, individual consumer pays a basic rate up to a certain amount of use per month and then, beyond that, pays a much higher rate.);

Until buses are no longer required to pay bridge tolls and commuting private autos stop getting a break in the form of reduced "commute" rates. (Private autos should pay more, not less during commute hours!);

Until metropolitan transit systems provide adequate and safe service at night and on weekends so that it is possible to not use one's car;

Until a large proportion of bus drivers are forced to drive in a sane and economical manner (The pedal pumpers and the ones who drive only with full throttle or full brake not only cause enormous wear and tear on the passengers and the equipment, but are using at least twice as much fuel as is needed for the run!);

Until we stop exporting fiber, petroleum, and other critical commodities;

Until we stop being the world's weapon supplier;

Until ALL advertising involving electricity is stopped, and I don't mean voluntarily, either (Lighted and moving signs are not the only offenders. The enormous and obscene consumption in and around and on all the plastic diners and pizza parlors is certainly several hundred percent more than needed to "identify" a business. They are better lighted than my office);

Until recycling of items such as bottles is legislatively "encouraged" and the "no-deposit-no-return" syndrome is ended legislatively (It takes energy to make new bottles and cans. Oregon has pointed the way and shown what can be done.)

These are just some of the more obvious steps that will have to be taken before I or any rational citizen is going to believe in the reality of a shortage or have any confidence that the legislators really believe there is a shortage.

The only things that have actually happened so far are (1) none of the things I suggest above; (2) reduction of office lighting to half of established adequate standards for Government employees only, since they are such easy targets, being direct pawns of the Executive Branch; (3) lowering thermostats in public buildings; (4) daylight saving time, which has to be the ultimate in irrational action, since moving the work day back into a darker and certainly colder portion of the

daily cycle can only guarantee increased energy consumption; (5) a lot of misleading, often ludicrous or impractical press leaks about possible rationing and allocation plans.

One of the most stupid and most unfair of these is the idea of preventing everyone from driving on a certain day of the week. If we must ration gasoline, let us ration it, but let us not impose unnecessary hardship or inconvenience just to make life harder for no good reason.

I want the lights restored over my desk where my eyes are now being abused eight hours daily. I want to see a lot more reason and logic used and a lot less political maneuvering in setting priorities and actions. This is not a matter for political maneuvering, it is first a matter of adequate lighting for working human eyes and enough heat for health and secondly a matter of setting priorities for stabilizing the economy in the most rational manner possible for the long term good of everyone.

Regarding the gasoline rationing plan, I must say the recently announced plan for gasoline rationing shows some good thought and basically is probably the best system that could be devised. It does have two flaws though, both unreasonable and unnecessary, but both easily corrected: This first is the 60-day limit on life of the certificates. Perhaps some limit is needed but I see no reason why it could not be longer, say, six months, so that people who wish or need to curtail local driving as much as possible so as to be able to use their car for one or two longer trips a year could do so without having to worry about getting more than their established allotment during a 60-day period. A longer useful life for the certificate would not only make everyone's life much simpler, it would encourage saving and thereby reduce the overall consumption of gasoline. The incentive would be very real. After all, we should not be trying to encourage a brisk sale of certificates. The objective should be to reduce consumption as painlessly as possible.

The second and more serious flaw is the size of the "unit" of gasoline one certificate would be good for. According to the newspapers the unit would be five or six gallons. For those of us with smaller cars with ten-gallon tanks this represents a real and surely unnecessary discrimination. Since we could only get gas when our tank was well over half empty we would be in a very difficult situation when driving any distance, especially in remote areas, since stations that are open and have gas are highly unlikely to be spaced so ideally, even in the best of circumstances. When travelling into remote areas or at any time when the weather is cold it is essential to have the tank close to full. (When cars are parked out in cold weather the tanks should be more than half full to minimize condensation of moisture in the tank.) How can one do this with such large units? This serious problem is important not only to recreationists but to people who live in remote and/or cold areas.

There is a public safety factor involved here too. People caught in this dilemma of large units and small tanks would be much more strongly tempted to haul gasoline in cans in their cars.

Please do everything you can to get the unit reduced at least down to three gallons. Two gallons would be better. Perhaps certificates should be printed for more than one size unit. It will not take that much extra paper and it is certainly important enough to be worth it. Don't discriminate against those of us who are caught in the situation of having small gas tanks. After all, we have been doing more than our share

for a long time in reducing fuel consumption and air pollution.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. SMITHEBERGER.

LEGISLATION PROVIDES BUSINESS INCENTIVES

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an advertisement recently appeared in the New York Times which calls attention to legislation providing incentives to Massachusetts business and industrial communities. This trend in legislation is critical if we are to establish a secure economic foundation upon which new industries may build, and a healthy economic environment in which existing businesses may grow and flourish. Advertisements of this type are encouraging, particularly at a time when our economy faces one of its most serious challenges. I refer my colleagues' attention to the article reprinted below:

MASS INCENTIVES—HOW MASSACHUSETTS' PROGRESSIVE LEGISLATION MAKES BUSINESS PROFITABLE

If your company is considering relocation, or a new facility, Massachusetts now has enough profit-making incentives to be at the top of your list. In the past three years Massachusetts has become the most progressive state in passing legislation beneficial to both new and existing businesses and industries. We're taking positive steps to help keep business profitable and make Massachusetts a state with a healthy tax climate. This, plus the special quality of life Massachusetts is famed for, gives you new incentive to locate here.

Property measure incentive: The tax rate on the corporation excise for 1973 was reduced from \$7.98 per M to \$5.76 per M. Further reduction can be expected for 1974. It is anticipated this tax will be completely eliminated within three or four years.

Three-percent investment tax incentive: The 3% investment tax credit on tangible property has been extended through November 1978 for manufacturing and R&D corporations. It covers investments in tangible personal property including buildings.

Payroll factor incentive: The payroll factor remains at 1972 levels plus a 5% annual growth. This eliminates future increases in tax liability of expanded payrolls.

\$500 employment credit incentive: A \$500 tax credit is allowed for employment of each individual taken from public assistance rolls to the extent that payrolls exceed 3% of prior year's payroll.

Sales tax incentive: No sales tax on machinery, replacement parts, tools and fuel.

Loss carry-forward incentive: Losses incurred in other taxable years may be applied to current year income for a period up to five years.

Local property tax incentive: Local exemption of tangible property tax exists on inventory, machinery and equipment of manufacturing corporation.

Corporation excise liability incentive: Credit is allowed for corporate real estate representing new construction in an eligible community certified to have substantial poverty. This could represent up to 52% reduction of local property taxes.

Urban job incentive: A 25% payroll deduction of eligible payroll is available for new and expanded manufacturing, R&D and warehouse facilities in certified areas within the state for up to ten years.

Corporate property leasing incentive: Property leased from an Industrial Development Corporation will be allowed a 3% investment credit to real and tangible personal property.

Industrial development financing incentive: Financing for Industrial Development up to \$5 million is tax exempt.

Leasehold improvement incentive: Leasehold improvements outside Massachusetts may be included in the denominator of the property factor in determination of the apportionment formula.

Waste treatment incentive: A 100% deduction for industrial waste treatment facilities and air pollution control. The value of such investment shall not be included in the taxable property base of excise tax.

One can only conclude that the Massachusetts government has gone far in seeking to eliminate any attitude which can by the most remote analysis be considered as anti-business. This is a long record of consistency in addressing problems which adversely affect the economy of this state and, if there is any case to be made for improving the investment by business within a state by providing economic incentives in the tax laws, then the actions of our state government should be looked upon as the most progressive of any state.

For more information on Massachusetts' tax climate and areas of site location write: Massachusetts Department of Commerce and Development, 100 Cambridge Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02202.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WILLIS B. BOYER

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Saturday as I left the beautiful and impressive memorial services for my friend, Willis B. Boyer, the lines written two centuries ago by the poet, Robert Burns, came to my mind:

The social, friendly, honest man,
What'er he be,
'Tis he fulfills great Nature's plan,
And none but he.

When Bill Boyer passed away January 31, we lost just such an ideal man as Burns described. He was one of the friendliest, most genuine human beings I have known, a man whose warmth reached out to all who passed his way. His rise to board chairman and chief executive officer of Republic Steel never tarnished the gold of his kindness, his sense of humor, his compassion for others. He was a man of fine intellect, driving ability, and splendid accomplishments, but he never lost his humility nor his desire to work for the good of his community and his fellowmen.

It was a privilege to have known Bill Boyer. The tragic news of his all too untimely death brought sorrow to literally thousands of Clevelanders, in all walks of life, who knew the worth of this

truly outstanding man. To his lovely wife Esther, his three fine sons, and his mother, Mrs. Pearce F. Boyer, Mrs. Minshall and I extend our deepest sympathy.

JOURNAL SALUTES HERB PEARCE

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the New England Real Estate Journal has recently named a very respected friend of mine, Mr. Herb Pearce, president of the H. Pearce Co., Realtor, to its list of "who's who" in the real estate business.

The article I am enclosing below, from the New Haven Register, describes Herb Pearce's accomplishments which have led to this distinction. As this article notes, Herb Pearce has the distinction of being a leader both in his chosen area of business and in the community of Greater New Haven and the larger community of Connecticut and the Nation. An experienced executive, a talented realtor, a member of the Connecticut State Development Commission, an innovator in commercial, industrial, and residential real estate transactions, Herb Pearce is the kind of man who makes solid contributions to his community and State, and I am proud to insert these remarks from the profile of Herb Pearce done by the New England Real Estate Journal, as reprinted in the New Haven Register.

The remarks follow:

JOURNAL SALUTES HERB PEARCE

Herb Pearce, president of the H. Pearce Co., Realtors, has been named to Who's Who by the New England Real Estate Journal.

In a span of just 15 years, Pearce has seen his firm develop from a one-man operation into one of the largest real estate firms in Connecticut whose staff of 22 sales associates recently set a company record of \$9 million in sales during the first six months of 1973, said the journal in an article devoted to Pearce.

"Although the H. Pearce Co. is recognized throughout south central Connecticut as a leader in residential, commercial and industrial sales and for the development of investment programs involving real estate, Herb Pearce is equally well known as a civic leader."

When Pearce opened his first real estate office in 1958, he had no real estate experience, but the executive experience he gained with the former A. C. Gilbert Co. of New Haven enabled him to develop a well-rounded professional team which now includes attorneys, engineers, accountants and business executives who, along with the all-woman residential sales staff, are able to meet the demands of any client.

"Pearce also is an innovator who has set the pace throughout Connecticut for other real estate firms to follow," the journal said.

"For instance, in conjunction with the New Haven Savings Bank the H. Pearce Co. sponsored the first public real estate investment seminar which attracted more than 1,000 persons from Connecticut and Massachusetts to hear nationally known experts discuss the advantages of investing in real estate.

"Likewise, Pearce was the first real estate

firm in the state to sponsor a bus tour to promote industrial and commercial properties to bankers, out-of-state brokers and local and state development officials and real estate investors."

The Journal further cited Pearce as being the first Realtor to arrange helicopter tours to provide busy executives with a birds-eye view of industrial and commercial properties and for distributing booklets on industrial and commercial properties to assist potential clients.

The H. Pearce Co. has initiated many other programs, including trade-in plans which take the risk out of home buying by splitting the profit and not the loss with the homeowner. The firm was also one of the first in Connecticut to offer computerized real estate investment analysis.

"Similarly, the H. Pearce Co. has been an innovator in the use of automated equipment such as telecopier services through the national Homes for Living Network through which any document or picture may be transmitted across the country in four to six minutes.

"The H. Pearce Co. also added the international flavor through its affiliation with Panorama Ltd. for the sale of properties on Spain's historic Costa del Sol."

Referring to other accomplishments by Herb Pearce, the New England Real Estate Journal referred to his appointment in 1971 to the State Development Commission, a post he still holds. The appointment was made by Gov. Thomas Meskill. That year Pearce led a task force of commission experts to California to bring back subcontract business from aero-space program prime contractors.

ARCHIBALD COX AND IMPEACHMENT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the sad events of Watergate have produced a few people who have grown in public esteem.

Judge John Sirica and Leon Jaworski are two examples.

Another is the Harvard law professor, Archibald Cox.

Here is a man who was on the front lines of the Watergate investigations. Here is a man who understands the judicial impact of Watergate.

Recently, an article by Richard Wilson appeared in the January 31 edition of the Houston Post outlining Mr. Cox's thoughts on impeachment. Mr. Wilson adds, of course, to Professor Cox's thoughts, but this article is laced with direct quotes from the famous professor.

Impeachment is a question to be settled by the legislative branch, but our decisionmaking process can be aided by considering the viewpoint of one who has participated in the judicial process.

I thus commend to my colleagues a review of the thoughts of Mr. Cox on impeachment:

[From the Houston Post, Jan. 31, 1974]

ARCHIBALD COX AND IMPEACHMENT

(By Richard Wilson)

The chief victim of the Saturday night massacre which reacted so badly against

President Nixon has introduced some sense into the impeachment question.

It is to the credit of Prof. Archibald Cox that his summary dismissal has not deranged his powers and reasoning. In a speech at Amherst College, the former special Watergate prosecutor puts the matter simply: "What are the wrongs against the people, the body politic, for which a president may properly be impeached?"

Cox rejects two opposite views, that a president may be impeached for any reason Congress deems sufficient; and, that he must only be impeached upon proof of violations of the criminal law. His thesis is that the cause for impeachment must be found in a broader, defined area that would apply not to one president but to all.

Cox notes the ambivalence of the polls—Nixon was wrong, maybe he ought to resign but don't impeach him—and finds therein an intuitive public understanding:

"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."

"The need," Cox adds, "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 wrong doing) are not enough."

What, then, is enough? Cox deals with three main points.

Surprisingly enough, he virtually rejects the alleged offense which bothers most people, the resort to every loophole and cutting every corner to avoid income taxes.

He judges this to be in bad taste, avaricious, and morally shabby, but doubts it is ground for impeachment. The same goes for the improvements for the President's safety and comfort at Key Biscayne and San Clemente.

Cox then states his second point in language as harsh and sweeping as that used by the President's critics. This is the President's approval in principle of bugging, mail covers and burglaries to gather domestic intelligence and effectuate administration policy and political objectives, hampering at the same time inquiry into such activities. Cox makes nothing but an implied judgment and does not even claim the foregoing to be the actual facts.

His third premise embraces the President's duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed. Cox asks if Nixon's elusive conduct with respect to Watergate is an impeachable violation of his responsibility to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

For this question, Cox also offers no answer, but he gives weight, by his tone, to a conclusion that the President's actions created an atmosphere favorable to aides seeking to avoid indictment and conviction, and at least indirectly prevented or delayed the faithful execution of the laws.

The usefulness of Cox's analysis is in defining the areas of impeachability and the difficulty in judicially weighing the degree of the President's culpability in each case.

A case in point is the recent statement of Eglil Krogh, upon his sentencing for illegal acts as head of the "Plumbers Unit," that he was not ordered directly or indirectly by President Nixon to conduct the break-in operation at the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

If Nixon did not do that, if his purpose was, as stated, to find out as much as legally possible about Ellsberg's motives and actions in passing out the Pentagon papers, then one of Cox's premises of impeachment is severely shaken. It had been widely pub-

lished that Krogh would directly implicate the President, but he did not.

Now, it is additionally stated by those claiming to have read transcripts of the White House tapes that they show former White House Counsel John Dean was wrong in his circumstantial evidence that the President knew of the Watergate cover-up prior to March 21, 1973. This affects Cox's third premise, that the President may have violated his duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

So, one returns to Cox's larger generality, honoring the intuitive public judgment that, to be impeached, a President must have done "such grave injury to the nation as to make any incumbent's continuance in office unacceptable."

When such lines of reasoning are followed through, it can be seen how hard the decisions in Congress on impeachment will be, especially if congressmen follow Cox's injunction to set aside "opposition, emotion, dislike, distrust and lack of confidence" as not enough for impeachment.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we in Congress in general have been bombarded with statements, statistics, and proposals for dealing with the energy crisis. Congressional committees have held hearings, State and local governments are grappling with conflicting information, business entities are trying to formulate long-range plans, and automobile drivers are wondering if they will have enough gasoline for their basic needs.

Throughout this period the American public has responded to the energy crisis in admirable fashion. As an example of the kinds of cooperative efforts being undertaken let me quote from a letter recently received from one of my constituents in California:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I know how interested you are in solutions to the energy crisis. While we certainly haven't solved it in Anaheim, we have taken a positive attitude that has already shown definite results. I want to take the privilege of passing the story along to you as an example of what your constituents are doing to help themselves.

Operating on the theory that the best and quickest help you can get is from yourself, the Anaheim Chamber of Commerce two months ago initiated a vigorous program to conserve energy in the Anaheim industrial community.

The program began with the formation of an Anaheim Energy Conservation Committee. This committee, chaired by Merrill E. Skilling, energy conservation authority from Northrop Corporation, brought together the 125 largest users of energy in the Anaheim industrial community.

Northrop's Anaheim operations has been conducting a vigorous energy conservation program for the past eight years. This experience was made available to the 125 company representatives attending the formation meeting of the Anaheim Energy Conservation Committee. These companies represent some of the best known names in the country, ranging from Disneyland to Rockwell, International.

The companies were asked to review their energy needs and to find ways to make voluntary reduction, with the aim of eliminat-

ing the need for mandatory allocations in this area.

As of this date, 15 of the companies, have given us their pledge to reduce electrical energy requirements. Their combined pledges now total more than 1,800,000 kilowatt hours per month.

The savings this alone will entail are sufficient to light more than 4,000 residential homes, and more pledges are coming as soon as our other members are able to assess their essential needs.

Of course there is always a discrepancy between pledges and final accomplishment, as I am sure you are aware. This happened in our figures as well. In the first report submitted of actual savings in relation to pledged savings, Northrop Corporation reported a pledge of 387,000 kwh. reduction a month, and the actual reduction for the month of November exceeded one-half million. We fully expect our other participating companies to make an equally excellent showing. Disneyland, for example, has pledged cuts in excess of 600,000 a month.

If this program is successful, as we are confident it will be, Anaheim will be able to achieve with voluntary action what other areas are attempting to accomplish with what appears to be very burdensome laws affecting private residential use of energy.

The response to the industrial program has been so successful that the Chamber of Commerce is expanding its activities for a vigorous drive for voluntary energy conservation in homes and small businesses.

Our goal is a strictly do-it-yourself program. I am sure that you share my pride in a group of people who believe that they can fight their own battle. In this age when it appears that everybody has his hand out for help from Washington, it is refreshing to me to find people still around with this attitude.

STANDARDIZATION OF NUCLEAR REACTORS

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues and those who read this RECORD, I would like to bring to their attention the present state of the Atomic Energy Commission and nuclear industry programs toward standardization of nuclear powerplant designs.

As background, I would like to point out that the first privately owned nuclear powerplant began commercial operation in 1959, at a power level of about 200 megawatts electric. During the interim our technological base for civilian power reactors has continued to grow and the capability of our manufacturers and constructors has also grown. Plants now in the licensing process are projected to operate at power levels sixfold higher than the initial plants—at a level approaching 1,300 megawatts electric. With increasing numbers of nuclear powerplants being committed by the utilities throughout our country it becomes increasingly important to improve the efficiency of the handling of licensing reviews.

The merits of standardization of reactor design have been recognized for some time. As a matter of fact, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy over recent

years has urged the manufacturers to develop standardized reactor designs and has urged the AEC to give consideration to defining the technical information required of the licensee for the safety review of such designs.

It has been the committee's belief, and I believe the Commission's belief as well, that if standardization of nuclear plant design and power level could be achieved, then reactor licensing time could be appreciably reduced. The attention of the reviewers would focus principally on the site considerations, including, of course, all of the environmental impact considerations now required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

During the past year the Nation's light water reactor vendors have taken the lead in developing standardized nuclear steam supply systems and I commend them for it. Recently, however, it has become clear that if significant gains in licensing review time are to be achieved, a standardization of design of what is referred to as the "balance of plant" is also required. The balance of plant refers to all of the normal auxiliary station equipment, generally found in fossil fueled stations. In other words, components that are not peculiar to the nuclear fuel cycle—secondary systems, switchgear, and the like. Further, it is important that the so-called "interface" between the nuclear portion of the system and the nonnuclear portion of the system is carefully studied.

In effect what I am doing here today, is pointing out that there is an area which if vigorously pursued would result in further decreases in the amount of time required for licensing of nuclear powerplants. This is an important gain to be made. Due to the energy crunch, the people of this Nation appear now to recognize the importance of constructing and operating nuclear powerplants in order to help replace present requirements for oil. In round numbers, each large nuclear plant brought on line will reduce our requirements for foreign oil imports by 12 million barrels per year. This works out to one-half a billion barrels of oil during the lifetime of each nuclear plant.

When a utility makes a decision to build a nuclear plant, a reactor vendor is selected and, in general, an architect-engineering firm is retained to design and sometimes supervise the construction of the balance-of-plant. The trend toward standardization, I regret to say, has not been pursued as vigorously by the architect-engineering firms as I would have hoped. To date, only one such firm has made a firm commitment to the AEC to prepare and submit a standard design for a balance-of-plant. Others are giving consideration to such a commitment, but as of the present date have not done so.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy today and tomorrow is holding hearings under section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, on the development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry. During those hearings, I plan to call attention to the need for architect-engineers to join with the reactor vendors and utilities in this

country in developing coordinated standardized nuclear powerplants which can be reviewed with a minimum of processing time. In this manner licenses can be granted more quickly than has been possible in the past under the situation where successive plants have experienced differences in design which were reflected in the safety review and thereby, quite properly, required additional study time by the AEC.

There are, of course, other areas which have caused delays in bringing nuclear plants on line. These include labor problems, materials problems, litigation, et cetera. The Commission and the industry should continue to assess all such areas and make improvements wherever possible so that our country may progress as rapidly as possible toward the goal of energy self-sufficiency.

GOVERNMENT STUDY DOCUMENTS
NEED FOR CONCERTED EFFORT
TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF
EDUCATION FOR MEXICAN-AMERICAN CHILDREN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 1.6 million Mexican-American children who attend public schools in the Southwest are being shortchanged by an educational system that virtually ignores their language and culture and fosters a vicious cycle of underachievement.

These findings—which have long been known to many of us from areas having large chicano populations—were well documented in a report issued Monday by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, entitled "Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans."

One of the most blatant examples of how miserably we are failing our Mexican-American children is the fact that only 70,000—or 4 percent—are presently taking part in some type of bilingual education program. Without such bilingual opportunities, how can we expect children who come from homes where English may not be spoken at all to achieve an adequate education in our Anglo schools? I have spoken with many chicano parents in my district who want so much for their children to get a good education, but are confronted instead with a system which fosters in chicano children feelings of inadequacy and inferiority.

I strongly endorse the recommendations of the Commission, especially for a sharp increase in Mexican-American staffing of schools and increased use of bilingual education. We must take immediate and effective action to provide our Mexican-American children with the quality education to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I insert articles from today's Los Angeles Times and Washington Post outlining the findings and recommendations of the report at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 5, 1974]
SOUTHWEST SCHOOLS ACCUSED OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LATINOS

(By Frank Del Olmo)

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights charged Monday that Mexican-American children are victimized by discriminatory practices in the public schools of the Southwest.

In a 269-page report issued simultaneously in Los Angeles and San Antonio, the commission said its five-year study found "a systematic failure of the educational process" with regard to Mexican-Americans.

Although 16 to 20% of the public school students in the Southwest are Mexican-American, the report states, the public school system often "not only ignores the educational needs of Chicano students but also suppresses their culture and stifles their hopes and ambitions."

The report, entitled "Toward Quality Education for Mexican-Americans," is the sixth and final one in a series of studies which focused on the public schools of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Texas.

The report was made public at a Greater Los Angeles Press Club news conference held by the commission's acting chairman, Dr. Stephen Horn, president of California State University, Long Beach and Los Angeles attorney Herman Sillas, chairman of the commission's California Advisory Committee.

The commission's study said Mexican-American children are held back a grade at more than twice the rate for Anglo students; they are overrepresented in low-ability class groupings and underrepresented in classes for high-ability students; and they are twice as likely as Anglo students to be assigned to classes for the mentally retarded.

Part of the blame for this discrimination was laid to a severe scarcity of Mexican-Americans as school teachers, counselors and administrators.

The commission called for a sharp increase in Mexican-American staffing of schools and the increased use of bilingual education or similar innovative approaches toward teaching Mexican-American children.

Noting that the report estimates the annual cost of grade repetition in elementary schools in the Southwest as \$90 million, Horn said "this money could be better used in bilingual education" or other innovative programs.

He said only 70,000 of the 1.6 million Mexican-American students in the Southwest are presently taking part in some type of bilingual education program.

The study also said that in 1972 only 4.8% of the 350,000 public school teachers in the Southwest were Mexican-American, and that "this percentage has barely increased in the last four years."

The commission study also charged that in Southwestern school districts with 10% or more Mexican-American population, only 5.4% of the counselors are Mexican-American while the overall student enrollment is 28.5% Mexican-American.

The report offers 51 specific recommendations for the education offices of the five southwestern states and the federal government.

Horn said the recommendations are based on "three basic principles."

"First, the language, history and culture of Mexican-Americans should be an integral part of the educational process.

"Second, Mexican-Americans should be fully represented in decisionmaking positions that influence educational policies.

"Third, all levels of government—local, state and federal—should provide the funds needed to implement the recommendations."

Among the report's recommendations:

State legislatures should require all school districts where non-English speaking students are 5% or more of the enrollment to establish bilingual-bicultural education programs.

State legislatures should prohibit at-large elections of school board members.

State legislatures should establish more stringent specifications that would have to be met before a child could be retained at a grade level or placed in a class for the mentally retarded.

State legislatures should prohibit the long-term grouping of students according to ability.

Teacher education institutions should incorporate Mexican-American studies into their basic courses and require trainees to do part of their practice teaching with Mexican-American students.

The federal government should step up its enforcement of civil rights legislation to prevent local school districts from continuing policies that discriminate against Mexican-American students.

Sillas said the five-year study cost \$2 million and expressed the hope that it would be "used as a guideline for the education of all bilingual, bicultural children.

"Five years from now there should not be a need to conduct similar studies for Chinese-Americans," he said. "It depends on how the educational system responds."

Horn said that since the commission began issuing its education reports three years ago, there has been some improvement in the situation "primarily because of the actions of concerned community groups and the courts."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 1974]
CHICANOS SHORTCHANGED BY SCHOOLS, STUDY FINDS

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

LOS ANGELES.—The nation's 1.6 million Mexican-American public school students are being shortchanged by an educational system that virtually ignores their language and culture and fosters a vicious cycle of underachievement, according to a \$2 million, five-year study by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

The findings tend to document a condition well known to observers of the educational system in the Southwest, where the bulk of the Chicano students are concentrated, and especially to Mexican-American activist groups who have fought for better school conditions over the decades.

Harman Sillas, a Los Angeles lawyer who served as an adviser to the commission's study, said the 269-page final report had "few things we haven't known for years," but he added, "it's a good tool for community persons, and educators alike to use in improving opportunities for bilingual, bicultural children."

The most striking impression derived from the final report, the last of six studies released in the past three years, is the minimal advances achieved during the recent period of heightened Chicano activism.

Bilingual classes for Chicano students has been a keystone of community demand over the last several years. Yet, of the 1.6 million children in schools, only 70,000, or about 4 percent, are being reached by such projects. Of these, fewer than 2 percent are involved in state-funded programs.

Courses in Mexican history are offered in fewer than 10 percent of the Southwest schools, fewer than 3 percent offer chicano studies programs. Chicano children, by and large, says the report, "are confronted with a school which either ignores their culture or regards it as an undesirable obstacle to success. This exclusion very often fosters in chicano children feelings of inadequacy and inferiority."

The study goes a long way in pinpointing the source of the problem: school boards and districts and state boards of education where chicano representation is minimal, where teacher education fails to include adequate

training for Mexican-American education and where little or no leadership has been exercised to establish guidelines or standards to stimulate improvements in the system.

Of 350,000 teachers in the Southwest, fewer than 5 per cent are chicano; fewer than 4 per cent are curriculum directors; only 7 per cent of total district administrative staffs are chicano.

The Civil Rights Commission, which has no enforcement power, came up with 51 recommendations, most of them aimed at the state level. They include:

Action by state departments of education to ensure that Mexican-American language and culture are represented in school programs.

Establishment by law of bicultural bilingual programs wherever non-English speaking students are 5 per cent of enrollment.

Recruitment of more chicano teachers, counselors, and teachers in teacher-training institutions.

Establishment of numerical goals and timetables to increase chicano staff representation in school districts, and at the state level.

TOO MANY ROLES

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, changing times have brought much controversy to the President and to the Presidency. The role of the President, drafted by the framers of the Constitution in much simpler times, has been seen and interpreted in many ways by many different people.

I think we need to reflect and put things into perspective as did Bob Fairbanks, the editor of the Great Bend, Kans., Daily Tribune, in his recent editorial which I would like to share with my colleagues:

TOO MANY ROLES

Amid the torrents of talk and writing about the presidency last year, a great contradiction stands out. A president today is expected to act in ways which make him at once a national unifier and a divisive force.

On the one hand, he is counted upon to be the great healer, the compromiser of differences, the one man who can use his voice for all America and not just some carved-out piece of it, the nation's moral leader, and the man designated to represent us abroad—both as ceremonial head of state and as chief soldier and diplomat in our dealings with foreign lands.

But at the same time, the president through history has become accepted as his own party's supreme political leader, which commits him to partisanship which is inherently divisive. One cannot be a vigorous Republican or Democrat and expect to carry the whole country continuously with him.

Moreover, his role as divider does not end there. He is the chief policy maker for the nation in all fields, foreign and domestic. Not always, but much of the time he can act on foreign matters with wide support. (The Vietnam war was a monumental exception to the rule.) The domestic arena, however, is a policy maker's jungle. A president's ideas, proposals and overt acts seem guaranteed to create enemies as well as friends. To act is, for the most part, to separate rather than unify.

The irony in all this is that the framers of the Constitution clearly never intended to

build this critical contradiction into the office of the presidency.

They saw the president preeminently as unifier. They took little note of parties, and thus didn't foresee that any president would emerge inevitably and necessarily as a partisan leader.

And, probably, they had no way to foretell that, in acting as commander and diplomat in foreign crises, the president would create in the public's eyes a concept of overriding leadership they would find useful in domestic dilemmas.

Both president and public found it natural and also desirable for him to act in what used to be called economic "panics" and, later, depressions and recessions (not to mention occasional crippling nationwide strikes).

After Franklin D. Roosevelt's massive moves in the Great Depression, it was perhaps a predictable evolution from acting chief domestic policy maker in emergency situations to playing the role all the time.

Everyone knows Congress greatly assisted the process by ceding great chunks of authority to the White House, too seldom showing the will to exercise what power it retained. Despite all the complaints against the swollen, "imperial" presidency, President Nixon still is winning battles for more discretionary authority.

Furthermore, the American people themselves have magnified the divisive consequences. Frozen in separate postures, they call upon the President to act in more and more kinds of trouble situations, only to denounce him bitterly if he acts in ways which do not suit their individual or group demands.

A president's contradictory roles pose a crushing dilemma for him and for the country.

FORGOTTEN VETS

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs today continues its consideration of the new veterans' educational bill. Certainly it is high time that we in Congress recognized our obligation to the Vietnam era veteran, whose present benefits fall far short of those enjoyed by his predecessors of World War II and Korea.

Last August, I introduced a package of bills which would provide realistic benefits for veterans during a period when educational costs are soaring. My bills, H.R. 9890, H.R. 9891, H.R. 9892, and H.R. 9893, would provide tuition payments up to \$2,100, increase the entitlement period from 36 to 48 months, abolish the present 8-year time limitation, and provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in payments.

While many of us are agreed that a new financial settlement must be obtained, I should like to remind my colleagues that the time limitation and the entitlement period are of paramount concern to many veterans.

Recently, I received a petition signed by nearly 4,000 veterans and friends from Kern County, Calif., urging that the time limitation be extended. As the leader of this petition drive, Mr. Donald Johnson of the Veterans' Affairs Office at Bakersfield College, wrote:

Those veterans separated from the service before 1966, left the military without expectations of educational assistance. These veterans went to work, and only later did they begin to receive word that they qualified for educational benefits. Some of these veterans found out only as recently as last year. They have come to school to seek opportunity, only to face an ending date of May 31, 1974. At present approximately 35% of our veteran enrollment, 990 veterans, will run out of time in May 1974. Many of them have many months of entitlement remaining.

This is true of thousands of other veterans across the country.

Of equal importance is the extension of the entitlement period from 36 to 48 months. Many students today find it impossible to graduate college in the 4 years provided, especially married students who have to have outside employment to continue their education. Most of our veterans are married, and have great difficulty in working and going to school as it is, and therefore may take 5 or 6 years to graduate. The extra year of entitlement would be a great help to these young men and women.

Yesterday's Washington Star-News carried an excellent lead editorial on veterans' benefits, which I place in the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read:

FORGOTTEN VETS

There is a widespread public belief that educational benefits for Vietnam veterans have been roughly comparable to those available to their dads after World War II. And if that were the case, President Nixon's proposal the other day to boost payments to vets under the GI education program by 8 percent would be a reasonable inflationary adjustment.

But the basic premise, which the administration has tried hard to advance, simply isn't true. In thousands of cases, as a couple of independent studies have demonstrated over the last year, the inadequacy of current benefits virtually wipes out the educational opportunities which Vietnam veterans had assumed was their right under the asserted policies of a grateful nation.

The disparities arise in part from a sharp difference in approach. Under the post-World War II pattern, the government paid tuition and other educational costs directly to colleges, and gave single veterans \$75 a month for living expenses. Access to government-subsidized housing also was often available. At the outset of educational benefits for Vietnam veterans in 1966, however, all these forms of assistance were lumped in a single, absurdly inadequate monthly payment of \$100. With the passage of time the monthly sum has increased—to \$130 in 1967, to \$175 three years later and to the present level of \$220 in October 1972. But in too many instances that amount has not nearly kept pace with leap-frogging increases in college costs.

This is not universally true—and that is one of the chief problems in this complex dispute. In California, for example, where public colleges and low tuitions abound, relatively high percentages of veterans are participating in the GI program. But that is not at all the case in other states, chiefly in the East and Midwest, where the present formula takes no account of higher costs.

In the House, as opposed to the President's 8-percent benefit boost, a Veterans Affairs subcommittee last fall backed a somewhat more generous increase of 13.5 percent. It is high time that the full House committee got around to considering that proposition. In the Senate, fortunately, hearings are expected to begin soon on a much more realistic approach, backed by 32 senators, to authorize special supplements where tuition costs exceed the national average.

One may honestly argue, we suppose, about the validity of the concept of continuing the GI education program, but the debate never seems to get phrased in those terms. What we have wound up with, in point of fact, is a national commitment which often provides lip-service promises instead of results, which heaps yet another outrageous frustration on thousands of young veterans who have had the misfortune to serve in a vastly unpopular war. Education takes on added importance in this period of uncertain employment. And it is ironic, as Senator Daniel Inouye observed the other day, that the GI-bill benefits of an earlier postwar period seem to have been so quickly forgotten by those in positions of political responsibility today.

THE ANATOMY OF WATERGATE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, on January 22 of this year, Mr. Robert C. Notson, publisher of the Oregonian newspaper, delivered the following address on the ramifications of the Watergate affair. I believe that his statement reflects valued perspective on a complex and confusing subject that is of great import to us all. As such, I am pleased to take the opportunity to share, in two installments, Mr. Notson's comments with my colleagues:

THE ANATOMY OF WATERGATE

We have started on a new year with growing apprehensions that we may experience worse national turmoil and uncertainty in 1974 than that we experienced in 1973 when the scandal of Watergate popped wide open. We have seen in recent years the destruction of presidents by various means and we now see forces girding for a continuation of that brutal business.

President John F. Kennedy was destroyed by gunfire.

President Lyndon B. Johnson was destroyed by a ceaseless, relentless propaganda, based largely on his conduct of the war in Vietnam—a conflict of progressive unpopularity.

Now President Richard M. Nixon teeters on the brink. If it should be determined that he has deceived the American people, that he did have a guilty hand in the Watergate mess or coverup, he could be impeached by the congress. He could be disgraced and forced to resign. Or he could be isolated, undermined, discredited to the point that his administrative effectiveness would be imperiled and the prestige of his high office drained.

It was only a year ago that Richard M. Nixon was sworn into office after a sweeping victory at the polls. How tragic that an administration with such a mandate, and such promise, should be flawed and brought to the threat of collapse by the consummate indiscretions of trusted political lieutenants!

The incredible Watergate fiasco has produced many shocking surprises and embarrassments to the administration, and there are surely more to come as two ex-cabinet members go to trial and other high officials are indicted for complicity in various ramifications of the affair. But Richard Nixon himself has proved highly durable. The hard, convincing evidence against the president has not been forthcoming.

The sordid chapters of the Watergate mess have been unfolding over the months, and many persons are heartsick at the things they have seen and heard. The media has heaped mountains of suspicion on the

President, and he has kept digging himself out. But he has been given little respite.

During this period, it has become routine to take a poke at Nixon. Any who have spoken in his behalf, or been close to him, have been likely to find themselves under attack or, worse, under investigation. And so the voices have been stilled in his defense.

During the year gone by men of supposedly highest integrity and substance in the Republican party leadership and in government have been involved in, or tainted by, the scandal.

But the sensational stories have left the public somewhat dazed and uncomprehending as to why these men could have become involved either in the burglarizing of the Democratic headquarters or the subsequent attempted cover-up. The whole affair seems incredible.

From our present vantage, it appears overwhelmingly stupid that anyone of substance could have sanctioned such activity because of possibilities of damage to the party, to personal reputations and to the Nixon administration.

The degree of involvement of various persons remains to be demonstrated by the judicial and legislative inquiries now under way. Despite this, every night on the air and every day in the press men and organizations are quoted as passing judgments and reciting allegations almost as if they were proven facts.

INVESTIGATIVE STAFFS LEAK LIKE SIEVES

Some members of the senate committee have let their prejudices hang out, so that at times it appeared that the inquiry had become an inquisition. Former prosecutor Cox asked that the senate committee desist, lest its efforts destroy the cases being developed by the prosecution.

The same might very well have been directed at some of the columnists, cartoonists and comic strip artists. Even Doonesbury wound up a castigation of former Attorney General Mitchell by holding his head and crying "Guilty, guilty, guilty."

Meanwhile, the staff of the special prosecutor and of the Watergate Committee have been like sieves, "leaking" information and advance testimony in a prejudicial manner. Witness after witness had the thrust of his testimony blunted or its public reception shaped long before the hearing. Some of these men have been convicted in the public mind without trial.

Such conduct is highly unethical. The canons of the American Bar Association are most explicit in forbidding dissemination of information designed to create a "climate" before trial. The attorneys responsible for such conduct could be, and in my opinion should be disciplined by the bar.

In any event, it appears very much a question whether the poisonous atmosphere of Washington could possibly yield an unbiased jury—or the country at large for that matter.

Some seven years ago the Supreme Court overturned the conviction of Dr. Sam Shepard in Cleveland for the murder of his wife. The court held that it had been impossible to obtain a fair trial in the face of the "Roman circus" created by pervasive press coverage.

More recently, Bobby Seale was turned loose in New Haven. He was accused of murder also. The jury at the trial disagreed. The prosecutors finally moved for dismissal, rather than attempt a re-trial, on the theory that an unprejudiced jury could not be found.

In both of these cases the courts did not address themselves to the question of actual guilt. Under our system of criminal procedure the streams of justice must not be tainted.

Let me say in passing, and with no conclusions as to guilt or innocence of the men

involved, that the Romans never in all their history engineered such a "circus" as that which has been going on now for a year in Washington.

TARGET, PLAINLY, IS PRESIDENT NIXON

Senator Sam Ervin has told his committee that more important than the conviction of any man or men is to "get at the facts." Being re-interpreted, that means simply that the committee's objective is to punish with public exposure, whatever ultimately happens in the courts. And this is further evident from the hearsay, conjecture and innuendo that has been both admitted to the record and encouraged by the committee.

Very plainly, the real target is President Nixon. And you may think that is as it should be—or not—as you may personally view the scene.

The overriding question has been, "Why did these men bug and burglarize the Democratic headquarters?" A secondary one has been, "What did they learn?"

Answering the second question first, there is no evidence that the Watergate burglars and wiretappers learned anything of value, politically or otherwise. It was an empty exercise, and a grim one.

Then why Watergate? Even in the spring of 1972 it must have been amply evident that Nixon had the campaign won. Only some incomprehensible mistake could lose it for him. Laying aside all moral questions, why would reasonable men have thought illegal espionage was required or advantageous?

The explanations have appeared from time to time but they have been submerged by the immensity of the scandal itself. Some of the men were lawyers. They should have known better. But others were former agents of the CIA and the FBI. They saw themselves as investigators. Although they were serving a campaign committee, they somehow regarded themselves as endowed with a certain authority of government and the privileges that sometimes attend government investigators.

And there was a larger rationale. These men had watched while surging mobs undertook, in bloody violence, to disrupt the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1968. They had seen some 100,000 demonstrators storm through Washington and seek to shut down the government.

In the early summer of 1972 the Peace Now movement sent out a call for recruits to move on San Diego and shut down the Republican Convention. Leaders of the Nixon Committee thought the Democrats were encouraging this activity. And at least some appeared to believe that Communist money, filtered through Cuba's Castro, might be behind it all.

The assassination of John Kennedy and Robert Kennedy, and the shooting of George Wallace, aroused fear for the safety of the President. At the very least, it was considered probable that an attempt would be made to shut off his speaking campaign by a bedlam of protest.

This, then, was the context in which the Committee to Re-elect the President decided to finance an intelligence setup. The rationale did have a legitimate basis. But it got entirely out of hand. Certain over-zealous men carried affairs to the point of wiretapping and burglary. They were searching, they told themselves, for evidence—"in the national interest." And the rest were sucked into the Watergate maelstrom to prevent a political disaster, as they thought, and emerged to find themselves charged with coverup and obstruction of justice.

Fear patterns, bad judgment and panic. This is the anatomy of Watergate.

Let me say that the recitation of this set of circumstances should by no means be taken to indicate that I approve or condone such activities. The explanation probably does not offer a legal defense; it may suggest

some mitigation in the courts and in the court of public opinion. It may help to explain the motivations of these men to a thoroughly baffled public.

When I previously voiced this explanation, I was roundly castigated by certain persons who accused me of dreaming up an "apocalyptic excuse" for the burglars and their backers. They want to believe only the worst, they want to believe that the President and all of his associates are essentially evil men. Their memories are most convenient.

It was this attitude—and atmosphere—that led the London Times to observe that what "Mr. Nixon is now receiving is a Washington variant of lynch law."

Clare Boothe Luce, in a talk at a luncheon of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington asserted that Watergate was one of the fruits of the excesses that grew out of opposition to the Vietnam war. For some years the idea had been fostered that individuals or groups had a right to decide what laws were "right" for them to obey and which were not. She called attention to the fact that some of these who were shouting the loudest against the morals and ethics of the Nixon administration were among those who coddled and excused many of the previous excesses of anti-war activists, including the theft of the Pentagon papers.

Parenthetically, it is now charged in testimony that these papers were delivered not only to certain newspapers but also the Soviet embassy.

Mrs. Luce condemned both the burglary of the Pentagon papers and the burglary at Watergate. And I agree with her.

Methods of Watergate overstepped the bounds of ethics and decency. There may have been many other fundamentally more serious breaches in the last campaign, but burglary is something the average man can understand and deplore.

Watergate was fostered by men who wanted to demonstrate the prowess they had learned in the CIA and FBI. In addition, E. Howard Hunt was the author of a series of "Who Done It" books. The probability is that these men also had been watching too many episodes of "Mission Impossible."

And what about these White House "Plumbers?"

They have been painted as a gang of political espionage agents bent on bugging and burglary. Well, they did engage in some activities that were both stupid and reprehensible, that's for certain. Evidence points to their tampering with State Department records, burglary of the office of Dr. Lewis I. Fielding, Ellsberg's psychiatrist, and, of course, the Watergate break-in.

Were they the evil men that many now believe?

The facts, when fully known, may very well show that the "Plumbers" had a legitimate and even necessary purpose, a purpose that became smothered by the unwise and improper activity that has come to light. Let's take a look.

For some time the intimate and sensitive affairs of the National Security Council apparently had been leaking to foreign governments and to the press.

The most celebrated case involved a publication in a nationally syndicated column. The report said that Henry Kissinger, then White House foreign policy adviser, had told the council the President wanted to "tilt" toward Pakistan in the Pakistan-Indian war over East Pakistan.

There are many important considerations that we cannot explore. Much that we do not know. Suffice it to say that Pakistan appears to have been the "diplomatic broker" assisting arrangements for the Nixon visit to China. Pakistan had been a good friend. On the other side, Russia had been supplying India with heavy arms at the very time we had shut off arms shipments to Pakistan.

These were the arms that India was using to destroy the small, beleaguered Pakistan

army in the East. There was also evidence of some hanky-panky between India and the Soviets. The latter were seeking naval bases on the Indian sub-continent, it was believed.

But, revelation of this country's sympathy at a time when we were endeavoring to maintain a correct neutral public attitude was most embarrassing. If India had been a stronger nation, it could have provoked an incident. At the very least, it created hard feelings and tended also to dampen relations with Russia at the time we were seeking to improve them.

A REASSESSMENT OF OUR LATIN AMERICAN "POLICY"

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, 29 years ago this month diplomats from the United States and most of the other Western Hemisphere republics met at historic Chapultepec Castle in Mexico City to develop strategies to cope with postwar political and economic problems. The final act of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace—the Act of Chapultepec—represented a new relationship between this country and our sister republics of the Americas and laid the foundation for United States-Latin American policy for over a decade.

It is appropriate, therefore, that Secretary Kissinger is scheduled to confer with his Latin American counterparts in the Mexican capital later this month, particularly as our Latin friends have yet to see any concrete or meaningful manifestations of the mature partnership which the President mentioned some 5 years ago. At this meeting Dr. Kissinger will be expected to respond to the Consensus of Bogotá, a document drafted by a number of Latin American foreign ministers last November. Specifically, this document—which is to be the basis of the conversations in Mexico City—calls for increased cooperation in Latin American development, promotion of "cohesive measures of an economic nature", a restructuring of the OAS, a solution of the Panama Canal dispute, a restructuring of the international commerce and monetary system, a limitation of the economic control of multinational corporations, greater participation by Latins in technology transfer and a general improvement in U.S.-Latin American relations.

A timely editorial on Dr. Kissinger's forthcoming trip to Latin America—and the issues with which he will be confronted—appeared in Sunday's Washington Post. I believe this editorial has considerable merit and I commend it to our colleagues' attention:

KISSINGER'S LATIN VISTA

Secretary of State Kissinger heads for Panama shortly to sign the recently negotiated statement of principles for a new canal treaty. In a few weeks he is due to confer with the foreign minister of Latin America in Mexico City. This evidence of his specific concern for a long-festering Latin issue, the canal, and of his general concern for inter-American relations, has elicited a certain amount of expectation that the "mature partnership" envisioned by President

Nixon in 1969 (in his first and last major statement on Latin America) may be starting to take on real life. Latins have properly become wary over the years of periodic American reaffirmations of devotion to the hemispheric welfare. But certainly the need for such a thrust is undiminished.

The economic ties between the United States and Latin America continually grow thicker and more diverse. To cite one "new" example, Venezuela and Ecuador are full-fledged members of the oil cartel which has quadrupled energy costs around the world. The politics of the hemisphere increasingly center on easing the strains created by these economic ties. For just this reason, Latin America requires from Washington not occasional spurts of headline diplomacy, however symbolically satisfying these may be, but steadfast application to day-to-day affairs. Latins deserve to be assured that their voices are regularly heard. Sen. Robert Byrd (D-W. Va.) noted candidly the other day that many congressmen have stunted Latin America "because Latin fields are not regarded as politically fertile." But the Executive Branch has no similar excuse for such a casual approach.

Responding to an earlier Kissinger suggestion for a "new style of dialogue," Latin foreign ministers met at Bogota last November to draw up "Bases for a New Dialogue" with the United States. This offers encouraging evidence that Latin Americans have used the recent years of Washington's relative inattentiveness profitably—not to draw away from the United States but to prepare for more fruitful and mature relations. In particular, the Latins have moved toward a position where they are less disabled by lack of confidence than they previously were in dealing with the non-Latin world. For instance, the Inter-American Development Bank is right now at the make-or-break stage of drawing into its membership and its work some 18 countries from outside the region; on the outcome largely hinges the question of whether the Latin economy grows in a regional or world context. The United States remains, and will remain, the dominant power of the hemisphere, but perhaps we are learning some of the advantages of self-effacement too. Dr. Kissinger's upcoming Latin visits should be especially instructive in this regard.

If economic relations are central in the hemisphere, however, at least one major political issue remains. Though Havana itself stays in a negative stance, it becomes progressively more anomalous that the United States should exert its influence to keep Cuba formally outside the inter-American system. Why should we treat Havana any less pragmatically than we treat Moscow or Peking? Latin governments with problems on their own left remain cool to lifting the sanctions which the Organization of American States voted against Cuba 13 years ago. But many other Latin governments are more than ready to move on. Now that the Latin subsidiaries of some American corporations see a chance to sell their products in the Cuban market, the United States is likely to come under heightened pressure from that quarter too. Mexico City would be an appropriate place for Dr. Kissinger to start bringing our Cuban policy into step with the times.

A TRIBUTE TO MARK S. REEVE

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in this area when politics seems to be slipping into

disrepute there are many elected officials that work quietly and diligently for their communities who do not always receive the favorable publicity they deserve. One of these men is Mark S. Reeve who has served as vice mayor and vice president of the Foster City City Council.

During his 10 years as member of the Foster City Council Mark has been most active in pursuing the interest of the Foster City community. Mark is one man who is probably most responsible for seeing that Foster City was incorporated as its own entity.

While serving on the community association as treasurer, he not only quadrupled the membership but built the treasury to the point where it became a viable power in the community.

Mark served on the city's first planning commission while also serving as a councilman and board member. As a planning commissioner, he was instrumental in the community development. As vice mayor, he spearheaded the drive to encourage builders and developers into the city, through his tireless effort and leadership.

Mark Reeve currently serves as chairman of the educational facilities committee, chairman of the government review charter commission committee, vice mayor, and president of Estero Municipal Improvement District.

Mark's presence on the city council will surely be missed. His continued presence in the community, however, will somewhat offset the community's loss of Mark's vitality and energy on the city council.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME TO HEAR TESTIMONY FROM HON. CLAUDE PEPPER ON THE COMMUNITY ANTICRIME ASSISTANCE ACT, H.R. 9175

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Judiciary Committee will hear testimony during its fourth hearing on the Community Anticrime Assistance Act, H.R. 9175, from the distinguished former chairman of the Select Committee on Crime, CLAUDE PEPPER. The hearing will be held on Thursday, February 21, 1974, at 10 a.m., in 2141 Rayburn House Office Building.

The purpose of the community anticrime bill is to involve citizens in constructive programs in the criminal justice system. Mr. PEPPER who has joined me as a sponsor of this legislation, has had a long-time interest in involving the community in the criminal justice system as a means of reducing crime and improving community relations.

The subcommittee will also hear testimony from Herbert S. Miller, the director of the Institute of Criminal Law at Georgetown University. Mr. Miller is a well-known authority on criminal law

and has written articles in the area of community involvement in the criminal justice system.

Those wishing to testify or submit a statement for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

DOMESTIC POLITICS AND RECENT EVENTS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I think we all can learn much from a poll taken of Dulaney Senior High School by the politics and political behavior class. I should like to share with you the letter I received from these interested and informed students:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG. The Politics and Political Behavior class of Dulaney Senior High in Timonium, Maryland recently conducted a poll to determine the attitudes and opinions of the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders concerning domestic politics and recent events. We would like to apprise you of some of the results of that poll.

Of those students polled, almost 45% considered themselves supporters of President Nixon in the 1972 election, and 26% considered themselves supporters of Senator McGovern. Some of the key questions and results are as follows:

Which of the following statements best describes your attitudes toward politics and unethical behavior?

- (a) all politicians are corrupt, 13%.
- (b) most are corrupt but a few are honest, 45%.
- (c) a few are corrupt but the majority are honest, 26%.
- (d) all are honest, 0%.
- (e) no opinion, 15%.

Does the American and electoral system lend itself to corrupt practices?

	Percent
Yes	52
No	13.6
No opinion	34

Has Watergate and related events affected your faith in government?

Yes	57.8
No	32.7
No opinion	9.5

Do you think Watergate and related events have affected the President's ability to govern the nation?

Yes	64.6
No	24.5
No opinion	10.9

In your opinion should President Nixon resign?

Yes	48.3
No	39.5
No opinion	12.0

In your opinion should President Nixon be impeached?

Yes	45.6
No	44.9
No opinion	9.5

Do you think the Office of the President is becoming too powerful?

Yes	42.2
No	42.2
No opinion	15.6

Do you think the news media's treatment of Watergate and related events has been fair?

Yes	40.8
No	42.9
No opinion	16.3

Sincerely,

DAVID B. CUNEO and Class.

PATRIOTISM AND OIL DO NOT MIX

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, at recent congressional hearings, the accusation was leveled at our major oil companies that they shut off all oil supplies to American military units during the Middle East war alert in October at Saudi Arabia's request.

Four companies are involved, the same four major oil companies who own Aramco, the Saudi Arabian oil exploitation consortium. They are Exxon, Mobil, Texaco, and Standard Oil of California.

A Business Week magazine article, later brought in to Senator JACKSON's hearing, indicated that the Saudi foreign ministry had told the Aramco companies that because of King Faisal's decision, they were to cut off all supply of products derived from Saudi oil to American forces stationed around the world.

We know American naval units on station around the world were suddenly cut off from oil and oil products, a move that could be enforced only by oil companies obeying the Saudi diktat. The proof, therefore, is in the result, which, in this case, was the sudden turn by our Navy toward alternate supplies of oil.

Today, confirmation of this event has been made, proving that the corporate conduct of these energy conglomerates placed national security last and profit first, far ahead of the lives of American boys in potential combat zones.

I have heard the debate over legitimacy over the Mideast worldwide U.S. military alert. Having no inside knowledge of what actually took place, I cannot accurately judge whether or not it was essential or not. Nevertheless, it is a fact that on a worldwide basis, American military units were placed on a stand-to basis, in preparation for possible military activity of an undetermined kind. In other words, the risk of war may have been very real and close.

This means our military personnel around the world had to be prepared on an instant's notice to perform their previously assigned military functions. Most such activities depend in large measure on access to petroleum. Ships do not sail without oil. Planes do not fly without jet fuel. Grounds units do not function without petroleum.

A shutoff of these supplies would mean total inability to function. That in turn would lead inevitably to helplessness in the face of a potential foe. Finally, it could lead to destruction in any kind of a combat situation because of lack of oil. The equation here is inexorable and inevitable. For American oil companies to

deliberately withhold fuel from American military units in an emergency because of an Arab despot's threat of economic loss is nothing less than treason and a willingness to sentence American boys to death in an emergency situation because of the mighty dollar.

Most of us have had some close experience with active duty military service. Many hundreds of thousands of Americans know what it is to have a loved one on active duty abroad in a situation where they might come into real danger. I wonder how the parents of those young men feel as they learn how our major oil companies owning Aramco behaved. I wonder how they will judge oil companies in light of facts we now know.

Who will come forward now to defend the poor barefoot billionaires of the energy industry? Who will weep copious tears for their maligned reputations? What it boils down to is that the presidents of the four companies, when confronted with King Faisal's ultimatum, chose to turn their backs on the U.S. servicemen in a potential combat zone and protect their investments. There are no words to describe these people. Their actions speak for themselves.

One certain conclusion, however, may be safely drawn. These companies have forfeited any and all consideration from America's citizens. If any of us had any doubts, by now they should be resolved.

I believe that a complete investigation is called for by the Secretary of Defense and that a full report should be made to the Congress once that inquiry is completed. Such a request has already been made by me, and it is my hope that other Members of the House will do the same.

AUDIE MURPHY'S RIDE WITH OLD SANTA CLAUS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, recently an article appeared in the *Victoria Advocate*, Victoria, Tex., about a close friend of mine by the name of Audie Murphy. Even though Christmas has passed, I believe a little of that spirit would do well to linger with us. More than that, I want to pay tribute to the late Audie Murphy, who was truly one of the greatest Americans I have known. Audie Murphy was our Nation's most decorated soldier in World War II.

The article follows:

AUDIE MURPHY'S RIDE WITH OLD SANTA CLAUS
SAN ANTONIO.—A new patriotic Christmas song which tells about America's most decorated soldier, the late Audie Murphy, riding with Santa Claus on Christmas eve night, is getting a big play on radio stations in Texas this holiday season. The folk-ballad is called "The Red, White and Blue Christmas," and has been released on phonograph records, both as a poem and song, by "Red River Dave" McEnery, long time ASCAP songwriter of American folk music.

Texas-born Audie Murphy, so the story goes, rides with Santa Claus, passing out mementos of American history such as miniature replicas of "The Liberty Bell," "The

Alamo," "The Battleship Maine," copies of the "Constitution," "The Declaration of Independence," and other treasures of America's heritage. The words go like this:

"THE RED, WHITE AND BLUE CHRISTMAS"

T'was the night before Christmas at Santa's abode,
The cold wind was whistling on the Old Arctic Road;
The reindeer were prancing out there in the snow,
And Santa's big sleigh was all ready to go.
When out from the snowstorm there marched a young man,
He stepped up to Santa, extended his hand
And said, "I'm Audie Murphy, I hope it's all right,
But, Saint Peter asked me to join you tonight.
"I'm bringing some presents, some items of 'truth,'
That I want to give to America's youth."
"Ho! Ho! chuckled Santa, "Of course, I know you,
I gave you toy soldiers in the year thirty two.
Why, you're Audie Murphy, of course it's all right,
I'm happy to have you on my journey tonight;
And, from 'Soldiers Heaven,' I'm glad you came back,
Now, what's in your duffel bag? What's in your pack?
"Why, you've got mementos of America, there!
There's Washington 'Crossing the Old Delaware,'
And miniature replicas of the 'Liberty Bell,'
And prints of the 'Star-Spangled Banner,' as well;
And pictures of patriots, long in the graves,
And 'Abe's Proclamation' that freed all the slaves;
And framed 'Constitutions,' to hang on the wall,
And 'Statues of Liberty,' nine inches tall.
"And flags called 'Old Glory,' God bless her name!
And little toy 'Alamos,' and the battleship 'Maine';
And copies of music! Why, there's 'Over There,'
And 'God Bless America,' and manuscripts rare.
Son, you've brought dear keepsakes more precious than gold,
For, they tell the story of our country of old;
'The American's Creed,' and the 'Great Declaration'
Of the 'Fourth of July,' that made us a Nation!
"Why, your pack's a treasure! I'm so glad you came
To help me deliver such gifts in the name Of 'Honor,' and 'Liberty,' and 'Freedom,' so sweet!
Audie Murphy, this Christmas will never be beat!
Quick, Dasher! Quick, Dancer! Quick, Vixen of old!
Yes, we've got a story that's worth being told!
Get moving there, Rudolph! Start leading the way!
This Christmas, we're boosting the Great U.S.A.!
With a "dash on the wind," they flew into the night,
Both, Audie and Santa Claus, holding on tight!
The sleigh bells were playing "Yankee Doodle," in time,
And here's what I heard Santa shout down the line:
"Merry Christmas," America! It's time to renew
Your 'Pledge of Allegiance,' to the 'Red, White and Blue!'
And, we found a "new Spirit" in America, because,
One night Audie Murphy rode with "Old Santa Claus.!"

THE FALSE SECURITY BLANKET

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, excessive secrecy in government and especially the free use of "national security" as a cover for foul-ups and illegal acts is a cause for concern by all Americans.

The January 28, 1974, issue of the publication *Aviation Week* contains an editorial by Robert Holz on the subject of the administration's excessive secrecy. It calls for candor on the grounds that the American people are fully capable of acting in the Nation's best interests providing they are not deluded by their leaders.

The editorial follows:

THE FALSE SECURITY BLANKET

(By Robert Holz)

Virtually every criminal and malodorous act that was committed during the sordid period now loosely known as Watergate was justified by President Richard M. Nixon and his aides on the grounds of protecting "national security." The use of the false security blanket as an alibi for acts otherwise unacceptable to humanity was certainly not invented by the Watergate conspirators. It was used to justify every atrocity in the Third Reich of Adolf Hitler down to genocide. It is still a standard justification for the police terror and labor prison camps in Soviet Russia. It is also one of the deadly viruses that have been sapping the traditional values of the American system of government for the past 20 years.

There are of course many legitimate areas of national security that require maximum secrecy, but these are seldom the areas involved in the most flagrant exercise of extralegal power by political leaders. The unfolding of the details of the Watergate affair has revealed exactly what aims these applications of executive force really had, in contrast to the label of national security publicly used for their justification.

We had been dealing with these false security blankets long before Watergate, and our experience invariably showed there was seldom any genuine national security involved. The false security blanket was generally used to conceal policies that were either illegal, corrupt or so patently wrong they could not stand the pressure of public debate. The evidence laid on the public record by the Watergate investigations now confirms the phoniness of the national security issue as routinely peddled by the executive branch of the government.

Was there in any of the Watergate "national security" cases anything that really involved the security of this nation? The record reveals nothing.

The U.S. bombing of Cambodia was one of the worst-kept Administration secrets and the subject of the most elaborate official deception and most vigorous pursuit of "leaks" to the public prints. The Viet Cong and Hanoi troops knew they were being bombed. U.S. insignia on the attack aircraft clearly identified the source. Hanoi, China and the USSR knew we were bombing the Viet Cong supply bases in Cambodia. Only the U.S. Congress and the American people were kept in the dark.

The U.S. position and proposal in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) with the Soviet Union was another major area where the Nixon Administration's "plumbers" unit battled desperately and illegally to hound newsmen who were reporting the story. The inept performance of U.S. diplomats is a sad tale that still has not

been fully told to the American people. Disdainful of any technical knowledge of military hardware, these diplomats bargained away a major strategic U.S. technical superiority in missile defense technology and allowed enough loopholes in terminology for the Soviets to exploit their offensive missile technology from inferiority to superiority. It would be far better for the security of this nation if both the U.S. negotiators and the American people understood more about "pop up" cold-launch missile techniques, MIRV warheads and the real status of missile defense technology instead of the secret police technology being developed by the White House staff.

The most ludicrous effort of all was the Pentagon Papers leak by Daniel Ellsberg which, except for its context in the rest of Watergate, would be a fit subject for an old-time Keystone Cops two-reel slapstick. The Pentagon Papers were pretty stale bread for any espionage agent—more grist for a post-graduate thesis than a Soviet planner. They gave the American public only a peep-show version of how it had been dragged into a bloody, costly and senseless war without even the vaguest idea of its purpose.

The latest case of the Pentagon spying on the National Security Council to find out the real national policy is pure opera bouffe. It speaks volumes of how super secrecy has clogged the functions of this government when the two organizations most concerned with national security have to spy on each other to find out what is really going on.

This problem of the sleazy use of "national security" to justify any action or policy that cannot stand the light of public scrutiny is far more serious than the current political plight of Richard Nixon's presidency. It is a cancerous rot that will erode the very foundations of democratic government if not given a strong antidote of frank public discussion of the major issues and policies on which the real security of this nation rests.

The events set in motion by Watergate have certainly proved the adage that secrecy breeds corruption. That is bad enough for the American system of government. But it is equally true and even worse that secrecy breeds poor policy and national disaster when carried to the extremes of the Nixon Administration and its two Democrat predecessors. The Bay of Pigs and the Southeast Asia fiasco could only hatch in the darkness of government secrecy. Neither could have survived even the preliminaries of public scrutiny.

If it is to survive the next century, the American government and its elected officials must operate with considerably more candor and intelligence with the American people than they have displayed during the past decade. The American people will respond to any genuine challenge with the full measure of their energy and devotion. But they are weary of being conned by self-seeking politicians and are now equally skeptical of phony crises and patent medicine doses of political soothing syrup.

A COMING CRISIS IN RAW MATERIALS

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation continues to work on its energy problem it is becoming increasingly apparent that we are approaching a crisis of even greater dimensions with regard

to raw materials. I take the liberty of placing an article which recently appeared in U.S. News & World Report into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SUPPOSE OTHER COUNTRIES CUT OFF UNITED STATES FROM RAW MATERIALS

For Americans already worried over the cutback of oil supplies to the United States by Arab nations comes this new concern:

A threat that other countries may follow the Arabs' lead and shut off supplies of a broad list of basic raw materials—or demand inflated prices for them.

It's a danger that is focusing fresh attention on just how heavily the U.S. depends on imports of commodities vital to its status as the world's most prosperous nation.

The fact is that this country is counting more and more on other nations to supply a major portion of metals, minerals and other substances without which American industry cannot continue to function.

The U.S. relies on imports for all of its natural rubber, and for most of a wide range of other items including manganese, cobalt, chromium, platinum, aluminum, tin and nickel.

The U.S. can still meet most of its needs for copper, uranium, coal, iron ore, lead, potash and a number of other materials from domestic sources.

LOOKING AHEAD

But demand is growing so rapidly, Government officials say, that by 1985 the U.S. could depend on imports for half of all its supplies of raw materials—including even iron ore and lead.

Anxiety over a cutback in raw materials from abroad is no idle concern.

Scheduled in February is a meeting in Guinea of major producers of bauxite, an ore from which aluminum is produced. The avowed goal: a common front to control production and fight for the highest possible prices for bauxite.

Zaire and Zambia, two major producers of copper, recently announced plans to coordinate production of that metal to keep prices high.

What worries U.S. officials is the spread of such tactics to an increasing number of commodities—helped by the concentration of production of key materials in just a handful of nations.

C. Fred Bergsten of the Brookings Institution says that two countries, Malaysia and Bolivia, account for 70 per cent of all tin exports. Four nations control more than 80 per cent of the world's copper exports. A similar number of countries hold more than half the world's reserves of bauxite, and half the supply of natural rubber.

As officials see it, the danger is a sharp increase in prices rather than a total shut-off of raw materials. A major reason: Most developing countries could not afford to go without revenues for any length of time.

Even without concerted action by raw-material suppliers, intense competition among consuming nations will drive prices further up in years ahead.

The United States, with less than 6 per cent of the world's population, consumes one third of the world's mineral output each year—including 56 per cent of all natural gas, 35 per cent of the free world's silver and aluminum, 32 per cent of all lead.

Rate of growth in demand among other industrial nations is expected to be even greater than in the U.S. And as developing nations industrialize their economies, they are likely to hang on to more raw materials themselves.

PUSH TO SUBSTITUTE

Higher prices, officials note, may encourage production of minerals in the U.S.—now too expensive to extract—from low-grade iron, aluminum, titanium and other ores.

A search for substitute products and syn-

thetics for some of the rarer and costlier minerals is likely to be speeded up, too. Stockpiles of key commodities that the U. S. has built up can help to meet immediate needs for a while.

Still, America—blessed with a wealth of natural resources—may have to worry about becoming a "have not" nation in some basic raw materials.

FORESTRY VITAL TO ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF NATION

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, few people realize just how important forestry is to the economic well-being of this Nation. In my State, for example, it is the second largest income-producing industry, a fact which generally surprises those outside the industry.

For this reason, I have taken particular interest in those programs that encourage forestry among young people. One of the best is that of recognizing State and National forestry program excellence within the Future Farmers of America.

The winner in Florida last year was a young man from my congressional district. His name is Billy Williams, of Macclenny, Fla.

We are proud of Billy and his adviser, Mr. Jack L. Williams. Three of the top winners in my State last year were members of the Baker County High Chapter. Three out of the last four State winners have come from Baker County.

It is a record in which I take great pride and commend those responsible.

In this regard, I would like to have reprinted the speech which Billy made after his selection as State winner to the Cincinnati Club in Cincinnati, Ohio.

This young man has a great deal to say about forestry and his remarks are well worth reading. They are as follows:

MY FORESTRY PROGRAM IN FLORIDA

(By Billy Williams)

Mr. Rice, Friends of the FFA, and Fellow Forestry Winners:

Forestry is the second largest income-producing industry in Florida—more than a billion dollars a year. My contribution to the industry is small, but I am proud to be a part of it.

I am a native Floridian being born and reared in rural Baker County some 40 miles west of Jacksonville on 40 acres of the original 120 acre farmstead.

Our farm management system includes production of cattle and hogs, general crops of tobacco, vegetables, corn, and of course forest products.

Our 30 acre farm woodlands has quite a history. The fine virgin timber was first initiated to gum farming by the old wood hack method in the late 1940's. My father applied the traditional once-a-week wounding which was most rewarding in those days. In the early 1940's, my oldest brother assumed the duty for his FFA work, but with the newer scientific method using a bark hack and acid solution. In the late 1950's, a second brother assumed these duties and was named State Naval Stores Winner in 1960.

Early in life I became interested in agriculture and began doing as much work as I

was allowed to do on the farm. Of course, my brothers were my idols, and for a small fee—sometimes free—I would work for them. Later, this paid good dividends.

I enrolled in VoAg and the FFA upon entering Baker County High School. As the fourth link in the family forestry chain, I too selected gum farming as a part of my Supervised Occupational Experience Program. My brothers and I, each in our time, have been the sole managers of the woodlands. But unlike my brothers, I have been able to develop a more diversified forestry program.

When I realized quality and quantity were related, I began making additional acreages available for my Management program. Through cooperative efforts and a most willing attitude on the part of friends I was able to expand my work in forestry.

Yes, it has been my pleasure, honor and joy to harvest some 105 bushels of pine cones, 15 cords of pulpwood and 125 fence posts. I have planted 26,000 slash pine seedlings on land that I prepared. To encourage the growth of pines I have controlled hardwoods on 75 acres. Other activities include the construction of 2 miles of firebreaks and control of insects on 30 acres of land. I gained much experience and knowledge in the control burning of some 340 acres. My gum farming program has netted me 42 barrels of crude gum which, fortunately, is bringing record prices this year.

I have consistently kept abreast of research in the field of forestry by attending forestry meetings, visiting naval stores, research laboratories and a model site where the latest in timber harvesting technology was being used. A guided tour of one of the Rayonier mills producing chemical cellulose was a part of my experience.

Besides my work in agriculture, I have been active in the FFA for four years. I have attended area and state leadership schools and earned recognition at area and state levels on both land and meats judging. I was a member of the state Livestock Judging Team and have participated in forestry field day activities. I attended state and national FFA conventions and the State FFA Forestry Training camp.

I was elected the Star Greenhand as a Freshman, have presented several TV programs, was a member of the Parliamentary Procedure Team, and have served as Sentinel, Vice President and President of the Baker County FFA Chapter.

Other honors have been recognition in the Beta Club, Freshman and National Honor Society, and I received the Star Student Library Assistant award.

Two of the main highlights of my life—one of which will be history in a few minutes—have been the honor of presenting my program to you as a forestry winner and being elected State FFA Vice President at our last state convention.

The forestry program and the FFA have given me the opportunity to reap a most valuable permanent possession—the physical and mental stamina to be an American.

Presently I am a part-time student in a local junior college, serving as a state FFA officer and continuing to manage my Supervised Occupational Experience Program. My plans are to continue my education and my experience program and finally end my FFA participation by receiving the American Farmer Degree.

In closing, I would like to express my gratitude to you, Seaboard Coast Line, for this wondrous occasion and you Leaders of Business and Industry for making this event possible. I think my feelings for the most part can be summed up in a short poem entitled:

WHEN LIFE IS DONE

I'd like to think when life is done
That I had filled a needed post
That here and there I'd paid my fare
With more than idle talk and boast.
That I had taken gifts divine
The breath of life and manhood fine
And tried to use them now and then
In service for my fellow man.

It has been my pleasure to represent the Sunshine State of Florida, the Florida Association of FFA and my home community in such an inspiring program.

WORTHWHILE PROGRAMS OVERLOOKED

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, many people point to the inequities of government programs, citing misuse of funds and abuses of power as characteristics of all such programs. At the same time, many worthwhile programs are overlooked.

I recently received a communication from the director of a community action agency in the Third District of Kansas which notes the response that agency has made to the energy shortages as they affect the elderly and the poor.

In December, when the cold winter season began, ECKAN, Inc., moved in to meet the urgent needs of the disadvantaged in the rural communities. Recognizing that many families would sacrifice necessities in order to have money for fuel, ECKAN has attempted to establish a clearinghouse for emergency relief.

The following article, taken from the Ottawa, Kans., Herald further illustrates the efforts this agency has made in this regard:

PLIGHT OF THE POOR FALLS UPON EVEN HARDER TIMES

(By Don Lambert)

Recent price increases of food and fuel have affected everyone, but no one as much as the poor, according to staff members of ECKAN and the Franklin County Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services.

They explained that many of the more than 900 households classified as "poor" in Franklin County, are on fixed incomes, which may be from social security, public assistance, meager savings or low-paying jobs.

And when the prices began increasing—gasoline up to 50 cents a gallon, propane at 35 cents a gallon, food costs rising each month—these people faced additional problems.

As a result, both agencies are more fully utilizing their present programs and are seeking outside help.

Terri MacNevin, director of ECKAN, explained that some of the people she talked to ran into many additional problems during the recent cold wave. Houses which were poorly constructed with little insulation, required additional heat just to keep the family warm. But with the increased prices of home heating fuel, this was sometimes difficult.

She also said it seems the poor are finding it more difficult to establish credit during the winter and are often told they must pay in advance.

More people in this area are looking for jobs, she said. With the possibility of fuel cutbacks and further price increases, the idea of working in this area for lower wages rather than in Kansas City for higher wages, sounds better. And when construction workers in the area couldn't work during the cold weather, they were also looking for jobs and were faced with little money.

Mrs. MacNevin explained that the need for emergency food in her agency has gone up and she is attempting to establish a central clearing house where the emergency relief could be distributed.

Mrs. Virginia Loyd, service supervisor of the Franklin County Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services, said the number of requests for food stamps has gone up considerably over the winter. People are realizing the cost of living increases and fearing them more.

"There are no more courageous people than those on a low-fixed income with children. When prices increase, they just sacrifice, do without more, and get deeper in debt," she said.

Another problem, according to Mike Clarkin, income maintenance supervisor of the agency, is that the amount of money allowed for utility expenses in the public assistance program is based on a 1964 cost study. In other words, it can allow people the same amount of money for utilities it did in 1964, though the prices have risen greatly.

And individual allotments in the public assistance programs have not been increased for several years, though prices of nearly everything have increased. This has been one of the reasons for the increase in the number of requests for food stamps. As people have had to use more of their public assistance money for other expenses, they have relied more heavily on the food stamps.

He also explained that additional frustrations caused by rising prices and cold weather would affect people, including those on public assistance.

Joe Wakefield, a service supervisor of the agency, said that as the fuel gets more scarce and more expensive, people will be burning wood more often, which requires additional care. He explained that in poorly constructed houses, this may be a more serious problem.

And these problems are compounded for the elderly people who are on a fixed income, according to Isabelle Robinson, coordinator of ECKAN's Meals on Wheels program. She explained that many of the elderly people to whom she delivers meals can not provide for themselves and are on a fixed income, yet must pay rising prices.

The two agencies are working together and separately to try to ease some of the problems. The staff members have called upon churches for additional assistance. Many of the local churches have special funds and programs to help people in need. One local minister said his church paid at least \$600 in 1973 to people who needed it. He explained that in distributing the funds, the church usually works with the Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services.

Richard Jackson, Manpower director of ECKAN, said that although his agency has no special funds for the emergency programs, he is working with the Franklin County Action Group to sponsor a dance with profits going into the emergency fund. The fund, he explained, would be to help people pay rising food and utility costs during the winter. He said he is trying to organize a benefit basketball game with profits also going to the fund.

Mrs. Robinson said Bendix Home Systems, Inc., has donated more than 20 pieces of carpet, many of them quite large, to be used in homes of the needy. She explained that some of them will be given to the meals on

wheels recipients, many of whom have bare floors and little heat.

Mrs. Loyd pointed out that food stamps can greatly aid the low-income family. She said some people are hesitant about applying for food stamps because they consider them a type of "welfare." However, she explained that the stamps, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, can result in significant savings to those who qualify to receive the stamps.

Jackson and Mrs. MacNevin said they are establishing a clearing house where donated money and materials could be distributed to those in the greatest need. With the cooperation of all the agencies and organizations, they explained the problems of the poor and elderly faced with rising costs could more easily be taken care of.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM CLAY DISCUSSES THE PRESIDENT'S TAX SITUATION

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, regretably our great Nation is undergoing a crisis in moral leadership as exemplified by the Watergate incident and other subsequent disheartening revelations. These revelations serve not only to destroy the faith of our great people in their chosen leaders, but hurt the noble institutions we serve as well.

My distinguished colleague, WILLIAM L. CLAY of Missouri, a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor and a highly respected member of the Congressional Black Caucus—whose outstanding achievements in social and economic legislation are well-known—recently wrote an article which appeared in the Boston Globe on January 28, 1974.

In this article, entitled "All Agree Nixon Defrauded Government of Income Taxes," Congressman CLAY forcefully spoke of another instance of the callous and morally bankrupt behavior of the Nixon administration and the President himself.

I commend Mr. CLAY for these thought-provoking remarks and hope that my colleagues will read this article by my distinguished colleague. The text follows:

ALL AGREE NIXON DEFRAUDED GOVERNMENT OF
INCOME TAXES

(By WILLIAM CLAY)

Our nation finds itself engulfed in strenuous debate concerning President Nixon's involvement or lack of involvement in Watergate. There is room for honest disagreement on this question. But on the question of Mr. Nixon's financial situation there seems to be unanimity. All agree that the President has defrauded the U.S. government of legitimate taxes.

The colloquy in the Capitol concerning this matter has reached the level of hilarious proportion. But to top IRS administrators the President's deceit and lawlessness is not a laughing matter.

In view of the anticipated consequences of it becoming public knowledge that the President has cheated on his income taxes, the IRS has taken steps to offset wholesale cheat-

ing by the general populace. In a bold move, the IRS requested that the President include in his budget money for 1200 additional agents. This request was prompted by estimates that the government stands to lose several billion dollars as a result of Mr. Nixon's shenanigans with his income taxes. Millions of Americans will attempt to find the loopholes and follow the illustrious lead Mr. Nixon has set.

In answering accusations of tax evasion and improper use of Government funds, Mr. Nixon's strategy in part is to proclaim his innocence by displaying his generosity. But my advice is to beware of the Greeks who bear gifts. In the case of Mr. Nixon there is certainly a motive lurking underneath. His defense of having taken \$576,000 tax deduction for his Vice Presidential papers is that he would gladly pay the taxes and take the papers back. However, the real inference is that by generously giving the papers to the National Archives, Nixon passed up an opportunity to realize a much greater profit. All who believe that a man petty enough to deduct a \$1.53 interest payment to a department store will voluntarily recede on a \$482,019 deduction should stand on their heads. Mr. Nixon's belated claim of virtue does not in anyway coincide with his reputation and most certainly does not dispel the serious charge that the requirements of law were not followed in making the gift.

In fact there is now reason to believe that the IRS never checked or approved the deduction for the gift as two of Mr. Nixon's lawyers claimed. Two key figures who would have been consulted in such an audit—Arthur Sampson, Director of the General Services Administration parent agency of the National Archives, and Ralph Newman, the appraiser who evaluated the Nixon papers—both say they were not approached by the IRS.

In addition, allegations of improper Government expenditure on the President's San Clemente estate and a failure to pay capital gains taxes on the sale of his New York apartment and part of the California estate have been raised. In an attempt to stifle the criticism surrounding his western White House the President has now offered to donate it to the Government after he and his wife die. One good reason for doing this would be that he could further claim a tax write-off by donating it. This writeoff could be substantial since the property value has been enhanced by more than \$6 million in Federal outlays. If Mr. Nixon believes that such a generosity would allay questions of his improper expenditures and tax evasion then he is naive beyond belief. This is too serious a matter to be cloaked in generosity and then just forgotten. Anyway, what makes Mr. Nixon think the people want a gift that might stand as a monument to its most corrupt, most callous President.

Incredible, is it not, that the President paid only \$792.81 in 1970 taxes, \$878.72 in 1971, and \$4,298 last year on a total income of millions.

My advice to the President is—no more gimmicks, no more gifts, just pay your taxes as all other citizens do.

LAURELS FOR 1973 IN AEROSPACE

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following editorial from Aviation Week & Space Technology, December 17, 1973, issue, listing persons who have made contributions to the world of aerospace during 1973:

LAURELS FOR 1973

(By Robert Hotz)

Here are the people we think made meritorious contributions to the world of aerospace during 1973:

William P. Clements, Jr., deputy secretary of defense, for his hard-nosed realism in demanding practical operational requirements from the military services and accurate cost performance from contractors and forcefully and candidly projecting defense procurement needs to Congress.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Peled, commander of the Israeli air force, for the magnificent performance of the command he directed in the October War facing tougher opposition, more complex problems and more critical responsibility than the air force faced during the 1967 war and achieving even more decisive results.

Lucien Servanty, technical director of Aerospatiale, for a lifetime of advancement of the aeronautical state of the art, which ended in October.

Arthur Kelly, president of Western Airlines, for leading his airline into a highly efficient and profitable operation after taking over the helm shortly after the CAB's disapproval of Western's merger with American.

William Podolny, manager of Pratt & Whitney Aircraft's fuel cell program, for bringing a new technology developed for the Apollo program to a state of the art where it is practical for widespread public utility power applications in the energy crisis.

Charles A. Sewell, Grumman chief test pilot, for his highly skilled test flying of the F-14 fighter in the low-speed, high-angle-of-attack envelope and testing of spin-prevention avionics hardware that has made a significant contribution in enabling a pilot to obtain maximum combat performance from the aircraft without risking loss of control.

Jean Franchi and Gilbert Defer, pilots of the Anglo-French Concorde pre-production prototype, for their demonstration of the supersonic transport in a practical airline routine during their epochal operation across the Atlantic to North and South America.

Kenneth Richardson, Phoenix missile division manager for Hughes Aircraft Co., and Cdr. John C. Weaver, Navy deputy F-14 program manager for Phoenix, for their combined efforts to develop the long range AIM-54 air-to-air missile and bring it to operational effectiveness as a major improvement in air defense capability.

Sergei K. Tumansky, leading gas turbine engine designer in the USSR, for a lifetime of contribution to advanced jet engine development, which ended this year.

Richard O'Melia of the Civil Aeronautics Board and Patrick J. Brennan of the International Air Transport Assn. for their leadership in vigorous and realistic enforcement campaigns against illegal fares and charters, slapping heavy fines on flagrant airline violators and making them stick.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D.-Wash.), for his persistently perceptive and realistic appraisal

of the pitfalls developing in the whole fabric of U.S.-USSR detente, from the trading away of U.S. strategic superiority at SALT to the one-sided technological trade deals proposed by the Soviets, and for standing firm in his position despite intense Administration pressure.

Kenneth S. Kleinknecht, Skylab project manager, Eugene Kranz, chief flight controller, and his five operational controllers, Philip Shaffer, Donald Puddy, Milton Windler, Charles Lewis and Nell Hutchinson, for their work in operating around Skylab systems damage and malfunctions, which kept Skylab functioning through three historic and scientifically productive missions that would otherwise have been aborted.

Jack Kinzler and his technical services division at NASA's Johnson Space Center for their six-day emergency design and development of the solar parasol that kept Skylab operational.

Richard Gieselhart, experimental psychologist, crew station design facility at USAF Aeronautical Systems Div., for his continuing contributions to crew safety and effectiveness through research on control systems and instrumentation.

Nikolai Kamov, who headed his own design bureau in the USSR from 1948 until his death last month, for a lifetime of contributions to helicopter development.

Rowland E. Brown, head of Boeing's 747 product development program, who revitalized the giant jet production future with such innovations as the special performance (747SP) version and new cargo applications.

Donald Button and Frank C. Black of the Canadian Air Transportation Administration, for their work in developing a practical STOL traffic control and navigation system in highly congested metropolitan areas, making possible the first true city-center STOL airline operation between Ottawa and Montreal.

Bernard J. O'Brien, program manager, and Herb Lassen, spacecraft designer, both of TRW, Inc., Systems Group, for their contributions to the Pioneer 10 spacecraft that voyaged 525 million mi. to Jupiter and transmitted basic new data on this planet, including the picture on the cover of this issue.

Robert D. Hofstetter of NASA Ames Research Center and Walter L. Natzic of Bendix Field Engineering Corp. for directing the Pioneer mission control center that successfully guided Pioneer 10 on its flight to Jupiter. Louis A. Watts and Samuel Pellicori of Santa Barbara Research Center for designing Pioneer 10's imaging system and Ralph Baker, University of Arizona, who designed the realtime viewing system.

Beverly Jean Raposa, Eastern Airlines Lockheed L-1011 stewardess, for her heroic conduct in directing the rescue of survivors after the crash of her aircraft in the Everglades swamps last Dec. 29. Although suffering serious internal injuries, she led survivors out of the waist-deep water to higher ground, shouted warnings against lighting matches in the dark swamp to prevent igniting aircraft fuel spillage and calmed the injured by leading them in Christmas carols that also helped ground searchers locate the site where 99 others died.

FOOD AND GOOD COMPANY FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a significant story, which appeared in the Washington Post on January 30,

1974, on a nutrition program supported by the Nutrition for the Elderly Act.

The program described in the article provides to senior citizens meals prepared and catered by the Hebrew Home in Rockville, Md., 5 days a week.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Minnie Michaelson, a widow suffering from arthritis and failing eyesight, said to Judy Luce Mann of the Post:

It's wonderful to have programs like this. You're home alone, you have to wait for people to shop for you. Volunteers pick you up and you have a marvelous meal. You get together to meet people. When you get home you feel you've had a marvelous day.

Mr. Speaker, let me also advise my colleagues that on February 13 and 14, the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, will begin hearings on H.R. 10551, a bill—introduced by the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, and me, along with over 140 cosponsors—to extend for 3 years the Nutrition for the Elderly Act.

Mr. Speaker, the article to which I have earlier referred follows:

MAGIC OF A HOT MEAL—ELDERLY FIND WARMTH, FRIENDSHIP AT LUNCHEON

(By Judy Luce Mann)

Minnie Michaelson, a widow who is troubled with arthritis and failing eye-sight, was having a wonderful time yesterday. So were Adolphe Pocialo, despite loneliness and three operations in the past year, and Gertrude Dobkin, who has been through one throat and five eye operations and can barely see.

They were among about 30 senior citizens who arrived at Adas Israel Congregation, 2850 Quebec St. NW, about 11 a.m. and stayed until 2 p.m. to talk, eat, play cards and be entertained by 10 children from the congregation's nursery school.

The scene is repeated four days a week at Adas Israel. Similar programs for people over 60 are starting all over the country, most of them in churches, senior citizens centers and high rises that cater to the elderly. They are financed by \$99.6 million in federal money, and the major effort is to give hot meals and warm companionship to the elderly.

"It's wonderful to have programs like this," said Mrs. Michaelson. "You're home alone, you have to wait for people to shop for you. They (congregation volunteers) pick me up. You have a marvelous meal. You get together to meet people. When you get home you feel you've had a marvelous day."

Mrs. Michaelson, reluctant to give her age—"my children don't even know it"—finally admitted to being 81. "I waited on my family all my life. Now we're waited on here. I wish in my mother's day when she needed it. . . ."

The lunch was prepared and catered by the Hebrew Home in Rockville and included tomato juice, roast chicken, mashed potatoes, peas, carrot salad, prunes, coffee or tea. "And it's all kosher," said Mrs. Michaelson. "This lady isn't Jewish and she's enjoying it," she said, nodding toward a woman sitting across the table.

The woman, who said she was Mrs. Evans, did not want to give her full name, saying "it's my first time." She was the only gentle among the six people at her table, and when she said, "What's the difference between kosher and Jewish," she heard five people answering her simultaneously.

"Jewish people are not allowed to eat veins," began Mrs. Michaelson, and she went on to explain how meats are prepared. "No vein. No vein," she emphasized. "It takes

years of study" to prepare and inspect the food, she said.

Most of the senior citizens said they heard about the program through other members of the congregation. Pocialo, a retired technical librarian and information specialist, said: "Some ladies I know told me about it. In the last year I've been very unhappy because I've had surgery three times. They told me about the food service here and I came. For the price it's impossible to get anywhere."

The people are asked to donate 75 cents to the over-all program—which includes movies, lectures and any health and social counseling they need—although no fee is charged for the lunch.

The Adas Israel project is one of six that will ultimately be sponsored with federal money given to the Episcopal Diocese of Washington. Vanette Graham, project director for the diocese, said Southeast House, Friendship House, the Urban League, and Change, Inc., are in the process of setting up similar projects and that ultimately more than 1,000 senior citizens will receive hot meals each day.

The District received \$498,000 from the Health, Education and Welfare Department for the program for a 12-month period. Maryland received \$1,471,149 and Virginia, \$1,787,289. Both states are now in the process of setting up similar projects, according to HEW and state officials.

Adas Israel's project was the first to serve kosher food in the area, according to Ruth W. Breslow, one of its organizers. "We are the only kosher program, I think, south of New York and north of Miami. One of the provisions of the act is that you honor ethnic preferences of the older people. That's why kosher seemed like it would fit in nicely."

It did yesterday. After lunch, the children from the nursery school got up from their table and, joining hands in a circle began singing, "Good day, everybody." There was polite applause and murmurs of "very good," from the audience.

Then, led by Alice Haber, their teacher, they launched into a number of Hebrew songs and dances, and within minutes the tables were being moved back to make space.

It was too much for Mrs. Dobkin. She got up from her chair, joined the children and led them in several chants, all the while dancing with them around in a circle, to the delight of the other older people.

After the last chant, she gathered the children around her and blessed them.

KROGH'S SENTENCE NO OUTRAGE

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, the January 31, 1974, issue of the Detroit News carried an important column by Carl Rowan. I include it in the RECORD for the interest of my colleagues.

COMPARE IT TO SPIRO AGNEW'S, FOR EXAMPLE—KROGH'S SENTENCE NO OUTRAGE

(By Carl T. Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—Watergate is a bitterly divisive issue under any circumstances but it splits families and friends when something pops up like that six-month prison sentence for Egil Krogh Jr.

No. 2 Son is outraged that the man who directed the White House plumbers in the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist didn't get something closer to the 10 years Judge Gerhard Gesell could have given him. This college-age son angrily compares Krogh's sentence with the lengthy terms in jail young people have been given for smoking a marijuana cigarette.

It's not just a generation thing. Some of my 40-ish journalistic colleagues say they feel nausea over the "leniency" shown Krogh.

It soon becomes obvious my journalistic conferees are angry because Krogh not only failed to "spill his guts" and throw the impeachment process into high gear; he made a statement that helped to bail some water out of President Nixon's sinking ship.

When I weigh all the factors I part company with both son and colleagues. I find six months in prison a stiff enough penalty for Krogh. After all, his crime was not nearly so venal as that of the former vice-president, Spiro Agnew, who got no prison term at all.

And Krogh has expressed remorse. He has warned the American people the plumbers set forth in the name of preserving freedom and wound up destroying personal liberty themselves. This sort of thing, he says, society must protect itself against.

Agnew hasn't expressed any sorrow to the nation. Watergate principals who are guiltier of much more than Krogh have not expressed one iota of penitence. And they don't have Krogh's legitimate argument that—foolish, illegal and stupid though the burglary may have been—he had an approved memorandum from presidential aide John Ehrlichman that Krogh at least interpreted to mean that the burglary was an official governmental action. Judge Gesell noted "a wholly improper illegal task was assigned to (Krogh) by higher authorities."

Finally, I think about what six months in prison means to a lawyer who once held power and had dreams of glory. With disbarment a distinct likelihood, that prison term and all the stigma that will go with it can be a pretty devastating blow to a man who apparently walked the straight line of honesty until he got "used" by the power-seekers.

The critics of Judge Gesell's sentence bounce back with the argument that Krogh "conned" the special prosecutor and the judge and got his "light" sentence on everyone's expectation he would "sing" and implicate Mr. Nixon in a politically fatal way. They don't believe he is remotely penitent.

Maybe I'm a sucker to believe anything from anyone connected with Watergate. But I want to believe Krogh when he says Mr. Nixon gave him no specific order to burglarize Dr. Lewis Fielding's office.

Wasn't it enough Mr. Nixon gave general approval to the T. C. Huston plan, which included illegal burglaries? Isn't it enough Mr. Nixon himself said he "did impress upon Mr. Krogh the vital importance for the national security of his assignment?" Why should Krogh have gotten orders from Mr. Nixon's lips when orders almost always went through either H. R. Haldeman or Ehrlichman?

I don't bear ill will against Krogh because he refused to jazz up his statement so as to try to drag the President into disgrace with him. There is plenty of damning evidence around without pressuring Krogh or anyone else to lie. I just feel sorry for Krogh, who will suffer so much for one foolish crime which he thought was cleansed by patriotism, even as those guilty of uglier Watergate offenses may never spend a day in prison stripes.

THE SOVIET WHEAT DISASTER LIVES ON

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the January 26 edition of the Washington

Star-News reported the following item:

For the first time since World War II, there are no U.S. import quotas on wheat. As of today and through June 30, wheat and flour will be allowed to come into the country to prevent a possible shortage and rising bread prices.

This situation can only be described as absurd. In 1972, the United States sold about 400 million bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union on the most incredibly generous—or should I say stupid?—terms. President Nixon's agreement with the Kremlin made available to the Soviet Union \$750 million in credit. In addition, the Department of Agriculture paid over \$300 million in subsidies to U.S. exporters who sold the wheat.

Aided by these massive Government credits and subsidies, the Soviet Union cornered about one-fourth of the entire U.S. crop. According to a study by the General Accounting Office, this large sale "caused a dramatic rise in the price of U.S. wheat." Domestic wheat prices shot up from \$1.68 a bushel in July of 1972 to \$3 a bushel in May of 1973. Today, the average price of wheat in the Chicago area stands at about \$5.75 a bushel.

The Soviet wheat disaster does not stop here, however. Now the United States is forced to lift its wheat import quotas in order to meet the needs of American consumers. The Agriculture Department has predicted that our wheat reserves may be down to 178 million bushels by July 1, the lowest since 1947. After the hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat shipped to the Soviet Union and subsidized by the American taxpayer, the United States now will be importing wheat to meet the requirements of its own citizens.

Is it not time that the present administration paid more attention to the needs of American citizens rather than pursuing the illusory dream of détente with the Soviet Union?

MISLEADING BRAND NAMES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today's shopper is confronted with many products on supermarket shelves and in food establishments whose brand names are inherently misleading.

I am referring to products—such as McDonald's Quarter Pounder, Hi-C fruit juices, and Wonder Bread—which can and do mislead the public as to a product's performance capabilities, value or quantity and quality of contents.

In addition, the names of a number of other products—such as Ultra Brite toothpaste, Compoz, 5-Day Deodorant Pads, Sleep-Eze, and No-Doz—could potentially mislead the consumer, in my opinion. Ultra Brite, for instance, has never substantiated the impression conveyed by its name that it gives the brightest teeth possible. The performance capabilities of these and other grandiosely named products should be

subject to strict requirements of proof—something that has not been done.

To help rectify this situation, I have introduced legislation that would effectively ban the use of misleading product brand names. The bill would make the advertising of such names a violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act unless the manufacturer can demonstrate that the product lives up to its name.

This legislation is necessary, because the Federal Trade Commission has refused to crack down on these practices and instead is showing increasing tolerance of advertising abuses. The bill is also needed, because no amount of corrective advertising can overcome an impression about a product created by a well-advertised brand name.

The FTC recently rejected my complaint that McDonald's was guilty of false advertising. Despite the fact that U.S. Department of Agriculture tests revealed that the average weight of the Quarter Pounders was far below the required 4 ounces—the average weight was only 2½ to 2¾ ounces—the FTC ruled that no false advertising was involved. Their reasoning, which I found faulty, was that "cooked beef products such as this are traditionally and uniformly sold on the basis of their precooked weight * * *."

McDonald's is now advertising that they "start out with a quarter pound of beef," but the impression that remains with the consumer is that a quarter pound of beef is actually served.

Manufacturers should not be allowed to grossly mislead the public with their brand names. Since the FTC refused to act, Congress must act, instead.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill.

FAIRNESS FOR POSTAL SUPERVISORS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as we all well know, there have been many, many disappointments since the creation of the U.S. Postal Service as a result of the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 and, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities, Mail, and Labor Management of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have taken a great interest in these problems and have, when necessary, introduced remedial legislation.

One troubling matter is the status of the postal supervisors who, under the U.S. Postal Service, were to have consultative rights in matters affecting them.

In practice, the postal supervisors have charged, with considerable justification in my opinion, that the Postal Service's idea of consultative rights is to make a decision and then inform the supervisors.

To correct this problem, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 7202, which would provide for an arbitration board to settle disputes between supervisors organizations and the U.S. Postal Service.

In the current edition of the *Federal Times*, February 6, 1974, Dan Jaspan—the very able administrative vice president of the National Association of Postal Supervisors—discusses in some detail the need for such legislation.

The article follows:

POSTAL SUPERVISORS' CASE FOR ARBITRATION

(By Daniel Jaspan)

Many readers of *Federal Times* may be surprised to see the name—National Association of Postal Supervisors—as were the industry-oriented officials of the U.S. Postal Service when they took over the reins and found in USPS an association composed of management employees. Such an organization is unheard of in the private sector.

It is not a new association. It was founded in 1908 when a courageous group of postal supervisors jeopardized their livelihoods by meeting in Louisville, Ky., to organize. In those days, it was difficult to form any association of postal employees since postal employees were not permitted to organize, but the idea of a management association seemed as preposterous to most people in those days as it apparently seemed to Postmaster General Blount and his official family shortly after the election of President Nixon.

Although classified as "management," supervisors had generally been treated as glorified craft employees before and years after founding of our association. It took many years of dedicated work to achieve proper recognition by the Post Office Department and Congress. However, that recognition had come about long before establishment of the quasipublic corporation in 1971.

The first real recognition of the various postal organizations was President Kennedy's Executive Order 10988, which granted three forms of recognition: exclusive, formal and informal.

The National Association of Postal Supervisors believed—as a long-standing organization of postal supervisors, representing all supervisors in the U.S. postal field service—it should have been entitled to exclusive recognition. But this request was turned down because only management employees were represented and the association was granted "formal recognition," the same as an organization representing as little as 10 percent of its potential membership.

Even though NAPS did not achieve exclusive recognition, it was granted regularly scheduled consultative sessions on the national, regional and local post office levels. Although we did not always achieve our objectives during these sessions, our problems were fully explored and decisions were made.

Under the Nixon administration, the EO 11491 superseded the Kennedy order. Postal supervisors were continued under formal recognition. However, consultative sessions were reduced unilaterally by the Post Office Department and few problems were resolved at the top level. Then came the Postal Reorganization Act.

The National Association of Postal Supervisors was and still is in favor of postal reform. We supported fully the Dulski bill, H.R. 4, which would have achieved postal reform without the radical surgery of the other legislation. We testified in favor of H.R. 4 and in opposition to H.R. 17070, which was enacted. We based our testimony on our strong belief that this legislation would mean decreased service and increased rates, among other reasons.

When it became evident that, in spite of our opposition, the Postal Reorganization Act would become law, we appealed to our friends on Capitol Hill to protect associations such as NAPS.

A section was placed in the bill to provide "a program for consultation with recognized

organizations of supervisory and other managerial personnel who are not subject to collective bargaining agreements" under the proposed new law. The bill further provided that an organization such as ours "shall be entitled to participate directly in the planning and development of pay policies and schedules, fringe benefit programs, and other programs relating to supervisory and other managerial employees."

The original bill provided for arbitration in case of impasses. However, this part was stricken from the bill when most of our congressional friends were not on the floor of the House. There were fewer than 100 out of the 435 members of Congress present at that time. This important provision was never reinstated.

The top officials in charge when the Post Office Department became the U.S. Postal Service discontinued consultative sessions, and never complied with the provisions of the law to establish "a program of consultation." Their idea of consultation was to act and then notify NAPS of their actions.

The most notorious example was the establishment of the job evaluation program, based on a very expensive (\$3.5 million) contract awarded to Westinghouse Electric which had never done any position evaluating. We did not participate directly in the planning and development of the job evaluation program—which downgraded about 50 percent of the supervisory positions—as provided by law and the result was a lawsuit against USPS initiated by NAPS.

The request made by NAPS for an injunction against initiating the Westinghouse job evaluation was denied at the U.S. District Court level on the grounds that irreparable damage would not be caused by the USPS action. The written decision stated that "to participate directly in the planning and development" does not mean that our association must be present at the inception of the program.

It has always been difficult for my untrained mind to understand how anyone can "participate directly in the planning and development" without participating from the very beginning.

The decision of the judge has been appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals. The attorneys for the USPS and NAPS have submitted their further arguments to the court and are awaiting a call to appear before the Court of Appeals for oral presentations.

The first we really learned about the Westinghouse contract was when hearings were scheduled by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to investigate why the contract was awarded to the highest bidder with little or no position evaluation experience. At least a half-dozen experienced position evaluation companies were bypassed even though they submitted lower bids. At the conclusion of the hearings the committee made several recommendations including the following:

The postal service should declare the contract with Westinghouse null and void and seek legal redress for moneys already paid to Westinghouse.

The postal service should solicit new bids to complete the job evaluation project.

The postal service should immediately take appropriate personnel action against those employees of the postal service who, at the very least, demonstrated poor judgment in awarding the contract to Westinghouse.

The committee also decided to send the record to the Justice Department with the recommendation that it take such action as is appropriate under the circumstances and requested that the Justice Department report its decision to the committee.

As of this writing, none of the recommended action has been taken by USPS nor has the Department of Justice made a report to Congress.

Since the postal service completely ignored

the provisions of the Postal Reorganization Act relating to consultation, the association necessarily turned to Congress for relief.

Congressman Charles H. Wilson, chairman of the House subcommittee on postal facilities, mail and labor management, introduced HR 7202, a bill to provide that, in case of impasses on major items, an arbitration board would settle such disputes. The board would be composed of three members: one chosen by NAPS, one chosen by USPS and a third selected by the other two.

This bill was co-sponsored by about 80 members of Congress and an identical bill was introduced on the Senate side by Sen. Quentin Burdick and was co-sponsored by Humphrey, Hart and Hartke. When hearings were held by the Wilson subcommittee in June, there was the largest turnout of members of the House committee in the memory of most people present.

Further action by the subcommittee and the full committee is expected shortly on this very important bill. During a legislative conference held by NAPS last year, practically all members of Congress were contacted and most of them pledged support of the legislation.

Two of the most difficult decisions in the history of our organizations were to bring suit against the postal service and to have the arbitration bill introduced. However, both actions were necessitated by the fact that USPS officials apparently feel that postal supervisors should be seen and not heard.

"WE TOLD YOU SO, MR. BIAGGINI"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the Federal innovations which we hope will succeed is that of Amtrak and its efforts to renovate long-distance passenger service. Columnist Mike O'Neal of the *Harvey Star Tribune*, in a column of January 31, dramatically reports his experiences aboard an Amtrak passenger train. I believe his constructive criticism and comments on the subject are worthy of review, therefore, I insert the article into the *RECORD* at this time.

"WE TOLD YOU SO, MR. BIAGGINI"

(By Mike O'Neal)

If you've been around a railroad passenger station lately, you may have seen some people standing around with expensive cameras around their necks and incredibly smug looks on their faces.

These people are railfans and most of them are still in a stupor over the renaissance of inter-city rail passenger service. It wasn't so long ago that the railfan seemed to be the only friend of the passenger train.

The federal government's transportation policies seemed to deal with building more and more and wider and wider expressways, and with handing out money to airlines to subsidize feeder routes.

The railroads themselves certainly weren't interested in reviving the passenger train. Most, in fact, took delight in thinking up ways of discouraging passenger traffic. The Southern Pacific railroad, under the direction of its president, B. F. Biaggini, conducted the most vocal anti-passenger campaign, declaring at every possible opportunity that the "passenger train was dead in the west." The SP sold airline tickets at its passenger stations and was before the Interstate Commerce Commission almost daily

with petitions to discontinue passenger trains.

The SP, in fact, devised perhaps the sneakiest trick of all in trying to get rid of its passenger trains. The SP persuaded the ICC to allow it to drop daily service in many routes and substitute trains that ran only three times a week. The SP's three-times-a-week trains operated on schedules that even a railfan couldn't remember, much less an ordinary traveler seeking to get from point A to point B.

In May, 1971, however, things began to change. A new quasi-governmental corporation known as Amtrak was created. Its job was to take over inter-city passenger trains. Railfans saw a bright new day, a new beginning. Biaggini thought Amtrak should preside over the dismemberment of the rail passenger network in an orderly manner. Many thought the passenger train had a future only in the "northeast corridor" between Boston and Washington.

Then the energy crisis came along. Gasoline suddenly became in short supply. Airlines started cutting back on their flights. People again turned to the trains.

During the past few months, Amtrak has shown astounding gains in passenger traffic. Passenger loadings in November, 1973, were 50 per cent higher than November, 1972. Amtrak, though, has begun to show signs of strain, especially during holiday rush periods when just about every passenger car that can roll, and a few that can't, are pressed into service.

I've been a railfan since I was old enough to realize what trains were. I've even managed to convert my wife, Pat, to a railfan. When we got married a little over two years ago, Pat couldn't tell the difference between a handcar and an E-8. Now one of her favorite pastimes is to curl up with a copy of Amtrak's national timetable and figure out different trips we could take. She knows that Southern 4501 is a steam locomotive operated by the Southern railway in excursion service, and not a phone number.

Pat's actually responsible for my latest experience with Amtrak. Pat, my mother-in-law, Mrs. Margaret Leinen, and I had planned a trip to Bloomington, Ill., for a weekend visit with Pat's sister and her husband.

It was Pat's idea to take the train instead of fighting the traffic and searching for open gasoline stations along U.S. 66. I didn't need much convincing and so on a recent Saturday morning we found ourselves in Joliet Union station awaiting the arrival of Amtrak Train 307, the Weekender, which operates between Chicago and St. Louis on Saturdays and Sundays in place of the new French turbofan, which runs on weekdays.

I started to have some doubts about the venture when I overheard two college-age persons talking about how one of them tried to get on a southbound train the night before, but gave up because the train was packed with people standing in the aisles and vestibules. A fairly large crowd had gathered at Joliet that morning and since none of them had cameras around their necks or employee timetables in their back pockets, I knew they had to be paying passengers and not railfans out for a day of picture-taking.

The Weekender was late in arriving at Joliet and for a while I pictured a huge riot at Chicago's Union station as people fought each other to get a seat on the train. When the train did arrive, however, the coach behind the locomotive was empty and ready to receive the Joliet passengers.

We climbed aboard and took two sets of seats next to each other. Actually, Pat and her mom got on the train first and found a pair of seats for themselves. They then got a seat for me by throwing a pork roast we were bringing to Bloomington for

Sunday dinner on the seat in front of them, thus discouraging another couple from taking it.

I deposited our suitcases in a special luggage area at the end of the car and made my way to the seats. The car itself was a delight. It had apparently been recently refurbished with carpeting extending half-way up the walls and reclining seats with leg-rests. Pat and her mom liked it so much they made some comments about going all the way to St. Louis.

We pulled out of Joliet about 15 minutes late and were on our way for a pleasant ride to Bloomington. The roadbed was relatively smooth and we travelled at close to the maximum speed of 79 miles-per-hour, passing cars and trucks on the adjoining U.S. 66 as if they were standing still. The roadbed was the biggest surprise of the trip, since it belongs to the Illinois Central Gulf railroad. Travel along the ICG's Chicago-New Orleans route had been an ordeal recently with numerous slow orders because of a crumbling roadbed. If the ICG let that happen to its main line, what would be mostly-passenger Chicago-St. Louis line be like?, I thought. Actually it wasn't bad at all.

A quick tour of the train revealed that all of the five cars had been refurbished. The heat in one of the cars was acting up, making it too hot for a comfortable ride, but other than that, everything seemed to be working fine. A disappointment was that the crew of the combination dome-snack-bar-coach was still trying to get their supplies in order and weren't open for business.

We would have arrived in Bloomington ahead of schedule, but the train got delayed just north of the Bloomington station by a northbound train that was loading passengers. As it was we stepped off the train at 10:30 a.m., about six minutes late.

I gave Amtrak a B-plus for the trip (the slight tardiness, the one overheated coach and the closed snack bar being my objections), got off the train and met my brother-in-law.

The trip back to Joliet, however, was a lot more hectic. To return, we chose to take Amtrak Train Number 306, also called the Weekender, on Sunday evening. The train was about a half-hour late arriving in Bloomington and we waited in the station with a large crowd. My brother-in-law remarked that he had picked up his wife at the station once and was the only person in the waiting room.

Now sitting around the Bloomington station isn't exactly a pleasant experience, even for a railfan. The interior of the building is painted a blah washed-out brown and features what has to be the steepest stairway in central Illinois. Actually, there's nothing wrong with the building that a wrecking ball couldn't cure.

The Weekender arrived at 8:17 p.m. (28 minutes late) and a surge of humanity left the station to get on. The conductor apparently knew he'd never be able to get through the train to collect the tickets, so he asked for them as we boarded.

We again entered the train through the first coach behind the locomotive. This time the car was filled to the brim. As was every other coach. We pushed our way through five coaches looking in vain for a seat. Each coach had its own personality. In one car, a group of people, obviously traveling together, were drinking and yelling things like, "Where are we now? Is this Springfield?" In another a guy made a pass at my wife.

Luck was with us, however, as we entered the sixth car on the train, the same dome-snack-bar-coach that had been in Saturday's consist. In the section of the car under the dome were a small galley that the crew used to sell food and drinks and a glassed-in compartment with two facing sofa-type seats that was used to store supplies for the galley. Well, the supplies were almost exhausted and

the room was almost empty. A young man (obviously a railfan, since he wrote down our departure time in a small book he was carrying and had an Amtrak identification card on his suitcase) was already seated there, so we decided to join him.

Pat cleared away some of the boxes and we all sat down for the trip back to Joliet. Some college-age women who got on at Bloomington joined us and we were on our way. The railfan left us, muttering something about trying to find a seat in the locomotive, and the five of us shared the European-type compartment all the way to Joliet.

It was a good thing we found that compartment since the only car on the train behind the dome car was filled with a kids hockey team.

We arrived in Joliet about 35 minutes late and managed to get off ahead of the young hockey players. For the northbound trip I gave Amtrak a C-minus citing the very tardy arrivals and the overcrowded conditions.

Yes, "Tracks Are Back" and its about time. I knew all along that Biaggini was wrong.

AN INDEPENDENT OIL MAN'S PLEA

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a constituent which eloquently sets forth the plight of the independent oil man—a situation which has not been the focus of the spotlight wielded so handily by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in the other body. I believe that the writer's story should be told; that their point of view should be heard. Too often the independent ethic is overlooked in an attempt to solve a national problem. Too often, when the rules are written and the Federal Government interjects itself into the breach, the very people who underwrite the franchise of this great Government are inconvenienced; indeed, it is they who bear the brunt of change no matter how well intended the panacea may be.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter in the RECORD at this point:

C & S OIL Co.,
Louisville, Ohio, January 23, 1974.

HON. RALPH REGULA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are small independent operators in the oil and gas industry. We are concerned now because of all the accusations being leveled against our industry and the unprecedented legislation now being proposed. All we hear about when you all speak of the industry is the "majors", as if the majors made up the whole industry. We are writing to remind you that they do not. Every oil man is not a Getty, Hunt or Rockefeller as every oil company is not a Standard Oil or a Texaco. There are literally millions of us "little guys" out here. We're not saying there are no "fat cats" in oil; we all know there are, just as there are in other industries. We're just saying they are the exception rather than the rule as everyone seems to believe.

We feel that a lot of politicians and the media are doing a disservice to the public by portraying the oil industry as a group of "fat cats" sitting around together plotting against the American public. Between two-thirds and three-fourths of all domestic wells drilled and nearly all domestic wildcatting (which

is tremendously important) is done by independent operators and we deeply resent the picture being painted of us.

We work hard for what we get—no forty hour work weeks in our business—and we certainly pay our share of taxes. In our opinion it is the most financially hazardous occupation there is. Every time you drill a well you gamble with the odds unbelievably against that well paying out. Talk to any small independent you find and chances are he'll tell you he's lost everything at least once in his life. An oil man is a peculiar type of person. Oil to us is not a job—it's a way of life and we love it. If we didn't we wouldn't stay in it. That is why it is so upsetting to see our work—our life—attacked. When you talk about oil depletion allowances, etc., you are talking about our life blood. We, as do other small operators, depend almost entirely on investment from outside individuals. Drilling, as we said before, is a risky business at best. Any problem in getting a well into production can wipe out any profit you could hope to make—not even mentioning the number of dry holes drilled trying to get a commercial well. Eight out of every ten wildcats drilled is a dry hole. Those are not good odds in anyone's language. The Bureau of Mines, Oil and Gas Division, at the individual state capitols keep records of all wells drilled and the production data on them. Look it up for your self. It should be no problem for you to find out how much a well costs. The Securities and Exchange Commission in either the state or Washington, D.C., depending upon where the independent raises his financing, controls how much the drilling and completion of a well can be sold for. You are probably saying to yourself that these are still figures provided by oilmen, but it has been our experience that the personnel at the Securities and Exchange are very well informed and up to date on current oilfield expenses. Then the Federal Power Commission controls the price we receive for our product.

There have to be good reasons for a speculator to invest with us. He has to feel he has a chance of making a profit that won't be eaten up with taxes. If he doesn't, he will use his money to buy bonds or something else safer. We need "outside investors" because oil men who can afford to invest, invest in their own wells. This brings me to the most important point—excess profits tax.

We deeply resent any excess profits tax as Americans in the free market tradition. Our industry is being singled out for punitive legislation. It implies we are making exorbitant profits and this is not true. Even by lumping the majors in with us independents the oil industry has a return on net worth no greater than that of similar industries. We wish we knew where the independent stood in that list; you can bet it would be way down the line. We think it is a very dangerous path to embark on when the government can tell us how much profit we are allowed to make. It is repulsive that supposedly patriotic Americans would even consider rearranging the free enterprise system. Even if the windfall tax measure is doctored up with the plowback option, it is still odious to be told how to invest my capital. Oil people, on the whole, have always "plowed back" their earnings. It is degrading for us and un-American for the government for us to be told "do it or lose it". It seems to us the industry has to make greater profits if we are to anywhere near keep up with the rising demand for petroleum products and if the independent is to remain in business at all. How can an industry expand without greater profits? The oil industry needs a staggering investment over the next few years. We should be encouraged to grow, people should be encouraged to invest, instead of throwing cold water on us. My husband has been an oil man for over fifty years. Never has such run down equipment been

used as is being used now. Personally, I have never seen a new rig.

If the independent oil man is squeezed out, which he surely will be if all this punitive legislation passes, this country will really be dependent upon foreign imports. The majors may control a lot of domestic production, but it is the independent who does the actual producing. It may be processed and marketed by the majors but it wouldn't be possible without us. If the independent elects to take a farm out, which includes the risks, from the major, the major retains an overriding royalty and control of all production. This does not take into account the tremendous amount of wildcatting and producing an independent does completely apart from the majors. The oil industry is a very complicated industry—different from all others. We deserve more than just a fleeting glance before irreparable damage is done by short sighted, uninformed persons. Kicking the oil and gas industry is now the "in" thing to do. It looks good to the "folks back home" when you can tell them how the rich oil companies are taking advantage of the hard working, long suffering little man, and how you are going to change all that by bringing the oil man down a peg or two. This is deception of the rankest kind.

The next time you look into those cameras and speak into those microphones, give a little thought to all us small oil companies out here. You can't afford to write us off.

Sincerely,

SUSAN ELESON.

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION BILL

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, the House of Representatives will be called to act upon the bill establishing the Federal Energy Administration. Although the Government Operations Committee which reported the bill maintains that the bill is designed to merely reorganize and consolidate certain energy functions of the Federal Government, I feel that the bill does much more than this, and for this reason I have considerable doubts about it. An editorial by Congressman JOHN MOSS in the January 28, 1974 Los Angeles Times reflects many of the concerns I have about the Energy Administration legislation. I urge my colleagues to give Congressman MOSS' comments the careful consideration they justly deserve.

The editorial follows:

REPRESENTATIVE MOSS URGES HOUSE TO LOOK CLOSER AT ITS VERSION OF THE ENERGY AGENCY

(By JOHN E. MOSS)

Under mounting pressure to adjourn for the holidays and in an emotional atmosphere created by the energy "crisis," the House Government Operations Committee, in the closing hours of the first session of the 93rd Congress, reported out a measure setting up a Federal Energy Administration.

The measure would create a superagency in the executive branch, with dictatorial powers over all policies and programs relating to energy, and, important though the bill is, the committee heard testimony from only two public witnesses and held hearings for fewer than nine hours.

The result was House Resolution 11793, a perfect example of the way government can suddenly create chaos out of confusion.

The measure is scheduled to go before the full House for a vote tomorrow. I only hope that my colleagues are more cautious and deliberative this time.

As it is now, the bill provides sweeping grants of power to the Federal Energy Administration with little regard to other laws enacted by Congress. For example, the provisions and powers provided in the National Energy Emergency Act, also currently under consideration would be totally ignored. Coordination with other governmental agencies in solving energy problems would not be encouraged, and there would be inadequate administrative procedures to insure accountability and due process.

The administrator of the energy agency would be given potentially unlimited powers over a myriad of energy-related problems. Such blank checks would include, as the committee report states, his power to be "a presidential adviser, a policy-maker, a planner, a coordinator, a manager, an expeditor, a monitor, a data collector, an analyst and a spokesman to the public on energy affairs."

Under such an arrangement, for example, the administrator could order stripmining of coal as well as mandatory development of oil and gas in the Navy's Elk Hills oil reserves, the Santa Barbara Channel and the continental shelf off the East Coast. All of this could be accomplished without regard for public opinion and state or federal laws pertaining to safety or the environment.

Under the resolution, the President, without congressional approval, would have the authority to reorganize existing governmental agencies. "Any functions" of four major departments—Treasury, Interior, Agriculture and Commerce—"which relate primarily to energy functions" could be transferred to the Federal Energy Administration. Rural electrification and mine safety programs and certain functions of the Internal Revenue Service and the Cost of Living Council, to name a few, could be transferred virtually overnight to the energy chief.

This act would also give the administrator sweeping powers to "collect" (by subpoena, if necessary) "energy information" from all persons "owning or operating facilities or business premises who are engaged in any phase of energy consumption."

Obviously, in order to facilitate wise energy policies, Congress and the American public need adequate data from federal and private sources, and particularly from major oil companies, but to require such information from every service station in the land is an indiscriminate approach that will harass mom-and-pop retail operations with bureaucratic overkill and red tape while yielding little substantive information.

A more salient problem is the blanket confidentiality given the energy administration by this bill. Although the agency would have the power to collect such data, it would not be allowed to make it available to Congress, the executive branch or the public. It is difficult to understand why the same Government Operations Committee that gave birth to the Freedom of Information Act could approve of such a repressive and antidemocratic provision.

Arguments can be made in support of the idea of a Federal Energy Administration. The legislation discussed here, however, would create more problems than it would solve—while establishing dangerous precedents for executive power.

We do not need a benign energy dictator to light our homes and heat our schools. For, just as war is too important to be left to the generals, America's energy policies are too vital to be left in the hands of one federal bureaucrats.

AID AND TRADE WITH THE COMMUNISTS—V

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, one of the perennial delusions of our foreign policymakers is that "peaceful coexistence" can be achieved with the Communists. Today "peaceful coexistence" is called "détente" or "rapprochement," apparently in the belief that giving something a French name increases its desirability. Or perhaps the terms were changed in the belief that the American people would not recognize the Communist slogan "peaceful coexistence" if the words were translated into a foreign language. Whatever the reason for the change, it is becoming increasingly clear that our foreign policymakers are determined to impose peaceful coexistence upon us, even at the risk of war with a military superior Communist bloc. In order to understand the meaning of the phrases "peaceful coexistence," "détente," "rapprochement," I ask that chapter 5 of Eugene Lyons' booklet "Operation Suicide" be entered into the RECORD at this point:

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

v

The confusions in American policy in large part derive from the 40-year-old slogan of "peaceful coexistence" revived and given a new polish by Khrushchev and his successors. All of them, to be fair, have tried hard to tell us that the phrase does not mean to them what it means to us, but the obsessed bridge-builders have steadfastly preferred to accept it at face value.

Pravda explained again in December, 1966 that the slogan "increases the opportunities for development of the class struggle through liberation wars." Brezhnev declared at a Moscow congress two months later: "We regard ourselves as part and parcel of the world system of socialism, a detachment of the world army of fighters for freedom . . . for the victory of socialism and communism all over the world." The Viet Cong delegate at the Havana Conference told reporters: "Within a short time there will not be just one but many Vietnams."

Secretary Rusk himself, before the American Political Science Association in Washington on September 8, 1965, said of the communists, "The strategy of trying to win control over Asia, Africa, and Latin America—thus encircling and strangling the Atlantic world—is common to all." A year later, he underscored this thought:

"The communist world has returned to the demand for what it calls a 'world revolution,' and to its support through what they call 'wars of liberation.'"

It is hard to believe that the Secretary who recognizes these facts can be in earnest about bridge-building illusions related to the Fulbright-Lippmann implication that communism has ceased to be a menace. As understood and described in Moscow and other communist capitals, "peaceful co-existence" is frankly a cover for intensified revolutionary work by all means short of general nuclear confrontation with the United States.

A few years ago, in a speech welcoming President Nkrumah of Ghana to Moscow, Khrushchev made a statement that deserves more emphasis than it received. "Even if all the countries of the world adopted a decision

which did not accord with the interests of the Soviet Union and threatened its security," he declared, "the Soviet Union would not recognize such a decision and would uphold its rights, relying on force."

Let the Rostows and Lippmanns square that with their versions of peaceful coexistence, or their belief that Soviet Russia can be fitted into their vision of a world of diversity. Even the *Washington Post*, a branch office of the bridge-building business, wrote editorially on August 23, 1966: "What is plain, however, is that the communist leaders, far from renouncing the cold war which they invented, are continuing to use it as a strategic tool."

The blind faith that the cold war is over, or about to be wound up amicably, is in the old pattern of euphoric behavior. In every previous time of self-induced optimism, too, its victims have argued to the same effect. No world dilemma has been so often "ended," only to reassert itself more strongly. Again it is assumed, in the words of Lippmann, that Soviet Russia has become "simply another world power." The implication is that we can now afford to ignore its revolutionary threats, its commitment to expanded subversion and its actual involvement in revolutionary violence from Southeast Asia and the Middle East to Latin America.

Yet the Kremlin has not retreated one inch from its global ambitions. When Marshal Lin Biao, Mao Tse-tung's war minister, outlined Chinese strategy for defeating the West through the "countryside"—the Afro-Asian and Latin American countries—American opinion was alarmed. In truth, however, there is no real difference between the Chinese and Soviet plans for isolating and strangling the Atlantic world through its soft underbelly of backward continents.

Anti-Western and anti-American propaganda from the Soviet bloc is greater and more vicious than ever before, despite our efforts to buy them off with trade. The huge network of Soviet schools training foreign leaders and guerrillas is as big and as busy as ever. How can these things be made to jibe with the bland assertion that the U.S.S.R. has become just another conventional power? How can the Soviet deployment of military force in Cuba be explained in terms of purely Russian national interests?

A *New York Times* article on February 26, 1967, sketching progress toward a detente, declared at one point that due to the turbulence in China, "Moscow has won its battle for authority in the communist world." It appears, therefore, that there is a communist world—most of it located within our world—over which Moscow seeks and has won "authority." There is no precedent in history for a garden-variety world power that sought dominance over political parties, undergrounds, and paramilitary forces in more than 80 other nations.

As long as communists instigate civil wars, train agents and guerrilla experts, maintain fifth columns in all non-communist countries, simple prudence should forbid us to ignore the persistence of the cold war. The President, in his 1967 State of the Union message, said that we should take steps "not to continue the cold war but to end it." Unfortunately no war, hot or cold, can be called off unilaterally except by surrender, as he has learned from his Vietnam experience.

True, the communists have suffered some staggering defeats—in Indonesia, Ghana, Guinea, Brazil, the Dominican Republic. However, they did not withdraw anywhere because of change of policy—they were kicked out. Nor have they renounced their objectives in those areas and in the rest of the world. Their failures surely do not justify American action to equip them, militarily and economically, for bigger and better operations.

George Kennan, testifying before Senator Fulbright, proclaimed that "the unity of the

communist bloc is a matter of the past. . . . This Humpty Dumpty will not and cannot be reassembled." That is debatable and in the final analysis irrelevant, since the communists act as a unit when confronting our world.

Communism has always been wracked by factions and schisms, but has prospered to embrace a third of the human race notwithstanding. There have been a few exceptions (notably in India) but overwhelming, in the clinches, the Red oligarchs show remarkable cohesion as against their common enemy. They are absolutely unified on Vietnam. Curiously, Kennan also testified that the Soviet Union dared not "lay itself open to charges within the communist world of 'collaboration' with the United States." So again, there apparently is a communist world to which the Kremlin must cater—this despite the sad condition of his Humpty Dumpty.

We have tended to muddle our thinking by dividing the enemy into "good" and "bad" communists. There are even those who see a possible American alliance with the "good" species against the "bad." But given the current conclusions in China, we may have held the funeral over the "monolith" too soon.

One of the possible, and even likely, outcomes is a return of the "good" communists to power in China either through the defeat of Mao or after he passes from the scene—and with it the restoration of the "monolith" from the Elbe to the Pacific. The acknowledged leader of the anti-Mao factions, Liu Shao-chi, has always been looked upon, especially in Moscow, as pro-Soviet. A victory of those factions would unquestionably bring a Sino-Soviet *rapprochement* in its wake.

But should the quarrel lead to war, declared or undeclared, the Kremlin's obvious goal would be to impose a "friendly communist regime on China and with it, a return to 'fraternal unity.'" The idea of an American alliance in support of that objective is on the face of it, preposterous.

DISTINGUISHED PROFESSIONAL

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of pride that I note the accomplishment of Miss Linda D. Woodard in becoming a certified property manager.

In the real estate profession, which has historically been dominated by men, Miss Woodard at the young age of 29 has surpassed many of her male counterparts. In addition to her previous achievement of becoming a real estate broker, she is now one of only 70 women in the entire Nation who to date have earned acceptance through intensive examination as certified property manager in the 40-year-old elite Institute of Real Estate Management of the National Association of Realtors.

Miss Woodard is presently assistant to the general manager of the Charles Dunn Co., a major management and leasing organization in Los Angeles, Calif.

The official awarding of the certified property manager designation to Linda Woodward took place on Wednesday evening, January 23, 1974, at the Chancellor Hotel in Los Angeles, Calif.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 68

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the principle reasons for advocating strong handgun controls for all citizens is that handgun murders are not the products of criminal elements. More people are killed by friends, relatives, and neighbors than by unknown assailants.

A case in point is the tragic shooting of two students outside a local Washington junior high school.

During the argument that took place outside Alice Deal Junior High, James Atkinson, Jr., was shot; and although he was not killed, was partially paralyzed with a bullet lodged in his head. His chances for survival are slight.

These boys were not shot by hardened criminals who intended to rob them. They were assaulted because of an argument with some acquaintances.

The preponderance of guns in our country cannot help but result in countless tragic and needless deaths and injuries. The only satisfactory answer to this predicament is strong handgun legislation.

Included below is the article from the Washington Post, dated February 5, 1974:

ONE TEENAGER LEFT PARALYZED: TWO ALICE DEAL STUDENTS ARE SHOT IN FIGHT

(By Adam Shaw and Alfred E. Lewis)

Two 16-year-old students at Alice Deal Junior High School were shot yesterday, one of them critically, when an argument involving them and several other young people erupted in gunfire at 39th and Yuma Streets NW, metropolitan police said.

Police and hospital authorities said that James Everett Atkinson Jr., of 1819 Kilbourne Pl. NW, lay partially paralyzed and in critical condition last night at Sibley Hospital following the 1:30 p.m. affray during a school lunch break.

The second Alice Deal student, Arthur Byrd, suffered only a flesh wound in the chest and was released from Sibley a few hours after the shooting.

Police said their investigation indicated that the incident involved five or six teenagers, and that some of them were students at Wilson High School. They emphasized, however, that the incident was an isolated one and did not indicate tension between the two student bodies.

Doctors said young Atkinson had been shot once in the forehead and the bullet lodged in the back of his head. In addition to paralysis, the incident apparently cost him his speech. Surgeons decided yesterday against an immediate attempt to remove the bullet.

Police said the shots were fired by an unknown member of the group. The weapon was not recovered, but is believed to be a small caliber pistol. No arrests had been made last night.

The fight began, young Byrd told a reporter, when a friend of his and Atkinson who attends Wilson came to Alice Deal during the lunch break and said he had been "beaten up" by a group of young men, and asked his friends to help find them to settle accounts.

Byrd said he, Atkinson, two other Alice Deal students and the Wilson student spotted a group of three young men standing on 39th Street a few blocks from the

school. When they were approached, Byrd told the reporter, the youths retreated down Yuma Street and then shots rang out.

The father, James Atkinson, a research technician at the Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, said his son "loved to play the guitar very loud in the basement with his friends," and that he was "really no trouble to anyone, ever."

His wife, Mary, a practical nurse at Georgetown University Hospital still in her white-and-blue uniform while talking to a reporter, said of her son that "he was an ideal fellow."

The parents sat quietly on a couch until Dr. Carroll came to tell them about the operation.

He knelt by a low wooden table and told them their son was half paralyzed, couldn't speak and was in "very serious condition."

When he stopped speaking there was a silence. Mrs. Atkinson started to cry, softly at first, then, standing up, she choked, "Why to him? Why to him?"

She was taken to the emergency room and was given a sedative as her husband sat by his son's bedside in the intensive care unit.

Atkinson's sister, Valencia, 14, also a student at Alice Deal, said she was called out of a home economics class to be told the news. "I don't know why it happened," she said, "he wasn't a fighter or anything."

Lyman Warner, principal of the junior high school, said Atkinson was "having his best year in school," and was in "fine academic standing."

"When I heard the first shot, I thought they were kidding. No one thought it was a real gun or anything," Byrd said last evening. He was sitting in his home with a hand-sized bandage on his right chest where he had been shot.

"Then another two shots were fired," he said, "and that was when I and James were hit."

Paul Cassagnol, whose house is at the corner of 39th and Yuma Streets, said he heard shouts, but no gunfire.

"Then a very excited young man banged on the door saying 'someone has been shot, someone has been shot,'" he said.

Cassagnol said he called police, then looked outside to see young Atkinson lying on the sidewalk under a stop sign.

Atkinson, a 9th grade star center for the Alice Deal basketball team, was paralyzed along his right side and unable to speak, hospital officials said. Dr. Charles Carroll, a neurosurgeon who operated on the youth for 1½ hours yesterday, said the bullet had lodged deep in the left rear of the brain.

"We didn't take the bullet out because it might kill him," Carroll said. "We'll just have to see how he does during the next 12 hours. His chances are slim."

Five hours after the shooting, Atkinson's parents and a score of relatives gathered in the hospital waiting room, and awaited the results of the surgery.

A TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM E. WALKER

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there are few times in this day and age when one has the opportunity to be a pioneer. One of those times came in 1963 when a city in San Mateo County, Foster City grew out of a portion of the bay. Starting a city in this day and age with all of the attendant problems of a large metro-

politan area is quite an undertaking. One of the first five families to move into the Foster City in 1963 was the family of William E. Walker. Today this city has a population of 18,650, and one of the men most responsible for the rapid, orderly and successful growth of Foster City was William Walker.

Elected to the city council in 1971, Bill was unanimously appointed mayor by that council in June of 1972 and served as mayor until August 28, 1973. His service as mayor was the capstone of a long and successful career of public service on behalf of Foster City. Shortly after moving to the city, he helped organize the first homeowners group to study elementary and high school needs in Foster City and negotiated with the school district to resolve the construction of the first Foster City school and the purchase of the high school district property. Education is probably the foremost concern of Mayor Walker's, but he did not stop there. He was deeply involved in the construction of shopping centers and construction activities around the city designed to make Foster City more independent and one of the most progressive cities in the bay area.

Mayor Walker's activities do not stop there, however. He was instrumental in a feat that all elected officials would like to accomplish when he supported reduction of the general city taxes by 26 percent in August of 1971.

The occasion of Mayor Walker's retirement will be a loss to Foster City. I am sure, however, he will continue to lend his many talents to Foster City and to the county.

NEED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the 93d Congress consider the best methods of addressing the energy crunch in which we today find ourselves, I want to remind my colleagues of existing legislation designed to educate the public about our environment and our limited natural resources.

I refer, of course, to the Environmental Education Act, a measure, overwhelmingly approved in 1970 by the 91st Congress, which provides assistance for developing teaching materials about the environment, training teachers, and providing community conferences to educate the public about the ecological dimensions of our existence.

Mr. Speaker, on October 24, the House approved H.R. 3927, a bill to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years, and Senate action on this bill is now pending.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, as we ask our fellow citizens to make sacrifices as a consequence of energy shortages, that it is of fundamental importance that we continue to provide education about the short- and long-term effects of our con-

continued abuse of our scarce natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, the view I have expressed is shared by others.

For, on August 13, 1973, the California State legislature approved Senate Joint Resolution, No. 6, urging Congress to extend the Environmental Education Act, and expressing the "distress" of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California "over the prospect of further reduction in funds for the Environmental Education Act."

Mr. Speaker, the resolution to which I have referred, follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SENATE JOINT
RESOLUTION No. 26

Whereas, The Congress and the President of the United States enacted the Environmental Education Act of 1970 as Public Law 91-516; and

Whereas, Said act authorized federal expenditure of fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000) for grants to agencies engaged in the crucial task of environmental education; and

Whereas, The ultimate solution to reversing the decline in the environmental health of this nation must include effective public education programs directed at understanding and dealing intelligently with environmental problems; and

Whereas, The development of such programs was the precise purpose of the aforementioned act and expenditure so authorized pursuant to such act; and

Whereas, The President of the United States, in his message to the Congress, stressed the importance of improving, in his words, "the nation's environmental literacy"; and

Whereas, Despite the action of the Congress, the statements of the President, and the eager utilization of the Environmental Education Act program by the states and the schools of this nation, the federal administration has provided barely one-tenth the funds authorized by the program during its three-year life; and

Whereas, Despite the crippling denial of funds to this critical program heretofore, the federal administration now proposes to further deny its responsibility to the environmental education needs of the nation by reducing program funds to an all-time low of one million dollars (\$1,000,000); now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature communicate its distress over the prospect of further reduction in funds for the Environmental Education Act program and respectfully memorializes the President of the United States to restore the program to its authorized funding level and to the Congress to enact legislation to extend the life of the act in order that its promise and purpose may be achieved; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

DELMARVA RAIL SERVICE—NOT
THE END BUT THE BEGINNING

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the U.S. Department of Transporta-

CXX—143—Part 2

tion released a preliminary report which was in essence an economic examination of existing railroad service in the Northeastern United States. The report was required under the provisions of the recently passed Public Law 92-236 and in no way does it set out a final rail system for the area.

The contents of the report are in no way an attack on existing rail service but only an assessment of its current economic status. Another 18 months to 2 years must pass before a final plan for rail service is achieved. Prior to that final plan the affected areas and their local citizens will have several opportunities to argue their case. At the end of that time the option still remains for individual States or local entities to subsidize existing rail spurs that otherwise would cease to operate.

I include as part of my remarks: First, an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of February 4, 1974, together with two memorandums; second, one from the Department of Transportation summarizing the preliminary rail plan; and third, the second of which I have sent to various persons within my own congressional district:

DOT RAIL PLAN

It is too early to attempt detailed comments on the U.S. Department of Transportation's proposal for abandonment of 25 per cent of the railroad track in the portions of the Northeast to be affected by the new Rail Reorganization Act. Although we have opposed wholesale closing of rural rail lines, at the same time we recognize that some duplicating lines, and perhaps some rural spur lines, need to be abandoned in the interests of economy.

But it seems safe to say that as far as Maryland, particularly the Eastern Shore, is concerned, the DOT recommendations go beyond these prudent abandonments. Twenty per cent of Maryland's 1,110 miles of track would be closed, and trackage that now carries 65 per cent of the Eastern Shore's freight would be abandoned; apparently the only Eastern Shore line to remain would be the main Penn Central line to Salisbury. This main line, incidentally, would be closed south of Fruitland, thus eliminating service to the Virginia portion of the Delmarva peninsula. Although Transportation Secretary Claude S. Brinegar says only 4 per cent of the freight in the region is hauled over the lines proposed for abandonment, obviously this supposedly minor impact becomes a major impact indeed for particular regions such as the Eastern Shore.

Fortunately, the DOT recommendations are only recommendations, and we trust shippers who would be damaged if they were implemented will make a good case in opposition to many of the abandonments at public hearings to be held by the Interstate Commerce Commission in Baltimore and other cities in March. After the hearings, the new United States Rail Association will make final recommendations to Congress, a procedure which will allow yet another review before final action is taken in 20 months or so. This multi-stage review process is far superior to earlier proposals which would have removed Congress from final decisions altogether. We trust there will now be full opportunity for presentation of arguments that will show the rather clear economic, environmental and reduced energy consumption advantages of rail hauling over the truck hauling that would replace it if there were wholesale abandonment of rail lines in rural areas.

REPORT BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ON RAIL SERVICE IN THE MIDWEST AND NORTHEAST REGION

SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS OF EMPHASIS

A. Perspective of the report

1. This report is the first of seven basic planning steps required by the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-236).

2. The Act required, within 30 days, a comprehensive report by the Secretary of Transportation containing his conclusions and recommendations for rail service within the region—17 States, plus D.C., plus 4 contiguous zones (Louisville, St. Louis, and 2 areas in Wisconsin).

3. The remainder of the planning process covers approximately 20 months, and includes two sets of public hearings held by the ICC Rail Services Planning Office, Preliminary and Final System Plans by the U.S. Railway Association, and ultimately approval or rejection by the Congress.

4. This report does not present final, concrete recommendations for a "Core" rail system in the region; it does present recommendations for points in the region which should receive direct rail service, for levels of rail service between major traffic generating centers in the region, and various goals for modernizing and restructuring the region's rail system for the consideration of the ICC Planning Office and USRA.

B. Purpose of the report

1. Describe the existing rail system and rail service in the region.

2. Analyze the railroad capital and operating problems that exist in the region and possible improvements that might be realized.

3. Launch the planning process by presenting recommendations as to where rail service should be provided in the region—both within and between zones.

4. Present recommendations and goals for improving, restructuring and consolidating the region's rail system so that it will:

(a) Provide service of adequate quality;

(b) Have sufficient capacity for present and future traffic;

(c) Be more efficient in the use of resources; and

(d) Be financially self-sustaining.

C. Basic conclusions

1. If the region's railroads are to remain as private sector companies, they must have a sufficient traffic volume to sustain a financially viable operation.

2. There is no need for duplicate track and facilities; two or three or four mainlines or branchlines are not required where a single line can carry the traffic.

3. A given traffic generating point does not require service from three or four individual railroads; one or two can provide quality service, probably better than a multitude of rail carriers.

4. If the duplication of facilities and service is eliminated, capital investment in upgrading and modernizing the consolidated system can then result in a much more efficient operation providing better rail service to all users in the region.

D. Analytical approach

1. The region's rail system was divided into two groups—the interstate network (high volume traffic between zones) and local network (pick-up and delivery within zones and feeder connections to the interstate network).

2. Analysis of the interstate level included:

(a) Identification of the 40 major traffic generating centers in the region;

(b) Identification of the existing high volume interstate mainline network and the traffic flows over this network;

(c) Analysis of the current density of traffic on these lines and their excess capacity;

(d) Analysis of the level of service which can be economically provided between these major traffic generating centers.

3. Analysis of the local service level included:

(a) Development of criteria for determining the financial viability of a given rail line (traffic volume and revenue versus operating costs);

(b) Collection of 1972 traffic data for every rail traffic generating point in the region (divided into 184 zones);

(c) Identification of each of these points which have sufficient rail traffic to support a financially viable rail operation;

(d) Identification of rail lines which are not required to service these points (on a zone-by-zone basis).

E. Recommendations

1. Each of the interstate and local rail service levels must be restructured in order to improve the economic efficiency and financial viability of rail operations in the region.

2. Local Service Level:

(a) Continued direct rail service should be provided for nearly all of the region's normal rail freight traffic (less than 4% of such traffic is originated or terminated on lines which are identified as potentially excess and 182 of the 184 zones in the region are recommended for direct rail service);

(b) Rail pick-up and delivery service should be coordinated so that it is provided by a single railroad in a given geographic area.

3. Interstate Service Level:

(a) Duplicative lines and facilities should be downgraded or eliminated and service coordinated with the goal of substantially increasing utilization of the consolidated and restructured system (up to a minimum of 30 million gross ton miles per track mile per year on any segment of interstate track);

(b) Existing interstate routes should be consolidated to establish a high volume interstate network which warrants a major upgrading and modernization program.

4. Rail competition should be maintained only over the high volume interstate network between major traffic generating centers identified by various criteria in the report. In our judgment, other points do not require mainline service by more than one railroad.

5. The solvent carriers in the region are urged to become full participants in the planning and restructuring of the region's rail system. This is an unprecedented opportunity to improve the entire region's rail system, not just the bankrupt railroads' systems.

6. The result of these recommendations and the specific identification of points to receive direct rail service are:

(a) 96 percent of total rail traffic in the region will be retained for direct rail service; of the remaining 4 percent, a part may be covered by additions to USRA's Final System Plan, other elements may be subsidized, and the remainder can be served by motor carrier or combined truck/rail service.

(b) Approximately 25 percent of the region's railroad route mileage appears to be potentially excess, either because it is uneconomic or clearly redundant.

(c) It is emphasized that neither of these figures represents the final result of USRA's planning.

(d) The overall impact on rail service of the recommended cutback in rail route mileage is quite small.

F. What can the affected parties do next?

1. Within the next 60 days, the ICC Planning Office will hold public hearings in several different parts of the region; this will provide an opportunity for comment on and critique of this report.

2. During the 14 months before the USRA Final System Plan is submitted to Congress,

there will be plenty of opportunity to provide inputs, including another set of public hearings conducted by the ICC Planning Office to critique the USRA preliminary system plan.

3. The ICC Office is also available to assist small communities and shippers in presenting their case to USRA.

4. And finally, the Congress will have the last word on whether to accept or reject USRA's final recommendations.

MEMORANDUM

Re Public Law—93-236, Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973.

From ROBERT E. BAUMAN, Member of Congress.

On January 2, 1974 the President signed into law the above captioned Act, a copy of which is attached. As informed public officials, I am sure you realize this emergency legislation was aimed at preventing the immediate financial collapse of the Penn Central and other Northeastern railroads. In the long range, it seeks to provide a means by which existing railroads can be reorganized, rebuilt and operated with Federal financial support.

Because of the complexities of this law and the fact that it definitely requires the intimate participation of state and local interests, as well as partial state or private funding of rail service, it is vital that state officials and legislators quickly grasp the provisions and procedures which the law includes. This is especially true since some state funding to be used in conjunction with this law probably should be included in the state budget at the current session of the General Assembly, a point I made to Governor Mandel at a Washington meeting last December.

It is consistent with this need to understand the new law and its impact that state and local interests should, and indeed, must organize to present a united front in dealing with the two entities the law creates, the U.S. Railway Association (USRA) and the Consolidated Railway Corporation (CRC). Thus, it is an important and vital development that, under the aegis of the Delmarva Advisory Council, the Delmarva Railroad Committee has been formed under the chairmanship of Ed Hobbs of Delmarva Power. The Committee membership is in fact a roster of those leaders in the Delmarva area who have labored hard and long to preserve rail service in our area.

(1) The law creates a timetable under which USRA will reorganize existing rail service. The first step comes on February 1, 1974 with the release of a "preliminary report" which has been prepared by Federal authorities.

Undoubtedly this preliminary report will not suit Delmarva's interest in every respect. So far as it varies from our best interests, however, the law allows us (if we have the will to do it) to present our case and ultimately to decide, by providing funding, what specific lines will remain in service. Thus, this first step can be viewed pessimistically as the "beginning of the end" for some lines, or, as I prefer to view it, the starting point in a process to rescue our rail lines. Prior to this law, we had no means at all.

(2) At the end of the 18 month period a new northeast railway system will exist under the management of the CRC. Profit, past and potential, is undoubtedly one factor which will determine which lines will be included in this core system. But it is by no means the only consideration, and I invite you to read the numerous factors set out in the law (See Section 206) which must be considered as well.

It is hardly accurate to say that unprofitable rail spurs will be "dumped" on the state and local subdivisions to operate. In fact, any funding needed to acquire or operate such lines must be advanced by the state or

local entities but is refundable up to 70% by the Federal Government. Surely, a 30% state contribution is not too great a burden if the lines are in fact needed and local commitment really does exist.

(3) As to the issue of funding, the law authorizes and Congress has already appropriated for rail service continuation subsidies in the amount of \$90 million per year for two consecutive years for a total of \$180 million. This will be matched by state and local funding of approximately \$39 million for the two-year period.

While it is true that the funds will be distributed to the states based on the lines or track retained in the core system (and not on track eliminated from the system), the law specifically says that no state will be given less than 3% of the funding available directly to the states nor may any state receive more than 10% of this funding. This effectively insures that no state will dominate the use of the funds appropriated.

While each state is given the responsibility for establishing a rail plan within its borders which includes the requirements that they equitably distribute the subsidies among state, local and regional transportation units, the act does specifically provide local entities the option to apply directly to the CRC for subsidies as well. Indeed this dual availability of funds preserves state power and discretion and also allows the Federal authorities to act directly. Obviously, these two methods of funding must be coordinated in each case.

While it is easy to criticize the law as being inadequate in amount of funds appropriated, it is hardly likely that the Congress would make what is in effect a multi-billion dollar appropriation-guarantee (including authorize stock issues) without having made in fact a long term commitment to support the Northeastern railroads. In future fiscal years, therefore, funding should be available.

(4) One of the problems that should be addressed by state officials is whether there is any legal or constitutional impediment on the part of Maryland which would prevent entering into a regional interstate agreement which could plan and submit requests to the CRC on a multi-state basis. A simple examination of the laws should answer this and again, state legislation may be needed.

(5) The question has been raised about the situation which occurs after a given spur line is declared outside the core network of rails. At that point Section 304 sets up the possibility that the state government or a local entity, or even a private entity, could do one of two things to maintain the spur's operation. The line could be purchased in fee together with its existing fixtures or it could be leased from the CRC. In either case, the law provides that an operating agreement must be entered into by the CRC and the local entity to provide service on the spur so long as the state or local entity provides the funding necessary to continue the operation. (Again, recall that such funding is to be reimbursed up to 70% by the Federal Government.) This is the very heart of this law, i.e. the requirement that CRC must provide service on any spur where the subsidy is paid by whatever entity is formed for that purpose.

These are only a few direct answers to points that have been raised in the brief month since this law has been in effect. Undoubtedly, there will be many more questions. Again, I reemphasize the need for coordinated efforts on the part of all of us in the Delmarva area. I have assigned Mr. Mike Wilkinson of my Easton staff (301-822-4300) as a permanent liaison with the Delmarva Railroad Committee. I personally intend to take as much part as my time will permit in attempting to insure the success of this new law as it relates to our area.

I welcome any inquiries which you may have.

FORDHAM STUDENT REPORTS ON
TRIP TO SOVIET UNION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, a former intern in my office, Frank Costello, recently visited the Soviet Union with some of his classmates from Fordham University. He wanted to see, firsthand, this country that has been an off-and-on ally and enemy of the United States. He wanted to see if the stories about the Soviet Union—both pro and con—were true or not.

It is heartening to read that he still believes America is the best place in which to live. Perhaps we should send to the Soviet Union some of those who claim that the Communists have a better way of doing everything, so that they can see firsthand what it is like to live in an oppressive society.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I am including in the RECORD following my remarks, Frank Costello's essay on his trip which appeared in his college newspaper, the Ram, January 25, 1974:

ONE STUDENT'S VIEW OF RUSSIA: "MY FIRST
ENCOUNTER WITH A CLOSED SOCIETY"

(By Frank Costello)

On Friday, January 18, I returned from a three week visit to the Soviet Union with the Fordham tour sponsored by Rev. Walter Jaskiewicz. I decided to write this essay on my short stay there while certain recollections are still fresh in my mind.

I went to the Soviet Union entertaining the hope that I could be objective evaluating my first encounter with a closed society. I was certain that it must have some good aspects. Perhaps the picture we were getting was distorted. That good points existed, I found undeniable. For example, the Moscow subway runs precisely on time, with a train entering the station every 58 seconds. The cars are immaculate and each subway station resembles a mini art museum. But certain of my prejudices remained intact. In short, I despised the Soviet system from the outset. As a result of the admittedly superficial vantage point I had of that system, I despise it more today.

We spent a brief five days in the Baltic states of Latvia and Lithuania, which had been liberated by the Russians in the early 1940's. That these small nations are captive and are the satellites of a wretched empire is self evident. The Latvian capital of Riga is as scarred as if it were sacked by its Russian liberators only yesterday. In the main square of the city, unplugged bullet holes adorn the cold grey structures. These are the features of one workers paradise.

In the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius on the evening of Friday, January 4, a small group from our party, myself included, met with a few students from the University of Vilnius in a secluded apartment. They told us that if word of their meeting with us got around, they would all be expelled from the University. But that would be the least of their worries. A 20 year-old student of Literature and would-be playwright explained how the state inhibits the creativity of the writer. Each work he produces must make some reference to the glorious people's struggle. Yet one thing he told me I found especially startling, and that was in reference to the difficulty of leaving the U.S.S.R. if only for a

short visit outside. A young Lithuanian like himself would have no hope of leaving unless he were married, so that his wife would have to remain behind. Yet he had known of cases where young men in good standing in the Communist Party, were able to "buy" their wives' freedom to travel with them from the government. It should be noted at this point that the Communist Party has a total membership of 15 million. There are 250 million citizens of the Soviet Union.

In Moscow, our group and about 200 other students from eight different colleges scattered throughout the U.S. were given a lecture by three professors from the University of Moscow. They told us that as a result of the success of successive five year plans, and the ownership of the means of production by the workers, Marxist-Leninist theory had now been formulated. If this was true, I queried, when would the withering away of the state take place? The answer was only when the ruthless capitalist system had been destroyed. I thought meaningful detente would have to work both ways.

One morning we lined up in below zero temperatures on a special tourist line to view the body of Vladimir I. Lenin in his tomb outside the Kremlin wall. As we passed this bearded figure enshrined in a glass case, old women cried at the site of this "saint" in men's clothing. It was all quite morbid. Lenin in this godless society, is still a god substitute.

The hardship of World War II still has a significant impact. Nowhere is this more obvious than in Leningrad, where the 900 day siege occurred. In a graveyard outside the city, almost one million people are buried in mass graves. The reaction to seeing a spectacle such as this for the first time is indescribable. We have never known the destruction and the death that these people have. Leningrad alone lost two million people during the war. The Soviet Union as a whole lost 20 million. The U.S. lost 400,000.

Generalizations are never accurate, but it is not unfair to say that the Soviets are a singleminded and toughminded people. Their patriotism is practically boundless, their sources of information are meager, and their appetite for revenge and retribution is substantial. Many still hate the Germans. The Judeo-Christian notion of tolerance has little credence in this society. Said one young professor to our group, in reference to Alexander Solzhenitsyn, "He who is not with us is against us." The author of this quote he told us was Lenin. We informed him that the original variation came from Jesus Christ. We interpreted this as another example of the deification of Lenin.

In last Thursday's edition of Pravda, the official newspaper, the entire editorial page was concentrated on an attack on "that traitor" Solzhenitsyn for his new book, *The Gulag Archipelago*. The previously mentioned professor viewed this as a sign of the strength of the Soviet System. He's fooling himself. The simple fact is that a society that is afraid to look back on the sensitive points of its past can have no real hope for the future. It's almost comical the way Soviet officials fear one man.

Maybe I'm all wrong. Maybe ours is the system without hope, a system whereby vested interests control the votes of Congress. But we had better remember one thing: we have never had to build walls around ourselves to keep our people in. As that student told me that night in Vilnius, the corruption within even the lowest ranks of the Communist party would make Watergate look like a three-ring circus. While we were in Moscow, two men were executed near Odessa. They had been involved in a fruit juice scandal whereby they produced juice without the fruit, thus making a profit close

on 60,000 rubles each. Needless to say there is a low crime rate in the Soviet Union.

MEETING THE NEEDS OF SPACESHIP
EARTH

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, last week Senator FRANK E. Moss of Utah addressed an AIAA banquet and made some stirring remarks. I present them to you and my fellow Members of Congress and the general public because I believe Senator Moss said something we should all be aware of.

The speech follows:

MEETING THE NEEDS OF SPACESHIP EARTH

(Speech of Senator FRANK E. MOSS)

It is certainly a great honor and a real pleasure for me to be asked to speak tonight. As you know, just this month I completed my "rookie year" of official connection with aeronautics and space, and here I am speaking to an illustrious assembly of all stars.

Like any rookie, I spent a great deal of time last year just studying the playbook and learning the names of the plays and the players. I must say that you pros don't make it easy with the terminology you use. I think I have it down pretty well now, but if you catch me missing a signal now and then, remember that I'd need 5 or 6 more seasons before Coach George Allen would even let me on the taxi squad.

The other day, a friend asked me to list the major accomplishments of my first year as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. I was eager to reply.

"First," I said, "with Skylab, the United States logged more man hours in space than in all the preceding years, and reaped a bonanza of solar and earth observations data."

"But," my friend replied, "those plans were made, and most of the money provided, in the years before."

"Second," I said, "the space shuttle program really got moving, with all the basic contracts being awarded, including a big one in my home State."

"Ted," my friend rebutted, "those are steps taken by NASA, and besides, the Utah contract has been challenged as illegal, immoral and perhaps even fattening."

"Third," I said, undaunted, "the first really large multinational space project was started, when ESRO agreed to build the Spacelab for shuttle flights in the 1980's."

"Now, come on," he said, "you supported that, but you know it resulted from Executive Branch initiatives."

"Well, fourth," I said, and here I knew I really had him, "there was *Kohoutek!*"

"But Senator," he said, "to paraphrase the words of the Bard, 'that is a tale told by an astronomer signifying nothing'."

More seriously, let me say that I firmly believe we can all take great pride, and even a modestly optimistic stance, in view of the accomplishments of the past year and the hopes for the months immediately ahead.

I'll list just a few—

Skylab was, and is, a fantastic success. ERTS-1 is proving even more valuable than its strongest boosters predicted, and the launch of ERTS-B will now be nearly 2 years earlier than announced a year ago.

We've looked at Jupiter up close for the first time, and can now have high hopes for the second Pioneer visit late this year.

In a few days we'll fly by Venus again, and then proceed on toward our first visit to Mercury a few weeks later.

The NASA launch rate will double this year, and the long-heralded age of space applications will become a reality with ATS-F, with the first domestic communications satellites, and with synchronous environmental satellites very much in the forefront.

The shuttle program is gaining real momentum, despite repeated delays, and though we may not match the record-breaking support in the Senate last year, I believe we're firmly underway.

And finally, and most important, when the NASA budget is unveiled next Monday, it will show a reversal in the dismal downward plunge of recent years. It will not be as high as the level we all worked so hard to attain, but it will represent a modest step back up the ladder toward realistic, stable levels.

Each of you here tonight could add to this list, I have not mentioned progress in aeronautics, or NASA energy efforts, or Apollo-Soyuz, or many other important signs of vitality in aeronautics and astronautics.

The hour is late, and without keeping you overlong, I want to spend a few minutes on a specific subject dear to my heart and important to all of you.

An author always gets in a plug for his latest book. As a Senator, I cannot resist this opportunity to promote a bill I believe you should support.

Let me start by summarizing three main points:

1. Our current drift toward becoming a "status quo" nation is not merely a threat to the employment security of scientists and engineers, it is a very real threat to the livelihood of every American.

2. As a nation, we must do a far better job of predicting the occurrence of critical domestic problems and providing the resources—often scientific and technological—to solve them.

3. Those who view NASA as an agency in search of a mission not only have the shoe on the wrong foot, they are dead wrong.

To take these three points one at a time, "I'll begin with the dangers of what I will call "creeping status-quoism." In recent years, we have seen a flurry of rebellions against rapid societal and technological change, and repeated calls for return to the "good old days," even though a wag tells us "nostalgia ain't what it used to be."

Perhaps in part because of these forces, and certainly in large measure because of well-warranted revision at some of our mistakes, there is I believe an increasing trend toward wanting to hold on to what we've got, to stay about where we are, in every important aspect of American life.

Increasingly one sees our foreign policy referred to in the press as that of a "status quo" power. And perhaps that is what "balance of power" diplomacy is all about.

Other nations, which once marveled at "American ingenuity", seem increasingly more ready, willing and able than we to seize technological opportunity in every field from heavy machine tools to hand calculators, from internal combustion engines to high performance aircraft.

And in less tangible areas, opinion polls show that many of us feel our societal reforms are moving "too far, too fast."

Without getting too deeply immersed in national psychoanalysis, let me say that we need to remind ourselves of some basic truisms.

We cannot turn back the clock, or even stop its hands. No person, no society, and no nation has ever succeeded in standing pat for very long. Every person in this room knows of the great, perhaps almost fatal, mistake we made in the 1950's of assuming

we would always far exceed the Russians in technological prowess. And we have learned in recent months how wrong those of us were who assumed, against all available evidence, an inexhaustible supply of cheap fossil fuel.

As Wernher von Braun testified before my Committee last Fall, and I quote, "World leadership and technological leadership are inseparable. A third-rate technological nation is a third-rate power, politically, economically and socially . . . Whether we like it or not, ours is a technological civilization. If we lose our national resolve to keep our position on the pinnacle of technology the historical role of the United States can only go downhill."

I fully agree. Change is, after all, inevitable. And only those who move ahead of the bow wave of change will avoid being submerged in history.

Now to my second point. We must get to work to improve our ways and means of anticipating problems that science and technology can solve.

Here comes the plug I warned you about, so listen closely. In case I forget to mention it later, the number of the bill is S. 2405. It was introduced by Senator Magnuson, with Senator Tunney and me as cosponsors. My good friend Tiger Teague has introduced it in the House as H.R. 10807.

As I said, the Federal Government does an inadequate job of identifying in advance to meeting critical domestic problems.

However severe you may feel the energy crisis is today or will be in the years ahead, I believe you will agree with me that we should not be in our current status of considering hastily a plethora of emergency measures to cope with it.

It's not that no one saw what was coming. Even a casual review of the literature will surface numerous examples of warnings five, ten, even thirty years ago. In a peak of frustration in 1969, one industry association asked, "Is anybody listening?"

Yes, the warning signals were clear, but there was no single Federal organization—no centralized early warning system—to galvanize us into timely action.

As David Rose suggests in this month's Scientific American, our present energy difficulties "were largely caused not by ignorance but by irresponsibility." I suggest that it is our responsibility now to better prepare for the next crisis. For the energy crisis will not be our last crisis. In reality, the term "energy crisis" is a catchall phrase for many shortages and problems we face. Already we are being warned of a materials crisis looming on the horizon. And water, always short in my home state, threatens soon to become in short supply in other areas.

Just as we must work harder to sort out and predict these problems, we need to do a better job of planning the utilization of our vast national scientific and technological resources.

The ups and downs, the stops and starts, that have plagued Federal research and development efforts ever since we embarked on Federal support for R. & D. have created a continuing state of chaos and uncertainty. Facilities are built and closed, scientists and engineers are trained, employed and laid off, all with little apparent foresight.

I needn't remind you that a few short years ago we were simultaneously rushing headlong toward an energy crisis and laying off engineers and scientists by the thousands.

It is time for us to bring these two shortcomings—poor planning and poor use of resources—into focus together, to examine them, and to do something about them.

That's what S. 2495 is all about. The two versions of the bill we have sent to numerous organizations, including AIAA, for comment, have this primary thrust.

We want to establish within the Executive Branch of the Government an improved

mechanism, an improved climate, and improved funding for making projections of critical domestic problems which may be susceptible to scientific and technological solutions in whole or in part. And we want to bring into that process careful consideration of the projected availability of the necessary scientific and technological resources to apply to those problems before they become of crisis proportion.

And that brings us to my final point. We seem, so far as NASA is concerned, to be developing a national blind spot. There she sits, like the proverbial girl next door, while we roam around town looking for someone to work on technological problems.

No one here or abroad has developed a greater capability than NASA and its partners in industry and universities for defining problems, devising solutions, and demonstrating those solutions.

But we have a curious penchant to ignore this proven resource. This is not to say that NASA should be thrown into the fray every time a problem emerges. There are many problems ahead that NASA is ill-equipped to solve. But where we need a systematic approach to a complex problem with high technological content, why should we studiously avoid our strongest asset?

Let me emphasize one point. We are not in any way suggesting that NASA lacks a mission in aeronautics and space. Support for that mission, as I have said, should not be diminished—it should be enlarged. What we are suggesting in S. 2495 is that NASA and its partners should also be authorized to tackle other missions upon assignments by the President and approval by the Congress.

NASA is not, as some gossips suggest, an agency in search of a mission. There are missions in search of a NASA.

To summarize, we should devise an institutional arrangement, with adequate funding, to contemplate our collective futures and identify the likely problems that science and technology can alleviate. At the same time, this organization should be projecting, over the coming ten years, what our scientific and technological resource shortages and over-capabilities will be, and how we should be moving to strengthen and apply them.

Over idealistic? Perhaps. But worth the try? That is surely is.

Ladies and gentleman, distinguished friends all, you have been great in hearing me. I thank you for inviting me here tonight, and I look forward with you to the challenging times ahead.

A LETTER FROM A GOOD FRIEND AND CONSTITUENT

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, a good friend and constituent of mine has asked that his letter of January 25 be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and it is as follows:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
January 25, 1974.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WILBUR: When I get into this conglomerate of trouble with our President and with our great country (I religiously keep up with every phase of it) my fundamental fairness, love of justice, honesty, integrity crop up uncontrollably. These characteristics were inherited by blood and training from a truly down-to-earth American father. My

father could throw his hat higher than anybody at an old fashioned fourth of July picnic wherein the fundamental Americanism of our forefathers were extolled.

The news media in all of its outlets has unmistakably and purposely sold the headline-reading public of this nation a bill of goods. Herein lies the major trouble. The average busy, reading public sees only the headlines from which they think their opinions are factually based. Fundamentally, the politician, if he wishes to continue in office, must listen to his constituents and act accordingly.

For example, in the *Arkansas Gazette*, January 16, 1974, in bold type: "Nixon personally asked for \$50,000 sources report," and, down in the fine print, Richard Danner whom they were quoting stated: "That is not my testimony. Nothing approaching that was ever true. I was very firm and vehement in my testimony that I never had any contacts with Nixon on that." And, the *Arkansas Gazette* on January 24, 1974 in bold type: "Krough to confess! 'Do in Nixon,' former aide says," Elgin Krough after his trial told reporters he knew nothing that would implicate the President in criminal activity. However, the damage had already been done. These threadbare, unsavory practices are the common rule. These kind of quotes of various individuals, with rumors of every description and most of them without a factual base or even downright false, are put forward prominently by the news media throughout the nation. It is impossible to exaggerate the enormity of these nefarious practices. The underlying purpose is to destroy Richard Nixon. As you know, most of the busy, reading public see only the punchline, then pass the information on as fact.

The *Arkansas Gazette* day in and day out, month in and month out, searches, and I mean diligently searches every nook and corner for items with which to downgrade President Nixon. Its publication and editorials are biased, far from factual to the nth degree. Richard Nixon is President of these United States. The *Gazette* with its biased reporting and slanted editorials is downright disrespectful to the Presidency and to a major extent smacks of disloyalty to our great country and its institutions.

Other news media such as the New York Times, Washington Post, Chicago Daily News, Los Angeles Times and many other newspapers, magazines as well as the radio and tv networks are extremely vehement with their biased and unfair distribution of the news. With painstaking bias, misquotes, statements arranged out of context, etc. the news media has so schooled the minds of the people as to be able to successfully criticize even profound privileges and rights duly practiced by Mr. Nixon as a citizen. For instance, the critically intended publicity about Mr. Nixon's church donations. The biblical injunctions in this field on which the average person is not informed make this strictly a matter between Richard Nixon and his God. Certainly by no stretch of the imagination can the news media rightly or correctly criticize his actions in this field. Obviously, Mr. Nixon's church donation records were publicized as an added morsel to the daily persecution complex so ably gathered and rammed down the throats of the gullible, unthinking public. Another item very widely publicized is Mr. Nixon's income tax payments. You and I know that every taxpayer searchingly takes every deduction the law allows. On questionable items we do the best we can and leave the final decision to the IRS. On the face of it that is exactly what the President has done, or so it would seem to the clear thinking individual. Should Mr. Nixon be criticized for following timeworn procedure? I am reminded of what Jesus said to the Scribes and Pharisees: "He that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone." John 8:7.

Yesterday a retired friend said to me, "I have just paid my income tax. Why should I pay income tax when Mr. Nixon does not?" Thousands of good Americans all over this country have been falsely and unjustly led into criticizing the President on this income tax fiasco. Is there any wonder the polls show him low on the totem pole?

For more than a year now we have witnessed by some form of the news item after item similar, or in the same vein and for the same purpose, to the church donation and income tax cases cited above. These apparently well planned and nefarious practices have profoundly and unjustly downgraded the President. I have been around quite a spell. All my life it has been my practice to keep abreast of what is going on in the nation. Never in my lifetime have I witnessed such an obviously planned and successfully carried out nefarious persecution of an individual citizen of this country. Without a defense, whether it be the President of the USA or an ordinary citizen, conviction of the most innocent is very largely a foregone conclusion. Under the circumstances, with the public mind molded, and I mean molded, by the news media in all its forms and forums, Mr. Nixon cannot possibly defend himself. However, or whatever he publishes or states vocally, the Leftists prominent or mediocre along with political minded leaders will be prominently displayed on the screen or in bold type in newspapers and magazines with excerpts taken out of context, so cleverly twisted and rearranged as to offer a logical-appearing critical conclusion.

Time after time prominent leaders come forward with: "Why doesn't the President lay it all out in the open?" I have just stated the reasons why this is impossible. These "Destroy Richard Nixon plans" have determined that he shall not successfully justify his actions. In these, Watergate in the background is nearly always used as a useful crutch. It is a vicious circle in any man's language.

These leaders, some of them well intentioned, are in reality unwittingly destroying the very thing they seek to preserve—this country and its supporting institutions. The results here are frightening. This thing primarily purposed to destroy Nixon, has to a very large extent destroyed the confidence and trust in our government, its leaders and institutions. If you approach the average citizen today on matters, any matters concerning our government the discussion will almost inevitably lead to ridicule, distrust, lack of confidence in everything attached to government. This will include almost without reservation all leaders, not just Mr. Nixon. The fundamental security of our great country is based upon confidence and trust in it and its institutions. History substantiates the fact that no nation has ever been able to stand without the trust and good will of its subjects.

Now a word about some things about which we hear so little . . . apparently President Nixon's great accomplishments in foreign service do not fit into these grandiose plans of doom and destruction. When Richard Nixon came into the Presidency we were seemingly engulfed hopelessly in the most destructive, costly, most ill-advised and unpopular war in the nation's history. In spite of massive road blocks by powerful men like Fulbright, Ramsey Clark, Father Berrigan, Dr. Spock and many other prominent leaders, he was able to end that war and get our soldiers and prisoners home. This in itself under adverse circumstances was one of the greatest accomplishments ever made by any president. Successful efforts toward normalization of relations with China and Russia are very great indeed. Now the accomplishments pointing toward settlement of the Near East troubles are amazing and deserve commendation beyond measure. All in all President Nixon's foreign policy accomplish-

ments have shown ability, dedication, finesse that must be accepted as great leadership.

Domestically the President and the Congress each must accept some successes and some failures. Mr. Nixon's choice of assistants shows his human frailties. Every man worth his salt is imbued with human shortcomings. Show me a man that does not make mistakes and I will show you a man who pines his life away doing nothing. I am sure that Mr. Nixon, battling some of the best minds of the country, whose obvious purpose is to destroy him, has made some grave mistakes. Under the varied circumstances there appears justification for him to change his approach or even his mind occasionally.

Finally, why am I writing "Mr. Democrat" extolling the virtues of "Mr. Republican?" The answer is simple—love of country and the fact that I know Wilbur Mills. You and I have been close friends for a long time. You will remember inquiring about many veterans' cases at the V.A. Regional office. When you would come in, the manager would always call me to collect the cases and go over them with the necessary assistance for you to offer desired help to the veterans. It was in these contacts that I acquired a very fundamental insight into Wilbur Mills' unimpeachable character. Among other things, when we would come to a case with no merit I would state, "This has no merit." Your immediate answer: "Lay it aside, forget it." This assured me that you had complete confidence in my ability to learn and present the facts. Further, your integrity and honesty of purpose made an abiding and permanent impression upon me.

Would you permit me to make an unusual request? Unless it would embarrass you, I would be greatly pleased if you would cause this letter to be placed in the Congressional Record. I think the message is greatly needed and that your colleagues in the United States Congress would be led to think. If I can lead them to think I will have rendered a service.

Your friend,

L. L. THORNHILL,
"The Senator."

IMPRESSIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are deeply troubled about their government, and strongly dissatisfied with its performance on the crucial issues.

They are uncertain and uneasy about several questions confronting the country: Should the President resign, continue, or be impeached? Is there really an energy shortage? If there is, how severe is it? Why this continuing inflation and all these shortages and what can be done about them?

This discontentment and uncertainty are the strongest impressions I have after talking with many constituents in the Ninth District during the congressional Christmas recess and after visiting with Members of the Congress and the news media, who are returning to Washington for the 1974 session. Three topics have dominated the conversations of the people as they have spoken with Congressmen and newsmen across the country: The energy shortage, the possible

impeachment of the President, and inflation.

From their deep doubts and uncertainties, the people are telling those of us in Government that we simply must do a better job of managing the pressing affairs of the Nation. They are not just sure what to do, but they are certain they want something done. From the President and the Congress they want clear and decisive leadership, not procrastination, wavering or buckpassing.

By and large people are unhappy with the leadership of the President and the Congress, but they are not sure what to do about it.

Some want the President to resign; others want to impeach him; and others fear what the process of impeachment would do to the country more than they fear the President's continuing in office. Almost all of them are skeptical of the President's explanation of his role in Watergate, but many just feel that impeachment is too extreme an action. If there must be an impeachment inquiry, they agree that it should be settled one way or the other without delay.

In the Ninth District I did not perceive any clear-cut signal from the people as to what should happen to the President. It is clear that he stands in a precarious position, and several more revelations about White House misconduct would certainly jeopardize the continuation of his Presidency. There is surprising resentment against the President for the way he handled his income taxes and for permitting large Government expenditures on his homes in San Clemente and Key Biscayne.

The Congress may not be in as much trouble with the people as the President is, but the Congress does not earn high praise from the people for its work in 1973, and they continue to think that politics, not a desire to do what is best for the country, dominate the Congress. They want to see much more cooperation between the Congress and the President in meeting the Nation's problems. The frequent clashes between the President and Congress have given them the impression of the two branches contending against each other for political gain to the country's detriment.

With the credibility of public officials at an all-time low, the single most important quality the people now seek in their officials is integrity. Far more decisive than party labels or ideological position on issues in the next election will be the simple virtues of honesty and truthfulness. Although there has been much discussion in the media about people "dropping out" of politics because of their cynicism and despair with government and politicians, I do not find that reaction among the people of the Ninth District. Indeed, I find the opposite reaction, a feeling that the vote and participation in the electoral process may be more important than ever before. I also find another encouraging reaction. Although they certainly have their doubts and disappointments, people nonetheless think that government can be made to work effectively, and that even our most

intractable problems will yield to energetic leadership.

These are some of the impressions other Congressmen and I are trying to assimilate as we return for an anticipated long and tough session with a heavy schedule of legislation to be completed.

As we assemble, the contrast in the mood of Congress today from 1973 is especially apparent. In 1973, the Congress convened in the aftermath of the President's astounding reelection victory, determined to curb expanding Presidential power. This year the President, seriously weakened by the Watergate scandals, is facing an impeachment inquiry in the House Judiciary Committee.

But the Congress, as well as the President, will be severely tested in 1974, not alone because of the President's weakened position, but also because of the people's insistence that the overriding issues—impeachment, inflation, and energy—be addressed effectively.

HANFORD, WASH.—THE WORLD'S FIRST NUCLEAR POWER CENTER

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks several eminent scientists, in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, have observed that an attractive method of siting nuclear power reactors may be to develop nuclear power centers containing several nuclear reactors with closed system for handling nuclear fuels and wastes within the boundaries of the park. Dr. Ralph Lapp agreed with me that the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford Reservation is a "very good prospect" for a nuclear power center. In Washington State I think the time has come for those of us who are concerned with planning to meet the problems of the energy crisis, and all other individuals in and out of government with similar concerns, take the cognizance of this potential at Hanford; not only of the direct benefits that it can bring to the American people, but also of the example it can set for the development of similar facilities and sites in other regions in our country. Clearly Hanford, Wash. is destined to become the world's first nuclear power center.

There can be no denying that this Nation—its people and its Government—are finally aware of the fact that there is an energy crisis and that it is very real. Gasoline and fuel oil shortages, cold homes, immobile automobiles, and reduced airline flights are confirming what many of us have been saying for some time—that action is needed to head off an energy disaster—and it is needed now.

But I am hopeful that our very valid concern with the problems of the present and the immediate future will not lead us into overlooking the fact that the most severe aspects of the energy crisis are long term rather than immediate. Even if we somehow solve—or learn to

live with—our immediate problems, we will still be energy-short for literally decades in the future unless we do now what we have not done in the past—plan ahead and act on those plans. The fact is, of course, that we have had no energy policy. Indeed, we do not have one today.

One particularly acute aspect of this problem lies in the area of electrical energy, which has been rapidly becoming everyone's preferred energy form for ultimate use. Here, literally hundreds of plants—fossil and nuclear—must be built to meet our Nation's ever-growing need for electricity.

Nuclear plants, in particular, are expected to play a vital role in meeting both our short-term and our long-term needs for electricity. Already there are 42 nuclear plants licensed to operate. Their aggregate generating capacity of 25,000 megawatts is about 5 percent of the Nation's total. Fifty-six nuclear plants, with an electrical generating capacity totaling 53,000 megawatts, are under construction. An additional 101 plants, totaling 109,000 megawatts have been ordered by utilities. The total of 199 plants will have a cumulative generating capacity of 187,000 megawatts.

It is forecast that about 150 of these nuclear plants, with a total electrical generating capacity of 132,000 megawatts, will be operating in 1980. They will provide an estimated 21 percent of the national electrical generating capacity at that time. By the year 2000, it is estimated that over 1,000 nuclear plants will be on line, producing more than half the Nation's electricity.

But whether or not these projections for nuclear power are fulfilled will depend on our ability to locate the plants on acceptable sites, and without undue delay. Currently, this is not happening. Although a substantial part of the delay has been caused by factors common to the planning, engineering, and construction of any complex facility, I am particularly concerned with those delays related to the siting of nuclear plants resulting from the opposition of a relatively small number of people who are waging a campaign of fear against nuclear power. It is almost tragic to note that these few who describe the risks of nuclear power in the most frightening of terms are also rather casually suggesting that the energy shortages are either without basis in fact or that, if the shortages do exist, their risks are readily acceptable.

But whatever the reasons for the current delays, such delays in the future are certain to have an adverse effect. Until the American people rise up and put into proper perspective the exaggerated influence of this relatively small band, we must find ways to avert the delays and problems they can cause. And, in the State of Washington, steps are underway to do just exactly that—at least for the Pacific Northwest.

At Hanford, with the support and encouragement of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, a nuclear power center is being developed. As I use the term, a nuclear power center has as its ultimate objective the integrated siting of multi-

ple nuclear related operations, including such activities as uranium enrichment and fuel preparation, chemical processing, and nuclear waste management and storage—and, of course, a number of nuclear powerplants. To pursue such an end is a visionary undertaking, one worthy of the technical expertise and the vast physical resources available at Hanford, including a large land area, suitable cooling water supply—although cooling water may not be essential to future nuclear power centers—low population density, and close proximity to the region's electrical grid. And it is an idea which I wholeheartedly support.

The nuclear power center concept at Hanford started over 4 years ago motivated, in part, by difficulties being experienced in siting nuclear powerplants close to load centers and populated areas of the Pacific Northwest. The concept offered an opportunity for local people, used to living and working with the atom, to support its peaceful application in electrical power generation on a grand scale—and they quickly welcomed that opportunity.

The nuclear power concept today—4 years later—is an idea well on its way to becoming reality. On the Hanford site, and coexisting with AEC's programmatic activities, the Washington Public Power Supply System has under construction a 1,135-megawatt powerplant, other 1,300-megawatt-nuclear-steam supply system to replace AEC's "N" reactor.

Adjacent to the Hanford site, Exxon Nuclear, Inc., has established a nuclear fuel preparation facility, Sandvik Special Metals, Inc., is producing zirconium tubing for commercial nuclear power reactors; Battelle Northwest Laboratories are providing expertise in both nuclear and life science areas; and local people are working and living in harmony with the peaceful atom. In addition, local leaders, together with the Washington congressional delegation, have for some time been actively encouraging the location of other nuclear related activities at Hanford.

In the long term, such a concept may set a precedent for other such centers in other areas of the United States and, thus, become a major ingredient in future land use planning for new urban and industrial development.

Contemporary historians already pay tribute to the Hanford project for its vital role in beginning this nuclear age in which we live. Future historians will, in my view, also commend Hanford and the citizens of the nearby communities for their farsightedness and courage in working to develop a nuclear power center. The growing pains associated with ushering in a new scientific era, if they are remembered at all, will be only remembered as challenges encountered enroute to using the atom to better serve mankind.

I firmly believe the nuclear power center concept is one of the keys to the ultimate solution of this Nation's long-term electrical energy problem. Hanford is rapidly becoming the world's first nuclear power center. I would hope that we—the Congress and the public—will not only be quick to recognize the value

of such a concept—but also to have the courage to use it.

NEW FEDERAL BUDGET SHIFTS GEARS, AUSTERITY PLANS ARE DROPPED—HUGE SPENDING PROPOSED TO FIGHT RECESSION

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal in an article today points out that the administration is again reversing its field in its approach to budgetary and fiscal policy.

Stringency has again yielded to deliberate deficit spending as the administration continues the erratic pattern of its budgetary management and philosophy.

In the budget message of February 2, 1970, the President said he was submitting a budget that fulfilled his plan for a balanced budget—a large deficit resulted.

In the budget message of February 1, 1971, the President switched economic policies and called for an expansionary full employment budget.

The year 1972—an election year—was also a year for expansion, growth, and generous allocations of Federal funds.

In 1973, however, the administration's watchwords were: Slow down, cut back, terminate, stretch out, restructure—all indicators of a stringent policy marked by massive impoundments of funds.

Now in 1974 the administration has produced another expansionary budget—and an increase of almost \$30 billion over fiscal 1974 is requested.

The Wall Street Journal puts it this way:

Stern fiscal discipline, last year's sacred cow, is this year's dead horse.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in these interesting developments, I place in the RECORD the article from the Wall Street Journal.

The article follows:

NIXON'S BUDGET SHOWS EFFECTS OF WATERGATE AND ECONOMIC WOES

(By James P. Gannon)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's new budget, unveiled yesterday, shows that his double woes of Watergate and economic distress are forcing him to reverse course drastically.

Gone is the ax-wielding President of austerity, who challenged his critics and Congress last year with cuts in social programs, veto threats and rigid spending ceilings. Now Mr. Nixon appears as a conciliatory, political weakened compromiser—dusting off some once-discarded liberal initiatives to try to appease his would-be impeachers and ready to bust his own budget with a federal spending splurge to stop a recession.

The contrast between the budget that Mr. Nixon sent to Congress yesterday and the one that he presented a year ago could hardly be starker—in rhetoric, content and economic thrust. Thus, the new budget measures the precipitous plunge in the presidency of Richard M. Nixon.

Flexing his massive 1972 electoral mandate,

Mr. Nixon a year ago confidently mapped out the course he wanted his second term to take: a "change in direction" for the federal government calling for fewer bureaucrats, fewer programs and tight control of spending. All this would be achieved in an uncompromising battle with Congress.

Now, with his poll ratings plunging, impeachment machinery grinding and a recession looming, a different President emerges. In muted tones, he seeks accommodation with Congress. The bureaucracy is growing again; programs on last year's chopping block are given new life; veto threats and spending lids are gone. The President who derided the government's tendency to try to solve problems by "throwing money at them" is preparing to solve emerging economic troubles by throwing money at them.

Standing on its own, the \$304.4 billion budget for fiscal 1975, which starts July 1, is unremarkable. Its new initiatives are few. Its language is bland. Its economic posture is moderation, neither highly stimulative nor sternly restraining. It is a budget unlikely to either excite or offend Congress, the press or the public.

MEASURING THE SPECIFICS

The new budget becomes remarkable, however, when contrasted with its immediate predecessor, the original road map of the second Nixon term. The distance between where Mr. Nixon thought he was going a year ago and where he finds himself today is measured in these specifics:

—Stern fiscal discipline, last year's Sacred Cow, is this year's dead horse. Whereas last year's budget vowed that "the administration firmly intends to hold spending in (fiscal) 1975" to \$288 billion, the total projected now is \$16.4 billion higher. More important, last year's demands for a "rigid spending ceiling" are replaced by Mr. Nixon's new promise of "flexibility" in using federal spending as a weapon against any economic downturn.

Says Frederic V. Malek, deputy director of the Office of Management and Budget: "We are prepared to do whatever is necessary to avoid a recession. The President is very firm on that. If it means busting the budget, then he will bust the budget rather than keep people out of jobs."

—Many of the 113 programs listed in last year's budget for termination or scaleback are alive and well. The new budget includes funds for public-service jobs, library aid, research training grants, area economic-development assistance and other programs that last year were branded a waste of federal tax money.

—The "leaner federal bureaucracy" that was promised in last year's budget is bloating again. The new budget projects a 22,200 increase in full-time permanent civilian employment, to 2.5 million during fiscal 1975. The extra bureaucrats will handle growing work loads in Social Security, health, welfare and energy offices.

—The era of confrontation with Congress, signaled last year, is giving way to an era of negotiation and accommodation. Tough talk and veto threats can't be found in yesterday's budget message. Mr. Nixon instead promises to "work with Congress" in shaping legislation on welfare, health, education and other domestic programs. "We have reached a conciliatory position with the Congress," Mr. Malek of the OMB says.

A "TOTAL" CHANGE

All this isn't lost on Capitol Hill. "This is a total shift in policy," Democratic Rep. Al Ullman of Oregon says. "It appears the President has given up attempting to hold the line on spending."

Another Democrat, Rep. Thomas Rees of California, finds some irony in the budget's proposals for more subsidized housing and a welfare overhaul built around the concept of a minimum guaranteed income. "When I ad-

vocated these programs two years ago," he recalls, "they called me a reckless liberal spender." He figures that the change occurred because "The White House is so freaked out over Watergate" that it is allowing Cabinet members to push their pet projects.

Republicans tend to cite the darkening economic outlook rather than Watergate's impact as the reason for the changed budget stance. "This is more related to economic conditions," Rep. William Steiger of Wisconsin says. With November's elections in mind, "I think many Republicans will welcome a budget designed to strengthen the economy," he says.

But some others say the Watergate influence can't be ignored. "If it hadn't have been for what has happened in the past year, you would have seen a considerably different budget," a former high official of the Nixon administration contends. "Part of the reason is political and part is economic. They intertwine and reinforce each other."

President Nixon knows that he isn't going to solve his massive political problems by loosening up on federal spending or proposing a few programs his Democratic critics like. Such moves will hardly lessen the chances of impeachment. But they do show that Mr. Nixon feels he no longer has any spare political capital to spend in fights with Congress.

On the economic front, the President clearly is willing to see his projected \$9.4 billion deficit for the coming fiscal year swell if a recession compels him to turn on the standby spending valves. The economic slowdown "shouldn't be permitted to go too far," he told Congress in noting that the White House has a broad range of contingency plans for spurring the economy.

Mr. Malek of the OMB says the standby anti-recession measures include acceleration of planned federal purchases or construction, a speedup in some cash grants or income benefits, and "tax relief." The main criteria for choosing among such steps, he says, are that they should have "a quick impact on unemployment" and be able to be focused on particular localities or regions in economic distress.

Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz, a starchy fiscal disciplinarian, warns that the administration must have "the patience and the cool not to be stampeded into action" by temporary economic setbacks. But he doesn't sound confident that there won't be a stampede.

"IF WE MUST . . ."

Mr. Shultz is especially concerned that the economic slump will raise demands for a tax cut to stimulate consumer spending. That idea, always popular in election years, has considerable appeal in Congress right now. "I think that should be at the end of the line" of contingency plans, Mr. Shultz says. Then he adds: "But if we must, we must."

In other ways, the White House is clearly signaling that it doesn't want to pick any more fights with liberal Democrats in Congress. Aides stress that spending will grow in all major domestic program areas in fiscal 1975. Nearly the entire \$6.3 billion rise in fiscal 1975 military outlays, to \$85.8 billion, is due to pay raises, costlier fuel and general inflation, they say. Military spending has dropped to 29% of the budget from 44% during Mr. Nixon's term in office, while non-defense outlays have risen to 71% from 56%, they add.

Furthermore, Mr. Nixon's two big domestic proposals, national health insurance and welfare overhaul, are the types of initiatives most liberals want to see. (Neither would begin in the coming fiscal year, however.)

The health-insurance plan, which would involve a net added outlay of \$6 billion annually when it went into effect in 1976, won't satisfy liberals, who envision a grander, costlier program—but it is a move in their

direction. The same is true of the vaguer welfare plan, which would replace several current relief programs that neither liberals nor conservatives like.

STAYS OF EXECUTION

Mr. Nixon's retreat from his austere stance of last year is most obvious in the new life that he has given to programs he had planned to kill or scale back. Congressional objections to his plan to terminate the depressed-areas aid program of the Economic Development Administration persuaded the White House not only to keep it going to fiscal 1975 but also to propose a similar and permanent new program, routing aid through the states.

The new budget seeks \$250 million for the current fiscal year and \$350 million for fiscal 1975 to be used for public-service employment, which was on the chopping block a year ago. "I've given up fighting that because everyone seems to want it," Secretary Shultz says.

The budget includes other such retreats, some forced by Congress: \$109 million to run eight Public Health Service hospitals that had been on the closed-down list; \$15 million for a new program of grants to public libraries, another no-no in the hard-nosed days; and \$55 million to help train biology and medical-science Ph.D.'s, who weren't on the White House favorites' list a year ago.

But Mr. Nixon hasn't given up on all cutbacks he planned a year ago. He still wants to close the Office of Economic Opportunity, headquarters of President Johnson's war on poverty. But that idea isn't very controversial any more, mainly because most antipoverty operations have been spun off to other agencies and will continue even if the poverty office closes.

The President still wants also to end federal grants for construction of hospitals under the Hill-Burton program and to phase out federal aid to school districts educating many children of government employes, such as those around Washington and other big centers of federal employment.

THE THIEU REGIME AND THE AMERICAN PRESS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, over 50,000 American lives and countless billions of American dollars have been wasted over the past decade, supposedly in defense of the "democratic" Government of South Vietnam. Despite the rhetoric of American aid for "freedom" in South Vietnam, the brutal truth is that American manpower and money was washed down the drain by the blood of over 1 million human beings simply to perpetuate a series of petty, vicious dictators.

The Thieu regime should be an embarrassment to our Government which is subsidizing its survival. From the barbaric tiger cages for political prisoners to the suppression of civil liberties, General Thieu has made his mark in history as but one more tyrant masquerading as an elected leader.

Most recently, James Markham, chief of the Saigon bureau of the New York Times, was interrogated by South Vietnamese police because of articles he was researching. After spending a week in Vietcong territory, Markham returned to

Saigon to find himself detained by the Thieu regime's police. Notes and film were confiscated.

Of course, General Thieu has never made anything more than a pretense of a free press under his dictatorship. Even so, the attempt to interrogate Jim Markham and censor whatever news reports he might prepare from his research is an inexcusable suppression of the press.

Is this the type of government that the American people want to continue supporting?

A RURAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend I invite the attention of my colleagues and the Nation to a very imaginative, helpful, and economic program. It is a rural transportation facility which emerged from the energy and ingenuity of James McHale, secretary of agriculture of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and which received the encouragement and support of Governor Milton Shapp.

The system embraces small fleets of centrally dispatched minibuses operating in rural areas to transport rural residents. It has been particularly helpful in transporting the elderly or handicapped to doctors, hospitals, shopping or just visiting.

When this program was initiated it served a necessary and helpful purpose. Viewed now in the light of our crisis in fuel it is a rural necessity and it does not cost much. I plan to advise my district about this helpful innovative program and I urge those of my colleagues who serve rural districts to do likewise. The following is a brief outline of the program, its success and its service:

A RURAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Rural transportation in Pennsylvania took a giant step forward with the recent signing of contracts between state and local agencies that will install rural transportation services in 23 counties, it was announced today by Agriculture Secretary Jim McHale.

The transportation program will be operated by the Agriculture Department's Bureau of Rural Affairs.

McHale said the transportation networks are considered projects, modeled after an earlier project in four southwestern counties, aimed at eventually developing transportation systems in Pennsylvania's rural communities. "This is the way I like to study a problem," said McHale. "Get out there and provide a service while collecting information, rather than compile expensive volumes of reports in the exclusion of an office."

One contract signed was between the Agriculture Department and the Crawford County Community Action Association for \$67,000. The Crawford County association represents community action agencies in 21 western counties, and the \$67,000 is the local share of the 21-county project which will have a total one-year cost of \$387,000.

Of the total cost of \$387,000, about \$290,000 is federal money that will be routed to the project through a contract between the Agri-

culture Department and the state Welfare Department.

The remaining \$30,000 will be supplied by the state Agriculture Department through inkind and administrative services.

Besides the rural transportation project in the 21 western counties, the Agriculture Department will also administer a similar transportation project in Wyoming and Luzerne Counties. The department will receive about \$69,000 to run the project for six months through a contract signed with the United Services Agency which is funded by the state Welfare Department.

"This is the kind of packaging of monies on the federal, state and local levels that is needed to get the ball rolling for rural development," said McHale. "When the Agriculture Department got interested in building health, transportation and other services for rural areas, some detractors of this administration accused us of redirecting so-called farm money for projects they said other agencies should handle.

"Now it should be apparent to those detractors," said McHale, "that the Agriculture Department is the right agency to lead in rural development because of our outreach ability into rural areas. Everyone can see that we have been able to cooperate with other agencies in building nearly a \$½ million rural transportation program with only a fraction of seed money from the Agriculture Department."

For the past two years, the Agriculture Department operated a pilot rural transportation project in Westmoreland, Washington, Greene and Fayette Counties. With three quarters of the funding coming from the Welfare Department, the project operated ten minibuses in a four-county area, controlled by a central dispatcher.

The minibuses were ridden chiefly by the rural elderly, who had no access to cars or public transportation. They rode to stores to do their shopping, to their doctors, or simply to visit relatives and friends.

This network will now be expanded into another 11 counties: Beaver, Lawrence, Mercer, Crawford, Warren, Venango, Forest, Clarion, Butler, Armstrong, and Indiana. An average of two vehicles will operate in each of the 15 western counties, comprising a network controlled by one dispatching office.

Another six northwestern and northcentral counties will constitute a second network. These are, McKean, Potter, Cameron, Elk, Clearfield and Jefferson Counties. These counties already had rural transportation projects operated by various social services agencies, which now will merge into the Agriculture Department project.

The third network will operate in the two counties of Wyoming and Luzerne.

McHale said the three networks will offer a comparison for the transportation study, a principal aim of which is to determine the costs of placing transportation in rural areas.

McHale, who is chairman of the Governor's Task Force on Rural Transportation, said results of the study will enable the administration to proceed with its ultimate goal of establishing a statewide rural transportation program.

BEATRICE O'BRIEN: EDUCATIONAL PACESETTER

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1974, the friends and colleagues of Beatrice O'Brien will honor her retirement from the Los Angeles school

system after 37 years of distinguished service.

As a teacher, principal, and administrator Ms. O'Brien has been an educational pacesetter. She was an early promoter of establishing a community voice in the educational system. By bringing teacher, parent, and student together she facilitated better education. This exemplary service was rewarded with the numerous honors Ms. O'Brien received from the Los Angeles School District.

Ms. O'Brien has also lent her expertise to several organizations dedicated to educational excellence. She served as State president for elementary school administrators and for Delta Kappa Gamma, an honorary society of women in all levels of education. Her writings have wide professional recognition as well.

Perhaps most important in Ms. O'Brien's devotion to education is the legacy left to the many teachers she personally counseled during her long career. The fruits of this legacy will endure in the education of many boys and girls for years to come.

YOU CAN NEVER MERELY DO ONE THING

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the February 1974 issue of Fortune magazine. As we struggle to legislate responsibly and effectively, the editors comment on "Why Government Often Makes Matters Worse" or "Hardin's law" might well be kept at the back of our minds—particularly as we deal with such legislation as the Emergency Energy Act—for the side effects of what we do may be worse than that which we sought to remedy.

The editorial follows:

WHY GOVERNMENT OFTEN MAKES MATTERS WORSE

If a prize were to be awarded for the most illuminating single sentence authored in the past ten years, one of the candidates would surely be Hardin's Law, formulated by the California biologist Garrett Hardin. It says, with deceptive simplicity, "You can never do merely one thing." This is something like a very clean glass door—you're not sure at first glance whether anything is there. But those seven seemingly casual words express a profound truth about human affairs.

Hardin's Law applies to any action that changes something in a complex system, such as a natural environment or a human society. Even when the action has the intended effect, it also has other effects that are not intended. Sometimes these turn out to offset or outweigh the intended effect.

THE NEW HORSEPLAYERS

Two instructive examples have recently come to light. One of them has to do with the consequences of legalized off-track betting in New York City. As its proponents promised, OTB has succeeded in drawing a lot of horseplayers away from illegal bookies.

But according to a report prepared within the New York City police department, OTB has also created a large clientele of new horseplayers. The city government, indeed, now has an interest in attracting new bettors, and OTB has become a major local advertiser. Many of the new bettors are housewives; some of them, it appears, have turned to prostitution to make up their losses.

OTB, moreover, has helped create a climate favorable to other forms of gambling. In the words of a police-department spokesman, "Thousands of people who never in the world would have thought of betting on football or basketball or baseball are now betting with the bookies." As a result, illegal bookies are enjoying a bigger total handle than they did before OTB.

The other example of Hardin's Law has to do with federal disaster relief, the subject of a recently published study by Howard Kunreuther, associate professor of management at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce. Disaster relief, it appears, is something of a disaster itself.

Congress responded to the Alaska earthquake of 1964 with emergency aid so open-handed that some supposed victims ended up better off than they were before. This set the pattern for legislation that assures generous help for victims of earthquakes, hurricanes, and floods. They can get long-term loans, sometimes for much more than the claimed loss, at 5 percent interest—a handsome subsidy in these times. (Until Congress tightened up last year, the rate was 1 percent.) Efforts to ascertain whether the claimant in fact suffered as much damage as he says have sometimes been minimal.

INVITING IMPRUDENCE

What is mainly wrong here is not the generosity—government should be generous toward people who suffer grievously in disasters. Nor is it the cheating—though any government program that invites cheating is contributing to social breakdown. Nor is it the cost to taxpayers—after all, the burden is spread over millions of backs.

The serious evil is that by virtually removing economic penalties for imprudence, federal disaster relief invites imprudent behavior. In effect, government generosity is encouraging people to build and live and conduct business in earthquake zones and flood plains, and to do so without using special construction methods to reduce damage. Accordingly, the government is ensuring costlier disasters in the future.

That's Hardin's Law at work. It should not be used as an excuse for inertia or hardness of heart, but it does call upon us to show more toughness of mind. The advocates and architects of government efforts to make things better are often upper-middle-class people with Pollyannaish notions about human nature. They write legislation or set up institutions that encourage bad behavior, and then they are disappointed (though still hopeful) when the predictable occurs. An ounce of insight, Hardin's Law suggests, is worth a pound of good intentions.

THE CASE FOR RAILROAD FIRST AID

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is little argument that it would be desirable to have an efficient, speedy, modern railroad and mass transportation system. Environment, energy and the inadequacy of much of the present railroad and mass transit systems have turned the Nation's attention to the need and

cost and desirability of improving railroad and mass transit facilities.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing in the December 15, 1973, issue of *Business Week*, expressing expert views on this subject. William B. Johnson, chairman and chief executive of IC Industries, which operates the Illinois Central Railroad, has briefly, but eloquently, stated "the case for railroad first aid." I recommend to my colleagues a study of his views as expressed below:

THE CASE FOR RAILROAD FIRST AID

Our booming economy has been substantially created upon assumptions calling for cheap and limitless energy. An energy shortage is thus bound to cause a period of deep social, commercial, and financial concern.

Less than 50 years ago, our economy was the marvel of the world—and it had achieved that status without abusing the air, land, and energy resources that we now recognize as having limits. We had trains, transit systems, autos, trucks and, within cyclical variations, an economy that functioned well.

We have since seen great and rapid change, including the wonders of air and automotive transportation in great abundance. But demand and supply trends for petroleum energy are not now reassuring, and our transportation systems, like many of our industrial systems, are geared to plentiful petroleum. At the same time, the U.S. economy depends upon transportation to a degree almost unheard of elsewhere. A White House study shows that transportation of people and freight consumed 25% of the energy used in the U.S. in 1970.

It seems obvious to many in government, academe, business, and the media that dramatic help in energy conservation can come from shifting transportation somewhat toward the less energy-intensive modes, such as railroads and mass transit.

Can we make this shift?

Yes, but to a limited degree at the moment. Unfortunately, the railroad industry, for all practical purposes, is in such condition that present unprecedented business volume approaches the physical limit of its fixed plant, power units, and rolling stock. Public policy on transportation financing, regulation, and taxation, has remained slanted toward accelerating further development of the energy-intensive transport modes despite 30 years of government studies and reports indicating the necessity of a more balanced approach. The result has been a decided imbalance in allocation of public and private resources for transport capability. Now the nation may, for some indeterminate period, have to pay the price of neglecting to encourage, compensate, or make investments in railroad modernization and productive capacity.

A REALLOCATION

It is beginning, however, to consider the great response that a financially strong and modern rail system could make to the nation's present need. Railroads move more than three times as much freight per gallon of fuel as large trucks and 125 times as much freight per gallon as a cargo airplane. The environmental impact is similarly beguiling: Rail emissions are 1.03 grams per ton-mile, while trucks create 3.76 grams per ton-mile. Railroads also occupy much less land space than do street and highway rights-of-way for comparable movements of freight. Clearly, a super railroad system would be a very valuable asset for the U.S. when the Arabs play petroleum politics.

Yet, our government's expenditures continue to promote greater dependence upon other transport modes. As a nation we are spending some \$28.2-billion of public monies in 1973 for support of transportation in one form or another. More than 86% will have

been spent for highways, 10% for air, 3.7% for waterways, but less than one-tenth of 1% for rail.

This policy needs revision to reflect a more equitable and efficient use of resources and, more particularly, a recognition of our national energy, pollution, and land-use goals.

One quick approach would be to start allocating 5% to 10%—rather than 1/10th of 1%—of our \$28-billion of annual public investment in transportation to railroad systems and public transit.

For a long while, public service needs have called for investment of about \$3.5-billion a year in railroad fixed plant and rolling stock. Since World War II, rail companies have earned only about 3% on their invested funds (while borrowing at much higher interest rates) and paid \$17.2-billion in income, *ad valorem*, and miscellaneous taxes. Consequently, they have rarely been able to invest more than \$1.5-billion a year in modernization and capacity even while borrowing heavily. Meanwhile, the nation's legislatures lavished more than \$350-billion on other transport modes during the same period, practically all of it for more energy-intensive and air-polluting operations.

NEW TASKS

If, for first aid in this energy crunch, the level of public investment in rails could be, say, 7½% of the annual public outlay, and if their own private investment level can be maintained, the improvement in railroad capacity could become substantial in just months. Even after 30 years of restricted, inadequate earnings and asset cannibalism, the rails still handle 38% of the nation's intercity ton-miles of cargo. The combined public and private investment of \$3.5-billion could enable the railroad industry to shoulder important new tasks for the nation in a relatively short period. In five years, the U.S. could start enjoying the many benefits of a modern super-railroad national system.

We will not solve our energy and environmental problems and at the same time cope with demand unless we get more in terms of transport performance per gallon of fuel.

When well-led and mobilized, our nation demonstrably can work wonders in solving major problems, and in time we will surely achieve both our energy and environmental goals. Of the available courses of action, few are more promising of short- and long-term advantage than to begin immediately some modest reallocation to railroads of present annual government expenditures for transportation facilities and equipment.

SHORTAGES OF PIPING AND CASING INCREASE ALTHOUGH WE HAVE EMBARGO BILLS IN COMMITTEE TO CORRECT EXPORTING TO MIDDLE EAST NATIONS

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, one of the important issues of our energy crisis is the shortages of piping and casing necessary to drill for oil in this country. Our embargo bills would specifically stop the shipping of these items to the Middle East as long as our country is having embargoes enforced on us. It would certainly help to keep piping and casing for independent oil companies in order that they might explore and drill for more oil here in the United States.

Because of the interest of my col-

leagues and the American people in this subject, I place into the RECORD a letter from Croft Petroleum Co. of Montana telling of the shortages of piping and casing and the unfortunate image created because of these shortages:

I'm getting damn sick and tired of having the industry in which I make my living, and the industry that has contributed so much to the greatness of America, kicked around, castigated, and abused by every two-bit political hack with some self-serving axe to grind. It's enough to try a man's soul to see elected representatives from our great State of Montana stand tongue tied and mute in defense of their constituency in those hallowed Halls of Congress while his way of life is put to the rack of Congressional inquisition. I've spent 28 years in all phases of this business, raising and educating a family, trying to act like a good citizen, and I don't feel that I owe an apology to any man for being an oil and gas producer. In all the years in this business I've met darn few of these so-called "oil millionaires", and these political vocalists who scream about excess profits in this business should join forces with me when I've had a run of tough luck and drilled 7 or 8 heart-breaking and expensive dry holes in a row . . . excess profits my backside.

These people who scream about the industry's favored tax treatment do not know of what they speak, let me give you some facts about the taxes just in the State of Montana—we pay the following and its one hell of a bunch of money:

1. Montana Oil and Gas Conservation Commission Tax.
2. Montana gross production tax.
3. Montana net proceeds of mines tax.
4. Montana Resources Indemnity tax.
5. Montana corporation license tax.
6. Montana unemployment compensation tax.
7. Montana Industrial Accident tax.
8. Montana property tax.

This is a tough competitive business, we're exposed to all kinds and types of handicaps that are not shared in by other industries, and we in the industry take some pride in the fact we can take these things on the chin and keep coming back for more; but we consider it a low blow when one of our congressional leaders is quoted as endorsing a government supported oil and gas company who would be using our tax dollars to compete against us.

Our biggest problem right now is the shortage of well casing in which to carry forward an exploration program, this problem is not unique to northern Montana but covers the whole Rocky Mountain scene. If Congress will help put pipe in the hands of the supply houses you'll see the greatest burst of drilling activity this country has seen in many years, you'll see what the industry does with excess profits.

Sincerely,

W. S. CROFT,
President.

SOVIET OIL AND U.S. TECHNOLOGY: PART III

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have been discussing the Soviet need for U.S. technology to develop their energy resources particularly their petroleum resources. With the lesson of the Arab oil embargo, which

has been supported by countries considered friendly to the United States, it seems completely foolhardy to become engaged in the development of Soviet oil resources. The Soviets would have less hesitancy in using oil as a weapon than the Arabs have. This being the case, American development of Soviet energy resources makes no sense. At this point I include in the RECORD two articles from the Oil Daily of Tuesday, January 8, entitled "U.S. Eyes Soviet Tyumen Field" and "Oil Engineering Mag Undertaken By U.S., Russia."

U.S. EYES SOVIET TYUMEN FIELD—GULF HASN'T DECIDED WHETHER TO PARTICIPATE

WASHINGTON.—American oil firms have expressed a continuing interest in development of the Tyumen oil field in the Ural mountains of the Soviet Union, despite Japanese reports to the contrary.

A spokesman for Gulf Oil said his company has "not slackened our interest," explaining "we have asked the Japanese to be kept informed of preliminary negotiations" which are looking initially to whether the reserves potential in the Siberian field are as great as the Russians contend. He added, however, that his firm has "not come to a decision" to participate in development of the field.

In a February, 1972, visit to Tokyo Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko began discussions of the feasibility of building a 4,850-mile oil pipeline from Tyumen to the port of Nakhodka on the Siberian Pacific Coast. The Soviet proposal reportedly sought a Japanese investment of \$1 billion in construction funds, with added American participation of an unspecified amount.

At year's end, Japanese financial and industry sources asserted the American oil firms had shelved, if not given up, their decision to take part in the proposed project, in view of the fourth Middle East war.

A spokesman for the State Department said he would be "rather surprised" if the report were true. He said the administration had not become "disillusioned" with the proposed joint venture, but indeed thought initial talks had been "going rather well."

The spokesman, on the department's Soviet Affairs desk, noted an American delegation of oil experts were in the Soviet Union last month for exploratory work survey discussions.

Tokyo had hoped to receive 40 million tons of oil from the Soviet field, but Moscow reportedly had scaled that figure down to 25 million tons. The State Department source said he understood the Japanese were "disenchanted" by that reduction, but that they were "still going ahead, at least through the exploratory stage."

An official of the department's oil and gas section said the U.S. is not contemplating investment of federal funds in the pipeline, at this time. Nevertheless, he said the American oil companies "are proceeding on schedule as far as I know."

The administration has taken no position on the project as a matter of foreign policy. "We've told the (U.S.) companies we have no objection to their preliminary investigations, but we have withheld any commitment of funds until other economic data are available."

He was reluctant to discuss the Tokyo assertion that the Nixon administration was behind the reported disruption of the talks, especially in light of the current shaky U.S.-Soviet detente.

This delicate treatment of the Soviet Union occurs as the U.S. is also reported interested, with mainland China, in exploitation of supposedly massive undersea oil reserves off the east and southeast coasts of the People's Republic of China.

The two American companies reported in-

terested in the joint Soviet venture were Gulf and Occidental, though it was clear other corporations would be needed to help finance the huge costs of such a long transmission line.

OIL ENGINEERING MAG UNDERTAKEN BY UNITED STATES, RUSSIA

HOUSTON.—Petroleum Engineer Publishing Co., Dallas, will cooperate with the Soviet trade organization, Mezhniga, to produce a trade journal which will be distributed through Russia and in seven other East European countries, the President of the Dallas firm announced.

Abbott Sparks called the arrangement "a significant breakthrough in technical communication" and said it evidently is the first of its kind since the USSR signed the so-called universal copyright convention.

He said editorial material will be translated in Moscow. The new publication will be entitled "Inzhenerneftiannik," the Russian equivalent of "petroleum engineer." It will be circulated to petroleum engineering and operating officials and to Soviet petroleum ministers.

The Dallas company, which published the magazines Petroleum Engineer and Pipeline & Gas Journal, will sell advertising in the joint venture publication from its offices in the U.S., Western Europe and Japan.

STEEL WIRE ROPE FROM JAPAN

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives recently passed the Trade Reform Act of 1973. I supported this legislation and believe its eventual enactment into law will result in fruitful negotiations which will allow the United States to expand trade. New tariff reductions and nontariff barrier removal as well as amendments to the Anti-Dumping Act will, in the long run, benefit both this nation and our trading partners.

However, the U.S. Tariff Commission made the determination of injury pursuant to the Anti-Dumping Act on a commodity from Japan—steel wire rope. The Tariff Commission found that the Japanese were selling this commodity far below its market value and as a result both American industry and workers were being injured.

The bulk of international trade must be both fair and equitable to all nations. In the case of importation of Japanese steel wire rope, unfair practices were being used by the Japanese in the American market.

Since in future years and particularly after the upcoming negotiations are completed, more of these antidumping issues may arise. I think it would be of interest to my colleagues to insert at this point in the RECORD the U.S. Tariff Commission's recent decision on steel wire rope from Japan.

The report follows:

[U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, Sept. 7, 1973, AA1921-124]

STEEL WIRE ROPE FROM JAPAN

DETERMINATION OF INJURY

On June 7, 1973, the Tariff Commission received advice from the Treasury Department

that steel wire rope from Japan is being, or is likely to be, sold at less than fair value within the meaning of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended. In accordance with the requirements of section 201(a) of the Antidumping Act (19 U.S.C. 160(a)), the Tariff Commission instituted investigation No. AA1921-124 to determine whether an industry in the United States is being, or is likely to be injured, or is prevented from being established, by reason of the importation of such merchandise into the United States.

A public hearing was held on August 2 and 3, 1973. Notice of the investigation and hearing was published in the *Federal Register* of June 20, 1973 (38 F.R. 16118).

In arriving at a determination in this case, the Commission gave due consideration to all written submissions from interested parties, evidence adduced at the hearing, and all factual information obtained by the Commission's staff from questionnaires, personal interviews, and other sources.

On the basis of the investigation, the Commission has determined by a vote of 2 to 1¹ that an industry in the United States is being injured by reason of the importation of steel wire rope from Japan that is being, or is likely to be, sold at less than fair value within the meaning of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended.

STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR AFFIRMATIVE DETERMINATION BY CHAIRMAN BEDELL AND COMMISSIONER MOORE

The Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended, requires that the Tariff Commission find two conditions satisfied before an affirmative determination can be made.

First, there must be injury or likelihood of injury to an industry in the United States.² Second, such injury or likelihood of injury must be by reason of the importation into the United States of the class or kind of foreign merchandise which the Secretary of the Treasury has determined is being, or is likely to be, sold at less than fair value (LTFV).

In our judgment, both of the aforementioned conditions are satisfied. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth below, we have determined that an industry in the United States is being injured by reason of the importation of steel wire rope from Japan sold at LTFV.³

In making this determination under section 201(a) of the Antidumping Act, we have considered the injured industry to consist of the operations of the U.S. facilities producing steel wire rope.

The U.S. steel wire rope industry in the United States, presently consisting of 17 U.S. firms with 23 plants located in 13 States, has traditionally recognized six "zones" or "regions" as areas to be serviced either by a regional manufacturing plant or warehouse facility. In addition to significant freight-cost differentials between these six regions, there also exist separate and distinct regional pricing and discounting levels that reflect

¹ Chairman Bedell and Commissioner Moore determined in the affirmative; Commissioner Ablond determined in the negative. Commissioner Young did not participate in the determination, and Vice Chairman Parker and Commissioner Leonard were absent.

² Prevention of establishment of an industry is not an issue in the instant case.

³ At the hearing, certain importers of a Japanese product, described as copper-coated steel-wire cord of stranded construction of a type used to reinforce automobile and truck tires, raised a question as to the applicability of the Treasury Department's determination of LTFV sales to this product. The complainants agreed that the U.S. steel wire rope industry did not make a product of this description.

specific market characteristics and competition.

Of these six regions, the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest and the South Central Regions were of the greatest concern to interested parties in this case. Data supplied to the Commission during its investigation indicated that during the period 1970-72 over half of U.S. shipments were sold in the Pacific Southwest, Pacific Northwest, and South Central Regional markets. It is apparent that these three regions are vitally important to the U.S. industry in its marketing of wire rope in the United States. We are of the opinion that there has been substantial injury to the U.S. industry in these three market areas. We believe that LTFV imports of steel wire rope from Japan into these three regions have been of sufficient magnitude to cause injury to the U.S. industry.

Market penetration

Imports of steel wire rope from Japan, the principal foreign supplier, have nearly doubled over a 5-year period, from 9,912 net tons in 1968 to 18,996 net tons in 1972. During the 6-month period January-June 1973, such imports amounted to 11,413 net tons, or about one-fifth more than during the corresponding period in 1972. It is clear that the tide of imports determined by the Treasury Department to have been sold at less than fair value has entered the United States and the regional market areas identified above in substantial volume.

The penetration of LTFV imports has occurred in the regional markets identified above in sufficient volume as to be injurious to the entire U.S. industry. For example, in 1970 the bulk of Japanese imports of steel wire rope sold in the Pacific Southwest, Pacific Northwest, and the South Central Regions were equal to about 8 percent of U.S. producers' shipments for these areas. In 1972, such imports from Japan increased to about 11 percent of U.S. producers' shipments. Such regional market penetration by LTFV imports has caused plant closures, market withdrawals, and a general suppression of wire rope prices in these geographic areas to the point where such prices are lower than prices paid elsewhere for wire rope in the United States.

Price suppression

Information developed during the investigation showed that prices received by Japanese importers were consistently well below those received by domestic producers. For example, between the first quarter of 1970 and the second quarter of 1973, the prices of five particular items of Japanese wire rope—which Treasury found to have been sold at LTFV—averaged 22 to 38 percent below the prices received by domestic producers for the same items. Such price differentials were even more pronounced in the Pacific Southwest, Pacific Northwest, and South Central Regions. As a result, in order to remain competitive, U.S. producers have been prevented from increasing their prices to offset fully increased costs of domestic production.

Loss of sales

Data supplied to the Commission documents specific examples of sales lost to LTFV imports. Although demonstration of every lost sale was not possible, it is clear from the evidence of price suppression that loss of sales has taken place, particularly in the Pacific Southwest, Pacific Northwest, and South Central Regions, where the price disparities between LTFV imports of wire rope and domestic wire rope are especially pronounced.

Plant closures

Since January 1, 1968, six plants producing steel wire rope in the United States have closed, and an estimated 1,300 workers have lost their jobs. Among the plants closing were two operated by Colorado Fuel and Iron Corp., one of the largest U.S. steel wire rope producers, where over 900 workers were

employed. We believe these plant closures and resultant unemployment have been due in part to LTFV imports of steel wire rope from Japan.

Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing we conclude that an industry in the United States is being injured by reason of the importation of steel wire rope from Japan that is being, or is likely to be, sold at less than fair value.

STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE NEGATIVE DETERMINATION OF COMMISSIONER ABLONDI

Although there have been LTFV imports of steel wire rope from Japan in recent years, and these imports may have caused some slight market disruption, I am unable to find injury, or likelihood of injury, to an industry within the meaning of the Anti-dumping Act, 1921, as amended.

There is an industry in the United States presently producing steel wire rope and it consists of 17 firms which are geographically located nationwide. The complainant, for example, with production facilities in Kenosha, Wis., sells and services the west coast area. Other firms in the industry located on the east coast do the same. Evidence, in part, indicates that most of the 17 firms are now producing at capacity (three shifts a day, 5½ day a week); that many of these plants are weeks behind in filling current orders with existing production capacity; and that the industry is operating at a generally increasing profit level. I do not believe that the industry above described is being injured by reason of the LTFV imports.

The complainant in this proceeding contends that the west coast area and the south central region are the areas most affected by LTFV imports from Japan. Application of this regional concept of injury would not, in my opinion, lead to a finding of injury to an industry of steel wire rope producers located in the regions complained of.

The four plants currently operating in the west coast area and south central region have increased their shipments by about 19 percent during the period 1970-72—the period when the injury alleged by the domestic producers is claimed to have occurred. Secondly, available data on net operating profits of wire rope operations for the plants most likely affected, i.e., those in the west coast and south central areas, indicate that profits were larger in 1972 (the year when Treasury found LTFV sales), both in absolute terms and as a percent of net sales, than in any year since 1968. Imports of steel wire rope from another Asian country were at a unit price level lower than that of the Japanese and compete in the same region.

The regional industry that would most likely be injured by reason of the importation of LTFV imports from Japan does not appear to be injured in light of available data. It has been reported that one large firm currently manufacturing on the east coast intends to begin manufacture of steel wire rope on a limited basis at one of its west coast steelmaking facilities.

In conclusion, since there appears to be sufficient reason to believe that no injury has occurred to domestic producers of steel wire rope by reason of LTFV imports of steel wire rope from Japan, I find no injury, or likelihood of injury, to an industry in the instant investigation.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION REQUESTED

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Christian A. Addison of St. Peters-

burg has requested that I draw the following communication to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

St. PETERSBURG, FLA., January 26, 1974
Congressman C. W. BILL YOUNG,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNG: Will you be so kind as to read this on the floor to your fellow Congressmen, so that they might understand the feeling of non-political taxpayers:

"CONGRESS: A LOT OF TALKING BUT A MINIMUM OF ACTION"

"Editor: In the belated and frantic search for the causes of all our current misfortunes, it is strange that the real culprit has succeeded in escaping responsibility. It requires only a minimum of mental effort to place the blame where it belongs . . . on our lawmakers.

"Congress, which callously took a one month (yes, a full month) vacation amid the raging storm of the energy crisis, is back in Washington and supposedly ready to get down to business of enacting legislation designed to get the nation again on an even keel. But what do we hear? Nothing but word of re-opened investigations, continued hearings, more schemes for shifting the blame for our troubles to the President, to the oil companies, to industry, to businessmen . . . anywhere to divert attention from their own shortcomings.

"So instead of serious action we face another six months of do nothing.

"It is the responsibility of Congress to give us laws that will keep the nation operating smoothly. But note their action in the current crisis. With the oil shortage threatening catastrophe our august statesmen labored . . . and brought forth highway speed reduction. They went home for a month to flutter over the countryside backslapping voters, patching political fences and incidentally, burning up enough gasoline to offset substantially, if not altogether eliminate the gas savings by lower auto speeds.

"Hell of a way to run a country!—Hal Fisher, Holiday."

The above letter to the St. Petersburg Times expresses the feelings of thousands of us taxpayers. You cannot avoid your responsibilities by "passing the buck". What is your answer?

Most sincerely yours,

C.A. ADDISON.

RIVALRIES IMPERIL ZUMWALT'S CAREER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been drawn to a column in the January 3 Chicago Tribune by that publication's Washington correspondent and columnist, Bill Anderson.

Although after a month some commentaries acquire obsolescent, but in this particular case, the questions raised and subject that is analyzed by columnist Anderson remain very pertinent. Therefore, I submit this article for the RECORD assuming it will raise some interesting questions:

RIVALRIES IMPERIL ZUMWALT'S CAREER

(By Bill Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—The American military is coming dangerously close to losing one of its most brilliant and innovative senior officers—Adm. Elmo R. [Bud] Zumwalt—because of a

rivalry that has reached into the White House.

Our reports from the Pentagon disclose that back-stabbing tactics are being used against the modern-minded reformer to undermine him as chief of naval operations in an attempt to end his military career on June 1. Success in this effort would head off the possibility that he could remain in uniform for another term or become chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Zumwalt has been the subject of the whispering campaign by mossbacked admirals since he made a command decision nearly four years ago to give women and blacks more opportunity [and rank] in the Navy and drop other rigid, traditional regulations. The 52-year-old working boss of the Navy created the most public upheaval, however, when he allowed sailors to grow beards and longer hair.

Closer to the heart of his problem, tho, is the fact that Zumwalt departed from the Navy's losing budget concepts, demanded cost accounting and efficiency, and went directly to Capitol Hill to fight for flexibility rather than a single defense concept. Ironically, his views on mobility are known to be exceptionally close to those of the new defense secretary, James R. Schlesinger.

Insiders in the military maze see both Schlesinger and Zumwalt as intellectuals, thinkers in an organization more noted for looking to precedents than to the reality of given strategic situations. Both men gave early-warning signals about today's energy crisis.

Zumwalt's unique stance, which began to take form in the early days of the Kennedy administration, has made him a highly visible target for the hide-bound factions of the military. One principal opponent has been Adm. George Anderson, ret. [No relation to this columnist], former chief of naval operations who was fired during the Kennedy administration.

Anderson became a bitter foe of Robert F. McNamara, Kennedy's secretary of defense, partly because the admiral was a big-ship advocate at a time when McNamara was questioning their high costs. At the same time, the then Capt. Zumwalt was helping Navy Secretary Paul Nitze make the service more adaptable to the requirements of the period.

Zumwalt's success was spectacular, while Anderson was demoted to becoming an ambassador to get him out of the country [to keep peace in the official family]. Anderson has since led a submerged attack on Zumwalt.

Anderson was aided in his battle because the Navy was saddled with two dilettantes as civilian secretaries—John H. Chafee, who spent much of his time preparing to run for the Senate in Rhode Island [he lost], and Incumbent Secretary John W. Warner, a rich playboy [and heavy campaign contributor] who likes the pomp and ceremony that the military can present.

Both of these secretaries have been highly unimpressive to senior lawmakers who pass on budgets and strategy—especially during the period when the military slipped in public support because of the Viet Nam War. The result has been to shift more of the legislative load to people like Zumwalt and his principal assistants.

Until March, Zumwalt's position was also being undermined at the White House by Charles W. [Chuck] Colson, a former special assistant to the President—and a former noncombat Marine junior officer. Some senior marines, who disliked Zumwalt's liberalism regarding personnel, used Colson as their conduit to attempt to discredit the admiral.

And now taking advantage of the Warner-Anderson-Marine Corps situation is Adm. Isaac [Ike] C. Kidd, an ambitious former destroyer officer who is actively campaigning for Zumwalt's job. Kidd is promising a return to the "old Navy."

Altho Kidd may be in the lead at the moment, there are six other candidates, some younger than he is [54] and more inclined to follow in Zumwalt's footsteps. The conventional wisdom of the Pentagon is that Zumwalt will be forced out. But the fact is that Zumwalt's leadership has made numerous, powerful, and bipartisan friends for him on Capitol Hill. They are likely to call on the President to keep this bold, talented admiral in the military.

NO PAY INCREASE FOR CONGRESS

HON. WILEY MAYNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President very unwisely recommended that salaries of Congressmen and Senators be increased by approximately 7½ percent. I am unalterably opposed to such a pay hike and have already filed a bill to prevent it. I invite all Members of the House to join with me in doing whatever is necessary to bring my resolution of disapproval to a recorded vote.

Our chances of defeating this ill-advised and untimely increase in salary will be greatly improved if every Member is required to stand up and vote in accordance with his clear constitutional responsibility. Otherwise many Members may find it easier and more profitable to look the other way while the salary increase recommended by the Commission on Legislative Salaries and endorsed in part by the President automatically goes into effect.

Mr. Speaker, we have been down this road before and it is not one of which the Members of the House or Senate can be proud. I well recall joining my good friend the senior Congressman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) in an unsuccessful battle to head off an even more outrageous raid on the Treasury in 1969. Congressman GROSS and I pleaded with both of the two committees having jurisdiction and with the Democratic leadership of the House to permit a recorded vote on the 41-percent increase then ordered by President Lyndon Johnson. I took the floor of the House daily to urge my colleagues to block this blatant invitation to the forces of inflation.

I said then, and I repeat now, that Congressmen should be setting an example to the rest of the country in the battle against inflation. What kind of an example are we setting if by our inaction we permit our own salaries to be raised by 7½ percent? Unless the House or Senate passes a resolution of disapproval within 30 days, the recommended increase automatically becomes law under the terms of the Federal Salary Act.

I have introduced and urged the passage of bills which would eliminate this nefarious automatic provision and require a record affirmative vote on any pay increase in each of the last three Congresses, and Mr. Speaker, I feel even more strongly on the subject today. I cannot think of a worse time to raise the salaries of Senators and Congressmen. Hardly a day passes without some Gov-

ernment official in or out of Congress lecturing farmers, businessmen, workers, and consumers on the sacrifices they should continue to make to bring inflation under control. The Congress is still insisting on wage and price controls which impose guidelines of 5.5 percent annual wage increases upon the laboring men and women of this country. How in heaven's name can the Congress justify a 7½-percent salary increase for itself? The answer is that it cannot.

Mr. Speaker, I have no pride of authorship in the resolution which I have introduced to block the pay increase. I will support any Member in any bill and join in any parliamentary strategy to forestall its going into effect. I have today signed a discharge petition and urge other Members to do likewise to force a record vote.

All the arguments which I voiced in the Chamber in 1969 against that pay increase have been vindicated by subsequent events. The horrible example set by Congress at that time triggered demands from Federal employees and every other branch of our society, setting off a new round of inflation. It will do so again if we now repeat the mistake of making an exception for ourselves and permitting this automatic salary increase. At the very least, we should stand up and be counted in a record vote which will show the position of each Member on this important issue. Our constituents are entitled to know where individual Congressmen and Senators really stand on inflation when our own pocketbooks are involved.

EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, I introduced legislation (H.R. 11846) to greatly expand and improve special education programs for handicapped and gifted children. Support for this legislation has been extremely encouraging, and today I am reintroducing this legislation on behalf of myself and 32 of my colleagues.

There are some 7 million handicapped children in the United States. Close to 60 percent of these children are being denied the educational programs they need, to have full equality of opportunity. One million of them have been excluded from public schools entirely.

For most of these children, educational services are something they will receive only through the perseverance and sacrifice—often at prohibitive cost—of their parents. Tragically, the education they are likely to receive will in no way prepare them for full, useful, and rewarding lives.

During the 1971-72 school year, there were seven States in which less than 20 percent of the population of handicapped children were provided educational services. In 19 States, 31 percent or less of the handicapped population was served.

Only 17 States served more than 50 percent of all handicapped children.

It is impossible to justify our nationwide situation. The blunt truth is that for far too long Government has been willing to condemn generation after generation of handicapped youngsters to lives without hope and without help.

That is not to say that we have not made any progress. In 1971, some 799 bills were introduced in State legislatures which sought to provide educational services for handicapped children; 237 of these bills were passed. We have increased Federal assistance to the States for this purpose from a mere \$45 million 5 years ago to \$215 million in the 1972 fiscal year. But this has been a token expenditure.

The progress we have made is simply not enough.

It is time for us to recognize that handicapped children are, above all, children. They have the same rights as any other child to live, to learn, to be free. Last August, this view was affirmed by a U.S. district court which declared that all handicapped children have a constitutional right to full, free, public education. It is up to us to assure that that right is a reality.

Nor are the handicapped the only children who are not receiving the kind of educational experience which they need and deserve. Ironically, those who have been termed our most precious resource, have likewise been overlooked—our gifted youngsters.

In the past, the existence of gifted children has scarcely been acknowledged by our formal institutions of education. And even when their presence has been recognized, their needs have been neglected.

There are at least 2 million children who should be considered as gifted—yet even the most generous estimates claim that only 80,000 of these youngsters are now receiving appropriate education. Only 10 States—including Connecticut—have a full-time person responsible for gifted and talented children. Only 22 States have laws to provide funds for their education. And many of these States have never appropriated funds.

This situation is best summed up in a 1971 Office of Education report that concluded that education of the gifted was of so little concern to Federal, State, and most local governments that it best could be described as "nonexistent on the national agenda."

Much of the reason for this is that we have been inhibited by the feeling that any special attention to the gifted is somehow alien to the true purposes of education in a democratic society—that gifted youngsters can do it on their own. But a bright mind will not always make its own way. Intellectual and creative talent cannot survive educational neglect and apathy.

Education must meet the needs of students. All students.

The Education for Exceptional Children Act would provide a quantum jump in the number and quality of special education programs available to exceptional children.

This legislation provides a basic en-

titlement to each State to aid them in expanding their efforts in educating these children; it provides grants for the training of teachers and supervisors to help guide these youngsters. It establishes a national clearinghouse to facilitate the interchange of information and ideas relating to this area of education. It sets stringent guidelines to assure that exceptional children—children with unusual learning needs, the gifted, the handicapped. They must not be neglected any longer.

Our challenge is to provide each and every one of them with a quality education.

I believe that we can meet that challenge.

The following list of Members of Congress have joined me in sponsoring the Education for Exceptional Children Act:

Robert H. Steele (Conn.).
Bella Abzug (N.Y.).
Joseph Addabbo (N.Y.).
Herman Badillo (N.Y.).
Shirley Chisholm (N.Y.).
Cardiss Collins (Ill.).
John Davis (Ga.).
Joshua Eilberg (Pa.).
Walter Fauntroy (D.C.).
Ella Grasso (Conn.).
Michael Harrington (Mass.).
Augustus Hawkins (Calif.).
Lawrence Hogan (Md.).
Elizabeth Holtzman (N.Y.).
Albert Johnson (Pa.).
Robert Leggett (Calif.).
Romano Mazzoli (Ky.).
Joseph McDade (Pa.).
Donald Mitchell (N.Y.).
Joe Moakley (Mass.).
Morgan Murphy (Ill.).
Wayne Owens (Utah).
Thomas Rees (Calif.).
Benjamin Rosenthal (N.Y.).
Edward Roybal (Calif.).
Ronald Sarasin (Conn.).
Paul Sarbanes (Md.).
Louis Stokes (Ohio).
Robert Tiernan (R.I.).
Jerome Waldie (Calif.).
Charles Wilson (Calif.).
Antonio Borja Won Pat (Guam).
Gus Yatron (Pa.).

CANAL ROULETTE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the U.S. military announces plans to counter Soviet gains in reopening the Suez Canal, the U.S. State Department announces its continued goal of losing U.S. control of the Panama Canal.

I include related news clippings:

UNITED STATES MOVES TO COUNTER SOVIET
GAINS IN SUEZ OPENING

(By George Sherman)

The United States is quietly moving to counter the strategic advantage that the Russians will gain from the opening of the Suez Canal.

The over-all aim, senior U.S. officials say, is to convince Moscow that the U.S.-Soviet detente cannot survive any new Soviet drive into the oil-rich Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean.

American intelligence is convinced that both Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and

the Soviet leadership are determined to have the canal opened in six months.

According to a senior Egyptian diplomat, Kuwait has guaranteed \$30 million from its oil revenues for rehabilitation of the canal.

That includes removing 15 ships trapped in the Great Bitter Lake on the canal and some 90 concrete block and other objects still submerged from the 1967 war.

Rehabilitation also includes clearing away the causeway built across the canal by the Israelis in last October's war and repairing 11 signal houses along the canal—perhaps adding closed-circuit television for better navigation.

The U.S. officials agree that all present signs show the canal will be open within six months for the first time since June 1967 to tankers, warships and merchant men. Both the United States and the Soviet Union will have access to the canal.

The rewards for Sadat are obvious, say U.S. officials. Not only can Egypt demonstrate the fruits of its first agreement with Israel to evacuate Arab territory, but the \$250 million in revenue from the canal can give Egypt more economic independence from Soviet aid.

The rewards for the Russians are equally obvious, say these officials. The Soviet Union now keeps up to 30 warships from its Pacific fleet in the Indian Ocean; the fleet is based in Vladivostok—11,000 miles away. With the canal open, Soviet ships can come from the Black Sea—only 2,200 miles away.

U.S. officials also acknowledge that the Russians can make maximum use of this new opportunity to "show the flag" in the area. Besides carrying on an accelerated naval shipbuilding program, far ahead of that of the United States, the Soviets have cultivated free use of ports in Somalia on the African coast just south of the Red Sea. They also appear to have facilities on the Somalian island of Socotra off the Arabian peninsula.

Furthermore, Soviet military aid has gone to the radical regime of South Yemen, with its capital of Aden on the tip of the Arabian peninsula.

But American officials doubt that the Soviet Union will move immediately to reinforce this foothold through dramatic use of the Suez Canal.

For one thing, its standing is already precarious. Any greatly enlarged Soviet military presence, say experts, will increase the determination of the conservative governments of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and their Arab allies—plus non-Arab but Moslem Iran—to resist Soviet encroachment.

At the same time, the reopening of the canal according to calculations in Washington, will bring added Western commerce, and perhaps, influence, to areas such as South Yemen and Somalia, now cut off from their traditional ties with Western Europe.

The United States, these officials say, is also going out of its way to warn the Soviet Union that oil and the survival of the industrialized West are at stake. For instance, on Nov. 30, Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger announced the United States would keep a continuous "naval presence" in the Indian Ocean. Since the October war, two separate American carrier forces have been on the move there.

The American naval "facility" at Bahrain, an Arab principality at the end of the Persian Gulf, continues in full operation—despite the announcement during the October war from Bahrain that the agreement would be ended within the year. The United States keeps its Middle East force there—two destroyers and a converted amphibious transport dock as flagship.

The United States and Britain, meanwhile, are putting final touches to an agreement for changing a small naval communications station on the British-held island of Diego-Garcia in the Indian Ocean into a land-based facility for American task forces in the area.

According to informed sources, the plan is to enlarge the airstrip and build fuel storage facilities. The island will then be able to take carrier aircraft and large jet transport planes in case of crisis. The new airfields will enormously increase the range of U.S. carriers patrolling the Indian Ocean.

But officials in the Pentagon and State Department acknowledge these military moves are largely gestures. "If the Soviet Union has the will for a confrontation south of Suez," said one Pentagon official, "we will obviously have to do much more."

Present calculations suggest, however, that the gestures will be enough to convince Moscow that worldwide detente with the United States is at stake in the Indian Ocean.

And oil producers such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iran—which already have strong economic and military ties to the United States—will also be bolstered in their efforts to neutralize any Soviet flanking moves via the canal.

PANAMA CHIEF AWAITS VISITS

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger is in for a novel experience this week when he journeys to Panama to meet the tough little strong man, Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, for the first time.

Kissinger and Torrijos get together Thursday in Panama City to agree on a set of principles for negotiation of a new treaty on the Canal Zone and the isthmian waterway. It will be the shortest international trip ever taken by Kissinger—five hours to get there, four hours on the ground and five hours back.

Neither man speaks the language of the other but both Kissinger and Torrijos fully understand the uses of power in the context of the nations they represent. Torrijos, who commands a military-police force of no more than 8,000 men, and Kissinger are equally strong personalities. But Kissinger is the consummate academician while Torrijos has no intellectual pretensions at all.

Torrijos normally wears the U.S.-patterned Ranger uniform of green combat fatigues, complete with widebrimmed cowboy hat, pistol and canteen belt. Kissinger's civilian suits run to somber blues and grays. Both men are stocky and clearly overweight. And both are uncommonly direct. Neither is the president of his country.

The difference in operating style is that Torrijos has a puppet president, Demetrio Lakas, and the last word on any decision taken in Panama. Kissinger, although he has wide powers, remains a subordinate of President Nixon and obviously of the U.S. Congress in any matter affecting treaty relations with Panama.

Kissinger has met many dictators in his career but never one with the life-style of the 45-year-old Torrijos or with his direct capacity to make trouble for a U.S. lifeline such as the Panama Canal.

Torrijos depends not on gulle but on muscle. He came to power through force and has defeated at least one major effort to overthrow him. He, like Kissinger, is a man who needs little sleep and can stay up all night with the best of them.

Like Kissinger, Torrijos can be light-hearted and casual but his sense of humor is no match for Kissinger's brand of wit and banter. The Panamanian strong man, in a way limited by Panama's geography, is an inveterate traveler and likes to take off on sudden trips that end when he gets tired of them.

Torrijos, never having met Kissinger before, is likely to engage him in long, intense conversation over the Canal Zone issue. Foreign Minister Juan Tack will be primarily a spectator.

The impulsive Torrijos may try to drag Kissinger into a journey uncountried to

Chiriqui Province or to the fascinating San Blas Islands, as has happened before to American visitors.

Both men have their nervous habits. Kissinger bites his nails. Torrijos sucks his teeth loudly. Both come from small towns, Kissinger from Fuerth, Germany, and Torrijos from Santiago de Veraguas. Both are sons of teachers, both are self-made men and both have more than their share of self-confidence.

On the surface, Kissinger and Torrijos seem worlds apart but the many similarities in their natures may very well cause them to get along quite well. Torrijos talks a flamboyantly tough line to his Panamanians but understands very well he the inexorable links he has with the United States and is much more moderate talking with Americans. He and Kissinger will no doubt duel a bit with words but neither can be bluffed.

If they get along well and are not too far apart on the main issue, the meeting may lead to solution of the nagging canal issue.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in October of last year, the National Rehabilitation Association, an organization made up of 30 national groups involved with helping handicapped Americans, held its annual Delegate Assembly, in Atlantic City, N.J.

And as one of those who had an opportunity to address the 3,000 delegates to the assembly, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a number of significant resolutions adopted by the assembly concerning rehabilitation programs for the handicapped.

For the assembly, Mr. Speaker, adopted resolutions concerning the oversight hearings now being conducted by the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, as well as resolutions on Federal Appropriations for rehabilitation services and training, on State and local administration of rehabilitation programs, and on the needs of the severely handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, the resolutions to which I have referred follow:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 1973 NATIONAL REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION DELEGATE ASSEMBLY, OCTOBER 29, 1973, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.

RESOLUTION I—APPRECIATION TO CONGRESS

Whereas, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is now law, and

Whereas, the signing of the bill (PL 93-112) following lengthy and difficult hearings and the veto by the President of two excellent and progressive rehabilitation acts, and

Whereas, in the face of these difficulties, the leaders of the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare never waiver in their determination to secure enactment into law of legislation that would permit an expansion and improvement of rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals, and

Whereas, these efforts finally succeeded, Be it resolved, that the National Rehabilitation Association express its profound appreciation and admiration for the efforts of Members of Congress of both parties that

produced the final legislation, and that the sense of this resolution be conveyed to these individuals.

RESOLUTION II—OVERSIGHT HEARINGS

Whereas, the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, chaired by Rep. John Brademas, has begun oversight hearings on vocational rehabilitation in an effort to determine the policies and plans of the Administration relative to programs financed under the Rehabilitation Act, and

Whereas, the testimony of high Administration witnesses reveals a lamentable lack of understanding of the purpose of rehabilitation and the practices employed in the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals, and

Whereas, some Administration officials appear to be giving serious consideration to administrative alternatives which would result in the dismemberment of rehabilitation programs,

Be it resolved (1) that the National Rehabilitation Association expresses its appreciation to the House Committee on Education and Labor for conducting these oversight hearings and urges their continuation until the plans of the Administration for the future of vocational rehabilitation are made clear, and (2) that the National Rehabilitation Association offers its assistance to the Committee in every possible way in this important undertaking.

RESOLUTION III—APPROPRIATIONS FOR REHABILITATION SERVICES

Whereas, the need for rehabilitation services is great and financial resources to provide such services inadequate, and

Whereas, this Administration, while affirming its faith in the effectiveness of the rehabilitation programs and its intention to strengthen them has, nevertheless, (1) vetoed two versions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, principally because of high appropriation authority, (2) withdrawn support of construction and staffing of rehabilitation facilities, (3) recommend a reduction of funds for rehabilitation research, (4) announced its intention to phase out federal support for training of rehabilitation personnel, (5) recommended appropriations for the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program scarcely sufficient to maintain its service level, (6) weakened the Rehabilitation Services Administration by transferring of personnel and authority to other levels of HEW, and

Whereas, these trends, if not reversed, will surely result in a less comprehensive and effective rehabilitation service program for handicapped individuals, and

Whereas, the end of United States involvement in East Asia should free financial resources for human service programs,

Be it resolved, that the National Rehabilitation Association urge the Administration to review promptly its current policies with respect to the support of rehabilitation programs authorized by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, particularly as these are related to preventing and overcoming dependency and the restoration of independence to severely disabled individuals, and

Be it further resolved, that the National Rehabilitation Association will urge the Administration to recommend and Congress to appropriate such sums as are needed to assure continued growth and increased effectiveness of rehabilitation programs, and

Be it further resolved, that the National Rehabilitation Association will enlist its own members at all levels of the Association and the support of other organizations to implement this resolution.

RESOLUTION IV—FEDERAL SUPPORT OF TRAINING FOR THE REHABILITATION PROFESSIONS

Whereas, federally supported training programs for rehabilitation personnel have been a source of strength to rehabilitation agen-

cies and of great benefit to handicapped people, and

Whereas, long term training programs administered through colleges and universities have supplied a steady stream of trained personnel for both public and voluntary rehabilitation agencies, and

Whereas, short term training programs have been invaluable in the training of rehabilitation personnel for specialized activities, and

Whereas, it is recognized that the complexity involved in the delivery of rehabilitation services requires specialized, in-depth training, and

Whereas, there is a distinct possibility that the benefits of various training programs at colleges and universities will be lost if the Administration's proposal to phase out federal support of training is permitted to take effect, and

Whereas, there is an undiminished need for training of the professions to insure the effective and efficient delivery of rehabilitation services to the handicapped,

Be it resolved, that the National Rehabilitation Association (1) urges Congress to continue to support such training programs with federal appropriations not less than the 1973 fiscal year levels; (2) urges the President to reconsider his proposal to phase out SRS training programs in 1974 and to amend his budget proposal accordingly; (3) urges all organizations and individuals concerned with the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals to join the National Rehabilitation Association in its efforts to assure the continuation of federally supported training programs in the human services fields.

Be it further resolved, that the National Rehabilitation Association go on record as proposing the establishment and implementation of a well rounded program of rehabilitation training with a minimum of the following components: (1) A network of strategically located college and university training programs offering training at the graduate level to individuals preparing to work with handicapped people; (2) A system of university-based interstate training centers (at least one in each region); (3) Intra-state in-service training programs for employees at all levels; (4) Under-graduate human service training programs, the purpose of which programs will be to recruit suitable individuals into the human services field and provide them with training sufficient for the entry positions in any one of several agencies administering human service programs and for preparation for graduate education; (5) Short-term training on an interstate level in areas of special concern, concentrating upon specialized training problems which have high national rehabilitation priorities.

RESOLUTION V—STATE AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF REHABILITATION SERVICES

Whereas, it appears to be the intention of this Administration to encourage in any way possible state and local administration of direct service programs with minimum federal restraints, and

Whereas, it is attempting to implement this policy through proposals to Congress for special revenue sharing and through special projects in the absence of specific legislative authority, and

Whereas, states are establishing umbrella agencies to administer human service programs and in some instances attempting to establish patterns for delivery of services which appear not to be in the best interests of handicapped individuals, and

Whereas, the distinct probability exists that the identity of rehabilitation programs and rehabilitation funding will be lost under such proposals,

Be it resolved, that the National Rehabilitation Association will use its full resources to maintain at local, state and federal levels strong and visible vocational rehabilitation

programs encompassing a unified system of services at administrative levels sufficiently high to assure exposure of the programs to the highest executive and legislative levels of government and in which the fiscal and administrative integrity of the agencies are maintained, and

Be it further resolved, that the National Rehabilitation Association will continue to encourage and support cooperative programming on a voluntary basis of rehabilitation agencies and other agencies providing services that are required by handicapped individuals.

RESOLUTION XIV—SEVERELY HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS

Whereas, in P.L. 93-112, Congress mandated R.S.A. and the state vocational rehabilitation agencies to give priority to serving individuals with most severe handicaps, and

Whereas, the National Rehabilitation Association long has advocated legislation that will assure that every handicapped individual, without regard to severity, has the opportunity to make the most of his potential, and feels that this legislation is a step in this direction,

Be it resolved, that (1) the National Rehabilitation Association commend Congress for including emphasis on services to the severely disabled in the new legislation, and the Administration for moving promptly to develop regulations and operating policies to put their concept into action; (2) that the National Rehabilitation Association offer its assistance to RSA in the development and implementation of policies that will result in the measurement of severe disability based upon functional limitations; (3) that the National Rehabilitation Association urge Congress and the Administration to cooperate in making resources available to make the promise of the legislation a reality, which will include resources for research, training of personnel, development and improvement of rehabilitation facilities, which will be required to serve additional severely disabled individuals, and funds to pay the very high cost of services.

INTRODUCTION OF STRENGTHENED "SATURDAY NIGHT SPECIAL" HANDGUN PROHIBITION LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last session along with my friend and colleague, BOB CASEY, I introduced H.R. 3611, a bill to halt the sale in the United States of certain handguns known as "Saturday Night Specials." Today, again with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY), and joined by several of our distinguished colleagues, I am introducing a new and stronger version of that bill.

I believe this legislation is a workable, moderate, and politically realistic approach. It does not impinge on the rights of law-abiding citizens to buy and use handguns for sporting and defensive purposes, and I believe it will enjoy their support.

Essentially, the bill would prohibit handgun manufacturers and importers—who all are federally licensed under existing law—from manufacturing, im-

porting, or assembling from parts a "Saturday Night Special" for sale in the United States.

As many Members are aware, one of the principal problems in drafting any such bill is to accurately define "Saturday Night Special." People familiar with firearms know generally what is meant: crudely made, pot-metal handguns selling for as little as \$10 or \$15. Of poor quality and scant durability, the "Saturday Night Special" is unsuitable for sporting, target, or defensive use, but it is uniquely attractive to the criminal as a cheap, disposable weapon.

Yet the formulation of a precise definition has been difficult. One bill passed by the Senate in the 92d Congress was so loosely worded that it also would have banned many high-quality handguns purchased by honest citizens for legitimate purposes. Many people suspected—rightly—that the bill was a Trojan Horse for an attack on private handgun ownership generally, and the measure died in the House.

Another problem is to be specific enough to avoid leaving administrative officials wide discretion to decide what the law means. The way in which some city governments have stretched and twisted loose language in gun control laws to harass and discourage responsible citizens from owning firearms provides ample reason to distrust any bill that affords broad opportunities for arbitrary "reinterpretation."

The bill that I am introducing today, like my earlier bill, clearly identifies, and is confined to, "Saturday Night Specials." And it eliminates any need for unfettered discretionary powers in the hands of administering bureaucrats.

It would supersede a present hodgepodge of administrative regulations which pertain only to imported handguns, and which cannot effectively remove "Saturday Night Specials" from the market.

The bill establishes an objective standard of quality which all new handguns—no matter whether manufactured domestically or imported—must meet, or be banned from sale.

"Saturday Night Specials" would be prohibited by rating the metal from which they are made by three scientific criteria: a minimum liquidus melting temperature of 1,000 degrees Fahrenheit; a minimum ultimate tensile strength of 55,000 pounds per square inch; and—where powdered metal is used—a minimum density of 7.5 grams per cubic centimeter.

Only those handguns which meet all three criteria could be manufactured, imported, or assembled for sale in the United States.

By their very nature, "Saturday Night Specials" cannot meet these criteria. Virtually all of them are made primarily of low-strength materials—such as zinc alloy—that permit the use of die-casting and other cheap manufacturing techniques costing as little as one-twentieth as much as conventional methods using strong steel or aluminum alloys. This prime characteristic of "Saturday Night Specials" accounts for both their poor quality and their low price.

Manufacturers of high-grade handguns avoid these cheap methods and materials in the construction of major parts critical to strength and durability. In "Saturday Night Specials," however, such parts are flimsy and perilously close to the margin of safety. For this reason, a quality standard is an effective means of distinguishing "Saturday Night Specials" from handguns suitable for legitimate defensive and sporting use.

This legislative approach was received very favorably when it was first embodied in H.R. 3611. The Illinois Legislature adopted the bill as a State law, as have several local jurisdictions. Citizens across the country, including a number of engineers and other technical people, have responded by volunteering their expertise to further improve the bill, suggesting ways to broaden its coverage and make it stronger.

The new bill which I am introducing today includes many of their suggestions, and goes far beyond the original measure, which imposed a single minimum 800-degree Fahrenheit melting point criterion on handgun frames. It will apply the three minimum requirements mentioned above to each of the following major structural parts of handguns: the frame—sometimes also called the receiver, the barrel, the cylinder of a revolver, the slide of an automatic pistol, and the breechblock of any other pistol. These parts are the ones critical to strength and safety. It should be noted that smaller parts that may be assembled to these larger components are not included, since their mechanical properties often are of necessity quite different.

In this new bill, the liquidus melting temperature—that is, the point at which an alloy turns completely from a solid to a liquid—has been raised considerably above the 727-degree Fahrenheit melting point of the zinc commonly employed in "Saturday Night Specials," to provide a safe margin against metallurgical variations.

The ultimate tensile strength—the load required to actually break a bar of metal by pulling it apart—requirement was added because there are a few metals suitable for cheap diecasting which melt at temperatures higher than 1,000 degrees F. However, none of these can meet the ultimate tensile strength requirement. Alloy A-380, for example, a common aluminum diecasting alloy which could be utilized in "Saturday Night Specials," has an ultimate tensile strength of 48,000 pounds per square inch. By comparison, high-strength aluminum parts produced by costly forging and machining have an ultimate tensile strength as high as 83,000 pounds per square inch.

The third criterion—density—pertains only to the use of powdered, or sintered metal. It has come to my attention that a few "junk" handguns now are being made by this process, in which steel granules molded in the shape of a part are fused solid by high heat. A melting point criterion is inappropriate here, and superficially high tensile figures can be achieved.

However, this is deceptive, for the

strength of sintered metal parts is determined by their density. For example, the auto industry uses powdered metal to fabricate automatic transmission gears; but to obtain the high density required, large presses and expensive dies must be utilized to compress the sintered part afterward under enormous pressure. "Saturday Night Special" manufacturers skip this costly operation, and produce cheap sintered parts lacking elasticity and impact resistance. Good enough for a "junk" handgun, but too brittle and unsafe for the major structural components of a quality arm.

Hence, a density level has been added to this bill to weed out "Saturday Night Specials" made of poor quality sintered parts.

Together these three requirements not only would eliminate every "Saturday Night Special" now being produced but would make circumvention extremely difficult.

I should emphasize that the provisions of this bill are easy to enforce and would take full effect 90 days after enactment without the need for further administrative approvals, promulgation of regulations, advisory committees, laboratory testing, or other redtape that has festooned many other proposals that have been circulated in the past.

And, unlike the Senate bill I mentioned earlier, this bill places the burden of compliance on those most knowledgeable and best able to obey its requirements: the manufacturers and importers. This point is extremely important, since virtually all Federal firearms law violations are classed as felonies, no matter how minor.

By cutting off "Saturday Night Specials" at their source, my bill would not subject ordinary citizens who might buy or sell a handgun in good faith to the risk of criminal prosecution for unwittingly running afoul of technical provisions—the Senate bill contained 37 technical criteria, and would have held ordinary citizens criminally responsible for failure to understand all of them.

A few words of explanation might be helpful on another point. After H.R. 3611 was introduced, I was contacted by several technical writers who had received the impression that each individual handgun produced would have to be subjected to a melting test—which of course would be ruinous to the finish and heat treatment even of high-grade firearms. That is not the case at all. This bill is best understood by comparing it to a ban on soft drinks containing cyclamates. No authority is provided—or needed—for the Secretary of the Treasury, who administers the Federal firearms laws, to require melt testing or prior approval of each handgun. This simply is not necessary, any more than it is necessary to open each bottle of soft drink to look for cyclamates.

Rather, this bill would be enforced in very conventional fashion: if a firm is discovered to be manufacturing or importing for sale a handgun made of materials known not to meet the prescribed specifications, that firm is in trouble.

It should be understood that the liquidus melting point and the ultimate tensile

strength of materials used in the construction of handguns are well known in the trade. A glance at any metallurgical manual reveals, for example, that 7071-T6 high tensile strength aluminum—which is not a die-casting alloy—would meet the requirements of this bill, while AG40A zinc alloy—which is Zamak, commonly used in "Saturday Night Specials"—would not.

Obviously, each manufacturer knows what materials he is using, and if he desires to avoid the risk of a felony conviction, he will make sure that he complies with the law's requirements, much the same as he presently complies voluntarily with the law that each handgun must be serialized, marked with his firm name, and duly entered on his records.

It has been suggested that this bill might be circumvented by the use of plastics. All available evidence indicates that to be an imaginary problem. The criteria in this bill refer to materials generally, not just metals. Both the melting point, and the tensile strength of polycarbonates and fiberglass—which are the two plastics sometimes used for non-stressed parts of certain firearms—are far too low and too weak to be used for structural components. These plastics turn to liquid well below 400 degrees Fahrenheit, and most have tensile strengths no higher than 10,000 pounds per square inch, not even close to the requirements of this bill.

In summary, manufacturers of handguns would be forced by this bill to produce only those handguns meeting a quality standard of durability and safety that make them suitable for legitimate use, or go out of business. Either way, the "Saturday Night Special" will be driven off the market.

Let me say at this point that I have no objection to low-priced handguns as such. I do not believe that firearms ownership ought to be reserved for the affluent. A citizen of ordinary means, if he is responsible and law abiding, has just as much right to buy and own a handgun for lawful purposes at a price he can afford as a rich man does. Manufacturers ought to be able to meet such legitimate demand through a full spectrum of price.

The reason that I am proposing to treat "Saturday Night Specials" differently from other handguns is not the price, but the fact that the very nature of "junk" handguns precludes much legitimate use.

The appeal of the "Saturday Night Special" to the criminal element is that it is cheap and expendable. It is a "throwaway" gun. It can be bought for a pittance—which is a prime consideration to somebody who needs a gun for a stickup—and it can be discarded without hesitation if the need arises. Quality is not important—what the criminal really needs is an instrument of coercion—a threat.

The "junk" handgun fills that bill, and has little other usefulness.

As the H. P. White Laboratory tests commissioned several years ago by the U.S. Treasury Department demonstrated, some of these guns are defective when new, and many break within the

first few dozen rounds. Significantly, many of these "Saturday Night Specials" suffered failures from fracture of one of the major structural parts.

It is a plain fact of economic life that quality costs money. It is no accident that a good quality handgun—not a "Saturday Night Special"—today costs between \$50 and \$100, and many of the most popular models are priced in the \$100 to \$200 range.

A prohibition on the manufacture, importation, or assembly of "junk" handguns would mean that many casual buyers—particularly those with criminal intentions who want a "throwaway" gun—will be unwilling or unable to make the substantially greater investment necessary for a quality arm.

In introducing this bill, I do not mean to suggest that criminals are able to walk into a gun shop and buy a firearm legally the way an honest citizen can. That is just not true.

The Gun Control Act of 1968 already prohibits the sale of handguns to a person under 21, or to a person outside the State of his residence. It also prohibits the sale of any kind of firearm to a person convicted of—or even under indictment for—a felony; as well as to any person who is a fugitive from justice; an unlawful user of narcotics or of any depressant or stimulant drug—including, I might add, marihuana; or to any person who has been committed to any mental institution.

These are very stringent restrictions, backed up by penalties of 5 years in prison or \$5,000 fine or both, and they apply to "Saturday Night Specials" the same as any other firearm. To the extent, however, that "junk" handguns change hands in illegal channels—often to youthful purchasers at giveaway prices—they would be cut off at their source by this legislation.

The cosponsors of the new "Saturday Night Special" bill are as follows:

Mr. Dingell, Mr. Casey, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Young of Illinois, Mr. Boland, Mr. Young of Georgia, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Stark, Mr. de Lugo, Mr. Huber.

Mr. Fraser, Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Dent, Mr. Karth, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Broyhill of Virginia, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Roybal, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Moakley, Ms. Holtzman, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Foley, Mr. Ware, Mr. Thone, Mr. Vander Jagt, Mr. Studds.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 12554

A bill to prohibit the sale of "Saturday Night Special" handguns in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 921(a) of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after paragraph (20) the following:

"(21) The term 'handgun' means a firearm designed to be held and fired by the use of a single hand. The term also includes a combination of parts in the possession or under the control of a person from which a handgun can be assembled. The term does not include antique firearms, or any firearm which comes within the definition set forth in section 5845(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(22) The term 'basic structural component' means any or all of the following single

parts (including a permanent assembly forming such single part) of a handgun; frame, barrel, cylinder, slide, and breech-block."

Sec. 2. Section 922 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(n) It shall be unlawful for a licensed manufacturer or licensed importer to manufacture, assemble, or import, for the purpose of sale in the United States, any handgun, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe the basic structural components thereof are made (1) of any material having a melting point (liquidus) of less than 1000 degrees Fahrenheit, or (2) of any material having an ultimate tensile strength of less than 55,000 pounds per square inch, or (3) of any powdered metal having a density of less than 7.5 grams per cubic centimeter."

Sec. 3. Section 925(d) of title 18 of the United States Code is amended

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4), and inserting "; or" in lieu thereof; and

(3) by inserting immediately after paragraph (4) but before the final sentence the following new paragraph:

"(5) is a handgun which is not prohibited from being manufactured, imported, or assembled for sale in the United States by Section 922(n) of this chapter."

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on and after the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment.

REPRESENTATIVE BINGHAM INTRODUCES OIL PRICE ROLLBACK BILL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, energy costs are rising at such a rapid rate that Americans will be paying an extra \$20 billion into the corporate coffers of the oil and gas industry this year. Americans can expect to receive fuel bills 25 percent higher in 1974 than in 1973, unless the Congress acts.

The administration's handling of the fuel price crisis is a total failure. The energy market is in chaos. Prices demanded by fuel suppliers have lost all touch with reality.

Residual fuel oil, needed by electric generating stations, now costs 34 cents a gallon—a fourfold increase in less than a year. In places where unfulfilled demand has created a black market, prices have reached 60 cents a gallon. Heating oil, which cost 12 cents a gallon last October, now costs more than 50 cents a gallon—a fourfold increase in less than 3 months. A year ago a ton of coal cost \$25, today that same ton sells for \$35. Thanks to an industry dominated Federal Power Commission, the cost of natural gas has gone up from 20 cents for a thousand cubic feet, to 55 cents. When the administration supports requests for increased fuel prices, as it did in the controversial natural gas case and resulting in the unprecedented 55 cent price, it is totally demagogic for the President to promise the American people an end to inflation and guarantee that he will avert a recession.

The administration's "the public be damned" attitude countenancing higher fuel prices is having staggering effects on the Nation's economy. For example, the U.S. chemical industry spends over \$1 billion a year for energy and the steel industry \$1.3 billion. Doubling the prices these essential industries must pay for fuel will most certainly show up in the cost of the goods sold to the consuming public. The cement industry, as vital to the economy as any, reports that 43 percent of the cost of making cement is fuel-cost related. Projected increases in the price of cement, just from higher fuel costs, are pegged at some \$400 million in 1974, costs which the consumer will bear—in higher prices for homes, or in increased taxes to fund public works projects.

The outrageous price increases imposed by the energy industry will have a rippling effect through the entire U.S. economy that truly staggers the imagination. Even the Nixon administration's energy czar realizes the need to get hold of runaway prices for imported crude, yet for unexplained reasons refuses to accept the fact that domestic crude oil prices are climbing as rapidly.

The Cost of Living Council's Energy Division is charged with the responsibility of holding the line on energy costs in the United States. Unfortunately, it has failed in its responsibility, refusing to use the power given it by the Congress under the provisions of the 1970 Economic Stabilization Act to fight inflation. In fact, since the beginning of November, while the CLC stood idly by, the wholesale price index for refined petroleum products has jumped an astounding 60.9 percent. For all of 1973, crude oil prices on the wholesale level rose by 27.5 percent, while refined petroleum prices jumped an unbelievable 125 percent.

Since the beginning of 1973 the price of so-called "old" or price-controlled crude oil has risen \$1.75 per barrel from \$3.50 to \$5.25, thereby guaranteeing the oil industry an extra \$3 billion in revenues without any assurance of increased domestic production. Likewise, the price of so-called "new" or decontrolled domestic crude oil has more than tripled during the same period, to the current astronomical level of \$10 per barrel. This would result in an additional \$6.5 billion in revenues for the oil industry, again without the slightest assurance that the consuming public would receive a deserved quid pro quo in the form of increased energy inventories.

Despite the fact that the real cost of producing domestic petroleum has increased only slightly since the oil embargo began, the cost of new petroleum has risen \$5.75 per barrel and old crude has risen \$1 per barrel.

I see no justification for these extravagant "gifts" for the benefit of the oil industry. These unjustified price increases are exacting billions of otherwise needed dollars from the public, resulting in unconscionable windfall profits for the oil industry, and bestowing no benefit upon the consumer in the form of expanded petroleum supplies.

The American people have a right to demand a responsible energy policy

which includes economic safeguards. Therefore, I am introducing legislation to freeze and then roll back the price of domestic crude oil to pre-November 1973 levels. This bill draws heavily on legislation proposed in the Senate by Senator MONDALE.

Upon enactment, my bill would immediately place in effect a 30-day freeze on the price of domestic crude oil. At the expiration of this period the price of all—old and new—crude oil extracted from U.S. wells would be rolled back to the level in effect on November 1, 1973. In addition, the legislation would require that all petroleum sales at the refinery level, or petroleum product sales at the wholesale level, be made at a price based on the average of domestic and foreign crude oil prices.

This would directly benefit New York City because the required price averaging of foreign and domestic crude oil would substantially reduce the price New Yorkers pay for fuel. Our city relies heavily on imported crude oil, so the mandatory price averaging of foreign and domestic crude would force the oil industry to spread the cost of foreign crude equitably throughout the United States, and not just on the east and west coasts. Coop-City, for example, which now faces a 30-percent increase in their electric bills, would receive substantial relief under my proposal. So too, would the motorist seeking a fill-up at his neighborhood gas station.

This legislation would also aid in the preservation of a competitive oil industry because it would eliminate a discriminatory sales practice adhered to by the major oil companies. At present, the integrated oil companies—those with both domestic and foreign crude oil sources—only sell higher priced foreign crude oil or products made from foreign crude to independent refiners or marketers. This results in a competitive disadvantage for the "independents", since they must pay top dollar for supplies while they in turn must price their products competitively as compared to lower cost domestic crude sold by the major oil companies to the consumer. My bill would preserve the competitive position of the independents by requiring the major oil companies to take the average cost of domestic and foreign crude to determine the price they may charge the independents.

I estimate that this legislation would result in a savings for the American consumer of some \$7 billion.

The time has come for Congress to take the lead in promoting responsible, practical and necessary measures designed to alleviate the inconvenience and suffering caused by the energy crunch. We must fill the void left by the executive branch which has abdicated its responsibility to the people in favor of high profits for big business in this country.

My proposal is not a punitive measure designed to render the oil industry impotent. There would still be sufficient profits reaped from sales to encourage the amount of exploration necessary to satisfy America's growing energy demands. What this legislation accomplishes, however, is a simple reduction of the outrageous windfall profits reaped by the in-

dustry, by returning this money to the consumer in the form of lower prices. At the same time this bill would provide interim relief from overburdensome fuel costs engendered by the world energy situation and force the big oil companies to follow a responsible pricing policy, until permanent reforms in the industry are effected. I urge that this legislation receive top priority consideration in the weeks ahead.

JACK KEMP CALLS FOR INCREASED FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL COOPERATION IN MAINTAINING OUR COMMITMENT TO RESTORE THE GREAT LAKES AND OUR ENVIRONMENT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure and honor this morning to address the opening session of the prestigious Association of Towns of the State of New York on the important subject of maintaining our Nation's commitment to restoring the quality of our environment.

To those who fear that our Nation may be relaxing our commitment to control pollution, I can assure you from the opinions which I received this morning from the 3,000 plus town officers and concerned citizens attending that session that nothing could be further from the truth. The resolve of our people on all levels—Federal, State and local—to meet the objectives embodied in recently enacted statutes could never be stronger.

What we are seeing, instead, is a shift in the visible aspects of that national commitment, away from the Congress and bill-related activity to the actual implementation of the far-reaching statutes which have been enacted over the past several years. We have moved from enactment to implementation, and just because that receives less press attention, we should never think that we have lessened our commitment. This fact must also be coupled with an understanding that other national priorities, such as alleviating the energy shortages, have moved to the center of the stage. And, even though there has not been full funding for the States, we are still spending funds for treatment work construction at a rate four times greater than the period before 1971.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few problem areas, and I addressed those in my remarks.

We must strengthen our resolve to clean up the Great Lakes, and this can be done without infringing in any way on the priorities among States not bordering the Great Lakes and without infringing on towns—which are not located along the lakes—in border States. This will require a separate funding source and I am committed to the authorization and appropriation of same, as well as full funding of the fiscal

year 1973 authorization for fiscal 1975 and I am joined by many other Members in feeling this way.

We must also insure that the legitimate complaints at the State and local level, public and private sector, in their capacities to reach the goals and objectives of our far-reaching statutes are given full weight. The hearings now underway before the House Committee on Public Works provide such a vehicle for those expressions, and I have called upon those at the New York meeting to use that forum to express their concerns to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I wish to include the full text of my remarks. They follow:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP

The year, 1973, will be known for what did not happen in the Congress on major pollution control legislation. Compared to prior Sessions, bill-related activity in this subject area was minimal. For the first time in years, end-of-Session wrap-ups did not even mention pollution control measures—water, air, or solid wastes.

The year will be known, however, for what happened among the States and local governments in making strides toward implementing the important measures passed during the prior Congress. The Nation's commitment to restoring the environment has shifted, in the activist sense, from the enactment of legislation to its implementation. This is important to apprehend, for some have already begun to assert that there has been an abandonment of the Federal Government's commitment—minimally, a relaxation of that commitment. I think this is wrong. We should all, at every level of government, seek to dispell such a notion. Why?

First, it is not only natural but important, after the enactment of far-reaching statutes, to get down to ironing out the problem areas and working out any inconsistencies, to the extent possible through regulations instead of amendments; to seeing whether we have imposed unrealistic requirements on State and local governments and the private sector; and, to see if we have the technical and administrative abilities to realize the substantive objectives and goals embodied in enacted legislation.

Secondly, because of the immediacy of beginning to solve other national priorities, such as overcoming the energy shortages, pollution control has moved somewhat from the center of the stage. If we are to deal adequately with all our national concerns, this is both understandable and necessary, but it must remain our high priority.

Let me discuss with you what I think are three critically important matters facing us: a balancing of consideration given to environmental and economic impacts, the recent refusals to allocate fully the treatment work construction funds, and a potential waffling of our commitment to clean up the Great Lakes.

ENVIRONMENTAL-ECONOMIC BALANCING

There is a growing public pressure, manifesting itself more strongly every day in the mail received by Members of Congress, to balance wholly environmental criteria with other considerations, principally potential economic impacts, both as to general policy and as to specific projects. This question has yet to be fully debated, and I can forecast no final resolution here today. But, I do believe you will see rising support for a statutory requirement for Economic Impact Statements to be prepared in addition to the Environmental Impact Statements required by section 102(2) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act.

REFUSALS TO ALLOCATE FUNDS

Despite the refusals to permit the full allocations of allotments of grant funds for treatment facility construction to the States, including the most recent refusal to allow full allocation of FY 75 funds, the Federal dollar commitment to such works since 1971 remains at a rate four times the appropriations of the previous 15 years.

But, while we are spending more, much more, than ever before, I see no reason to acquiesce in these continued holdbacks of allocations.

As you may be aware, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held on January 24th that the refusals to allocate treatment facility funds were illegal. The government has not yet announced its decision on whether it will appeal this decision to the U.S. Supreme Court. In light of the dollars involved, I would not be surprised if they did appeal it. At this point, it looks like good odds to bet on an appeal. And, inasmuch as the Court decision related specifically and only to the allocation of funds, it is conceivable that even if the Administration allowed the decision to stand, unappealed, they would then impound the actual outlay of dollars. This idiosyncrasy of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—of allocation and outlay at separate stages—lends itself to such a maneuver.

This is of no small matter for the towns of New York State. If the full allocation were made in fiscal year 1975, the State of New York would receive an allocation of \$873,200,000. As a result of the announced allocation of \$4 billion instead of \$7 billion nationally, the State of New York would receive an allocation of \$490,654,200. Cautious planning as to projections on allocations had, as we all know, permitted forecasting of available funds for priority projects in our State, based on an expectation of only \$490,654,200 for New York, thereby not creating any expectations which could not be fulfilled, i.e., we expected only the \$490+ million.

If the full allocation for FY75 is allowed, many towns not on the FY75 funding list will be encompassed by the expanded allocation amount.

COMMITMENT ON CLEAN UP OF THE GREAT LAKES

Because it is of great importance to the State of New York, particularly as to Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, I wish to speak a minute about the clean up of the Great Lakes.

Two significant events, both on the negative side, have recently occurred, both of which raise concern among many that the U.S. may be renegeing on its commitment to help clean up the Great Lakes. First, the new allocation formula law, Public Law 93-243, provides that hereafter the EPA Administrator shall not require any State to consider in the development of the ranking in order of priority of needs for the construction of treatment works any water pollution control agreement which may have been entered into between the United States and any other Nation and shall not consider any such agreement in the approval of any such priority ranking. Second, the refusal to allocate all funds for fiscal year 1975 does impact upon planned treatment facilities along the Great Lakes. These actions have occasioned the Canadian Government to informally protest, charging that the U.S. is abandoning its treaty obligations with Canada. A State can still take these agreements into consideration, but it is not required to do so. New York is, in my opinion, to be commended for its leadership in cleaning up the Great Lakes.

I can understand why the States ought not to be required to include criteria in formula, which criteria were completely out of their hands, often producing hardships for other parts of the State. But, that does not mean that we have to abandon our commitment at the same time; rather, we should

find another way of honoring these treaty obligations.

I call upon the President to consider immediately submitting to the Congress a proposal for new legislation which would provide a second source of funds to meet our treaty obligations. It is only fair that these treaty obligations of the Federal Government be met with funds other than those provided to the States under the basic Act. To do otherwise is to place an undue burden on border States. If the President does not come forth with such new legislation, I think it is incumbent upon the Congressional Delegations from the border States, and all others who share our concerns, to move forward without waiting further for the Administration to move. We need to clean up the Great Lakes now.

Let me discuss with you in more detail, first, what is being done this year in the Congress on pollution control, and secondly, the nature of the impact which I sense the Congress needs from you on the magnitude and type of problems you are experiencing in the administration of pollution control programs.

POLLUTION CONTROL AND THE 93D CONGRESS

There have been four developments within the 93d Congress to date in this subject area which are, I believe, worthy of mention:

The enactment of the allocation formula for fiscal year 1975 funds;

The pending enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act;

The proposed reorganization of the House Committees having jurisdiction over various pollution control programs; and,

The oversight hearings presently underway before the House Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC LAW 93-243: ALLOCATION FORMULA

On January 2, 1974, the President signed into law Public Law 93-243, an act providing for the allocation formula for fiscal year 1975 funds for grants for the construction of treatment works under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. In no instance is a State to receive an allotment less than that which it received for fiscal year 1972.

The preliminary detailed estimate of needs for funds for treatment works must be submitted by the Administrator to the Congress no later than September 3, 1974. Inasmuch as this needs study is based upon information obtained through the States, it is of great importance that the State of New York proceed at full speed. I realize this is a difficult task, one about which there has been much complaining at the State and local levels, but the State should never jeopardize its allocation by not meeting the deadlines required for this September 3 study. What you have been asked to do is to deal with the hard questions of competing types of needs for pollution control facilities, variations on available technologies for varying situations, competing geographical needs, land use planning, and, let us be candid, the political ramifications emanating from all other considerations. And, all of this is complicated by the disciplines which comprise this search: economics, engineering, ecology, biology, and law. The planning requirements of the basic Act, principally sections 201, 208, 209, and 303, have established the primary responsibility in planning by placing the burdens on the State and local governments. (I commend to your attention an article, "Legislative Goals and Constraints for Water Quality Planning," by Lester Edelman, Counsel of the House Committee on Public Works, and in the Potomac: Water Quality Planning, published by the Interstate Commerce Commission on the Potomac River Basin.)

It should be noted that this new law, P.L. 93-243, amends the basic Act to insure that grants may be given for other than operable

units by the Administrator and to clarify the requirements for the development of priorities. With the new glosses placed upon the basic Act by these amendments, nothing in the act shall now be construed to require, or to authorize the EPA Administrator to require, the grants thereunder for construction of treatment works be made only for projects which are operable units usable for sewage collection, transportation, storage, waste treatment, or for similar purposes without additional construction. And, as I have already stated, the Act also requires that the EPA Administrator shall not require any State to consider in the development of the ranking in order of priority of needs for the construction of treatment works any water pollution control agreement which may have been entered into between the United States and any other nation and shall not consider any such agreement in the approval of any such priority ranking.

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT

One of the Administration's environmental proposals for 1973 was the establishment of standards—national standards—for safe drinking water. The Senate passed this measure, S. 433, on June 22 of last year; the House passed its version, H.R. 9726, on January 21, 1974; the matter now awaits resolution by the Committee on Conference.

Briefly, the bill, as reflected through its House version, establishes a program to regulate public drinking water, supervised by EPA and enforced primarily by the States. The bill also provides that EPA establish Federal and State programs to protect underground sources of water and for grants to assist with surveillance and enforcement of quality protection programs.

It requires the EPA Administrator to publish proposed primary public drinking water regulations within 90 days after enactment. These regulations will specify contaminants which may have an adverse effect on health, their maximum allowable levels in drinking water to insure public health, and measures which should be observed by States to assure compliance with these levels. Although States will regain primary enforcement responsibility, the EPA Administrator is given enforcement authority in cases where States fail to insure compliance with primary drinking water regulations. He can undertake enforcement through orders; violators can be fined up to \$5,000 and made subject to court action.

The bill requires a study within two years by the National Academy of Sciences to determine how free of contaminants drinking water must be to protect public health and requires the Administrator to revise regulations on the basis of the NAS report when it appears. He is also directed to promulgate secondary drinking water standards dealing basically with esthetics, i.e., taste, color, appearance. Secondary standards will not be enforceable by the Federal Government; however, State compliance will be requested.

Authorization levels contained in the House-passed version are \$5 million in FY 75 and \$7.5 million in FY76 for grants to States for water quality supervision programs; \$5.0 million in FY75 and \$7.5 billion in FY76 for grants to States for underground water source protection programs; \$15 million in FY74, \$25 million in FY75, and \$35 million in FY76 for research grants; \$7.5 million in FY74, \$7.5 million in FY75, and \$10 million in FY76 for special studies and demonstration projects; and, \$1 million in FY74, \$2 million in FY75, and \$1 million in FY76 for rural water survey.

This legislation, once ironed out by the Committee on Conference should become law this month.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

The House Select Committee on Committees has completed its preliminary draft of a major restructuring of the legislative juris-

dictions of the House standing committees. Needless to say, when one proposes moving one category of legislation from one committee to another, thereby affecting positions of strength, expertise, and seniority—as well as the constituencies which have had normalized relations with the committees as they now stand—such a proposed reorganization is highly controversial. That notwithstanding, the Select Committee's recommendations are moving forward.

As a part of the proposed reorganization, a new Committee on Energy and Environment would be established, with full legislative authority. Into this new Committee would be placed all legislative authority, other than appropriations, on air, water, and solid waste pollution control. The new Committee would consist of all the jurisdiction from the current Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and would add to it some authorities of the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Public Works.

The Select Committee is considering the final draft of the proposal in open mark-up sessions this very week. The Committee chairman has indicated that he hopes to report the proposal, obtain a Rule, and have it to the Floor for consideration by the Easter Recess.

I think it is important to note that unheralded action, such as this, does reflect the capacity of an enlightened Congress to act constructively in meeting the Nation's changing priorities.

OVERSIGHT HEARINGS

The House Committee on Public Works has commenced oversight hearings on the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. These hearings are beginning to focus on the specific problem areas associated with the 1972 amendments embodied in Public Law 92-500.

I would be less than frank, if I did not state that there is growing concern that there may be too much to be done and too little time within which to do it—on all levels: Federal, Interstate, State, and local.

The Congress has seldom voiced a determination to solve a national problem as strongly as it did in the enactment of the 1972 Amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Teeth were put into enforcement provisions; authorizations for appropriations were set at the highest levels attainable; restatements of priorities and policies were etched into the legislative intent. Only a relatively brief period of time has passed since the enactment of those Amendments, but it has been enough time to see in better perspective the contrast between the ideals set forth through the objectives and goals embodied in those Amendments and the very blunt realities of being able to attain them. It is a common technique in law to set goals at a level which, though not attainable, is at least attainable in greater measure because the community strove harder to reach a higher goal. But, we must be ever mindful that nothing is more frustrating, giving rise to lack of credibility in government, to set goals so high that a failure to reach them ushers in either apathy or frustration. This may very well be a problem as the States and local governments strive towards holding up their responsibilities. And, we must make sure—very sure—that a failure to meet adequately all the goals cannot be interpreted as a failure of State or local government by those who really do want a total replacement of State and local responsibilities by Federal machinery.

One of the most important tasks you can assign to yourself this year, whether it is through testimony before the Committee on Public Works or other expressions to both elected and appointed officials at all levels, is to communicate rapidly and fully all of your complaints about the new Amendments and the burdens they place upon you on a

State and local level, what remedial action you think is prudent, and what role the enactment of new amendments, if any, might play in obtaining a more proper balance between the ideal and the real, between involving State and local governments fully but not on schedules which are impossible to meet. Do not do what has often been done in the past—hold your frustrations to yourselves. Congress is not going to know what ought to be done, unless it has full knowledge of the problems you are experiencing. Pollution control has been a hallmark of intergovernmental cooperation; that will survive only if every level of government feels it has meaningful input and impact as to what is being done and ought to be done. For the States and local governments to be relegated to little more than an administrative, functionary role, under the guise of being a full partner, is to accomplish nothing.

Take the opportunity of these oversight hearings and the entire aura of reexamination now pervading this subject area to make the voice of the people at your levels of government felt most strongly.

CASTRO STILL EXPORTS REVOLUTION DESPITE NEW DÉTENTE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of those who control the Nation's press never ceases to be amazing. The dust had barely settled on the great Middle East crisis before the local Washington news media began beating its drums for normalization of diplomatic relations between our Government and Castro's Cuba.

Even the Washington Star-News, which apologetically calls itself the more conservative of the papers in our Nation's Capital, has editorialized—

The updating of American policy does not require fondness toward a still-hostile Castro and his totalitarian regime—a test we do not apply in dealing with many other unpleasant governments. A recognition of realities, 15 years after the fall of Batista and 11 years after the missile crisis, calls for an end of the economic boycott and talks leading to diplomatic relations.

And true to the new timetable for change, Soviet party leader Brezhnev is now being pictured as the Soviet version of Henry Kissinger on his latest peace move. Chairman Brezhnev is expected here in Washington to confer with Dr. Kissinger, reportedly in the interests of gaining U.S. favor for Castro. Castro's activities in exporting communism and revolution are now being given low profile in expectation of the latest détente.

Interestingly enough, this rising feeling of détente with Cuba coincides with hearings to be held by the House Committee on Agriculture to extend the Sugar Act. An effort by the State Department's détente crowd to reinstate the sugar quota for Cuba may be expected. Howard Flieger in the February 11 issue of U.S. News & World Report pointed out the seriousness of this action to our other Latin American neighbors:

What about the "Cuban sugar quota"? This was Cuba's share of the U.S. sugar mar-

ket, and would amount to more than 200 million dollars a year at today's prices. Since Castro, the quota has been spread among 30 other sugar-producing nations. The U.S. is inviting trouble with friends if it takes those sugar allotments away from present suppliers and gives them back to Cuba.

Seemingly unnewsworthy is last month's Communist uprising in Mexico. Also given little attention was the state of siege declared by the President of Bolivia to counter an offensive organized by a Bolivian later exiled in Cuba.

Also overlooked in the present fury to discredit the new Government of Chile has been the factual background of what precipitated Allende's police state, which provoked the Chileans into action. Seldom mentioned was the Cuban role in the Chilean socialist experiment including the fact that Salvador Allende's son-in-law, Luis Fernández Oña, was Chief of Secret Police of Cuba, who was sent to Chile by Fidel Castro, after Allende's election in 1970.

If there has been any mellowing, it has not been by Castro or his exportation of violence to overthrow his neighboring countries in central and South America.

Or can this latest public opinion molding exercise be another of the American prices for Dr. Kissinger's successful détente in the Middle East?

I ask that related news clippings follow:

[From the Washington Star-News, Jan. 29, 1974]

"SIEGE" IN BOLIVIA

LA PAZ.—President Hugo Banzer has imposed a state of siege in Bolivia to combat what he calls an attempt by foreign guerrillas to set up bases in his country for attacks against other South American nations.

Political sources said authorities made numerous roundups of suspected subversives throughout yesterday. Banzer's announcement that constitutional Rights would be suspended was made in a broadcast last night.

At the time of the broadcast, an estimated 10,000 peasants were blocking the three roads between agricultural areas in southern and eastern Bolivia and towns in the highlands. They were protesting Banzer's recent order increasing basic food prices which he said was to halt smuggling of food to nearby countries, where prices were higher.

Interior Minister Walter Castro, who followed Banzer to the microphone, claimed that three subversive movements, including two directed from outside the country, were gravely threatening the political and social stability of Bolivia.

He said extremists plotted during a recent meeting in France to set up headquarters in Bolivia for both urban and rural subversion across the continent.

Officials government sources claimed that former Bolivian cabinet minister Antonio Arguedas, who has been in exile in Cuba, is organizing the guerrilla offensive.

[From the Washington Star-News, Jan. 24, 1974]

MEXICAN VIOLENCE

CULIACAN, MEXICO.—A policeman was abducted, tortured and slain yesterday in the aftermath of student violence near this rural town in northwest Mexico.

Police announced the arrests of nine Communist youths charged with participating in farmland invasions a week ago that resulted in four shooting deaths and widespread damage.

The body of officer Jesus Zavala Rocha, 45, was found in a school building here. Au-

thorities said he had been burned, slashed, beaten and riddled with bullets.

Police said they received threats of further violence.

The arrested youths were identified as members of the 23rd of September Communist League that authorities say led a student invasion of farms to form a "people's army" of peasants.

The raids coincided with the kidnaping of a wealthy rancher in Mazatlan, just south of here. Authorities have not pinned that abduction on the Communist League but blame the group for previous kidnapings, robberies and bombings throughout the country.

THREE YEARS OF DESTRUCTION
(Published by the Chilean Printer's Association)

(NOTE.—Illustrations, mentioned in the following article, are not shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprint.)

The three illustrations on these two pages speak for themselves. In the upper one Salvador Allende appears as he practices with a heavy machine gun under the supervision of his son-in-law, Luis Fernández Oña, who was sent to Chile from Cuba by Fidel Castro as soon as it became known that Allende had obtained the first majority at the polls in 1970. Previously, Fernández Oña was Chief of Secret Police of Cuba.

The lower illustration is another of Allende watching Eduardo Paredes—a doctor of medicine, ex-Director of the local Bureau of Investigation and a Socialist-Mirist militant (MIR being an extreme-left movement) practicing with a Soviet-made automatic weapon. Fernández Oña also appears on this page as he watches his wife Isabel Allende—the President's daughter performing on the shooting range. In the background—Salvador Allende himself.

Whilst all this was going on at Cañaveral—the abode of the President's "private secretary"—Allende was accusing the Right Wing Opposition and the Fascists (sic) of accumulating weapons and of having clandestine military training camps all over the country. Thus, supposedly, he thought he could deceive those who know only too well that if any were preparing to unleash civil war, which would have meant an incalculable number of deaths, it was the Marxists themselves.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1974]
BREZHNEV TO BEGIN CUBA VISIT
(By Robert G. Kaiser)

Moscow, January 26.—Soviet Communist Party leader Leonid Brezhnev is to arrive in Havana Monday on a visit expected to mark the official conclusion to a rocky period in Soviet-Cuban relations.

As usual before Brezhnev's trips abroad, the press here has blossomed with reports on Cuba and Soviet-Cuban relations. Prime Minister Fidel Castro's government has been applauded as a full member of the socialist community since it joined Comecon, the East European economic bloc, last year. That was the de facto end of the latest period of troubled relations.

The press contains no hint of ideological discord between Moscow and Cuba, although sources here indicate that the two still disagree about how best to bring socialism to Latin America. For several years, the Soviets have tried—with some success—to moderate Castro's line, insisting that he should not export armed revolution.

But the military coup in Chile is thought to have bolstered the argument that there is no peaceful road to socialism in South America.

Rumors in Moscow suggest that Brezhnev and Castro may convene a meeting of Latin American Communists during the Soviet leader's visit, which is expected to last about a week.

Brezhnev's visit, his first to Cuba, was originally scheduled to coincide with the 15th anniversary of the Cuban revolution, celebrated earlier this month.

Some Western diplomats here speculated that Brezhnev did not want to be in the audience when Castro lambasted the United States in his anniversary address. Soviet sources, however, suggest that Brezhnev simply did not want to diminish the impact of his visit by sharing the spotlight with the anniversary celebration.

Premier Alexei Kosygin was the last major Soviet leader to visit Cuba, in 1971. Since then, Castro has implemented numerous Soviet demands for rationalization of the economy.

Cuba remains an enormous financial drain on the Soviet Union. Western diplomats estimate that the Soviets provide Cuba with 30 to 35 million barrels of oil a year, the tankers making the long return trip to Soviet ports empty.

The Cubans provide sugar in return for the massive aid. In recent years, Castro has been unable to meet promised levels of sugar deliveries, forcing the Soviets to make big purchases on the world market. However, this situation seems to have improved in 1973.

There are hundreds of Soviet technical experts in Cuba, many providing advice in the fishing and sugar industries, and aid will undoubtedly be an important topic on the agenda of Brezhnev's talks with Castro.

This is the first round of intensive summit diplomacy Brezhnev plans for the months ahead. French President Georges Pompidou is to visit the Soviet Union in late February, and West German Chancellor Willy Brandt is expected soon afterward. The Soviets apparently still hope for a visit from President Nixon—or "the president of the United States," as Soviet leaders are now saying in public statements—before the autumn.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 11, 1974]

CASTRO—WHO NEEDS HIM?
(By Howard Fieger)

As happens periodically, hints are surfacing in roundabout fashion that Cuba's Fidel Castro wants to get in the good graces of the U.S. Government and business.

There is talk of his willingness to resume "normal relations"—if the United States will lift its embargo of Cuba and generally warm up the atmosphere between this country and the Communist dictatorship that is starting its 16th year of power in Havana.

The recent arrival in Cuba of the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev—who sent a friendly message to President Nixon en route to visit Castro—heightened suggestions that the U.S. should thaw out its Cuba policy.

One argument made is that, since the U.S. is now on better terms with the Soviet Union and with Communist China, it is a political non sequitur to be so hard-nosed about Castro.

Another is that some hemisphere nations want increased trade with Cuba and that American-owned subsidiaries in those countries should be permitted to get in on the business. They can't under the embargo.

But, let's not be too hasty. More is involved than the fact that Communism is entrenched within 100 miles of the U.S. coast.

There are important things that must be weighed before Castro is welcomed into the embrace of the United States—very practical things. For example:

What does Castro intend to do about the 2 or 3 billion dollars' worth of American-owned property he stole—yes, stole—when he and his little band of conspirators seized power in Cuba? Not one cent of compensation has ever been paid. None of the property has been returned to its rightful owners.

Most of it has gone to ruin under his mismanagement. It now is worth only a fraction of what it once was—but that doesn't mean American owners haven't suffered tremendous losses at the hands of Castro without any sign he's ever given them the slightest thought.

What about the "Cuban sugar quota"? This was Cuba's share of the U.S. sugar market, and it would amount to more than 200 million dollars a year at today's prices. Since Castro, the quota has been spread among 30 other sugar-producing nations. The U.S. will invite trouble with friends if it takes those sugar allotments away from present suppliers and gives them back to Cuba.

What about the thousands of refugees who have found safety in the United States? Among them are some of the finest citizens of Cuba—people who gave up everything to flee from Castro. They still are Cubans. Most cling to a hope of returning someday to their native land. But they will abandon that hope in despair if Castro's dictatorship gets Washington's seal of approval.

What about anti-American subversion? Castro hasn't had much luck spreading it among his neighbors, true, but he's dedicated to that goal. He wants to get "Yankee go home" foment boiling all through this hemisphere, by fair means or foul.

Added up, Fidel Castro still doesn't strike one as the sort of person the U.S. ought to forgive and offer a helping hand.

In practical terms there is also this: Soviet Russia is keeping Castro afloat—and it is costing the Kremlin 1.5 million dollars every day of the year.

That's a lot of money. The Russians would like nothing better than for the U.S. to pick up part—or all—of that tab for maintaining a Communist Cuba.

Castro is the longest-lived failure in today's world. If ever there was a vivid display of how his brand of Communism ruins a good thing, it is on exhibition right there in Cuba.

To be realistic: Castro needs the U.S. a lot more than the U.S. needs Castro.

Let him wait 'til Havana freezes over.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK AID TO THE SOVIET UNION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the pursuit of "détente" policies which involve one-sided concessions by the United States and no similar concessions by the Soviet Union appears to be continuing.

On January 28, about 400 parents, wives and children of Americans still missing in Vietnam crowded into the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing room and complained about a lack of response from our own Government concerning their tragic plight.

B. C. Mills, a director of the League of Families, proposed a three-point plan: A worldwide campaign to focus attention on the issue; a refusal to grant any reconstruction aid to Hanoi until the information is provided, and a ban on better tariff treatment for the Soviet Union unless Moscow puts pressure on the North Vietnamese.

Frank A. Sieverts, the State Department prisoner specialist, said that he had reservations about denying the Soviet

Union trade concessions, even if it did nothing to help in the matter.

Trade concessions are bad enough. Lending money to the Soviet Union through the Import-Export Bank at 6 percent interest with no foreclosure collateral is even worse.

The Chicago Tribune notes that—

... the government backed Ex-Im Bank used to balk at lending even to non-Communist countries on collateral which was considered iffy. Congress was firm when setting up the bank in insisting that Ex-Im protect its loans with good collateral. But that's been forgotten.

The Soviet Union's record of paying back debts is not good. The Tribune pointed out that:

We haggled about that for years and Mr. Brezhnev finally allowed in 1972 that he'd pay \$722 million (of \$10.6 billion). By 2001. And provided Mr. Nixon got him most favored nation status in a trade deal.

There are few Americans who can borrow money at 6 percent interest, either from the U.S. Government or from anyone else. The Tribune poses a question which those who advocate such improper use of the Export-Import Bank are obligated to answer to the satisfaction of the American people:

What does Mr. Brezhnev have that the rest of us don't and that makes him such a splendid credit risk? Does detente mean financial imprudence?

I wish to share with my colleagues the editorial, "Brezhnev, the Magic Borrower," from the Chicago Tribune of January 30, 1974, and insert it into the Record at this time:

BREZHNEV, THE MAGIC BORROWER

If any of us could borrow from the Export-Import Bank at 6 per cent interest with no foreclosure collateral, we'd count ourselves lucky. But Leonid Brezhnev does it with ease.

Elliot Janeway, our economic columnist, has called attention to this topsy-turvy absurdity in an interview with Prof. Marshall I. Goldman, consultant to the Russian Research Center at Harvard University.

Mr. Janeway notes that the government backed Ex-Im Bank used to balk at lending even to non-Communist countries on collateral which was considered iffy. Congress was firm when setting up the bank in insisting that Ex-Im protect its loans with good collateral. But that's been forgotten.

Mr. Goldman observed that the Soviet loan—to be used for developing natural gas fields—will help build a plant that will not be workable for 20 or 25 years and will be on Soviet territory. "It's not Ex-Im collateral," he said.

Mr. Goldman is right. Anybody who tried to foreclose on a plant on Soviet soil would quickly discover what an immovable object really is.

This sort of unencumberable collateral would make sense only if the borrower's previous record of repayment was good—and even then not at the cushy 6 per cent which Mr. Brezhnev has wangled.

How good is Mr. Brezhnev's record of payment?

Well, there's the Soviet lend-lease debt of \$10.6 billion owed to the United States since World War II days. We haggled about that for years and Mr. Brezhnev finally allowed in 1972 that he'd pay \$722 million. By 2001. And provided Mr. Nixon got him most favored nation status in a trade deal.

Too, there are scattered other unpaid Soviet debts here and there.

What does Mr. Brezhnev have that the

rest of us don't and that makes him such a splendid credit risk? Does detente mean financial imprudence?

BIG THICKET NATIONAL PRESERVE

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee began 2 days of hearings on legislation to establish a national preserve in the Big Thicket area of Texas. I have recently received reports of timber cutting in the Turkey Creek Unit of the Big Thicket, and there is reason to believe that cutting may start soon in other areas. This causes me great alarm. I hope that the Senate will realize the consequences of this practice and act expeditiously on the Big Thicket legislation before irreplaceable areas are destroyed forever.

I would like to submit the following article by Dr. Pete Gunter, which appeared in the December 22 issue of Environmental Action. Dr. Gunter's expertise goes far in explaining the Big Thicket's history and the urgent need to preserve this rare and threatened land.

The article follows:

BIG THICKET: PARK OR TREE FARM?

(By Pete Gunter)

Texas conjures up an image of desert, dry creeks and sagebrush. But the Big Thicket of southeastern Texas is far removed from this image: it is a place of bayou bald cypress and semi-jungle.

The Thicket's proximity to the Gulf of Mexico provides both a stable semi-tropical climate and over 50 inches of rainfall a year. Its soils are ideally suited to the storage of water and the growing of trees, at least 15 of which are the largest of their species in the United States.

But while the region has the climate and the ecosystems of the deep South, it also has a northern and a western exposure. Beech, sugar maple and witch hazel are found there, sometimes in plant growth patterns almost identical with those found in the southern Appalachians, many miles to the east. Other areas, the "arid sandyland" communities, contain the wild flowers, mesquite trees, post oak, yucca and cactus of the American Southwest. Other areas resemble jungles in the Mexican states of Tamaulipas and Vera Cruz.

The Big Thicket is also a place of legend and folklore. Long cut off from the nearby cities of Beaumont and Houston, it has a reputation as a sanctuary for "outsiders" of every stripe. During the Civil War, conscientious objectors hid there to avoid conscription, in spite of the persistent efforts of Confederate troops to root them out. Escaped convicts used to flee from a nearby state prison in Huntsville, Texas, to the Thicket a step ahead of the baying hounds. East Texas' lone Indian reservation is on the northwest border of the Thicket which has traditionally afforded the Indian a refuge. The region provides one of the last havens for the alligator, the golden eagle and the Texas red wolf, and some people insist that a few last bear and panther still exist there too.

But the Big Thicket is in danger. The unique area's abundant natural resources are coveted by lumber companies and developers.

Efforts to preserve the Big Thicket date

back as far as 1927, when the first Big Thicket Association was formed. At that time the ecological importance of the sprawling wilderness was barely beginning to be realized, although conservationists asked for a contiguous block of 440,000 acres as a minimum wilderness preserve. Unfortunately, the drive to create a Big Thicket National Park in the 1930s was destroyed by the Second World War. Today, as the remarkable ecological diversity of the Thicket becomes more apparent, conservationists are pleading for 100,000 acres of wilderness—before the region is lost forever.

Recent controversy over the Thicket began in the mid-1960s and has consisted largely of a struggle between conservationists and lumber interests. The lumber companies and their supporters originally argued that the Big Thicket deserved no environmental protection. But as public interest grew they opted for a 35,000 acre park, the "String of Pearls," made up of widely separated tracts.

In the meantime, conservationists had gradually united behind a park configuration of 100,000 acres, or at a high point of optimism, 191,000 acres. Conservationists found little to complain about in the individual tract concept proposed by lumber interests, but they did object to the fact that these isolated areas would be cut off from their natural water supply and would soon die, as they were surrounded by sprawling subdivisions. In contrast to the lumber companies' "postage stamp" proposals, conservationists opted to run corridors between the pearls based on existing streams, and add acreage to the pearls wherever possible.

The original lumber-interest proposal included several ecosystems: a longleaf pine savannah, a virgin loblolly pine forest, two beech groves, a virgin river-bottom forest, a river-bottom swamp area noted for its heron and egret rookeries, a virtually untouched swamp-bottomland forest and a corridor ranging from the hills at the Thicket's northern limits to the poorly drained cypress-palmetto-hardwood ecosystems on its southern edge.

However, soon after the industry proposal was made, two of the areas were cut by private lumber operators and a third was bulldozed to create a vacation subdivision. Subsequently the lumber companies imposed a cutting moratorium on 35,000 acres, but since they owned or controlled only 18,000 acres of the total, as much as one-third has been cut by smaller lumber operators and local land owners.

Meanwhile the movement to create a park continue to grow. While lumber company lobbyists toured the state insisting that their 35,000 acre plan was an environmentalist proposal, conservationists protested loudly, insisting that new areas had to be added or the park could not survive. To preserve the Thicket, they argued, it would be necessary to protect its major water-courses: the Neches River Valley, the Big Sandy-Village Creek corridor and the Big Pine and Little Pine Island Bayou. Besides saving three completely different types of streams, such a system of corridors would ensure the water supply of the isolated "pearls" and would provide uninterrupted hiking and canoeing opportunities. Along with the proposed stream corridors, three biological units were envisioned: Jack Gore Bayall (semi-swamp), the Saratoga Triangle (lowlands laced with streams and sloughs) and the Turkey Creek Minibiome (an area which includes all of the Thicket's ecosystems).

But while the conservationists made the rounds of television and radio talk shows and argued their case before service clubs and newspaper bigwigs, they felt the pressure of time. The Thicket cannot last forever because the lumber companies that were once willing to cut selectively in the area now propose to convert the great ma-

majority of the area into monoculture: row after row of nothing but pines. In such "pine plantations" only one species of tree, the pulp or slash pine, would be allowed to exist, and the ferns, vines, wading birds, owls, mushrooms, orchids and small game of the original Thicket could not survive.

Some of the giants of American industry are heading the assault on the Thicket: Santa Fe Industries (Chicago) which owns Kirby Lumber Company; International Paper (New York); Owens-Illinois (Toledo); Champion International (New York); Southland Paper Mills (Lufkin, Texas, but 40 percent owned by St. Regis of New York); and Time Inc., now the third largest land owner in Texas (1,060,000 acres) after a merger of its Eastex subsidiary with locally-owned Temple Industries. In the past, Temple avoided bulldozer and monoculture timber technology while Eastex planned to turn at least 80 percent of its 600,000 acre Texas holdings into slash pine. It is unclear whether the two contradictory policies will be maintained in the two divisions or whether one of the two will prevail.

Student boycotts of Time Inc. Magazines (*Time*, *Sports Illustrated* and *Fortune*) have made that corporation more sensitive to public opinion and the addition of Texas' most rational and far-sighted lumberman, Temple Industries' Arthur Temple Jr., to Time's ranks may foster a more balanced land-use policy in the region. Temple, for example, has offered to protect all rare or endangered species on Time's Texas lands.

Whatever the future may hold, conservationists concede ruefully that the Thicket's remaining 300,000 acres are being irretrievably lost at the rate of 35,000 acres per year to sterile pine monoculture. The problem with sterile pine monoculture—a term which is liable to send lumbermen into fits of frustrated rage—is that it does not permit multiple use. During the first few years a pine plantation constitutes essentially a prairie ecosystem and in such an ecosystem quail, rabbits and deer manage to survive. And, assuming a rotational system of cutting and replanting, a certain amount of the original pine-hardwood forest would be kept in prairie, and thus be available to hunters. But besides this minimal multiple use, pine plantations are as mono-usage as they are monoculture. They are not attractive for hiking, photographing or picknicking. After they are bulldozed right up to the stream-banks and the resulting brush, refuse and debris are pushed into the stream (as used to happen in the Thicket with regularity), the stream is no longer a good place to canoe, fish, swim or camp.

Most of the scientific value is also lost in a monoculture. Virtually every major university in the United States has at one time or another sent scientists to the Big Thicket looking for biological specimens. More recently biologists have used the Thicket to study those intricately interrelated groups of species known as ecosystems, such as a series of ponds in different stages of ecological succession, or a swamp containing several species of aquatic fauna not known to co-exist elsewhere, or a hill whose slope contains four different ecosystems in 100 feet. But in a pine plantation there is little to interest the scientist except the pine bark beetle and pine "root rot."

Former Texas Senator Ralph Yarborough, one of the Thicket's staunchest defenders, scored a big victory in 1970 with the Senate passage of a bill to establish a 100,000 acre Big Thicket National Park. Tragically, the House did not act in time to pass a similar bill because Wayne Aspinall, then the Chairman of the House Interior Committee, got married and went on a vacation which lasted until the Congressional session ended. This made it necessary to start all over again with new legislation. Equally tragic for the Thick-

et's prospects was Senator Yarborough's defeat at the polls and subsequent retirement from Congress. Though he continued to fight from the political sidelines, it became necessary for Rep. Bob Eckhardt (D-Tex.) to take up the crusade.

On December 3, 1973, the House passed a new compromise bill (H.R. 11547) to establish a 84,500 acre park. The compromise, worked out last summer between Rep. Eckhardt and newly-elected Rep. Charles Wilson (D-Tex.) whose district contains the Big Thicket, drops the magnificent Big Sandy-Village Creek corridor from the park while picking up a corridor along heretofore neglected Menard Creek, which flows west into the Trinity River. The compromise was necessary to pass the bill, but valuable acreage was lost in the process and an entire ecosystem, the arid-sandyland community, was left out of the national area. Since the point of the Big Thicket National Preserve is to safeguard specimens of each ecosystem in the area, this is a serious omission.

A Senate Interior Committee staff member told *Environmental Action* the Committee may reinstate the Big Sandy-Village Creek corridor in the Senate bill, scheduled for hearings in late January or early February. If the Senate passes a bill which includes the corridor, the dispute would be settled in a House-Senate conference.

Texas' two senators, Lloyd Bentsen (D) and John Tower (R) have both committed themselves to passage of Big Thicket legislation. But failure to pass a bill early in 1974 could cause the Big Thicket to be swept aside as congressmen rush home to begin Senate and House election campaigns. If no bill has been enacted by the time the 93rd Congress adjourns, all current efforts will be erased from the lawmaking process, and by the time new bills have cleared all the nooks and crannies of Congress again, there may be little left of the Big Thicket.

For its diversity, richness and sheer abundance of life, the Thicket may not be equalled on the surface of the planet. It must be preserved.

YING LEE KELLEY DESCRIBES VIETNAMESE PRISON HORRORS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, recently Berkeley City Councilwoman Ying Lee Kelley spent 2 weeks in a privately funded investigation of the South Vietnamese police and prison system.

In an interview with *Indochina Focal Point* newspaper, published by the *Indochina Peace Campaign* in Santa Monica, Calif. Ms. Kelley describes the conditions she found, as well as her impressions of current conditions in Vietnam.

As we read Ms. Kelley's words, let us remember that it is U.S. taxpayer funds who are paying for the South Vietnamese prison system—a system which holds the largest per capita percent of political prisoners in the world.

The interview follows:

YING KELLEY: U.S. AMBASSADOR CLAIMS NO POLITICAL PRISONERS

When you interviewed Ambassador Graham Martin, what did he say about political prisoners?

He and his staff members had prepared for our visit and had a stack of materials several

feet high when we arrived. When we started talking about political prisoners, he literally threw a folder of pictures at us, including photos of a dead Vietnamese and his alleged assassin. Martin said, "Are these the people you're concerned about, assassins and murderers?" He denied that there was even one political prisoner and said that the stories about the prisoners were the result of an incredibly powerful and deceptive wave of Communist propaganda.

Ambassador Martin said that more than anything else in the world he wanted also to look into the prisons. I said, "Why can't you?" and he said, "You as an Asian should appreciate that Vietnam is a sovereign country."

I said, "Well, I appreciate your respect of an Asian government, but we pay 80-90% of the budget for Saigon. Surely this implies some responsibility. I as a taxpayer am concerned about how my money is being spent."

Did you speak with any ex-prisoners?

I spoke with one ex-prisoner who gave a very detailed account of his life since he was arrested.

Police camped in his living room and all visitors were detained until he arrived the next morning. Then six police stayed in the house for two weeks to entrap any other visitors to the house.

He was charged with "writing." He had translated an important book about the Indochina war from English to Vietnamese.

He was taken to National Police Headquarters where he spent seven months. During that time he could not contact a lawyer or his family. Then he was transferred to Chi Hoa prison for three months before he was given a trial by a Military Field Court, where the judge is an Army officer. There was no evidence, no witnesses. Thirty people were tried at the same time.

A police file is presented and the defendant is told the main points of the accusation by the judge. The defendant is asked if the material submitted is true. If the defendant submits that he was beaten and a confession forced from him, the judge would say, "But you would not have been beaten so badly to have given all these details." This would end the defense.

Then, the prosecutor went with the judge and the jury of military officers into private session to determine the sentence.

What were your impressions about Thieu's strength?

Thieu's government maintains its leadership by sheer oppression and repression. We talked to people who were thrown into prison and tortured. The torture is not done by a group of sadists. It is not done by people who enjoy torture, although I think you have to be able to tolerate it. It is government policy. If you speak up against Americans, if you speak up against Thieu, you are thrown into prison.

Anyone who is arrested, the first thing that happens is that he is beaten. Sometimes, he is tortured for information. But just as a matter of habit, of policy, he is beaten. This, really I think, paralyzes political activity.

Did you discover any public opposition to Thieu?

Yes, some opposition leaders are tolerated because Nixon likes to have a picture of democracy. So a few opposition leaders have immunity from imprisonment, torture and beating, but they're very few.

What is the attitude of these opposition leaders towards Thieu and the Peace Agreement?

Time and time again people told us they felt it was the Saigon government fighting very aggressively for land militarily (not politically, as allowed in the Paris Agreements) that has brought them new territory. They feel that there is a total absence of the

spirit of reconciliation and accord, which is one of the conditions of the ceasefire agreement.

When I asked one opposition deputy about whether he could live with the NLF, he said, "Yes, I am interested in the reconciliation policy of the Agreement. We believe that North Vietnam wants peace. The North recognizes that South Vietnam doesn't want communism. The communists are Vietnamese."

The same Deputy said of Thieu, "Vietnam is extremely rich with its potential for rice, coal, oil, minerals, sand, fishing and also its strategic location in terms of Southeast Asia. Thieu is not an economist, but a militarist. He sells Vietnam's resources to line his own pockets. Militarists in Asia have not been interested in economics and culture. Therefore, we ask for two things: one, an end to the war; and two, an end to militarists administering our country."

Did most of the people you interviewed share the openness towards the PRG suggested by that Deputy?

Most people would rather not be in politics, they want to lead their own lives. They want the Paris Peace Agreement to be respected. Through the Agreement, they could move around freely, but now they can't do that.

They want more than anything else to return to their land. Time after time they told us: Vietnam is an agrarian country. We were the rice bowl of Asia. We used to be able to ship rice to every country in Asia, and now we are importing rice from America. Let us go back to our farms, to live in our villages.

Right now, American money is responsible for keeping people out of their villages away from their farms because Thieu is so afraid that in the countryside he has no control.

Did you visit any of the refugee or concentration camps which Thieu maintains?

Yes. These camps are placed very close to future industrial parks and along the major national roads to stabilize them. The reason for them being near the future sites of industrial parks is obvious. For example, Ninh Thuan camp near Cam Ranh Bay is designed to provide cheap labor for the Japanese-planned industrial park. And Long Khanh and Binh Thuy camps are for the protection of National Road 1 from PRG attack.

There are approximately one million refugees, with about 600,000 in refugee camps. I feel that America went on record with the Nuremberg Trials that we don't believe in putting people in concentration camps and that we don't support the maltreatment of civilians. Yet we find ourselves giving \$5 billion a year to do exactly what we condemned the Germans for doing.

What do you think Americans should do?

I would like to see Americans sit down for no more than 3 or 4 minutes a day and write a letter getting their Congressman and Senators to promise to cut off the aid from America that is allowing the war to continue.

I work the way that I do, as a part-time school teacher and also a Councilwoman, because I have tremendous faith in the goodness of the American people ultimately. I don't think Americans want their tax money going into torturing people. I grew up during World War II and was educated by reading about Dachau and Auschwitz, and I remember the horror with which Americans reacted to what the Germans did. And I think we Americans have to know now that this is what we're doing to Vietnam. I don't think Americans want this. I think if we knew, we would pressure our Congressman and we would say "Please stop this."

We can't say like the Germans could say during World War II that we didn't know what was going on. What we have created in Vietnam is horrible. It is something I would

be ashamed to tell my children about. If they ask me "did you know about this? why didn't you do something about it?", I want to be able to say, "Yes, I knew about it, and I did something to stop it."

ADMIRAL BULKELEY, A SUPERB
INDIVIDUAL

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, last year when the Seapower Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee wanted to learn from an unimpeachable and impartial source about the condition of the ships in our Navy, we called in as a witness Rear Adm. John D. Bulkeley, president of the Navy Board of Inspection and Survey.

Admiral Bulkeley was retired from the Navy but has been recalled to active duty to continue his leadership on the Board of Inspection and Survey. In recognition of Admiral Bulkeley's fine accomplishments, Secretary Warner sent him a letter which Warner shared with me and I include it at this point in the RECORD, because it is a well-deserved tribute:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,

Washington, D.C., December 17, 1973.

Rear Adm. JOHN D. BULKELEY, U.S. Navy, President, Navy Board of Inspection and Survey, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL BULKELEY: As the time draws near for your retirement from active duty, it is my pleasure to salute you for the special excellence of your most distinguished career.

During four decades of naval service, you contributed invaluable service in a wide variety of important assignments. Your distinguished leadership and courage during World War II earned you the esteem of a grateful nation for which you were awarded the Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross, the Army Distinguished Service Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster, both the Navy and the Army Silver Star Medal, the Purple Heart, the Army Distinguished Unit Badge and the Republic of Philippines Distinguished Conduct Star and the French Croix de Guerre with Star.

Your peacetime duty at the Naval Academy and subsequent commands in the destroyer force enabled hundreds of young officers to profit from their association with you.

Most recently, as President, Navy Board of Inspection and Survey, your personal determination, initiative and superb leadership have been directed to the improved readiness of the fleet. Your outstanding achievements in this effort were marked by the award of the Distinguished Service Medal. I know of no flag officer who has won such a widespread reputation as a practical, shirt-sleeve engineer and seaman, a man devoted to professional excellence.

It should be a source of great pride for you to recall in future years that you contributed so unstintingly to our Navy and Nation. Please accept my best wishes for continued success and happiness. I am especially pleased that you will be at the helm of the

Board of Inspection and Survey while serving on active duty in a retired status.

You are a superb individual.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. WARNER,
Secretary of the Navy.

GILMAN BILL TO PROMOTE RAIL
SAFETY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today amending the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-458) to require the installation of safety glass on all new railroad passenger cars.

In the past, the glass used in the windows of railroad passenger cars has generally consisted of ordinary pane glass which has been highly susceptible to breakage and shattering when struck by a thrown projectile. There have been numerous serious accidents recently resulting in injuries from rocks thrown by vandals through passenger train windows.

Recently, there have been significant technical advances by several domestic corporations that have produced low-cost shatterproof glass and glass substitutes. While this glass is being installed on some rail passenger cars, it is not being done in every instance; there being no current requirement that new cars include such specifications.

Because of recent accidents and the dramatic increase in rail passenger traffic, it is imperative that minimum safety standards be established. By requiring shatterproof safety glass on all replacement panes and new cars, we will go a long way toward improving safety for railroad passengers.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure and I include the full text of the bill in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R.—

A bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-458), to provide for the installation of safety glass on railroad passenger cars

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-458), is hereby amended as follows:

SECTION 1. Safety glass or glass substitute on passenger cars. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, it shall be unlawful for any railroad company or a transportation company or authority operating a railroad to use on its line or lines any new passenger car purchased after the effective date of this act not equipped with shatterproof or splinterproof safety glass or glass substitute of a type approved by the Secretary of Transportation and to use such safety glass or glass substitute in all replacements on used passenger cars. The Secretary of Transportation shall promulgate such rules and regulations necessary to effectuate the intent of this section.

Sec. 2. Any violation of the provisions of Section 1 of this act shall be punishable by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars, and each day or part of a day a car is operated and not so equipped, as provided herein, shall constitute a separate offense.

Sec. 3. This act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after it becomes law.

RELIEF FOR TRUCKERS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 months, truckers across the country have been trying to obtain effective action to meet their increasingly desperate financial predicament. So far they have received only "promises, promises."

While I am not in a position to evaluate all their demands, it is obvious that they cannot continue in business with their costs rising and their freight rates frozen. It is also obvious that efforts to hold down the cost of fuel have not been successful.

I am pleased to read in this morning's paper that the conferees on the emergency energy bill have approved a rollback of crude oil price which would, in turn lower diesel fuel and gasoline prices. As a cosponsor of a separate bill to roll back fuel prices, I approve such action in principle and hope that both Houses can quickly approve some practical measure to roll back fuel prices.

Realistically speaking, however, this step is no panacea for the problems of the truckers. Their financial squeeze results primarily from the fact that while their costs have been skyrocketing in recent months, their freight rates have remained frozen at the direction of the ICC. The truckers have been forced to absorb the cost of increased fuel to the point where many are facing bankruptcy.

The only other recourse is to allow the truckers—as other businesses do—to pass through these increased costs to the consumer. Yesterday I sent a telegram to the White House urging the President to issue an Executive order immediately transferring authority over freight rates from the ICC to the Cost of Living Council for the duration of the energy crisis. It is my opinion, and that of experts. I spoke with, that the President currently has that authority under the Economic Stabilization Act as amended last spring. The telegram also urged the President to direct the Cost of Living Council to allow truckers to pass their increased costs through to the consumer.

Such a step, as the Washington Post points out in an editorial this morning is "a bitterly unattractive one, but in this instance and many others inescapable."

I am painfully aware that the energy crisis has added to the financial woes of most consumers. But the fact is that the trucker is being singled out among all consumers to bear a disproportionate share of the burden of the present crisis.

It is not the trucker, but the bankrupt

policies of the Federal Government and the private sector which are responsible for the present troubles. These policies must be changed, and their change must be the first priority of this Congress. In my opinion, both Houses should attach greater urgency to this issue than is presently being exhibited.

But in the meantime, the burden of higher prices and shortages must be distributed equally to all segments in the economy. And that means providing immediate, meaningful relief to the truckers.

The editorial from today's Washington Post entitled "The Truckers' Revolt" follows:

THE TRUCKERS' REVOLT

The increasingly violent revolt of the truckers may very well be unfortunately, only one of the first reactions to the drastic rise in fuel costs. It is necessary to assume that there will be others. It would be utterly unrealistic to assume that the economy can smoothly and swiftly accommodate jumps of this size in basic fuel prices. The truckers' complaints about fuel prices and shortages are largely justified. Both Congress and the administration, in trying to meet them, need to keep it clearly in mind that they are not dealing with a special and isolated case. There are going to be other justified complaints. The rules worked out for the truckers are going to have to be applied in many other cases yet to come. Any solution for the truckers ought to follow several general principles that are already clear.

The first of these principles is to allow all businesses—not just the big ones with lobbyists and lawyers—to pass on the full increases in fuel costs. The federal government has decided to let the price of oil products rise, and indeed it has very little choice. But who is to pay for the increase? Last fall the administration tried for a time to make the service station operators swallow part of the rise in wholesale gasoline prices. Most service station operators, including most of those selling the familiar brands, are in fact independent retailers who make their living out of the profit margin on each gallon of gasoline. The Cost of Living Council squeezed that margin for a time, in an attempt to shield the consumer. But that tactic was totally unfair to the retailer, who was already being hurt by the cuts in the volumes of gasoline that he could sell. Now the truckers are being squeezed between fuel prices and the freight rates administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission. There is only one way to distribute the increased cost in the cases, and that is to make everyone help carry it. That means passing it on to the consumer.

The second general principle for lawmakers and administrators is to avoid the temptation to try to carve out special low prices for the loud screamers. The truckers are entitled to a remedy, but they are not entitled to last year's price for diesel oil, maintained by special government rules below the price that others must pay. Differential prices for a single commodity always generate their own inequities and distortions as people with access to cheap sources begin, one way or another, to compete with those who must pay higher prices. The differential would be particularly harmful in the case of diesel oil, since it is the same thing as home heating oil. Many truckers would face a great temptation to resell their fuel at the higher price for home heating.

Since heating oil is now under mandatory rationing, the Federal Energy Office cannot offer the truck stops unlimited supplies. One possible solution, in theory, might be to peg the price of roadside diesel fuel higher than home heating oil and then give the truckers a prompt rebate of the difference, based on

mileage. But as a practical matter, in the present climate, it would be very difficult to sell anything involving a higher price to the truckers even as a means of assuring them adequate supplies along the road.

The process of adjusting to expensive oil is going to be difficult everywhere. But it will be the least difficult for large organizations with economic research staffs and sophisticated purchasing offices. It will be very hard for small businessmen who keep their own books, and live on the difference between monthly receipts and current bills. It will be harder still in those industries, like trucking, where the independent operator competes directly with large corporations.

The homicidal violence in the truckers' revolt is terrible, but it is also predictable. Violence always seems to arise most quickly in those industries characterized by isolated working conditions, uncertain returns and a degree of personal danger. Trucking is not the only example.

It is fair to ask: Why did the government not foresee this reaction on the part of the truck drivers? The answer is that the increasing cost of oil products will have a hundred such effects throughout the economy and no one will be able to foresee them all. For every case resolved without disruption and breakdown, there will be another that was permitted to go too far simply because no one was watching. Knowing this much, it is necessary for both the administration and Congress to develop a capacity for smooth and quick response to legitimate grievances.

The idea of passing all of these costs through directly to the consumer is a bitterly unattractive one, but in this instance and many others it will be inescapable. No consumer wants to pay more for the delivery of the goods that he must buy every day. But no one can fairly ask the trucker to absorb the soaring costs of fuel oil. The trucker, too, is a consumer, after all, and will pay his part of the freight when he goes into the store to buy the goods that he brought there.

No one can forecast with any accuracy the effects of a sudden leap upward in basic fuel prices. They are going to come home to all of us in many ways, first in the prices of the fuel that we all buy directly, later in the prices of everything made from oil, made in factories powered by oil, made in factories powered by electricity generated with oil, sold in stores heated by oil, and transported there by oil. It's a long list, and no one can afford to delude himself that the truckers have brought us anywhere near the end of it.

HON. JACK VALENTI ON THE MERITS OF A 6-YEAR PRESIDENCY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, there is growing debate among Members of Congress, the press, and academicians concerning the advisability of one 6-year term for the President.

Many feel that one 6-year term for our Chief Executive would solve many problems that have grown around the modern Presidency.

At the same time, critics of the one 6-year term proposal say it would free the President to ignore the people's wishes once in office.

The arguments pro and con are strong. I personally am weighing the issue in my own mind.

I do think we should give a close reading to a recent article on the question by the Honorable Jack Valenti, former Presidential Assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Jack Valenti is well qualified to speak on this subject. He knows the burdens of the office at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue where he served with great distinction and understanding.

This article recently appeared in the February 4 issue of *Newsweek*.

I place it in the RECORD:

A 6-YEAR PRESIDENCY?

(By Jack Valenti)

If the Watergate mess tells us anything, it is that the re-election of a President is the most nagging concern in the White House and that, given the limits of human nature, it is altogether possible that the first item on the agenda of an incoming Administration is its re-election. There is really nothing sinister in this objective—it's the most normal thing in our politics.

But, at the risk of stepping on the droppings of shrewder and wiser philosophers, I think the time has come for changing the rules by which Presidential politics are played. My proposal is a single six-year term for the President with no re-election eligibility.

Two of the most respected of all United States senators, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana and senior Republican George Alken of Vermont, have both sponsored such an idea. They believe that while we ought not to tinker too much with the constitutional machinery, we can rearrange a bit of the constitutional furniture.

THE JUDGMENT OF HISTORY

Consider for a moment the election of a new President under a six-year term. He takes office knowing that he cannot seek re-election, that he will make his place in history, for better or worse, on the deeds and achievements of the next 72 months of his stewardship. He has only to do what he thinks is right, with the sure understanding that he must heed the people, for they are co-authors of the record he will leave to the historians. It is this judgment that most Presidents are keen to certify; they value it far above the Great Gallup Poll in the Sky that measures their popularity rather than their legacy.

Should taxes be raised? Should rationing be instituted? Should troops be withdrawn? Should wrongs be righted even though some voters are offended? If the election is a year or two away, you can mark it down as a Major Truth that a first-term President will carefully weigh the effects of whatever he does on his second-term prospects. Kenneth O'Donnell, JFK's closest political aide, wrote some years ago of a conversation President Kennedy had with Senator Mansfield in 1963 during which the senator urged JFK to get the hell out of Vietnam. To which, according to O'Donnell, the President wryly confessed he wanted to do just that, but he had to wait until after the election lest he be swamped at the polling booths.

Watergate would never have occurred if Presidential aides were not obsessed with re-election. If they had been comfortable in their tenure, knowing that in six years they would lose their lease—and in that short time they must write their record as bravely and wisely as possible—is it not possible that their arrogance might have softened and their reach for power might have shortened?

The counter-arguments to the six-year term are (1) the President must not be freed from considering the political implications of his acts or he becomes isolated from the people, and (2) he is a lame duck the day of his election.

Let's consider those two arguments.

POWER AND POLITICS

Don't we make the President a lame duck now the day he is elected to his second term? Does that hamper him? Of course not. The President has such power that he can wield it sufficiently and with precision to the last weeks of his tenure. President Johnson signed into law two of the most controversial pieces of legislation of his Administration in the last seven months of his office, the equal-housing and tax reform acts. The powers of appointment, of veto, of budget making, of initiation of programs, of moral suasion—these are all intact, fully armed and borne by him until his successor is sworn in. Lame-duckism is a myth in the Presidency.

A six-year-term President is not isolated and divorced from the daily political marketplace. Any President who wants to pass a bill, build a budget, construct a program, implement a plan, make a treaty, negotiate at a conference must be sensitive to the people and the Congress. He must act within the framework of the separation of powers, he is powerful, but he is not all-powerful. Common sense dictates his actions, and his own sen-

sitivity to his place in history freights his every move. Therefore it follows, quite reasonably, that the President who would write a durable and measurably valuable record must persuade the Congress and the people.

The Congress and the Supreme Court (the one answerable often to the voters, and the other secure behind lifetime tenure) have only to exercise their power under the Constitution and the insensitive President, opaque to the nation's needs, can be pressured to straighten up and fly right.

We must always remember that a President's noblest stirring is toward his place in history as a Good, perhaps Great, President. If we abort his other objective, his re-election, we reduce the potential for mischief and leave the better angels undisturbed.

We should also factor into our decision the time consumed in the re-election campaign. Some two and a half years after a President is inaugurated, the elephantine apparatus of the Federal establishment moves to provision the re-election caravan. Energy, money and time are thrown into the job of precinct winning.

Why waste this effort and treasure? We no longer have the luxury of slow communications, of ships taking a month to cross the ocean, and the slow seepage of political impact. Today we deal in eight minutes to catastrophe, or the time it takes a MIRVed missile to hurl itself across borders. The stakes in the game have become too high to indulge ourselves in what seemed all right a century, or even three decades, ago.

The Founding Fathers understood the possibility of change; they built the amendment mechanism into the Constitution. We have used this mechanism 26 times, mostly to our great benefit—and we should use it again to bring about the six-year Presidency.

A HOSTAGE TO EMERGENCY

Churchill once observed: "The amount of energy wasted by men and women of first-class quality in arriving at their true degree before they begin to play on the world stage can never be measured. One may say that 60, perhaps 70 per cent of all they have to give is expended on fights which have no other object but to get to their battlefield."

That dusty, wasteful system is no longer acceptable in a world living on the nerve edge of disaster. The Presidency today is hostage to emergency. Every moment devoted to getting re-elected squanders the most precious resources of the Presidency—and the nation.

SENATE—Wednesday, February 6, 1974

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God who art above us yet ever near us, we thank Thee for citizens steeped in that righteousness which exalts a nation and who hold fast to truth and justice amid all change. We thank Thee for all who serve without blemish or stain in the Government of the Nation. Be to them "a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night" that they may be guided by Thy precepts, obey Thy commandments, and advance Thy kingdom. Be with us in this place in all that is said and done and when the day is ended send us to our rest with peace and joy in our hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 5, 1974, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PLACING ON CALENDAR OF SENATE RESOLUTION 276, TO DISAPPROVE PAY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 276, submitted by the distinguished Senator from Colorado on yesterday and now at the desk, be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMTRAK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since the inception of Amtrak, I have continued to press for innovated and constructive improvement in our Nation's passenger train service. On occasion, I have questioned the intentions of the managers of our Nation's trains and have made repeated requests for improvements and expansion of service. The current energy crisis makes an expanded and updated passenger train system all the more important. I have received a