

tion of facilities in rural areas and towns near the national forest and Forest Service program locations in accordance with the standards in section 901(b) of the Act of November 30, 1970 (84 Stat. 1383), as amended."

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1974

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

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

MARGARET G. COBLE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on January 30, 1974, the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 251, which authorized the payment of a gratuity to the widow of a deceased former employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death. Unfortunately, due to a clerical error, the name of the recipient of the gratuity and the deceased employee was misspelled in the resolution as agreed to.

I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to correct the spelling of the names in the resolution.

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

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON S. 2394, ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have until 7 p.m. today to file the report on S. 2394, a bill relating to the Rocky Mountain National Park, providing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs orders the bill reported later this afternoon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRIFFIN. 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.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS CHILES, GRIFFIN, AND ROBERT C. BYRD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1974, AND FOR PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS AND CONSIDERATION OF S. 2296

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday after the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, that he be followed by the distinguished assistant Republican leader (Mr. GRIFFIN), for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that he be followed by the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD) for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes with statements limited therein to 5 minutes, at the conclusion of which period the Senate will resume consideration of Calendar Order No. 661, S. 2296, a bill to provide for the protection, development, and enhancement of the national forest system, its lands and resources, and for other purposes. Ye-and-nay votes could occur.

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

QUORUM CALL

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. BARRY SIMMONS, ATHENS, GA.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I wish to comment today on the very fine humanitarian work being done by Dr. Barry Simmons, a dentist from Athens, Ga., to help people throughout the world less fortunate than ourselves and to build goodwill for the United States.

Each summer for the past 11 years, Dr. Simmons has traveled at his own expense to emerging nations throughout the world to provide free dental care to needy people, many of whom have never seen a dentist in their lives. In 1972, Dr. Simmons was named one of the 10 outstanding young men of America by

the U.S. Jaycees, and he has won praise from many nations throughout the world.

All Georgians are very proud of Dr. Simmons, and I join in wishing him well in all of his future endeavors to help the world's needy people.

Mr. President, there appeared in the Sunday Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., of November 4, 1973, an excellent article on the work of Dr. Simmons. I bring this article to the attention of the Senate and ask that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

GEORGIA DENTIST WORKS TO AID NEEDY IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES
(By Ann Sullivan)

Dr. Barry Simmons, 36, dentist, unmarried, amateur ornithologist, expects to spend three months out of every year of the rest of his life doing something for other people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes with statements limited therein to 5 minutes, at the conclusion of which period the Senate will resume consideration of Calendar Order No. 661, S. 2296, a bill to provide for the protection, development, and enhancement of the national forest system, its lands and resources, and for other purposes. Ye-and-nay votes could occur.

RECESS TO THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1974

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

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:24 p.m. the Senate recessed until Thursday, February 21, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

The something is what he knows best, dentistry, and the people are the underprivileged in a long succession of countries he has been visiting the past 10 years.

He has a list of 120 and hopes he can go to most of them, maybe two at a time, in the rest of his life.

It isn't exactly easy, for this one-man dental Tom Dooley Foundation has been doing it all himself, lugging along some 17 to 18 cases of 1,500 pounds of tools and supplies.

When wars and floods, bureaucracy, heat and disease throw up roadblocks, it just challenges him a little more. Simmons, who practices three-quarters of the year in the lower floor of his Georgian house in Athens, Ga., came upon his life's passion by accident through his love of birds and animals.

He went to the Colombia jungle on the Amazon river with a collector.

"It was pretty primitive, and the local priest found out I was a dentist and asked me to treat some patients. I was hooked."

That was 1963, the first of 11 successive

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

summers, June to September, in South America, Tahiti, Thailand, the Sinai desert, the Gaza strip, Bali, Indonesia, Cameroon, Nigeria and last summer in Bangladesh.

Always concentrates on teaching dental hygiene to a couple of volunteers who go to the schools to teach the teachers to teach the children.

He winds up the portable gas generator that was a gift of the Adeco Co. of Newberg and goes to work on the never-ending painful mouth troubles presented to him. The generator is boxed in a case from another Oregon firm, Grants Pass Environmental Containers.

Dr. Simmons, visiting in Portland through Monday, spoke to a group of dental and medical students at a dance Saturday night. He will speak to a public meeting at Portland Elks Club, 1515 SW Morrison St., Monday at 7:30 p.m.

His pitch is securing help for his newly founded Dental Health International, which helps him now to recruit, outfit and send other dental and dental hygiene volunteers to still more countries. So far about 50 have gone.

Mailing address is 847 S. Mille dge Ave., Athens, Ga., 30501. Various church mission groups are beginning to help set up visitations. Transportation is the biggest bugaboo.

Dr. Simmons once found himself and 1,500 pounds of dental equipment stranded on the Bay of Bengal unable to get into the cyclone-tormented area of Bhola Island.

He recruited a Soviet helicopter, and officials simply said OK. But when he wanted to come back, the Russians were no where to be found. Nor any other air vehicle. He and the boxes came back by a small, slow boat.

Dr. Simmons was named by the Jaycees as one of the nation's 10 outstanding young men in 1971. He has a busy practice with five chairs and five staff people.

He thinks he might like to get married and notes that many Scandinavian dentists are female, blond and beautiful. He also collects parrots.

In the meantime, he's trying to figure how to hire enough Sherpas to get his boxes to Nepal next summer. He's very serious:

"The pleasure is that you can give. You can give relief for a physical problem such as an abscessed tooth. You give better health with the education you have. It's not just an 8 to 5 life. It means you have done something with your life. It's a fantastic feeling when you leave and you see the faces. They know you were there to help."

"The best feeling you can have is to give something and not expect a return."

Dr. Simmons is staying in Portland at the home of Dr. Don and Dr. Chris Wilson, 1205 SW Myrtle Drive.

JOHN FOLTZ SELECTED FOR EAGLE SCOUT TASK FORCE

HON. WILLIAM L. SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, during this month of February the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating their 64th anniversary. I wish to add my tribute to this "ageless" youth movement and join with my colleagues in the Senate in wishing Scouts of all ages—Cubs, Scouts, Explorers, and adult Scouters, as well—a "happy birthday." All of us can take pride in their accomplishments—achieved through their many "good deeds" every day.

One young man from Virginia has been singled out for special recognition and I ask unanimous consent to have a statement regarding this Scout in the RECORD as an example of how some of our young people spend their time in a constructive manner.

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

JOHN FOLTZ SELECTED FOR EAGLE SCOUT TASK FORCE

John Foltz, 16, has been named a member of the recently formed Task Force of the National Eagle Scout Association (NESA). The primary purpose of NESA is to conserve and develop the manpower potential represented by those who hold the Eagle Scout rank, as well as to promote and support the ideals of the Boy Scouts of America (BSA).

John is one of six youths in the nation selected to formulate the initial policies of this new organization. He travels to Kansas City, Missouri for the first meeting on February 16 and 17. Currently active Eagle Scouts were picked to assure that programs are developed which will meet the needs of youth.

John earned his Eagle rank at the age of 13, while a member of Mt. Vernon Troop 1680, where he was also a Patrol Leader. He had previously served as Cub Scout Den Chief and received the coveted God and Country Award. Soon after becoming an Eagle Scout, John joined Knights of Dunamis, the national Eagle Scout honor society. This organization served as a forerunner of NESA. John is now Recording Secretary of the President's Chapter 82 of NESA, in the National Capital Area Council (NCAC).

Though busy with school and other activities, in addition to NESA leadership, John has added a Bronze Palm to his Eagle award. He is chairman of the Family Banquet for Eagle Scouts in the metropolitan area, to be sponsored by NESA this spring. At the BSA Southeastern regional meeting last fall in Washington, D.C., John assisted—as a NESA representative—with the presentation of the first "Outstanding Scoutmaster" award.

John has attended four summer sessions at Goshen Scout Camps, including NCAC Conservation Camp. He was elected by his fellow Scouts to the Order of the Arrow, the national brotherhood of Scout honor campers. In 1972 he was a Crew Leader at Philmont Scout Ranch in New Mexico. Last summer he held a staff position at the VIIIIth National Scout Jamboree in Idaho. Holder of the Scout Lifeguard rating, he was the youngest member on the waterfront staff.

As he climbed the Scouting ladder, John has gone into Exploring. He is presently a member of two Explorer Posts. Post 1334—one of the most unique in the country—is made up exclusively of Eagle Scouts from the Washington area. Post 891 conducts a Medical Explorer program at DeWitt Hospital on Ft. Belvoir, near his home in Fairfax County. John has his sights set on a career in medicine.

This past summer, Post 1334 took part in the Explorer Olympics held at Quantico Marine Base. Competing in both track and swimming events, John won one gold, two silver, and two bronze medals. As one of the top three winning posts, this "Eagle Post" is eligible to compete in the National Exploring Olympics. John is already making plans to go to Fort Collins, Colorado where the national finals will be run off on the campus of Colorado State University in August. At the conclusion of this olympiad, he will participate in the first National NESA Conference, also being held at CSU.

John is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John C. Foltz, 5301 Remington Drive, Mount Vernon Terrace.

February 19, 1974

A TRIBUTE TO MR. ALBERT MCKEE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of his 100th birthday is an appropriate time to pay tribute to Mr. Albert McKee, of Kahoka, Mo. His life has spanned a time of great progress in this country. Mr. McKee has contributed much to his community.

The article follows:

TRIBUTE TO MR. ALBERT MCKEE

(By Jeanne E. Brewer)

Being active, happy and healthy is what we all look forward to in our lives.

For Albert McKee it has been all three. Mr. McKee will be 100 years young Sunday, January 27, and counting all the activities during those years, the milestones will measure 100 or more.

Born the son of J. T. and Julia Ann Ferguson McKee, he lived his early years on a farm north of town in the Anson community. At the age of 17, he and his family moved to Kahoka.

Attaining the title of centenarian is not unusual in the McKee family. Mr. McKee's only sister, Mrs. Nellie McKee Wilson, reached her 103rd birthday.

They always jokingly attributed their longevity to not drinking coffee.

At the age of 20, Albert and his father formed the firm of J. T. McKee and Son. It all began in 1894 in a store building situated where the present Western Auto now stands. The building was purchased from Clarence Sherwood and the inventory price was listed at \$380.61. From the original inventory sheets appear such retail prices as a lap robe for \$1.00, a buggy whip for 45 cents, and a horse blanket at \$1.15.

After operating the store together for three years, Mr. McKee bought his father's share in 1897 continuing the business under its original name.

In the early days of business, handmade harness was its main product. Hides were bought by the roll, each roll containing ten hides, weighing approximately 300 lbs. About 1,000 lbs. were purchased at a time. Ready made good were also sold along with items made at the shop.

In 1913, a saloon owned by Dick Brothers Brewery, located on the east side of the square became available and the store relocated into its present home.

As the tractor became more popular in the 30's and horses did less work, the harness business began to decline. In 1933 a shoe department was added along with a line of fine luggage. These items are still a part of the business.

Towards the 1940's sulky racing became very popular and Mr. McKee would make as many as twelve sets of racing harness a year. He was especially proud of these sets. He recalled that out of six horses starting at the Clark County Fair one year, four of the rigs were wearing McKee made racing harness.

Serving J. T. McKee and Son as a faithful full time employee was Mr. John Seyb, who was with the firm over 50 years until his death in the late 1950's.

During these years his personal life away from business was varied and exciting.

Sometime in the 1890's a young lady from Glenwood, Missouri traveled by train into Kahoka to work in the millinery shop of Mrs. George F. Kroh.

Late in 1900, the following news item appeared in the Clark County Courier. "Albert

J. McKee and Miss Dora E. Penny, both of Kahoka, were married by Rev. A. J. Carrick, at his residence, Tuesday evening, October 30, 1900 at 7:30 o'clock in the presence of immediate relatives and friends. They left on the west bound evening train on a brief wedding tour. They will reside in Kahoka."

They were blessed with three children: Mrs. Julia May Connolly who resides in Colorado Springs. Mrs. Dorothy Dixon living in Phoenix and Dale of Kahoka. He also proudly claims a granddaughter, D. A. (Dora Alice) the daughter of Julia May, and two great grandchildren.

After 22 years of marriage, Dora passed away. For 22 more years, he remained a widower until his marriage to Lillian Wray in 1943 with whom he shared 22 years until her death.

One of his most loved hobbies, of course, was harness racing. He very seldom missed attending the Springfield Grand Circuit races.

Running away with the circus was every child's dream. This dream became a reality for McKee. In the first years of the century, a circus ran a circuit in the area of Knox City, Edina, Memphis, Kahoka and other Northeast Missouri communities. Being one of the best baritone players around, Mr. McKee followed the circuit playing in the circus band and acting as an advance man.

It was during this time with the circus that he became friends with Miss Ella Ewing. Miss Ewing, touring as the tallest woman (a towering 8'4") would come to Kahoka to have Miss Maude Wilson custom make her clothes. On these visits she and Mr. McKee would engage in several serious games of Pitch and Rook.

His expertise at playing the baritone led Mr. McKee to a seat in the Kahoka band under the leadership of Mr. Bill Bowers. This band was in much demand at local functions.

Mr. McKee served as a member of the school board in the 1920's and remained as treasurer of the board for several years thereafter. He is also a charter member of the Kahoka Kiwanis and Knights of Pythias. In the 1950's he served as secretary of the Kahoka Industrial Development Organization.

In 1965 Mr. Albert McKee retired from active business after successfully and faithfully serving the Kahoka and Clark County area for 71 years. His son, Dale, who returned in 1957 to open an electrical shop in the rear of the store, remains in the store, continuing the same loyal service as has been the tradition of J. T. McKee and Son.

Dale recalls the day of his dad's retirement. "Usually when a man retires, he cleans out his desk and takes home a lot of personal items. Not Dad. He just put on his hat and walked out." It is from these items left behind that we are able to relate some of the interesting parts of his life.

Mr. McKee now resides at the Clark County Nursing Home. Although his eyesight is poor, he is still a cardplaying fan. Until his recent bout with the flu, you could find him any afternoon in the all purpose room of the Home, playing a game of solitaire.

In this year of 1974, Mr. McKee celebrates his century birthday and the firm of J. T. McKee and Son observes its 80th year.

Mr. McKee has indeed enjoyed activity, happiness and good health. This week members of his family and his many friends extend to him their most sincere good wishes.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING REFORM

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the thoughtful

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

article by David Broder entitled, "A New Look at Election Financing," which appeared in last Sunday's Washington Post. There are few people in this body who are not concerned with election reform, and fewer still who do not believe that concern about the last election should be translated into legislative action to insure more satisfactory and less easily abused means of election financing. Let us not forget, however, that the Congress of the United States is supposed to be a deliberative body, capable of studying and responding to the complexities of an issue, rather than a pell-mell foot race across the closest finish line. I am sure we will eventually embody in our election laws some form of public finance, but I am also sure that the major public financing provision pending in the other body requires the kind of caution on our part that Mr. Broder suggests. I am not asking for delay, but for the kind of analysis which looks at the fine print as well as the demonstrated need and the splendid purpose. The article follows:

A NEW LOOK AT ELECTION FINANCING

The December filibuster conducted by Sen. James Allen (D-Ala.) and his allies against quick passage of the bill for public financing of federal election campaigns has served the classic purpose of the filibuster—to slow down action and permit a second look at an issue.

The measure had whipped through the Senate the first time with barely a day's debate, as an amendment to the debt ceiling bill. The House had balked at accepting such a major piece of legislation as a rider to another bill. And Allen's filibuster caused the Senate sponsors to accept a compromise under which public financing would be given separate consideration, in both houses, early in 1974.

The time for that consideration is now at hand, and if ever there were legislation that needs careful examination, the public financing bill is it.

The public and political reaction to Watergate has created what Rep. John B. Anderson (R-Ill.) rightly calls "an unprecedented opportunity to fashion a campaign financing system that can service this nation well for decades to come."

But, as Anderson went on to say in the next sentence of a recent speech, "if we proceed with too much haste or without rigorous conceptual and empirical analysis of the problems to be corrected, that tremendous opportunity may be tragically frittered away."

"I think we would be well served to proceed with utmost caution and restraint," Anderson said, "yet already we can detect the warning signs that public finance is being treated as an all-embracing panacea rather than a solution for an important but limited set of problems"

Lest Anderson be thought an opponent of reform, trying to place roadblocks in the path of legislation, let it be noted that he and Rep. Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.) are co-sponsors of a major public financing proposal which has been backed by more than 160 other members of the House.

What he understands is that adoption of a system of taxpayer-financed campaigns will alter the whole structure of American politics—the terms of competition within and between the parties, the relationships between candidates and the parties and between candidates and the public. Unless attention is paid to what Anderson calls the "total system impact" of campaign spending reform, the results are likely to be opposite what the reformers intend.

Regrettably, the Senate has little of that kind of analysis available to it as it prepares for the debate. The four days of sub-

committee hearings on the bill last September and the brief floor debate included a great deal of rhetoric about the "evils" of private financing, but not much that is thoughtful on the effects of a switch to partial or complete tax-financed campaigns.

The task the Senate faces is made difficult, not only by the skimpiness of the hearings but by the fact that the Rules Committee has chosen to package, in a single bill, proposals to limit private contributions, to control campaign spending, and to finance—in varying ways—the primary and general election campaigns for President, senator and representative.

Unless the result is to be disastrous, floor debate and amendments will have to clarify the quite different problems in each of the areas the bill tackles—and the remedies appropriate to each.

For example, in House races the main problem to be solved is achieving adequate financing and rough parity of funds for challengers. But the problem of adequacy and parity is not a serious problem at all where major party presidential candidates are concerned.

Thus, a scheme that provides—as the Senate bill does—for full Treasury funding of all federal office general election campaigns may well have the effect of discouraging one of the most widely used and valuable forms of citizen participation in politics—the small gift to a favorite president candidate.

At the same time, full federal financing of House races, if passed at all, is likely to be at so low a dollar level as to leave undisturbed—or even to increase—the present incumbents' advantage, which is the main problem to be solved.

That is why it is terribly important for the Senate to take time to analyze, not just the imperfections of the present system, but the effects of any new system of campaign finance.

Depending on how the bill is finally structured, it can serve to centralize or disperse power within the federalized political system we now have; to strengthen or weaken the two-party system; to improve or diminish Congress's leverage with future Presidents to reduce or increase the present public cynicism about politics.

What it cannot do is simply "prevent future Watergates" and leave everything else unchanged. This is a fundamental alteration in our politics that is being proposed—as fundamental as the introduction of the direct primary or the promulgation of one man-one vote decisions. It needs to be debated in those terms.

CAPTIVE NATION'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians throughout the United States and around the world observed during the past weekend the commemoration of their captive nation's Independence Day.

Although the Soviet Union's occupation of that little Baltic state prevents its citizens from holding any public ceremonies to mark the event, I have no doubt that the Lithuanian people there indeed did observe it in their hearts and in the safety of private get-togethers. A public gathering of exactly that kind was held in Holy Cross Parish in Dayton, Ohio, within my congressional district. The event also received a good deal of publicity from Dayton news media as

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

surely was the case in many other communities across the United States.

These observances, and the many others conducted by natives of the Iron Curtain countries, serve to remind us of the unfortunate circumstances besetting those lands. Additionally, we, as American citizens, also are reminded of the preciousness of our own society. Although it is not perfect, our way of life appropriately reflects concern for the rights of the individual, to do and say as he pleases under a government of law freely elected by the people.

The Lithuanian people in bondage, I believe, are as strong in their devotion to the cause of their country one day returning to free and independent status as Americans are in preserving that same tradition in this country. I am pleased and honored, Mr. Speaker, to be able to add my remarks to those of my colleagues in reflecting on this observance of Lithuania's Independence Day.

APPEALS FROM OSHA

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, probably every Member of this body has received complaints from constituents who have been hounded by Federal inspectors operating under the purported authority of the Occupational Health and Safety Act. South Carolina happens to be more fortunate than some other States in that our inspectors operate under the authority of the State government, and have generally interpreted the law in a reasonable and proper manner. But it seems that under OSHA some of the worst aspects of the capricious and arbitrary type of government bureaucracy have surfaced in many States throughout the country.

Recently, however, a fine editorial in the Orangeburg Times and Democrat described the mechanism through which some hope for reason is being held out to businesses. The Occupational Health and Safety Review Commission has shown uncommon good sense on a number of occasions in acting as a damper on some of the more outrageous examples of overzealous enforcement by Federal OSHA inspectors.

Without endorsing in any way the administrative organization of the Review Commission, or its relationship with OSHA itself, I did feel that my colleagues might be interested to review several of their recent cases, as compiled by the editor of the Orangeburg Times and Democrat. For this reason, I include the editorial entitled "Appeals From OSHA," which appeared in the November 24 issue of the Orangeburg Times and Democrat, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

APPEALS FROM OSHA

It appears that there can be some relief from arbitrary rulings by the Labor Department's inspectors charged with enforcing the Occupational Health and Safety Act

(OSHA). There have been few complaints of ridiculous charges made by those inspectors in South Carolina because the law is administered by the state and the state's inspectors have used common sense in their interpretation of how it should be interpreted. There have been many complaints from employers in other states where federal control has been established, however.

Now, complaints against capricious rulings by Labor Department inspectors may be carried to the Occupational Health and Safety Review Commission (OSAHR) whose members appear to be more knowledgeable of the intent of the law.

In a recent case brought before OSAHR, it was ruled that the Staten Island, N.Y., Advance would have to pay only a \$10 fine, instead of the \$145 demanded by the Labor Department, for 12 "nonserious" 1972 job safety violations. The charges included failure to "use a feasible method of reducing noise, failure to provide machine guards and guards on five saws, a housekeeping violation and failure to require safety shoes."

In other recent cases, OSAHR:

Dismissed charges against an airport operator in Hawaii because OSHA admitted that an inspector had failed to show his credentials before beginning his inspection;

Reduced from \$700 to \$1 the fine for a small builder in Tennessee who admitted his failure to meet an open-sided platform railing requirement; it was ruled that the large fine would place a burden on the builder's poor financial condition;

Refused to permit a new charge to be made against an employer while an earlier charge was still in effect; OSHA had modified the first charge, of which the employer was apparently not guilty, so as to bring the action into violation of another standard;

Relied on the minor gravity of a firm's offenses and its safety record to dismiss \$90 in penalties against a California remodeling firm;

Ruled that an order against one employer did not become binding on second employer who later purchased a plant; and,

Agreed that toilet facilities for employers need not be located on the immediate premises of the employer; in this Pennsylvania case, OSHARC found that it was sufficient for female employees to use toilet facilities located in an adjacent retail establishment which was less than 200 feet away.

It is gratifying to see that some controls have been established over the overbearing, power-hungry and arbitrary actions of some petty bureaucratic agents of the federal government. OSHA, well administered, is a protection to both the employer and his employees—but only if common sense is used.

SIGNIFICANT PRIVATE FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in Congress I have strongly supported legislative proposals to encourage a higher level of forest resource protection and incentives toward development and management of forest lands by small nonindustrial owners.

In view of our Nation's growing demands for timber and the need for proper management of forest resources, I would like to share with my colleagues

February 19, 1974

a development in Arkansas that is of great significance to private forestry. The remarks which follows are from the February 11, 1974 newsletter of the Southern Forest Products Association:

Direct annual payments to small landowners in return for growing and managing young timberlands has been initiated by the Edward Hines Lumber Company of Hope, Arkansas. This first-of-its-kind program guarantees annual payments for 10 to 15 year terms and is patterned after the popular "Soil-bank" program of the federal government. Tracts 40 acres and larger are eligible under the program. Hines plans to lease 2,500 acres annually, with lease payments amounting to more than \$2 million by the time the first leases mature. Graduate foresters will evaluate the timberlands and negotiate income and length of lease with the individual landowners. Hines assumes all risk of loss from natural hazards, such as fire, windstorm and bark beetles, insuring security of the landowners income.

The innovative action by the Hines Lumber Co. is a direct response to the commendations of the President's Panel on Timber and the Environment and to those of the National Commission on Materials Policy. Both of these official bodies pointed out that national needs for wood products would double by the end of this century. In order to meet projected wood requirements, it will be necessary to improve the productivity of some 4,000,000 small, privately owned, nonindustrial forests. Hines Lumber has found a way to do it.

MEDAL WINNER A REAL PATRIOT

HON. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, recently the Fort Nelson chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Portsmouth, Va., presented its National Society's Medal of Honor to Mrs. Jane Sparks. The DAR award is presented only to those Americans who have displayed exceptional leadership qualities and have performed outstanding patriotic service.

Although Mrs. Sparks has a severe physical handicap, she plays an active part in civic affairs. The following is a newspaper article written by Shirley Winters and published in the January 6 Virginian Pilot newspaper which serves the Tidewater, Va., area. The article describes her many activities which make a significant contribution to the Tidewater community:

MEDAL WINNER A REAL PATRIOT

(By Shirley Winters)

PORTSMOUTH.—Hemophilia and a series of strokes may have confined Jane Sparks, but an indomitable perseverance enables her to range far horizons via letter and telephone.

"She's a one-woman communications center," said Mrs. Marian Whitehurst Rawles, veteran Daughters of American Revolution member, describing the recipient of the organization's National Society's Medal of Honor.

Presented in absentia last Thursday because of Mrs. Sparks' inability to attend

public gatherings, the coveted DAR award recognized the Cradock native who lives in Norfolk for her active role in patriotic research, her telephone outreach in national-defense projects, and work on "Support Your Local Police" committee activities.

"Historians, journalists, law-enforcement officers, have sought her counsel because of her known devotion to duty and dedication to cause," Mrs. Rawles said. "She's a born teacher."

Readers of The Virginian-Pilot and Ledger-Star newspapers have become acquainted with the stand on national and local issues often taken by Mrs. Sparks. "I felt I simply have to share with others my convictions. I'm simply trying to live up to being a good American, which is something everyone should do to deserve the privilege of living in this wonderful country," she said in appreciation of the DAR citation.

She said she recently was surprised to learn that her letterwriting constancy had caught the attention of administrative officials of the newspapers, one of whom traced her correspondence "to at least a once-a-month published letter since 1958."

Mrs. Sparks has gained the respect of area police chiefs, who have expressed appreciation for her encouragement of public support for their efforts, Mrs. Rawles said.

This included active engagement in the distribution of "Support Your Local Police" bumper stickers and an effort to underwrite the purchase of American Flag uniform patches for the police.

Mrs. Sparks maintains a busy phone obtaining speakers for public meetings sponsored by the SYLP Committee, meetings that she is unable to attend.

Her mind is a veritable mental filing cabinet of congressional legislation action that Mrs. Sparks keeps abreast of through research, and, which she makes available to the sincerely interested.

Describing herself as "no joiner," the former Jane Barnes treasures, she said, her independent status in politics. "I vote and work for the promotion of constitutional government. If a candidate is a Republican and he supports this cause, he gets my vote. If he's an independent, he gets it. I haven't been able to vote democratic," she said, her voice trailing into a small laugh.

It was her conservative, zealous stand on matters of national significance that first claimed the attention of the DAR nearly 10 years ago. "To visit this woman in her home, to learn of her incapacitating condition, is to admire a spirit which overcomes adversity," Mrs. Rawles explained in the presentation ceremony sponsored by Fort Nelson Chapter, DAR in Portsmouth.

Among the correspondence received by the award winner are letters from internationally and locally known personalities including Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the late J. Edgar Hoover.

Locally, she communicates regularly with Norfolk Chief of Police Claude Staylor. "He's going to run for Norfolk City Council after he retires, and I'm already working on his behalf," Mrs. Sparks announced.

Letters written in lieu of testimonial speeches by Staylor (an admirer and long-time associate) and Harold B. Anderson, retired police chief, attest to their appreciation of Mrs. Sparks' endeavors.

Staylor wrote: "I know of no person more interested in preserving the ideals and traditions of this country and who has worked so diligently to combat those influences bent on destroying the American way of life. She is a true American in every respect. We need more of her calibre."

Anderson, who retired after 43 years of military and police activity including service as chief of police of Norfolk and Petersburg, said: "Of the hundreds of persons I have

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

come to know, the one, most unforgettable personality is Mrs. Jane Sparks. As a private citizen she is a most steadfast and loyal friend of the police. All of the Tidewater police officialdom know and appreciate her efforts, which have been accomplished in spite of stark incapacity and physical suffering."

Although he wasn't present for the award ceremony, Mrs. Sparks' husband Jerry was commended by his wife and the award's chairman. "People credit me with working on projects, for my ideas, but Jerry is the shoulder I have to lean on," the wife said.

Mrs. Rawles noted that the couple shared a patriotic bond of interest. "Jerry is a veteran of the Battle of Iwo Jima, and he is in complete accord with what Jane tries to do for her country."

She emphasized that the DAR's Medal of Honor is not lightly or regularly given but is presented on occasion to an adult, native-born American who has displayed exceptional leadership qualities and performed outstanding patriotic service.

The award, initiated at the local level by Ft. Nelson Chapter, DAR, was screened by the state organization before recommendation to the national awards committee and the president-general of DAR.

"The nominee is never aware that he or she is being considered. The Medal of Honor is to the civilian patriot what the Congressional Medal is to the military patriot," the chairman explained.

NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION REGISTER PROTESTS

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, while the vast majority of Americans are looking the other way, a few Americans are looking at a flight pay bill which is scheduled to come before the House this week. The bill treats the officers magnificently—it does absolutely nothing for the enlisted men. Here is how the Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the United States of America expressed their opposition to this legislation in a letter received in my office today:

NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Washington, D.C., February 15, 1974.

Hon. OTIS G. PIKE,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PIKE: The Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the United States of America (NCOA) noted with interest your opposition to H.R. 12670, to provide incentive pay for flight crew members. Although your opposition may be of a different nature, we join you in taking issue to the legislation as adopted by the House Armed Services Committee.

Early in the calendar, the NCOA appealed by letter to the Honorable Samuel S. Stratton, M.C., Chairman, Subcommittee No. 4, to consider revising the pay ratings for certain enlisted personnel. For example: enlisted pilots, flight engineers, crew captains, and others having responsibility for the aircraft's maintenance in flight. The justification offered was simply this: "equitable pay for responsible duties."

The Association invited the subcommittee's attention to pay rates for flight sur-

geons and nurses. Under the present and proposed legislation they have been and will be receiving incentive pay based on their grade rather than responsibility to the aircraft or crew members. The question was, of course, "Why should they be entitled to higher pay than certain enlisted crew members?"

It is yet unknown as to why the subcommittee chose to ignore amending certain enlisted incentive pay, but should H.R. 12670 pass the Congress, there is little if any hope that it will be amended in the near future.

We seek your assistance in having this legislation at least returned to the subcommittee for further evaluation of enlisted pay rates. There is no rationale that we are able to conceive that justifies paying navigators, bombardiers, surgeons, nurses, and other officer flight crew members as much incentive pay as authorized for pilots, or more than certain enlisted personnel charged with the responsibility of keeping the plane flying.

We also question the subcommittee's opposition to provide equitable incentive pay for enlisted pilots. Their only answer appeared to be that there will soon be none. However, we offer that the Navy and Marine Corps, in particular, have had enlisted pilots in the last three large-scale conflicts. We see no reason whatsoever to believe they will not appear again in future hostilities.

Secondly, it may be noted that H.R. 8537, now Public Law 93-64, continued entitlement of basic allowance for quarters for aviation cadets. Like the "Flying Sergeants," there are no more, but the same legislators, members of Subcommittee No. 4, provided this benefit just in case there would be others in the future. So why not provide for future enlisted pilots—just in case?

There are many existing provisions in Titles 10 and 37, United States Code, that are inequitable to enlisted members of the U.S. Armed Forces. We ask your help in correcting these injustices now—and with this bill, H.R. 12670.

With grateful appreciation from the non-commissioned and petty officers of this Association, we are,

Respectfully yours,

MACK MCKINNEY,
Director of Legislative Affairs.

OUR GROWING HEALTH CARE CRISIS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, health care in the United States is our second largest expenditure, consuming more than \$75 billion annually. Yet, despite this tremendous investment, America lags far behind many other developed nations in such health care indicators as life expectancy, and infant mortality. Spiraling health care costs, inefficient utilization of resources and a shortage of trained physicians all contribute to America's current health care crisis—a crisis that calls for action.

Attention now is focusing on the various proposals for national health insurance in the Congress. I am pleased to direct your attention to the statement Congressman BOB ECKHARDT submitted to the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last De-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 19, 1974

ember. Congressman ECKHARDT, a co-sponsor of my Health Security Act, H.R. 22, documents the magnitude of our current health care crisis, and argues persuasively that only the Health Security Act provides the comprehensive program necessary for effective reform. His statement follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE BOB ECKHARDT, EIGHTH DISTRICT, OF TEXAS, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Chairman Rogers, Members of Congress, and guests, I am grateful for this opportunity to participate in these hearings on health care reform legislation. There are so many varying and important viewpoints in this area, I look forward to future hearings on health care reform legislation when others interested in this problem can be heard. In the meantime, I would like to discuss the concerns of many people, primarily, those who receive health care and those who need to, but for whom it is unavailable.

President Nixon told a news conference in July, 1969, that unless action was taken by both the Administration and Congress to meet a growing health care crisis, within the next 2 or 3 years, we would be faced with a breakdown of our medical system. Few would disagree with that statement; the very fact that these hearings are being held indicates that we are at least in agreement that we are faced with a problem in our system of health care. The disagreement arises out of our approaches to deal with the problem.

Today, more and more families live in fear of a major illness or disability, in fear that they will be unable to get the medical care they need, and in fear that even if the medical care is available that they will be unable to afford it.

Let us examine some aspects of the over-all health care problem and some alternatives which are offered in the Health Security Act, the national system of health insurance I have co-sponsored in the U.S. House of Representatives and which I strongly support against the weak and inadequate alternatives urged upon us on grounds of false frugality.

I shall speak of human needs upon which is based a gigantic business. Health care is now the nation's second largest business with expenditures of more than \$75 billion annually. Only in the area of killing people, or in preparing the means of doing so, do we spend more of our national income. The defense budget is higher, but it will not continue at its present rate.

In 1972, we were spending 8.5% of our personal incomes on personal health services such as hospitals, insurance payments, doctors, dentists, and other vital health services. This compares with 6.5% in 1962, and only 5.1% in 1951. Thus, health costs have increased more than fivefold over the last 29 years and continue to rise. It would seem that Americans would be getting more and better care for the amount of money we spend. But now, Americans are spending more for health care and enjoying less as compared to others in the family of developed nations. (See Figures 1, 2 and 3).

Another very disturbing fact is reflected in the data available on the racial and geographical breakdowns. The infant mortality rate for non-whites is considerably higher than for whites. This is due in large measure to lower non-white incomes and hence less medical care. Infant mortality rate is significantly higher in the South, again reflecting a lower income. For example, in my own state of Texas, San Antonio, the 9th most populous city in the United States with a large Mexican-American community, is rich in poverty with an average per capita income of \$1,633 as compared with a national average of \$3,139 and an average of \$2,810 for Texas. Most San Antonians have no access to health

care, which accounted for the shocking diphtheria epidemic in 1970. The cost of a single immunization against diphtheria is 17 cents. Yet four children died and 269 were hospitalized leaving many with permanent damage because they were not immunized.

I find these statistics alarming. But, what is even more disturbing is the fact that these conditions can exist in a nation rich in material wealth and medical know-how. America has won more Nobel prizes in medicine and science than any other country. We have some of the best doctors, the best facilities, and the most advanced technology and yet the masses are not deriving their due from these resources. The problem is clearly one of delivery; how can we best get the services to the people? It is evident that the system we now have cannot do the job. It cannot do the job because it is weighted with inefficiencies, shortages, and waste. The Health Security Act recognizes, identifies, and attacks these problems.

Americans have learned to depend on health insurance, but the private health insurance system does not alleviate their problems; rather, it exacerbates them. Despite the deluge of dollars flowing into the enormous health insurance business, in 1972, 16.5% or 30.5 million Americans under 65 had no hospital insurance; 24.9% or 45.9 million had no in-the-hospital medical expense insurance; 19.2% or 35.5 million had no surgical insurance; and 26.2% or 48.3 million had no insurance to cover X-ray and laboratory examinations when not in the hospital. (See Figure 4)

In this same year, 1972, private health insurance covered only 26.4 per cent of the total personal health services. The other 74 percent was an out-of-pocket expense to the consumer or was paid by government. Private health insurance pays only 4.7 percentage points more of the total health bill than it did 12 years ago. A good example of the inefficient coverage by private health insurance can be seen in the case of 8 year old Kenny S. who was paralyzed in a car crash in which his mother was killed. Kenny's hospital bill for the first six months was \$45,000 of which the insurance paid \$17,000. Because Kenny's father earns \$24,000 a year, the hospital claims the family is not medically indigent and Kenny's father must pay the remaining \$50,000 in bills, which was accumulated over the following ten months.

In addition to often not providing adequate coverage, insurance policies contain internal incentives and pressures to use our physical, technical and mental resources wastefully. People are hospitalized when they could better be treated on an out-patient basis and much more cheaply. This comes about because most health insurance plans cover hospital bills, but not bills for treatment on an out-patient basis. Unnecessary surgery is encouraged. Figures show that more than twice as much surgery takes place in the case of Federal employees enrolled in the indemnity reimbursement plan than occurs in the case of enrollees in prepaid group practice plans in the Federal program. Too often patients are put into hospitals for testing when the testing could be done outside the hospital at a much lower cost.

Leonard Woodcock, President, International Union, UAW, stated in a press release on July 13, 1973, that because this Administration refused to control outrageous increases in health insurance premiums under Phase II and III, the six largest insurance companies alone increased their gain from group health operations to \$140.1 million last year from \$31.9 million in 1971, representing a 350 per cent increase in profits.

I can only conclude that the private health insurance industry has failed us. It provides only partial benefits—not comprehensive benefits; it provides acute care—not preventive care; the insurance companies have no

incentives to hold down health care costs; and it ignores the poor and the medically indigent.

In addition to the inefficiencies and waste perpetuated by the health insurance industry, we find our system severely handicapped by a tremendous shortage of physicians, dentists, nurses, and other trained technicians in the medical field. In 1970, there were more than 100 counties in the U.S. without a single physician. More than one fifth, or twenty-two, of these were in Texas, and some of those counties are almost two hundred miles from border to border. Texas is well below the national average when we consider the number of physicians per 1000 population with 58 percent of the doctors in the state concentrated in seven counties. As a nation, we are very dependent on physicians trained outside of this country, many in poorer countries offering inferior medical training.

Our health situation has been allowed to develop over the years into the very complex malady it is today. Because this is so, the remedy cannot be a simple one. We cannot place a bandage on one of the sore spots in the form of a makeshift health program and expect a complete cure. We must attack the whole and set out to develop a totally comprehensive health program.

The idea of a national health insurance scheme is neither new nor radical. We happen to be one of the few industrialized nations of the world without such a system, and many authorities believe that the lack of such a system is a major contributing factor to our poor relative health position.

President Truman first proposed national health legislation in 1945. Although the Congress failed to act on this proposal during the Truman Administration—partly due to the effective campaign launched by the AMA and the insurance industry—a compromise measure was passed eleven years later. In 1965, under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson, Congress enacted medicare as a limited program of national health insurance for persons 65 and over, and shortly after, medicaid, as a Federal-State medical care program on a means test basis for indigent and medically indigent persons.

Our experience with medicare and medicaid demonstrates very clearly that money alone is not enough to deal with the problem. So long as the delivery system remains basically unchanged, no amount of money, new hospitals, or the extension of old programs, can hope to resolve the health care problem. Anything short of a major overhaul of our health delivery system, like the Health Security Act, can only serve as a temporary expedient at best and, at worst, exacerbate the problem under the pressure of increasing public demands for adequate health care.

Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths, first introduced a national health insurance bill in the House in 1970. By similar legislation also was introduced in the Senate that year by Senators Yarborough and Kennedy. The Health Security Act, H.R. 22 and S. 3, was introduced concurrently by Representative Griffiths and Senator Kennedy in the 92nd Congress and again on the opening day of this 93rd Congress.

The purpose of the Health Security Act is twofold. It seeks to establish a comprehensive system of national health insurance for the U.S. which is capable of providing the same high quality health care to every resident.

It also seeks to "effect modifications in the organization and methods of delivery of health services which will increase the availability and continuity of care, enhance its quality, emphasize the maintenance of health as well as the treatment of illness and, by improving the efficiency and the utilization of services and by strengthening

professional and financial controls, restrain the mounting cost of care while providing fair and reasonable compensation to those who furnish it."

Under the Health Security Act all residents of the United States would be eligible for health benefits. These benefits would include all necessary physician services and all necessary hospital services. This includes skilled nursing home care, other approved non-custodial institutional health services, and home health services. The program will include pathology and radiology services and all other necessary services. Psychiatric services and ultimately all dental services will be included. With only a few exceptions, there would be no restrictions on needed services, no cut-off points, no co-insurance, no deductibles, no waiting periods, and no bills—all would be taken care of by the program.

Medicines will be provided to in-patients or administered to out-patients while in a hospital and to persons enrolled in comprehensive group practice plans and professional foundations as long as the drugs were from a broad list approved by the Health Security Board. For others, drugs would be covered if they were necessary for specified chronic diseases and conditions requiring long or costly drug therapy. Health Security would also provide coverage of therapeutic devices, appliances—including eyeglasses, hearing aids and prosthetic devices—and equipment. Many other miscellaneous and supporting services too lengthy to mention are included. In sum, the legislation would assure protection for every American family against the health service costs of serious, prolonged or expensive illness or disability.

The bill places great emphasis on encouragement of group practice. The program not only will provide seed and development funds for more group practice, it will also favor group practice and teamwork among personnel in the way services will be paid for.

Another very important aspect of this program, is that it will offer additional financial incentives for health personnel to serve in disadvantaged areas.

In order to control cost, the total expense of the Health Security program will be established annually, in advance of the program benefit year. Advance budgeting will restrain the steeply rising costs and provide a method of allocating available funds among categories of covered services.

The financing of Health Security would be through a Health Security Trust Fund, similar to the Social Security Trust Fund. Employees would pay a 1 percent tax on the first \$15,000 a year in wages and non-earned income. Employers would pay a 3.5 percent tax for their employees, and unions can negotiate to have employers pay the workers' tax as well. (In September, 1973, an agreement was made between the United Automobile Workers and the Chrysler Corporation which provides that Chrysler will pay the full cost to an auto worker of any taxes levied to meet the cost of a national health insurance program.) Another 2.5 percent tax will come from the first \$15,000 a year on self-employment income with the remaining 50 percent coming from Federal general revenues. The money the Federal government will be paying, which originally flows from the people in taxes, is not an additional burden beyond what is now being paid for health care. It is a rechanneling of money actually being spent now under other governmental programs, private health insurance and consumer expenditures.

The future of our nation and the health of its citizens is not a partisan issue. Let us unite to establish and protect once and for all the right of every individual to good health care; the Health Security Act is the only bill that will do this.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FIGURE 1
INFANT MORTALITY

Rank and country	Rate per 1,000 live births
1. Iceland	11.7
2. Finland	12.5
3. Netherlands	12.7
4. Japan	13.1
5. Sweden (1968)	13.1
6. Norway (1968)	13.7
7. Denmark (1969)	14.8
8. France	15.1
9. Switzerland	15.4
10. New Zealand	16.7
11. Australia	17.9
12. United Kingdom (1969)	18.6
13. Ireland	19.2
14. Canada	19.3
15. United States	19.8

Source: 1970 Demographic Yearbook of the United Nations.

FIGURE 2
MALE LIFE EXPECTANCY AT BIRTH

Rank and country	Life expectancy at birth	Data year
1. Sweden	71.85	1970
2. Norway	71.03	1961-65
3. Netherlands	71.00	1968
4. Iceland	70.8	1961-65
5. Denmark	70.7	1968-69
6. U.S.S.R.	70.0	1967-68
7. Israel	69.55	1970
8. Japan	69.05	1968
9. Bulgaria	68.81	1965-67
10. Canada	68.75	1965-67
11. East Germany	68.72	1965-66
12. Switzerland	68.72	1958-63
13. United Kingdom	68.5	1967-69
14. New Zealand	68.44	1960-62
15. Ireland	68.13	1960-62
16. Australia	67.92	1960-62
17. Yugoslavia	67.74	1966-67
18. Belgium	67.73	1959-63
19. France	67.6	1969
20. West Germany	67.55	1966-68
21. Greece	67.46	1960-62
22. Czechoslovakia	67.33	1966
23. Spain	67.32	1960
24. Italy	67.24	1960-62
25. Hungary	67.00	1964
26. Poland	66.85	1965-66
27. United States	66.6	1958
28. Romania	66.45	1964-67
29. Austria	66.34	1970
30. Uruguay	65.51	1963-64
31. Finland	65.4	1961-65

Source: 1971 U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FIGURE 3
FEMALE LIFE EXPECTANCY AT BIRTH

Rank and country	Life expectancy at birth	Data year
1. Sweden	76.54	1970
2. Netherlands	76.4	1968
3. Iceland	76.2	1961-65
4. Norway	75.97	1961-65
5. Denmark	75.6	1968-69
6. France	75.3	1969
7. Canada	75.18	1965-67
8. United Kingdom	74.7	1967-69
9. Japan	74.30	1968
10. Australia	74.18	1960-62
11. Switzerland	74.13	1958-63
12. United States	74.0	1968
13. New Zealand	73.75	1960-62
14. East Germany	73.66	1965-66
15. West Germany	73.58	1966-68
16. Czechoslovakia	73.57	1966
17. Austria	73.52	1970
18. Belgium	73.51	1959-63
19. Israel	72.96	1970
20. Poland	72.83	1965-66
21. Bulgaria	72.67	1965-67
22. Finland	72.6	1961-65
23. Italy	72.27	1960-62
24. Spain	71.90	1960
25. Ireland	71.86	1960-62

Source: 1971 Statistical Yearbook of the United Nations.

FIGURE 4

THE GAPS IN PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

Percent	Millions	Of the 183,000,000 noninstitutional civilians in the United States in 1971 under 65—
16.5.....	30.5	Had no hospital insurance.
19.2.....	35.5	Had no surgical insurance.
24.9.....	45.9	Had no in-the-hospital medical expense insurance.
26.2.....	48.3	Had no insurance to cover X-ray and laboratory examinations when not in the hospital.
43.6.....	80.0	Had no visiting nurse services.
46.5.....	85.4	Had no insurance against the cost of prescribed drugs.
46.9.....	86.1	Had no insurance to cover private duty nurses.
52.0.....	95.5	Had no insurance for visits to doctors' offices or doctor visits to their homes.
85.0.....	155.7	Had no insurance for nursing home care.
89.7.....	164.2	Had no insurance against dental expenses.

Source: Social Security Administration.

THE MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress, the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert was Secretary of the Air Force. Gene Zuckert has had an outstanding public career as a Harvard business professor, an Atomic Energy Commissioner, and as Secretary of the Air Force. In private life, he is one of the most outstanding attorneys in Washington, D.C. I have just had an opportunity to read a speech which Mr. Zuckert delivered to the Massachusetts Hospital Association on November 30, 1973. This speech titled, "The Management of Change: A Call for National Planning," is a result of the Gene Zuckert's long years of public service and outstanding analytical mind. I feel that every Member of Congress, administrators in the executive branch of our Government, and Americans at large can learn and profit from this outstanding speech. Therefore, I would like to include it as an extension of my remarks.

THE MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE: A CALL FOR NATIONAL PLANNING

(Remarks of Eugene M. Zuckert)

The founders of the Cambridge Research Institute made very clear their intention that the organization would seek assignments with an unusual intellectual challenge. This policy had long drawn my interest and when I signed up with the Institute a few years back, a key factor for me was the opportunity to join in efforts directed to problems of clear relevance to modern society, including those of importance to industry. Although an onlooker rather than a participant, I have been impressed by the degree to which the study of Deaconess Hospital and CRI's subsequent activities in the health field serve the goal of taking on the unusual and the important.

Working with the responsible and concerned people in the health area, CRI has sought to assist in assessing the environment in which hospital administrators must operate in order to achieve the best possible care for the people of Massachusetts at the lowest possible cost. I don't have to tell you

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that your environment is one of increasing complexity, with a new element of public interest represented in state regulation of the business of providing hospital services.

Crucial to the success of such an effort—identification and analysis of the external factors which bear upon your operations—is the ability to foresee the implications of change, change in standards of hospital care, changes in population distribution and accessibility to hospital centers, changes in people's habits and tastes, continuing and rapid change in the technology of hospital care, and, in your case, change in the relationship with government.

It is strange that so often we are so casual about change. Perhaps it's because change is so much a part of us. Man is the product, the victim and the instrument of change. Yet, he has traditionally given little attention to coping with change as such. He sometimes seems to pretend it doesn't exist; then when he recognizes it, he usually opposes it.

Some people may say that the title I have put on these remarks, "The Management of Change," is pretentious. How can you manage change? Well, there are several ways, or, at least, several things you can do to make it easier to live with. You can even make it work for you, particularly if you can spot changes as they are taking place, if you can identify the components—if not the causes—of change, and if you have clearly in mind your own priorities so that you can evaluate the impact of change. This process is an essential of any planning effort.

It is not only difficult, it is sometimes downright painful to spot change. We oppose change, or even fear it, for several reasons. One is that we hate to acknowledge that our previous investment of time, brains, energy or means, or failure to so invest, was a mistake. We hate to admit we were wrong, either by commission or omission. Second, we shrink from having to do the things necessary to adjust to the change, whether we are trying to dam it, change its direction, or repair its damage. This is true for individuals, for families, for communities, and for nations.

THE NATIONAL SPIRIT

Today, I want to talk about changes taking place in the broader environment in which we in this country are living. In particular, I want to discuss two aspects of our scene where our failure to assess the impact of change threatens our national, political and economic health. Often, some dramatic event is required to spark the realization of the magnitude of any problem facing society. In the context of my remarks, Watergate is one such event and illustrates gross imperfections in our political process and serious shortcomings in our educational efforts. Another event, the so-called "energy crisis", makes the change in our economic posture vivid. Both of these headline items are of great importance in themselves. But they also call for change in the conduct of our affairs if the maladies they have exposed are to be arrested.

These dramatic events—Watergate and the energy crisis—may be looked upon as marking the end of an era, a quarter-century over which the curve of our national spirit has plummeted from its peak in the brief period after World War II to a low perhaps even deeper than the Depression at the start of the thirties. The pre-Korean period seems to have been a high point in several ways. We emerged from World War II having paid a heavy price but unscathed relative to the other great nations. In the military sphere, we had atomic superiority and seeming long-term invulnerability because of it. Because of the magnitude of our resources and because we thought we had learned some very special lessons about war, we were able to launch the Marshall Plan and provide crucial assistance in rebuilding both allies and en-

emies in Europe and the Far East. We were, unquestionably, the world leader.

Then what happened? We became so preoccupied with the cold war and fear of communism at home that we forgot the lessons we had learned. We fought a war in Korea that was so indecisive that a general won the presidency by promising to get us out of it. We went through the fifties apparently unaware of the significance of the changes taking place in the rest of the world. The Cuban missile crisis shook our faith in our invulnerability to attack. Since then, we've taken even heavier blows to the body politic, to our pride and to our standing in the world, and, more important, our standing in our own eyes.

We have fought the longest war in our history and failed to deter a people less than one-tenth our size. It was a war that we didn't intend to get into and many of our people couldn't understand why we were in it. It cost us dearly in lives and resources. In waging it, we caused cleavages among our people, we undermined faith in the fairness and equity of our military conscription system, and we sowed among our people cancerous seeds of doubt that their government levels with them.

It will take some time to measure the corrosive effect of all this on our defense posture. Not only has the stature of our military suffered, but this trauma has bred a dangerous skepticism toward the need to maintain forces we need to deter attack and counter pressure threats against us.

We are faced with a problem of infinite importance and complexity. The change in the nature of war brought about by the development of ultimate weapons and the inevitable proliferation of nuclear capability are obvious facts of life and thus war will become a less and less rational solution. But the inability to develop more effective and better ways to resolve issues between nations and the manifest existence of danger require us to maintain armed forces of credible degree.

But there are other factors, other changes, which have gotten "out of control." Look at what has happened in our cities. Despite the time and energies of well-meaning people and an outpouring of public and private resources, we have been unable to control violence and rot in our great cities. We can provide healthful life support for astronauts in outer space while slum children live in rat-infested housing, suffer from lead poisoning, and are retarded in learning because of basic shortcomings in diet. And outside of the slums, our cities are being choked by too many vehicles grossly unsuited to the urban environment.

Our education structure too has been shaken by a generation of young people who grew tired of academic bureaucracy and questioned the relevance of what had long seemed most basic in education. In monumental facilities which should foster inspiration, we have trained people in administration and management in a way that makes manipulation of the system more important than the mission, neglecting basic social values and the essential standards for living together and governing ourselves. The failure in our institutions of high education to provide some kind of value system along with the techniques of management and control is reflected in the behaviour of the privileged elite in the Watergate parade.

Now, we are beginning to doubt the validity of our conservative economic beliefs, our commitment to growth, our quest for abundance without restraint, and our trust in technological progress. We have begun to realize that such an approach failed to take into account the incredible magnitude and growth of our demand and the fact that our resources are not unlimited. We now know that we can no longer afford the waste that in some ways we've treated as economic incentive. We know now that some problems

are of such magnitude they cannot be solved on a "crash" basis. We are learning the necessity of difficult choices and maintaining balance in pursuing objectives however desirable. As the rest of the world changes, and as other nations become formidable economic competitors, we are forced to recognize our limitations.

What I have said to this point is undoubtedly gloomy. But let's not despair. This country has accomplishments to cite. For example, I believe that historians will agree that progress in civil rights has been remarkable considering the roots and inherent difficulties of the problem. We could cite accomplishments in space, medicine, the development of cultural activities and a host of others. But, to my mind, it is much more useful to examine the causes of the drop in our national spirit and our relative position in the world.

Watergate

As I mentioned before, I believe that two dramatic and topical events—Watergate and the energy crisis—provide significant insights into fundamental changes we have failed to comprehend and deal with in time. Watergate is shorthand designation for a serious national illness, rooted in some very fundamental changes to our political environment and recovery may be slow and costly.

At a time when we most need strong leadership and respected government, the nation has been weakened by a dreadful virus within the White House itself that threatens our most respected institution, the presidency. The disease entered the system through the channels of twisted loyalties of men close to the president, men who had never learned that our system of self-government depends upon the will to make it work. The system necessarily calls for men of good will, of moral standards, and of devotion to the principles clearly stated in the Bill of Rights attached to our Constitution. The men exposed by the opening of Watergate were expert in the manipulation of the machinery of government, but they lacked respect for it.

The ruthlessness with which they sought power for its own sake, their crass conspiring to invade the privacy of citizens, and the cynicism with which they preyed upon the weaknesses and exploited the vulnerability of people outside their own protective walls are more than an affront to freedom-loving people. Such attitudes on the part of those bearing public trust are a threat to freedom itself. The responses of these men to public exposure of their betrayal of that trust have not revealed courage and conviction. Instead, exposure has been met with dissembling rhetoric and defensive legalisms.

Government and the press

Watergate is threatening national institutions other than the presidency. Threatened with exposure, government officials have attacked the press. The power of our government and the economic vulnerability of the press are such that an attack on the press by the chief of state can only be a threat to the freedom of the press. The press—and I mean the electronic as well as the print media—is due continuing criticism by all elements of society—except the government. A press subject to pressure from government or subservient to the demands of officers of government is not a free press. Whatever the faults of a free press—there are not many free press areas in the world—whatever its shortcomings and however it discharges its responsibilities under a Constitutional guarantee of freedom, the only thing to be feared more than a free press is an unfree press.

Both history and common sense tell us to beware when any government attempts to discredit the press of its own country. We are now witnessing an ill-concealed effort on the part of our government to undermine

the credibility of the press. There is an office in the White House which gathers ammunition against the press.

In addition, one of the best-known, government-supported "think tanks" has received federal funds to gather data on the ownership and control of the media of mass communication. Such data are publicly available, of course, but a special study of this type financed by government funds is worrisome in a free society.

But the examination of the functioning of a free press cannot be one-sided. Watergate has called into question whether the press is living up to its responsibility to safeguard our rights and liberties. Among the most sacred of those rights is the right to a fair trial by a jury of one's peers on the presumption of innocence until and unless guilt is proved. This is an area quite different from the reporting of activities of government. Intensive reporting of various aspects of a crime, or of the police efforts to solve a crime, can impair the rights of the accused, and it can interfere with the investigation. It can also essentially convict the accused as far as the public is concerned without benefit of trial. I believe we have seen examples of both in the Watergate case. The fault will not lie wholly with the press, however, because those in official positions involved either in investigating Watergate or trying to avoid exposure have exploited the press through news "leaks" to serve their respective ends. The press is at fault for permitting itself to be used by those unwilling to be held accountable for what they tell reporters. Where the judicial process is involved, there is need for much more discipline and restraint than is being shown. The problem is how to avoid interference with that process without interfering in other processes equally important to freedom.

Election reform

The impact on the judicial process of unrestrained public reporting is not, however, the central issue in Watergate. Of far greater import and concern is the undermining of our faith in the elective process, which is such an essential component of the machinery of democracy.

The solutions to the Watergate type of problem are not wholly clear, but the direction of our efforts to prevent recurrence are starkly clear. We must revise the elective process to reduce the influence of money. Money is not new in politics, but the recent months have shocked us into the realization of the colossal growth in its role and the consequences of that growth. We can certainly find ways to prevent the use of funds contributed to a political campaign from being used for purposes not covered by statutory reporting requirements or purposes not intended by the contributor.

Controlling political expenditures is a must if we want to assure the validity of our elective process. If limits are imposed, we must have the watchdog organization for effective enforcement of those limits. And of allied importance, we must have full disclosure of financial status and business connections of both elected and appointed officials, complete enough to permit identification of possible conflicts of interest.

One suggested method for controlling political campaign expenditures is through provision of public funds. The possibility is intriguing in theory, but any system would be difficult and complicated to administer, considering requirements for equitable distribution among incumbents and challengers, especially independents. Political parties would have to take major responsibilities, but they would have to make some changes inside—such as establishing clearly defined and publicly visible methods of selecting their own managers. The important point is that elements crucial to our con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cept of a democracy are functioning imperfectly, and we have to do something about it.

The energy crisis

Now, let us look at the other situation we have selected which dramatizes our failure to assess the course and indicated impact of change. If anyone needs evidence of the need for definition and alignment of national priorities—planning in the economic field—let him examine the roots of the fuel debacle.

The President, in his discussion with the Associated Press managing editors, acknowledged that the energy crisis was not brought on entirely by the machinations of the oil export countries of Africa and the Middle East through their embargoes of oil as a new kind of economic warfare. He seemed to be trying to place the blame on Congress, citing his energy message of two years ago. His hindsight is a bit shortsighted, to say the least.

Solution to the energy crisis lies not in determining whose fault it is, but in starting now in earnest to do something about it. As far as the fault is concerned, there is blame enough for everybody. The crisis has been coming on for a long time, and almost everybody has seen it coming. The point is, we didn't do enough about it.

In a book published in 1956, which I co-authored with Dr. Arnold Kramish, titled, "Atomic Energy For Your Business," we urged intensive development of nuclear power by 1970, and I quote, "the nation would begin to feel the pinch in fluid fuel resources." When I served as a member of AEC, that one government agency used about 5% of the nation's electric power, then something like 10 billion kilowatt-hours a week. The subsequent rise in demand was clearly visible. Last week it had reached nearly 35 billion.

Back in the late forties, Dr. Lawrence Hafstad, when he was head of reactor development for AEC, said that nuclear fuels would be an interim source of fuel energy to tide us over the period between exhaustion of the sun's stored energy—stored in the fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas—and full use of the sun's energy direct. In the meantime, we have speeded up our consumption of energy, both in terms of per capita usage by an expanding population and in terms of changing patterns through a belated effort to quickly achieve environmental controls, thereby reducing efficiency of utilization and causing a switch from more plentiful to more precious fuels. Throughout the period of approach of this energy crisis, and it is at least a decade, neither the government nor the energy suppliers have shown the foresight they should have. One reason is that "planning," thanks in part to the allergies of business interests fearing government's role, has been a bad word since the days of the New Deal. We've been charging ahead for the past quarter-century with practically no energy planning. Now we are paying the price.

The search for devils to blame for the fuel shortage can be very divisive. It is more than a partisan matter. Surely it results in part from lack of leadership at the top, both in industry and in government, but it won't do any good to make big business the whipping boy for what has happened. Nor will it help to blame Israel, the Arabs or both. The Arab embargo didn't cause the crisis; it only shortened the fuse.

There is no question but we are in for some personal discomfort and costly inconvenience. Our hope has to be that our government will adopt policies designed to assure as equitable as possible distribution of both, and to alleviate any suffering. As a result of such events as Watergate, confidence in those policies may be slow in building.

There is also no question that the difficulty will be with us for more than one winter. In the long run, however, the prob-

lem is solvable. It will take some courageous government policy guidance, a huge investment in research and development, and establishment of specific national priorities and, above all, time—but the job can be done.

The fuel energy shortage highlights the fact that our conventional fuels, as contrasted with nuclear fuels, containing the compacted organic residues of ages past, are critically valuable for other than their energy content. As hydrocarbons, they are one of our most important raw materials. Oil is an increasingly important feedstock for the chemical industry. Petro-chemicals are the source of plastics and synthetic fibers.

The coming materials crisis

In the energy crisis, we will thus get a taste, and doubtless a bitter one, of a far worse crisis to come. This is the crisis of basic raw materials. The same economic and political realities will emerge, but with far greater impact. Nor is the solution so readily foreseeable—only the approach of the crisis, and it is coming fast. The population of the world continues to increase and the per capita consumption of materials continues to increase. The result is an exponential demand curve. But the amount of the earth's resources is fixed, and new technologies are not yet visible which will change that fact. Here is an ultimate crisis but we are going to feel it long before we approach the end of the recoverable supply of such materials as bauxite, cobalt, copper, fluorspar, lead, manganese, molybdenum, nickel, tin and zinc.

And all of the industrially advanced countries will feel the pinch long before the supplies run out. This is because of the places in which the earth's mineral wealth is found, much of it in the smaller underdeveloped countries. The Arab experience in withholding oil will not be lost on those nations which have the raw materials needed by the industrialized world.

The nations possessing raw materials which their own economies cannot utilize will want more than just money for their natural wealth. They may want political accommodation as the oil exporters do, and they will want a piece of the action. They may want to do the processing and sell partly finished products to the purchasers of their raw materials. Whatever they want, they are learning how to trade and they will insist upon trading as equals.

Everybody's independence thus becomes interdependence. Whoever has something to trade takes his place at the table. This is a change we can manage. The condition of detente between two great nuclear powers is a reflection of it. Detente is not a panacea, a guarantee of security and relief from competitive national pressure. Detente, if anything, is a recognition of conflicting interests with a mutual acknowledgement that the issues cannot be solved by military violence. Detente necessarily takes into account the resources problem and the on-coming materials crisis. The most highly industrialized nations are, of course, the most vulnerable. We are near the top of that list.

NATIONAL PLANNING

If we are to cope with this threat to our security and well-being—and it is far more than a threat, it is a certainty—there are a number of things that must be done. Changes are on the way, and we must make ourselves aware of them. We must identify the components of these changes, try to assess their potential impact. How can we have a coherent strategy, how can we define and align our priorities, that is, put them in order of importance to our national life, unless we have the basic information for decision making and a system for influencing those decisions?

All of which adds up to the development of a national planning system more com-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

prehensive and authoritative than our scattered and primitive efforts up to now.

This means we must upgrade and broaden the planning function in government. It means we establish a better system of clarifying and coordinating the interests of producers and consumers, management and labor, business and government. It also means we devise a better means of federal program development than the techniques of competition between mission-oriented agencies of government. The competition is sometimes as much bureaucratic as functional. The ordering of priorities demands a readiness to reduce or restructure government agencies, change their missions, and deal straightforwardly in public view with the constituencies supporting those agencies or constituting from their programs.

The impact on the business community will be much greater. Government will have to exercise a far greater participation in those decisions which affect the availability and utilization of resources and the capacity for processing them. Steel, cement, oil, and chemicals are prime examples. Cement production capacity, for instance, has actually declined in the face of increasing demand. Higher returns elsewhere draw capital away from cement plants. Refinery capacity and operations have followed too closely the dictates of immediate profit. Higher interest rates represent increasing demand for money, especially capital to invest in new facilities. Ways must be found to guide capital into areas of national need. The cost of the various aspects of solution to the energy crisis—partial relief for the short term and real solution for the long term—is going to make necessary some quite untraditional, for this country, actions on the part of public agencies. And we're not prepared for the change.

We must have the organization, people and techniques to plan in order to gain greater coherence in national effort. We have seen what the Japanese have done in the area of national planning. I'm not suggesting that the Japanese economic system is either a panacea or importable to the U.S., any more than the British parliamentary system is—even though some people might have wished it were in recent months. But there is much we can learn from the Japanese. Japan has developed the technique of economic planning because she had to. Now we have to. Here is change that is forced upon us. Having made economic planning a bad word way back in Franklin Roosevelt's days, we now have to change attitudes as well as practice.

The Japanese practice depends upon close cooperation between government and industry, but for the national benefit, not just industry's. One of the essential characteristics of the Japanese system is that the very best people go into the planning offices of the Foreign Ministry, the Finance Office, the Bank of Japan and the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, which are highly respected by business and provide the most prestigious employment for professionals at all levels.

One firm step forward in the planning field by our government was the Full Employment Act of 1946. It contains a policy base for a rudimentary economic planning. The Act calls for a yearly report by the President on where we're going, established a Council of Economic Advisors to oversee the federal effort, and created the Joint Economic Committee of Congress to handle the legislative responsibilities. This machinery must be greatly expanded and strengthened. Our national planning requirements are far broader than the relatively rudimentary effort to create and maintain maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

As one of my wise friends has said, the United States must get used to being a "have not" nation. This is not a cause for despair. Realization of the change in our situation

must lead to more precise systems for planning to determine what we can and should afford. A determined innovative spirit beyond planning—in the area of finance, for example—can lead us to develop new ways to maximize the strengths we undoubtedly possess. We will have to develop more sophisticated skills in the multi-dimensional field of international trade relationships. There will be dislocations and rude awakenings, but I am confident of the viability of our economic system.

Obviously, in the time we have had, I could not treat these problem areas or their solution comprehensively. But I hope we have covered enough ground to see that the future of our country is critically dependent upon the degree to which we can manage changes of the depth and breadth we have seen in recent years. Success depends upon more than national determination. It will require continuing and realistic assessment of the political and economic environment in which we live, of the very many complicated dynamics of our total environment. It will depend upon our readiness and skill in planning, on the ingenuity we can bring to bear on solving problems, and in the discipline with which we face and meet the changes. These are the elements of the management of change, and they are the key to the quality of our future.

RESOLUTION FROM THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, LAKE COUNTY, IND.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, February 17, I attended the banquet and meeting of the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, which was held in East Chicago. This gathering was in commemoration of the 56th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. A resolution was unanimously adopted by the Lithuanians of the Indiana Calumet region which I ask to include with my remarks:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Lithuania's Declaration of Independence on February 16, 1918, in Vilnius, whereby a sovereign Lithuanian State, having more than 700 years of history, was restored:

Whereas, the forcible occupation and illegal annexation of the independent Republic of Lithuania by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940 as a result of an agreement between Stalin and Hitler;

Whereas, the Lithuanian American citizens extend their sincere gratitude to the Administration and Congress of the United States of America for the continued non-recognition of the seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet Union;

Whereas, the Communists of the Soviet Union persisted on practicing genocide thru out these years of occupation, but failed to eliminate all religious worship, have renewed efforts, during the past several months, and those who dare to speak up for their rights, are now put under arrest and sentenced to free trips to Siberia; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces and administrative apparatus from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian people to exercise their sovereignty and self-government, of which they were deprived as the result of a conspiracy between the dictator of the Soviet Union, Stalin, and the war criminal, Hitler;

February 19, 1974

That we request the President of the United States to make the issue of liberation of Lithuania an integral part of the foreign policy of the United States in seeking European security;

That we respectfully request President Nixon to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums on behalf of the restoration of sovereign rights to the Lithuanian people and to protest the present violation of human rights and the Soviet colonial rule in the occupied Lithuania;

That Simas Kudirka, who unsuccessfully sought freedom in the United States be released with his family from the Soviet Union into the free world;

That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to both Senators and all the Members of Congress from our State and to the news media.

FARMWORKERS SUBJECT TO EXTREME HAZARDS IN WORKING CONDITIONS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps no greater struggle for human dignity underway today in this Nation than the efforts by farmworkers to secure improvement of employment and living standards.

The United Farm Workers of America has made definite gains, under the most adverse of obstacles, in recent years. Still much remains to be done.

The continuing plight of the workers in the fields has been singled out in many instances by Cesar Chavez, the union's dedicated and inspirational leader. Recently, Chavez, in an article published in the Los Angeles Times, outlined the dimensions of one other problem of the worker—farm safety. The story is not a happy one but a real one and I recommend that all Members read it. At this time Mr. Speaker, I include the Chavez account in the RECORD.

In Florida, Gulf & Western Products Co., a major sugar-cane grower, hauls Jamaican cane workers in 8-by-35-foot aluminum vans with no windows, no seats and no inside lighting. The company says it has a policy of carrying only 80 men per vehicle but, in the pre-dawn darkness of Monday, Jan. 7, upwards of 180 farm workers were jammed into a van headed for Gulf & Western's Okeechobee mill near South Bay. The truck's steering failed, and the vehicle overturned in a ditch. One cane cutter died and 86 were injured.

Like most Florida cane growers, Gulf & Western imports Jamaican labor through an arrangement between the United States and Jamaican governments. If a cutter does not fulfill his quota—200 feet of cane per hour or eight tons per day—or if he complains about his working conditions or food, he is likely to be summarily deported to Jamaica—and charged for his passage. The Miami News quoted one Florida grower who summed up the process this way: "We used to own our slaves; now we rent them."

Florida is not alone in allowing such inhuman treatment of farm workers. Many California and Arizona growers have their own system for "renting" them.

They go to "The Pit" in Mexicali, a crude dump where hungry people from Mexico offer themselves to employers from the rich American croplands. From 2 a.m. on, hundreds of men, women and children show up to hear the prices that growers are willing to pay for that day. Then they climb aboard buses provided by labor contractors, who take them to work at distant points in the Imperial, Coachella, Yuma and Palo Verde valleys.

On Monday, Jan. 14, Pablo Arellano, 51, started picking up farm workers at 2 a.m. for Jesus Ayala, a labor contractor. By 3 or 3:30 a.m. Pablo had a busload of people and began his 135-mile trip to High and Mighty Farms lettuce fields near Blythe. Then, after a full day working in the fields himself, Pablo drove the workers back to Mexico at night and cleaned the bus before trying to get some sleep for the next day.

Early Tuesday, he again picked up a crew of farm workers and headed north. On approaching Blythe shortly before sunrise, the bus missed a turn and careened off the road into a drainage ditch. On impact, seats and farm workers were thrown to the front of the bus, crushing Pablo to death and trapping many others who soon drowned in the ditch.

On the day of the accident, I was in Atlanta—along with other farm workers—taking part in services marking the death of Dr. Martin Luther King. When we heard of the tragedy in Blythe, we canceled the day's meetings with Coretta King and other black leaders, and took the first flight to Los Angeles. That night we drove to Calexico.

For the next three days we visited the families of the dead workers and sought more information about the causes of the accident.

Among the dead, we discovered, were men, women and children. In one family, a father and his three teen-age children were killed.

Amid the grief there was great bitterness. The workers were—and still are—bitter because they've been through this kind of tragedy too many times before. The workers learned long ago that growers and labor contractors have too little regard for the value of any individual worker's life.

The trucks and buses are old and unsafe. The fields are carelessly sprayed with poisons. The laws that do exist are not enforced. How long will it be before we take seriously the importance of the workers who harvest the food we eat?

On Saturday, Jan. 19, 2,000 farm workers crowded into the Calexico National Guard Armory for a funeral mass celebrated in Spanish. Afterward, at the request of the farm workers' families, on behalf of their union, I made the following remarks in Spanish, printed here in English for the first time:

"Brothers and Sisters: We are united here in the name of God to pay final tribute to our brothers and sisters who lost their lives in a tragic bus accident. We are here also to show our love and solidarity for the families who have lost so much in the deaths of their loved ones.

"We are united in our sorrow but also in our anger. This tragedy happened because of the greed of the big growers who do not care about the safety of the workers and who expose them to grave dangers when they transport them in wheeled coffins to the fields . . .

"There have been so many accidents—in the fields, on trucks, under machines, in buses—so many accidents involving farm workers.

"People ask if they are deliberate. They are deliberate in the sense that they are the direct result of a farm labor system that treats workers like agricultural implements and not as human beings. These accidents happen because employers and labor contractors treat us as if we were not important human beings.

"But brothers and sisters, the men and women we honor here today are important

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

human beings. They are important because they are from us. We cherish them. We love them. We will miss them.

"They are important because of the love they gave to their husbands, their children, their wives, their parents—all those who were close to them and who needed them.

"They are important because of the work they do. They are not implements to be used and discarded. They are human beings who sweat and sacrifice to bring food to the tables of millions and millions of people throughout the world.

"They are important because God made them, gave them life, and cares for them in life and in death.

"Now that they are gone, how can we keep showing how important they are to us? How can we give meaning to their lives and their sacrifice?

"These terrible accidents must be stopped! It is our obligation—our duty to the memory of those who have died—to see to it that workers are not continually transported in these wheeled coffins, these carriages of death and sorrow. The burden of protecting the lives of farm workers is squarely on our shoulders.

"The farm workers' union is . . . demanding a full investigation by the grand jury in Riverside County. We are also asking for hearings by the California Legislature as a first step toward stronger legislation.

"Let the whole world know that the pain that today fills our hearts with mourning also unifies our spirits and strengthens our determination to defend the rights of every worker.

"Let the labor contractors and the growers know that our union intends to press the boycott of grapes, lettuce and Gallo wines until our contracts are restored, and let them know that we will never stop working and struggling until there is an end to the inhuman treatment of all farm workers."

One dead in a Florida cane workers' truck accident . . . 19 in a California drainage ditch . . . when will it all end?

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN: JEFF WILLIAMS, VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the speech written by Mr. Jeff Williams, which won the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Wyoming's annual Voice of Democracy Contest.

Jeff is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Glenn A. Williams, of Cheyenne, Wyo. He is a junior at Central High School, and excels in both scholastic and extracurricular pursuits.

I congratulate Jeff for his achievement, and am heartened by his belief that the events of the last year have served to strengthen citizen loyalty to our Nation.

The text of the speech follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America", to this country I pledge allegiance, this being my responsibility as a citizen. In those few words from the American Pledge of Allegiance, I discover

that I as a citizen have a responsibility to fulfill.

In as much as this country has granted me numerous civic rights since the day I was born, I, as a true citizen owe allegiance through responsibility for these wonderful gifts.

I am living in a time of scandal and criticisms, there are those who have degraded the image of America as never before in the history of this nation. It is my responsibility as a citizen to speak out against this negative pessimism toward our country. True, I must be concerned with finding out what's wrong with America, but more important, I should find out what is right about America. For it is not my duty to overly react to the calamities of the nation, on the contrary, it is my responsibility as a citizen to provide optimistic support and provide a solution. As part of the solution I must keep the integrity of this country by not downgrading it because of its political trials and tribulations. America will stand, and its affairs will be carried out, regardless of these misfortunes. Individuals may fall, but not the nation.

It is therefore my responsibility as a citizen to support my government and obey its laws which have been so specifically outlined in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. James A. Garfield once said, "A Law is not a law without coercion behind it." I too, feel it necessary to provide our laws with that needed enforcement by respecting the statutes of this nation. Obviously then, being a citizen does not mean I can act as I please however, but rather I should decide how I will act by understanding and completing my civic duties with a sense of responsibility.

This responsibility lies in individualism. I, being that individual, am a citizen of this nation. I have a share here, and a part to bear, a character to form, frame and present to the United States. I will present my character, carrying out my responsibility as a citizen, by accepting a challenge. America has always had the challenge of building something entirely new, with each individual having a task, a responsibility. So I will thrust forward, testing, trying the new, failing and trying again and again by using my own individualism.

Carrying out my individual responsibility as a citizen I must not assume an apathetic attitude. I cannot, as the cliche goes, "stick my head in the sand and ignore what's going on around me". I will not be like Phillip Nolan, Edward Hales main character in *The Man Without A Country*, who because of general lack of concern did not wish to hear about his country any more, only to have that wish become reality. I maintain to properly fulfill my responsibility. I must train myself to act responsible by gaining the true facts on any given matter. This entails a total commitment on my part to study, inquire of the present proceedings, and get a good education.

Since I have a place in the pattern and perfection of the United States the final success, or failure lies in my hands. Ever since this nation was founded, each generation of Americans has been given the responsibility to become loyal citizens. I, a 20th century American, must take my place in history by carrying out my responsibility as a citizen, through the acceptance of duties.

It is my duty and responsibility to have a place in my heart for all those Americans who have carried out their citizenship to the utmost by giving their lives to preserve my freedom. I commit myself to follow in their footsteps by pledging my allegiance as a citizen to the maintaining of the civic rights of this country. I accept this responsibility as a citizen to set an example, for if I don't who will?

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this year, the Wisconsin winner of the Voice of Democracy Contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin, and its auxiliary, was a young man from the Ninth Congressional District, Michael Rindo, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Rindo, of Muskego, Waukesha County.

Michael will be in Washington next month for the final judging, competing against similar winners from the other States of the Union. Michael's speech is entitled "My Responsibility as a Citizen." It contains some very mature thoughts, in a concise manner. I commend the contents of his presentation to the reading of my colleagues:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By Michael Rindo)

The world is an armored camp these days, and the fate of freedom hangs in the balance. Yes, today America is threatened from all sides, tyranny outside and anarchy within, and we the people, the citizens must do what we can to keep this greatest living example of freedom alive. That, ladies and gentlemen, is our responsibility as citizens.

Today the United States is being threatened by factors which are both internal and external. Tyranny is spreading throughout the world and may even soon be knocking on our door. The ideas of Marx are becoming much more appealing to many more people. Communism, Democracy's greatest foe, already rules one third of the globe and is winning more victories each day. It also has a foothold only ninety miles off of our shore in Cuba.

These factors are surely a threat to our nation, but are not nearly as damaging as the internal problems we now face.

We are in the midst of the ugliest political scandal in this nation's history, Watergate, the Vice President's resignation, and talk of impeachment are contributing to the erosion of the very base of our Government. Inflation of the dollar and higher prices have caused an economic depression, and crime has reached an all time high.

I am not an alarmist, however, the result of all this, if we don't take care, could cause utter chaos and an end result in which anarchy would be the supreme ruler.

Now what does all of this have to do with you and me? How can you and I possibly do anything that would change the course of human events?

The answer as I see it starts with this dedication. I am only one, but I am one and one is one hundred percent more than none. I cannot do everything, but I can do something, and what I can do I will do, so help me God.

I believe that the key to keeping the freedom of this nation alive and thus upholding our responsibility as citizens is *involvement*.

Involvement, starting at the local government level, such as attending Common Council meetings and voicing your opinion in City government. Involvement in Federal Government by going to the polls and voicing your opinion through the vote. Supporting the candidate of your choice, or voting for the memorandum you want passed. Involvement by taking a few minutes out of your day to write your congressmen about something you want done, something you do

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

or don't like, whichever the case may be, or just writing to let him know he's doing a good job. And finally, involvement by supporting our Law Enforcement Agencies. Uphold the law, you and I must support our law agencies in order to keep law and order in, and crime, chaos, and anarchy out.

If all citizens were to exchange their "I don't want to get involved" attitude, for an attitude of involvement, we would all become better citizens, and our responsibilities as citizens of this great nation would be upheld. Strengthening the nation and defeating the anarchy and tyranny I talked about earlier.

The role of a citizen's involvement in government was best stated by Daniel Webster nearly two hundred years ago. "Nothing will ruin this nation if the people themselves undertake its safety. Nothing can save it if they leave that safety in any hands but their own". This statement is true more so today than at any other time in history.

All of us, in our homes, in our schools, in our work and churches should begin today to get involved and take the safety of this country, as Daniel Webster stated, "into our own hands". This, ladies and gentlemen, is the most vital obligation to our nation at this time.

For in this time of National strife, the citizen will decide upon how we come out of the conflict. We, as citizens, should follow this plan of involvement, for after all, Democracy is not a spectator sport. I believe that through involvement we will not only become better citizens, but we will also uphold our responsibility as citizens.

Can you, can we meet this challenge?

EARTH WEEK FOR EAGLES

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a most worthwhile campaign to preserve and protect our vanishing bald eagles, our national symbol, has now been underway for several years. Sponsored by Eagle Valley Environmentalists—EVE—and its president, Terrence N. Ingram, this project of raising funds for the establishment of a 1,000-acre wilderness eagle reserve in southwestern Wisconsin along the eagles' migratory route has won wide public acceptance.

Last year I was pleased to assist EVE in their sponsorship of "Walk for an Eagle" which raised many thousands of dollars for the purchase of land for this reserve. This year I am again urging support for EVE's program: "Earth Week for Eagles." I hope that schools and environmental groups can give this program the support it deserves and take this concrete step forward toward protection of the bald eagle. I include the following information:

EARTH WEEK FOR EAGLES

Since the first observance of "Earth Week" in 1969, seven days in the spring of each year have been set aside for public study and appreciation of the American environment. The surge of concern for environmental quality that characterized the late 1960's was a rebirth of ideas and concerns that had lain dormant during a quarter-century or more of unprecedented national economic growth.

Today, it is time for a rebirth of interest in the welfare of wildlife species that have become endangered, wholly or in part as a

February 19, 1974

result of our prosperity. The majestic bald eagle, our national symbol, is one of the endangered species. It would indeed be fitting to dedicate Earth Week 1974 to the bald eagle, as part of a national attempt to preserve it from extinction.

With its gleaming white head and seven-foot wingspread, the bald eagle is a magnificent bird. Once common in many states, it is now threatened with extinction in much of the country that has adopted it as a symbol. Tragically, few Americans have ever seen bald eagles living free, and unless our treatment of the great birds and their environment changes soon, the eagles of the future may soar only in the silence of dusty museum exhibits.

The bald eagle was selected as our national symbol in 1782, because it embodied "... a free spirit, high-soaring and courageous." In the hearts of many Americans the eagle is synonymous with grace, dignity and strength. To thousands of young people, it represents the true spirit of their country, a rallying point for energy and commitment to the idea that the United States of America is a great land.

But the bald eagle population, particularly in the lower 48 states, is dangerously low. Along the Atlantic seaboard, about 600 eagles remain of the thousands that once lived there. In the Middle-West, only 1,100 eagles have survived. Many eagles still live in the Alaskan wilderness, but even there eagle numbers have declined.

Bullets, chemicals and bulldozers are responsible.

During 36 dark years of our country's history, more than 100,000 bald eagles were killed in Alaska—for bounties ranging from 50¢ to \$2.00. And although the bird no longer carries a price on its head, illegal shooting by ignorant and fearful men is still the greatest single cause of unnatural eagle deaths.

In recent years, significant numbers of bald eagles have fallen prey to pesticides and to chemical wastes such as poly-chlorinated biphenyls, which can kill adult eagles or render them sterile.

And human encroachment on eagle nesting and roosting areas continues to reduce the quantity and quality of the special habitat types the birds require to survive and maintain their numbers.

The plight of the bald eagle deserves the attention of every American—not only because the bird is our national symbol, but because it is also a symbol of the quality of our land. Eagles are environmental barometers, perched—and vulnerable—as we are, on the end of a long food chain. Can an environment that is lethal to eagles support healthy human beings? In the long run, the kinds of things that are happening to eagles today could also happen to us.

Fortunately, increasing numbers of Americans are becoming concerned about the bald eagle, and a small but growing "movement" of professional scientists, amateur ornithologists and students of all ages has taken on the formidable task of saving the eagles that remain in the lower 48 states.

A citizens group called "Eagle Valley Environmentalists, Inc." is part of that movement. Today, the 250-member organization is buying a 1,000-acre eagle roost and nature preserve located along the Mississippi River in southwestern Wisconsin. More than a hundred eagles commonly winter in that area, and many of them seek the protection of a two-mile-long wooded valley in the heart of the preserve.

Because eagles cannot tolerate people and their machines near the areas that are used as roosts, EVE's first goal is to purchase the valley and protect it from real estate development, off-road vehicles, and other disturbance. When more of EVE's \$190,000 land debt has been paid, the organization will establish a private nature education center for students of all ages who can use the land as an outdoor laboratory.

EVE also recognizes the value of simply letting most of its land alone, to grow and develop as natural forces dictate. If EVE can buy the land and hold it, Eagle Valley and the surrounding woods and prairies will remain as an example of the wild land that once lined the Mississippi.

At present, EVE owns 70 acres of the valley outright, and holds land contracts and options on the remaining acreage. Much of the money that has been paid on the contracts has been raised by school children throughout the Middle-West, and the energy and imagination they have devoted to fund-raising projects has served as a constant inspiration to EVE's adult members.

In 1972, for example, 63 young people from Weston, Missouri hiked a total of 870 miles as part of a "Walk For an Eagle" program that raised \$1,700 for Eagle Valley.

In 1973, a fourth-grade class in Lodi, Wisconsin sold EVE buttons, shoulder patches and stationery and raised more than \$650 from a community of only 1,800 people. School children in dozens of other cities and towns have held similar campaigns, demonstrating their willingness to work without compensation for the welfare of birds that few of them have seen.

This year, Eagle Valley Environmentalists, Inc., is sponsoring an earth week campaign for eagles, and invites every school and conservation organization in the country to join the effort. Donations are badly needed, and because EVE is a non-profit organization of volunteers, all funds raised during the campaign will be used for land purchase, which is of direct benefit to the eagles. Concerned persons should contact EVE President Terrence N. Ingram, Box 155, Apple River, Illinois 61001 for more information.

PERFECTLY CLEAR ON TRANSIT?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the administration, through the President's state of the Union message and the proposed fiscal 1975 budget, has painted a somewhat rosy picture of the outlook for American communities in the field of rapid transit.

It is not clear to me, however, and apparently to many in the media that this lofty goal of providing significant support to fast and pollution-free mass transit has been translated into a meaningful policy.

The budget we now have before us contains recommendations for additional funding to local and regional transportation offices for the acquisition of equipment and planning assistance for new systems. However, the administration still places its fullest emphasis on the development of a highway system as the ultimate solution to local and interstate transportation needs. I would like to offer one example of the administration's apparent in-house confusion on just how it envisions development of rapid transit as a high national priority.

Last month, while in Los Angeles, Transportation Secretary Claude Brinegar made it quite clear to local officials that the Federal Government could not substantially assist in financing a \$6.6 billion, 116-mile fixed rail and bus network in the area.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

At the time, Mr. Brinegar opted in support of a highly sophisticated car pooling program in the Greater Los Angeles area as a solution not only to the current energy emergency, but as a form of ultimate solution since the area has an extensive highway and freeway system.

The Brinegar statement prompted the Los Angeles Times to comment:

We think Brinegar is wrong in opposing the rail system. Obviously Southern California needs more car pools and more buses. But there is no way to make it all hang together as a rapid transit system—emphasis on the words "rapid" and "mass"—without a backbone of rail service.

I concur entirely with the editorial viewpoint. The development of modern, efficient, low-cost, and nonpolluting rapid transit in the United States has not been an easy task and certainly will not be made easier by policy outlooks such as the one espoused by Brinegar.

I believe that the efforts, such as those in Los Angeles, should be encouraged rather than given short shrift by an administration not willing to show even the slightest inkling of future conceptual planning and development in local transportation.

It would seem to me that the Department of Transportation is taking more than a cavalier attitude to a metropolitan area with a population of 7,032,075 citizens which ranked second among the Nation's 263 metropolitan areas measured in the 1970 census. The statements of Brinegar, in my view, certainly run in direct contrast to the somewhat optimistic statements made by Mr. Nixon. Essentially, the Congress should now ask Mr. Nixon if he is running the store, does he ever take time to confer with its manager?

Recently, too, other publications, such as the Christian Science Monitor, have questioned the policy logic of the administration in planning for future transportation needs. In a February 1 editorial, the Monitor noted:

The case for mass transit legislation really does not lie in the short-term crisis. The administration's bill—with its expected emphasis on bus systems rather than rails—is more geared to the short term. So is, for that matter, the appeal of many existing transit system managements who find increased rider demands also increasing the deficit at which they operate.

The lack of straightforward transit goals also was noted in a January 22 editorial of the Sacramento Bee which stated, in part:

In dealing with the energy crisis, there is oratory and there is commitment. President Nixon in his November address on energy needs, solemnly called for greater use of mass rapid transit. However, two months before his eloquent plea for people to shift from private automobiles to public transportation, the Office of Management and Budget had blocked federal funds for cities to start new rail transit systems for the 1974 fiscal year.

In a recent nationally broadcast message on transit goals, President Nixon stated that he would ask the Congress to spend \$16 billion for metropolitan and rural transportation over the next 6 years. However, at no point in that message did the President spell out a national goal to provide such urbanized

centers as Los Angeles with the long-term commitment necessary to plan for decades or longer needed to develop a full rail system for local transportation.

The President stated that local officials, who understand their community better than anybody in Washington, would determine transportation priorities, choosing between construction of highways or public transit systems, or the purchase of buses or rail cars. This, he said, would provide for flexibility between capital investments and other expenses.

To me, Mr. Speaker, this assessment still falls far short of a policy which local communities can grasp for long-range planning purposes. I would suggest, rather, that the Congress adopt a policy of transit insurance which would offer guarantees to our largest and most diverse metropolitan areas and the latitude to plan systems which the Government will contribute to in the fullest possible manner. Rapid transit, Mr. Speaker, is one area where Mr. Nixon has the chance to put some teeth in the so-called New Federalism. From his most current comments, I would venture to say those teeth are becoming impacted.

REPUBLICAN NEWSPAPER WAKEFIELD ITEM WANTS TO KNOW "WHAT THE HELL IS GOING ON"

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to two fine editorials which appeared recently in the Wakefield Item which is one of the daily newspapers that serve my district. These editorials are significant for two reasons.

First, I can assure you that they capture accurately the sentiment of the people of my district. While I was at home during the recent brief recess of the Congress, I had the opportunity to hear many of these same complaints and concerns on a firsthand basis from my constituents.

Second, the Wakefield Item is known within the area of its circulation as a newspaper with decided Republican leanings. This factor makes its criticisms that much more significant and deserving of attention.

I commend the Item for publishing these deeply felt expressions of concern, and I hope that all of my colleagues will take the time to read these two editorials. [From the Wakefield (Mass.) Item, Jan. 17, 1974]

WHAT THE HELL IS GOING ON!

Prices go up. Jobs go down the drain. An affluent nation is caught in an "energy crisis" which many doubt is real. While a federal government proposes a wide range of voluntary conservation methods for its individual citizens, the oil industry is "lured" by profits to research, explore, and seek to make the country independent as far as fuel is concerned.

The Watergate scandal, pushed in the background for a while by the ever-growing

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

energy shortage and a sorely injured economy, surfaces again with the disclosure that the infamous Haldeman-Nixon tape had been erased and re-recorded at least five times and perhaps as many as nine times. The White House, of course, denies that the President either deliberately or accidentally erased the tape—but it has no explanation to offer as to what might have happened. And, following the established line, the White House feels it would be inappropriate to comment on the latest, shoe-dropping incident, while the tape controversy is under court review.

The public is weary of the involved mess. It has looked with increasing dismay on an Administration that has been decimated of personnel, that has lost those once in high places who have either been indicted or have been found guilty of illegal actions. It winced as it saw a Vice President disgraced and driven from office by his own admitted misdeed, and it recoiled as it read of the decision of three Maryland judges that he is "unfit" to be a lawyer and that he should be disbarred.

And while John Q. Public is struggling with spiralling prices, incredible shortages, and rising taxes, he reads of a President weaseling out of paying his full tax share—legally, perhaps, but certainly unethically. He reads of a President maintaining two palatial estates with taxpayers digging deep to finance them. He reads of the ITT's and the milk industry's clouded contributions. He reads of major industries admitting they had contributed illegally to the 1972 campaign.

John Q. Public has always had a healthy respect for, even a reverence for, the office of the Presidency. When talk of impeachment was first whispered, he experienced horror. It's strong medicine and difficult to swallow. With the beginning of 1974, and the continuing bad news out of Washington, he's beginning to change his attitude.

There is too much to be done, too much that needs doing immediately. The country needs solutions to the giant-sized problems confronting it. There must be direction, leadership, innovative measures introduced, and John Q. Public, wondering "what the hell is happening" to his country, grows impatient. He also has increasing doubts that a federal government, shorn of credibility, weakened and distracted by scandal in high places, can meet this challenge. Let's get on with it and let's have a return to something resembling normalcy—this is the message being heard on Wakefield streets and on Main streets throughout the country.

[From the Wakefield (Mass.) Item, Feb. 5, 1974]

WHAT THE HELL IS GOING ON?

PART II

Well, we've heard from our leader. We listened to the State of the Union broadcast, and we've drawn our own conclusions. The State of the Union in 1974 is a state of disunion, discontent, chaos and frustration.

Platitudinous mutterings, pathetic pledges that "there will be no recession in the United States," and a proud parade of "five years of success" add up to a placebo unacceptable to growing numbers of Americans who are suffering from the ills besetting their country.

Disunion? It ranges throughout our society. Take the oil and gasoline shortage. There are many who doubt a shortage exists, and among them are owners and operators of gasoline stations and owners of fuel companies. The soaring costs are straining tempers as well as pocketbooks, and full page advertisements from the major oil companies, even after a thorough and information-seeking study, fail to satisfy the consumer that those huge profits are not so huge, after all, and are earmarked for research and exploration for increased American oil sources.

"Big is indeed not necessarily bad", but when one group can control all fuel—oil, coal, gas, from their sources to the consumer's home or place of business—that control better be in the interests of the public. And it isn't. Aided and abetted by a benevolent government, the oil beat goes on. In generous paternalism it grants oil depletion tax allowances. It allows the writing off of "taxes" (or shouldn't they more accurately be called "royalties"?) paid oil-producing companies from the taxable income in the United States. When this type of thing exists, the "biggies" can become the "baddies", and there are many who would award the oil barons the black hat of the villain. Private capital is necessary for a venture as gigantic as oil exploration, and profit is the carrot dangled as the lure—but there has to be some intelligent restraint and some control. And if it isn't done voluntarily by the oil "biggies," it's time for the government of, by, and for, the people to step in.

Like a giant octopus, its tentacles reaching into a myriad of other businesses and industries, the energy crisis is affecting jobs, production, and prices. Tell the Wakefield housewife there will be no recession—she'll show you the family income and the family outgo, from checks and bills dated February, 1974. Bread prices continue to go up, and she is warned of a wheat shortage looming and higher prices to come. Of course, there is the comforting news that the USSR will be able to sell us wheat—wheat that we exported to the Russians—at a "price."

And while grocery bills mount and families cut down and eliminate some items from their menus, irate trucksters, protesting the pinch they are feeling because of petroleum prices, called the strike that will block delivery of fresh food products.

Chaos? Try to buy gas. Mark the differing prices. See the long lines of waiting motorists. Look at their faces. Look at the faces of the pump attendants. Look at the faces of police officers trying to keep traffic moving, unclog tie-ups, and prevent accidents.

Some commentators, discussing the State of the Union message, focused on the appearance of the President. He looks vigorous, hale and hearty, and healthy. Maybe so, but the health of the union is anything but good.

Watergate? One year of Watergate is enough? The majority of Americans, whether or not they support the President, would agree that one day—one minute—of "Watergate" was more than enough. It should never have happened. There is disunion among the people on the resignation proposal and on the question of impeachment. There is unanimity, however, that out of Watergate must come reform. Never again must there be a Watergate.

Frustration? Yes. But the American people are not helpless. They do not have to become meek sheep standing by for their slaughter while their government deteriorates. Now is the time for petitions, for strong letters and wires to Washington. There is strength in numbers, and the voice of the people, if lifted in tumultuous unison, will be heard. If the Presidential hearing is not too acute, there is nothing wrong with the auditory sense of the Congress.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XXII

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, indiscriminate possession of handguns often leads to unintended injury or death. The following article appearing in the Feb-

February 19, 1974

ruary 11, 1974, edition of the Washington Post tells the story of a 17-year-old youth who shot off the tip of his finger and critically injured a woman acquaintance while cleaning his pistol, a pistol for which he had no need:

GUN DISCHARGES, INJURING Two

A 17-year-old youth was cleaning a pistol in his apartment at 1116 6th St. NW, yesterday when the gun accidentally discharged, shooting off the tip of his left index finger and wounding a 20-year-old woman visitor in the chest, metropolitan police reported.

The woman, Barbara A. Anthony, 1213 4th St. NW, was taken to Freedmen's Hospital, where she was in critical condition last night. Hospital officials said the bullet hit her in the right chest and lodged in the abdomen.

The juvenile was taken to D.C. General Hospital for treatment after the 6:30 p.m. incident and then arrested and charged with assault with a deadly weapon.

WHY CAMPAIGN FINANCING SHOULD REMAIN PRIVATE

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the Minneapolis Tribune of February 18 carried a syndicated article by Richard Wilson headlined "Why Campaign Financing Should Remain Private."

The same article appeared in the Washington Star-News yesterday evening.

The Wilson article is part of a growing body of commentary which points up not only the desirability, but the need, to maintain a private system of financing for Federal elections.

The Wilson article is especially interesting, because it makes two points which have largely escaped editorial notice so far. The first is that rich patrons can always find ways to support causes. The so-called single-purpose lobby groups whose issues are tailored to the candidates they favor are a good example.

The second point is that public financing will tilt the election pendulum toward groups which can muster manpower or publicity in favor of their candidates.

This article, like every thoughtful article on campaign financing, develops new and powerful reasons why public financing of elections is a poor idea:

WHY CAMPAIGN FINANCING SHOULD REMAIN PRIVATE

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—The big money is already assembling—\$23 million of it so far—and the prospective presidential backers are rallying (meeting with Sen. Kennedy, among others) for another go at multimillion-dollar politics.

The time has come to head off the big blowout through the federal financing of election campaigns, right?

No, absolutely wrong, notwithstanding the proposed reforms of Common Cause, the League of Women Voters and AFL-CIO. This is one instance where liberal wisdom collides with fairly impressive scholarship to the contrary.

It seems so simple. Ambassadorships are "sold." "Milk money" in large sums goes to politicians who will fight for higher prices. Campaign money shows up in a hush fund to keep the Watergate burglars quiet. High of-

ficials are caught in sleazy deals to win favors for generous contributors. A big corporation seeking favor at the highest level finances a national political convention.

This is enough to show, it is argued, that political money and public policy have become so adhesive that they must be ripped apart once and for all if decency and honesty are to be restored to politics.

A complex scheme for public financing supported by Kennedy and others died in the closing days of Congress last December. It would have established a new system of federal campaign subsidies for candidates in congressional elections and presidential primaries and broadened existing law to make public funding mandatory for presidential nominees.

Now a new attempt is underway in the House and Senate to revive the legislation making the public generally foot the bills for presidential and other federal campaigns. President Nixon, doubting if Congress will finally act on such a broad proposal, is understood to be preparing a new campaign-reform program which will further complicate the issue.

In this murky atmosphere, Kennedy has not placed all his faith in the prospect for a federally financed presidential election in 1976. He has met with a California real estate developer who is a kind of informal spokesman for well-to-do liberals who provided funds for both Sen. Eugene McCarthy in 1968 and Sen. George McGovern in 1972.

According to one report, the liberal California grapevine is now carrying the word that Teddy will "go" for the presidency in 1976, and the big-money West Coast liberals are described as eager for the fray.

These are the people who financed the anti-war politics of the '60s and the '70s, and the fact they are becoming active again is a good illustration of why public financing of presidential campaigns won't work. A number of scholars of politics in the academic world have pointed out that rich patrons find ways to support causes, and there are many ways to advance the cause of Kennedy without organizing a formal campaign for him.

The same is true of organized labor. It is in a position to contribute highly valuable "volunteer" services without violating any campaign-spending laws, existing or planned. Already its unpaid services for Democratic candidates can be costed out in the millions (according to one challenged estimate, as much as \$50 million).

If federal financing is made the law, the advantage will go to him who can command the most "volunteer" support, which organized labor is better able to provide than any existing campaign organization. Second to that powerful force come the cause-oriented organizations capable of mobilizing manpower and creating publicity supporting candidates with whom they agree, and with or without direct political participation.

Fundamentally, there is a fallacy in the argument of those who argue that good causes and campaigns collapse for lack of money. More often it is the other way around: Strong causes and candidacies attract money. Contrary to the liberal wisdom, there is no showing that money has been decisive in presidential elections. Certainly McGovern did not lose for lack of it. Democrats elected presidents from 1932 to 1952 at less expenditure than Republicans, according to a study by Prof. Ralph K. Winter of the Yale Law School.

Existing scholarship, according to Winter, is completely at odds with the impressionistic conclusions that money has so corrupted politics that the public will is thwarted.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

MR. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow when the House is scheduled to begin consideration of H.R. 11793, the Federal Administration Act of 1973, I plan to offer three amendments, at the appropriate time. I bring them to my colleagues' attention and ask that they be printed in the RECORD in order to afford timely notice.

The first amendment requires the Administrator to prepare preliminary summer guidelines for citizen fuel use so that the people of this Nation will have the opportunity to plan for their summer vacations and the businesses dependent on such tourists can make the necessary plans.

The amendment requires a response from the Administrator which, unfortunately, I and many of my colleagues in the House have apparently been unsuccessful in attempting to elicit from Mr. Simon through verbal and written requests. It has been some time since I joined with others in attempting to call Mr. Simon's attention to the serious problems already faced by the tourist industry and asking that he issue such guidelines so that those planning summer vacations can do so on some realistic basis.

The only response to these repeated requests has been a remark by Mr. Simon carried in a magazine interview the other day in which he responded to the same questions we have been posing by asserting that, "Summer is a long way off. . . ."

I submit it is only a short time off for the tourist industry of my State, as well as of the northeast and other areas, Mr. Speaker, and for the many thousands of citizens now planning their summer vacations. The time to act is now. Since the Congress has been unable to obtain the same courtesy from Mr. Simon in responding to our questions that he has given to the editors of national magazines, I intend to offer an amendment imposing a statutory responsibility on the Administrator to respond within 30 days.

The second amendment I will offer requires the Administrator to develop a plan to use the waste oil that is now indiscriminately disposed of by the U.S. Government itself in this time of energy shortage.

Facts and data developed through the diligence of my colleague Mr. VANIK, of Ohio, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, has established a shocking volume of oil that is now simply wasted which could be recycled and reused if the effort were made. Because the Government ought to take the lead itself in setting an example for the rest of the country in the conservation of energy, Mr. Speaker, I will offer an amendment to mandate development of a plan for sharply reducing this wastage and increase use of recycled oil.

The third amendment would reverse

the mistake this Congress made in creating year-round daylight saving time.

A new report just the other day of the death of a youngster in Maryland in the predawn hours again calls this problem to our attention in a tragic way, Mr. Speaker. The incidents of such tragedies in my own State of Florida have been well publicized. Those tragedies, and the lack of any significant saving of energy which have resulted, have generated a clear feeling by the people in my judgment that Congress should waste no time in ending this unfortunate provision promptly and without further delay.

For that reason, the amendment I offer affords, I believe, an immediate opportunity for such action.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some question raised about the germaneness of this third amendment. However, I would call the attention of the House to the language of the declaration of purpose in section 2(a) on page 14 of the committee bill, which declares that among the purposes of the act is to require "positive and effective action" in order to promote "the general welfare and the common defense security . . ."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that under this broad language and for the stated purposes of the act that the general welfare declaration permits an interpretation and a finding by the Congress that the enumerated and authorized activities established for the Federal Energy Administration, if executed within the framework of the year-round daylight saving time provision, would not serve the general welfare.

What is germane, Mr. Speaker, is the deaths of at least eight schoolchildren in Florida, many more injuries, many more deaths of youngsters in other parts of the country, and now of a Maryland youngster, and the prospect of more such tragedies until Congress acts in order to preserve the general welfare in this instance.

Therefore, I shall also offer this amendment at the appropriate time and urge an interpretation of germaneness based on the general welfare declaration and the clear fact that, in terms of these needless deaths of schoolchildren, that the general welfare is not being served by establishing a Federal Energy Administration that would be charged with carrying out the declared purposes of this act if required to do so in the framework of continued daylight saving, and in fact could not carry out the act's purposes in that framework.

The full text of the amendments follow:

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. GUNTER TO H.R. 11793 AS REPORTED

Page 19, line 23, add the following new subsection:

(11) Issue preliminary summer guidelines for citizen fuel use within 30 days of the enactment of this Act.

Page 19, line 23, strike out "(11)" and insert in lieu thereof "(12)".

Page 20, line 1, strike out "(12)" and insert in lieu thereof "(13)".

Page 23, line 21, add the following new subsection:

(k) The Administrator shall develop a program for the use of waste oil from all motor vehicle fleets of any government

agency one calendar year from the date of enactment of this Act.

Page 23, line 21, strike out "(k)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)".

Page 38, line 21, add the following new section:

SEC. 22.

a. The Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-182; (87 Stat. 707) is hereby repealed.

b. This section shall take effect at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the first Sunday which occurs after the enactment of this act.

NTEU WINS COURT CASE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, 1974, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit issued its decision in a suit brought by the National Treasury Employees Union seeking to overturn the President's 3-month postponement of the October 1, 1972, pay raise for Federal employees.

The court found that the President acted illegally in withholding the pay raise and that he acted with no regard for the mechanisms of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 mandated by Congress.

The unanimous decision in favor of NTEU is of extreme importance not only to the more than 2 million general schedule and military employees of the Federal Government who stand to recover the back pay, but also to the Nation as a whole. By holding the President subject to suit for failure to enforce an act of Congress and to a judicial decree that he should implement the law, the decision has a broad-range effect on the constitutional power of the Chief Executive.

Through this decision, the court has reaffirmed the congressional intent in enacting the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 which was to guarantee that Federal employees receive annual wage increase comparable to those received by private sector workers. The language of the act specifies a procedure by which the President can, in extreme economic conditions, delay or decrease Federal employees' compensation. However, the statute specifically requires that, to do so, the President must submit an "alternate" plan to Congress. President Nixon attempted to circumvent the Comparability Act by saying that he was not submitting an "alternate" plan, but rather was acting as required by the Economic Stabilization Act.

The court of appeals rejected the President's action in language which provides a vital delineation of the Chief Executive's power. The court, in essence, ruled that the President does not have the authority to be selective as to which acts of Congress he chooses to enforce. The court also ruled that the President, like any other citizen, is subject to suit and judicial decree.

NTEU is to be commended for pursuing this suit. The union's effort will insure to the benefit of all citizens.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I insert into the RECORD an editorial concerning the unprecedented ruling which appeared in the Washington Post on January 31, 1974:

EXECUTION OF THE LAWS

In legal as well as political terms, President Nixon's efforts to enlarge the power of the presidency are having just the opposite effect. Time after time, Mr. Nixon has claimed sweeping authority and autonomy—to withhold information from Congress and the courts, to wiretap without a warrant in domestic security cases, to dismember the Office of Economic Opportunity, to kill programs, to impound appropriated funds. And time after time, federal courts have rejected these vast and novel claims as inconsistent with the first principles of constitutional government. The thrust of such cases so far has been to sharpen and reduce the bounds of executive discretion and extend the reach of judicial review.

These issues arose in yet another context last week, when the U.S. Court of Appeals here ruled that the President, as well as lesser federal officials, may be sued for failure to perform duties mandated by law. This landmark decision came in a suit brought by the National Treasury Employees Union, which had charged that Mr. Nixon had violated a federal pay law by refusing either to grant a scheduled federal pay raise in October, 1972, or to submit an alternative plan on time. The union had asked the court for a *writ of mandamus* directing the President to pay the increases, and had argued that this was the only way to get relief because the chief executive was the only official authorized to carry out that particular law.

The Justice Department's arguments resembled those advanced in other controversies over the scope of executive power. The department asserted, first, that Congress had meant to give the President the flexibility to set the pay law aside; second, that the whole matter was "political" and outside the jurisdiction of the courts; and third, that the President could not be sued because that would violate his constitutional immunity and could cause "intolerable interference with the effective functioning of government."

The appellate court properly rejected that entire chain of argument. "To begin with," Judge Frank A. Kaufman wrote, "there is a serious question whether presidential actions inconsistent with congressional mandates constitute effective government." If issues of statutory interpretation are "political," the judge continued, "a President could render every legal issue 'political' by publicly expressing his opinion . . . before that issue reached the courts." To suggest, as the Justice Department did, that the only remedy in such cases is impeachment "resembles making available a nuclear bomb as the sole weapon to bring down a pheasant." After a careful review of laws and precedents, the court concluded that the pay statute had indeed been in effect in autumn 1972, and that Mr. Nixon, like any other federal officer assigned certain ministerial duties, could be ordered to carry out the law.

Thus another federal panel has ruled that the President may be held answerable through judicial processes for his stewardship of the laws. While advancing this basic principle of limited, accountable government, the court did temper its firmness with some deference. "In order to show the utmost respect to the office of the presidency," the court stopped short of ordering *mandamus* relief and instead suggested that the President "be given every opportunity to implement the law" or appeal the decision to the Supreme Court. This is a prudent course. It illustrates again that disputes over constitutional issues need not become full-blown constitutional tests. And it under-

February 19, 1974

scores the extent to which Mr. Nixon could minimize such confrontations by adhering to less extravagant doctrines of presidential power, and by accepting the traditional role of the judiciary as the arbiter of disputes between branches of government and between citizens and their elected governors.

THE NEED TO KEEP THE INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are a number of individuals, both within the Congress and outside of it, who are advocating the abolition of the House Committee on Internal Security.

Those who advocate this position advance the thesis that there are no real threats to our internal security and, since this is the case, there is no need for a congressional committee to concern itself with this matter.

There are others who state that, while there may be minor threats to the internal security, there is no danger of a "takeover" of our Government and, therefore, it is futile for the Congress to concern itself with subversive and potentially subversive groups.

In my view, this is a short-sighted analysis of the problem. In a letter to Representative RICHARD BOLLING, Prof. William A. Stannmeyer points out that:

The "no-takeover therefore no-problem" argument is a false disjunction; it is like saying, "not dead, therefore, perfectly healthy." Actually, every serious student of a free society's political health recognizes, if not blinded by ideological preconceptions, that there are degrees of danger to the polity, and that "takeover," like death, is only the most extreme. In America there have been para-military groups attacking the rights of minorities, like the Ku Klux Klan; estranged radicals who have used bombs and terror to harass the "system"—and crime syndicates spreading heroin addiction.

Professor Stannmeyer writes that:

Reasonable men may differ on how to deal with each of these problems. But what is unreasonable is to close one's eyes to them, to pretend that they do not exist. Yet this ostrich-like posture is just what the critics of the House Committee on Internal Security usually display . . . the Congress . . . should dismiss out of hand their petition to strip the nation's legislature of any systematic institutional method of discovering this reality.

At a time when radicals have engaged in murder and kidnap in California, when airplane hijackings and other acts of sabotage have become of concern to nations around the world, and when there are numerous serious threats to the national security and tranquillity from groups which advocate violence, it is essential that the Committee on Internal Security be preserved and enabled to continue its important work.

I wish to share with my colleagues the thoughtful letter of Prof. William A. Stannmeyer of the Georgetown University

Law Center, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

NORTHBROOK, ILL.,
January 30, 1974.

Hon. RICHARD BOLLING,
Chairman, Select Committee on Committees,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLLING: Under the rubric of "transfer of jurisdiction" your Select Committee presently entertains a proposal to abolish the House Committee on Internal Security.

As a law professor broadly conversant with the Committee's work and a serious student of both the variety of threats to domestic tranquillity and the problems of dealing therewith, I wish to protest this plan and to present a case for another course of action far more in keeping with the manifest desires of the American people.

I am aware that a number of law professors have submitted to the House a petition urging abolition of the Committee. While respecting their right to state their opinion, from personal acquaintance with some of them, I must state that in most cases this topic lies far outside the petitioners' teaching assignments and scholarly research. Indeed, just because their expertise lies elsewhere it is likely that few of the signers are any more qualified to be considered an expert on internal security problems than any other literate citizen. Yet the impression is given, perhaps because the opponents of the Committee are organized and the proponents are not, that only one argument can be made. The "phenomenon of transferred expertise"—a person expert in one thing is therefore expert in everything—became widespread a few years ago when movie stars and baby doctors began lecturing college audiences on foreign policy; but I am sure that the reflective members of your Select Committee realize that the merit of any case lies not in the prestige of the speaker but the power of the argument.

In the comments that follow, I wish to point out some fallacies in the case for abolition and to suggest some reasons why a better course would be the suggestion of Congressman Ichord for a new Committee with a well defined mandate and oversight functions.

ROMANTIC IGNORANCE OF HISTORY

Reading the statements of Mr. Drinan, some law professors, and other opponents of any measures to protect internal security, one has the uneasy feeling that if the issue were budget for a city fire department they would recommend its abolition because, walking through their home neighborhoods that morning, they could see no houses on fire.

It is a little frightening to hear otherwise respectable intellectuals airily dismiss the possibility of subversion when the twentieth century is replete with cases where democratic societies were harmed, rendered lawless, and even destroyed because of insufficient attention to internal security. The salient cases are Kerensky's Russia and the Weimar Republic in Germany.

One may agree with the statement of the leading Congressional foe of internal security legislation that "there is no cognizable threat of a communist takeover in this country," and yet remain distressed at his apparent historical amnesia not only of world history in his lifetime but even of events as recent as the last 10 years.

Part of his epistemological problem may be that threats are not recognizable to those who will not recognize them. But a greater failure is lack of logic; a selective choice of data and false generalization, namely, the willingness to lump all threats into one and decide that the one does not exist. A doctor could display this same style of thought if

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

he said, "We have eradicated malaria in the United States; therefore disease is no longer a problem in our country."

The "no-takeover-therefore-no-problem" argument is a false disjunction; it is like saying, "not dead, therefore perfectly healthy." Actually, every serious student of a free society's political health recognizes, if not blinded by ideological preconceptions, that there are degrees of danger to the polity, and that "takeover", like death, is only the most extreme. In America there have been para-military groups attacking the rights of minorities, like the Ku Klux Klan; estranged radicals who have used bombs and terror to harass "the system," like those who in 1970 destroyed the University of Wisconsin Math building, killing an innocent student, and those who bombed the New York offices of ITT on September 28, 1973; crime syndicates spreading heroin addiction, like the Mafia; extremist right-wing groups readying their illegal weapons, like the Minutemen; and possibly, despite the feeling of security by intellectuals walking through their home neighborhoods in the morning, a few persons in the sprawling federal bureaucracy who would use their sensitive positions in Defense, or State, or the Atomic Energy Commission, or wherever, to harm their own country.

The health of a free society is not measured solely by surface tranquillity. The illegal acts described in the prior paragraph require advance planning, organizational support, collective agreement. As the *Dennis* case held, society has a right to prevent the preliminaries to the "takeover," which harm society through its ultimate dissolution may be averted. Individual citizens and society's free institutions should enjoy the maximum of real tranquillity, secure because they have investigated, informed the public of, and legislated against threats in advance, while they are small. It is foolish to inflict, by ignorance and inaction, the suffering of having to repair the damage after the fact, when the victim cannot be restored to life or the victimized society readily protected against serious harms already set in motion.

Reasonable men may differ on how to deal with each of these problems. But what is unreasonable is to close one's eyes to them, to pretend that they do not exist. Yet this ostrich-like posture is just what the critics of the House Committee on Internal Security usually display. Until the critics begin to deal with historical and contemporary reality as it is, not as they wish it were by harking back wistfully to the pre-revolutionary Victorian era, your Committee and the Congress as a whole should dismiss out of hand their petition to strip the nation's legislature of any systematic institutional method of discovering this reality.

DISGUISED ABOLITION

In this period of public distrust of government, when on all sides people demand full disclosure and utter honesty in reaction to governmental secrecy, it is shocking that the Congress should seriously entertain a proposal to abolish the Committee on Internal Security through such a devious and secret stratagem as pretending to transfer its jurisdiction to the already-overworked Judiciary, without giving any clear mandate and insuring adequate budget, staff, permanent subcommittee status, a chairman committed to its function, etc.

The public will think that the opponents of Internal Security are afraid of a straight up-and-down vote on the continuation of the Committee. They are afraid to tell the people that the practical effect of this move will be to put the Committee out of existence. Where is the honesty in this tactic? Though some of your Select Committee will applaud the end result, their conduct will be just one more instance of the amoral maxim

that the end justifies the means. Let them no longer go before their constituents to complain that oil companies display too much secrecy or that Presidential aides are devious or that we need "full disclosure" in public affairs.

The hypocrisy manifested in the movement for disguised abolition shows itself yet another way. Many of the critics of the Committee make an economic argument: look at all the tax money we can save, they declare, by merging (or, a few are candid enough to say, abolishing) the Committee. This sudden discovery of the virtue of frugality is commendable, but its evenhanded application to other governmental spending issues would be more inspiring. By and large the opposite is the case: they tend to vote for every spending measure that has a wishful connection to the general welfare, to expand programs that have been utter failures, to create commissions and bureaus and agencies with no specific mandate beyond the direction to "do something" and no effective means of cost-accounting or productivity evaluation.

Again, reasonable men may differ on the merits of a given spending program. But it seems dishonest to build a consistent voting record supporting the expenditure of the taxpayers' money on every possible issue and then turn around and attack the House Internal Security Committee because it spends taxpayers' money. The real objection, though disguised under rhetoric about cost-effectiveness, is philosophical.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL AVENGER TO SELF-PROTECTION

A careful reading of the statements by those who would abolish the Committee on Internal Security (whether overtly by voting it out of existence or covertly by transferring its jurisdiction to an overworked Judiciary Committee unprepared, unfunded, unmanned, and possibly unwilling to do anything in this field) reveals one continuing pre-judgment: they declare that a free society is best preserved by doing little or nothing in its defense.

A few, like the outright revolutionaries of our epoch, simply want to make their own task easier. The fox is never happy when the farmer sets a large watchdog outside the hencoupe.

Most, like many academics who criticize the Committee, truly would be distressed if the hens were eaten by a fox; but never having ventured, in their work or their reading, outside the farmhouse, they think that foxes are extinct. Or perhaps they have mellowed. Obviously if there is such thing as a fox or if he is now tame, well-fed, and friendly, there is no reason to buy a watchdog.

And there are a few that believe the system of farming will be more idyllic under a policy of social laissez-faire, abolishing fences and watchdogs, letting hens, domestic animals, foxes, and the farmer's children all wander the woods in pursuit of self-fulfillment. Probably nothing will happen to them; if something does, well, that is the price one pays for a free society.

Attractive as may be such a theory, it utterly fails to deal with the real challenges to internal security, many of which because nominally "political" it deems beyond the reach of society's inhibitory laws or investigatory agencies. Thus we are told that "political opinions" and "free associations" are inhibited by HCIS's mere existence; that this one body has such impact. This is amazing, since the existence of the FBI and the State police did not prevent the bombings or inhibit the bombers alluded to above. But in any event, in a free society not everything "political" is permissible. There are "rules of the game," as Watergate so sharply reminds us; certain tactics in the pursuit of "political change" are legitimate and others illegitimate. It is simply captious to claim that any group or cause is legitimate and cannot be exposed just because its actions are

called "political" rather than, say subversive. KKK bombings of Black churches and SDS bombings of corporate offices are crimes, pure and simple, whatever their "political" veneer.

Though most libertarians are troubled by such crudities as bombing and assassination—and should be troubled by the "leaking" of State security secrets to foreign governments—they nonetheless attack any preventive actions by the authorities. Not only do they denounce infiltration of violence-prone groups or intelligence files on potential assassins, they decry even the most innocuous information-gathering function of the Committee, such as its occasional Reports on the causes of disruptive attacks on various institutions [see, e.g. Reports by HCIS, 93rd Congress, 1st Session, "Revolutionary Target: The American Penal System" (December 18, 1973)], designed to inform the American people and provide a basis for Congressional action. They don't *think* there are any hostile animals in the forest, and want to abolish any way of finding out.

Being absolutists, they cannot balance rights. Many of the people who object to studies on internal security object to electronic screening of passengers at airports. They forget that innocent passengers have rights not only to privacy but also to security. Indeed, the parallel is close: in every society, especially in an emotion-charged revolutionary era, there are those who would "hijack" or at least disable that society. Preventive measures are indeed burdensome, annoying, and at times interruptive of absolute privacy. But they are the small price one must pay to maintain essential freedoms.

In the limited space of a letter of this type, I cannot elaborate on all the fallacies the philosophical absolutists commit. I have attempted a more systematic exposition of these points in my testimony on the Constitutional Oath Support Act, H.R. 6241, which will be found in the Hearings before HCIS of April 11, 1973, Part I-A, p. 391-408. While there is no "last word" on complex matters of practical policy, I believe the arguments stated there are comprehensive and original; one may hope that fair-minded persons who sincerely want to hear both sides will consider them.

IMPROVING THE COMMITTEE

Many of the critics of the House Internal Security Committee insist on exorcising yesterday's demon. Whatever the merits or demerits of the defunct House Un-American Activities Committee, the sins of the ancestors should not be visited upon the descendants. The Internal Security Committee has taken a narrow mandate in a very controversial area and exercised its authority with decorum and responsibility. The main line of attack these days seems to be that the Committee has not done much, that its files are secret, etc. It should be obvious that if it had striven for quantity in its work instead of quality, the attackers would say it has done too much, that it harms reputations by not keeping its records secret, etc.

The fact is, even these charges are unfounded, as Congressman Ichord and others have pointed out (see *Congressional Record*, vol. 119, pt. 7, p. 9018 and following). And an equally telling fact is the high regard in which the Chairman, Mr. Ichord, is universally held. The period 1969-1974 was, at least in its earlier part, one of the most turbulent domestically in our history. In accepting direction of the Committee, Congressman Ichord took a thankless task that promised him no personal return except a headache. There is no reason why in future years the House leadership cannot appoint successors with the same qualities of hard-headed realism about domestic security problems coupled with personal discretion, detachment, and honor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Considering Mr. Ichord's experience and record of moderation in this sensitive field, it is gravely troubling that your Select Committee appears utterly to disregard his eminently sensible recommendation that the Internal Security Committee's mandate be expanded to such areas as all statutory crimes affecting national security, the general loyalty-suitability programs for federal employees, industrial and defense facilities security programs, and other directly cognate matters such as Congressional oversight of Federal investigative agencies dealing with internal security.

These are the tasks which the average citizen presumes his government performs for him. People I talk with are shocked when told that in a time of political assassination, prison riots, organized drug trade, worldwide intelligence-gathering by the Soviet Union on a scale that dwarfs the espionage efforts of all other nations combined, the United States cannot even exclude her sworn enemies from defense plants, insist on a simple oath of loyalty to the Constitution among federal employees, or—if the abolitionists have their way through this jurisdiction-transfer sleight of hand—even maintain a single Committee of its national parliament to investigate these matters full-time!

Such a move will be one more abdication of responsibility by the government. For the prime responsibility of government, as any political theorist knows, is to provide for the safety of the country's citizens from all enemies, foreign and domestic. Without this precondition, all the other welfare and education programs are meaningless. It is impossible to write a law dealing with the problem of domestic security when one knows nothing about that problem; yet, here we have a Select Committee of the Congress apparently ready to abolish, under the guise of reorganization, the one Committee that can give the problem the attention it deserves and thereby provide a sound factual basis for legislation. In the name of "efficiency" we are to act in ignorance.

Mr. Bolling, I write both as a law professor and as a private citizen. As a lawyer I am troubled that your Select Committee seems ready to adopt the fallacious romanticism of libertarian absolutists who think we can get something for nothing, viz., domestic tranquillity without working for it, liberty without the price of eternal vigilance. Lawyers know that in the real world the man who promises you something for nothing almost always plans a fraud. And the history of our real world in this century shows that free societies are not self-perpetuating through sheer momentum, but rather that they must develop continuing institutions to deal with the varieties of security threats as they develop.

As a private citizen I am outraged that the Congress may be on the brink of abolishing a standing Committee by subterfuge, a Committee that enjoys the strong support of a vast majority of the American people, despite sometimes ragged performance of its lineal ancestor and the intense controversiality of its mandated field. I challenge those inclined to kill the Internal Security Committee under the guise of transferring its jurisdiction to put the matter to the public first by announcing their intention through such forums as press conferences, floor speeches, and so on; to allow a few months for public opinion to develop; and then to have a straight up-or-down vote on the matter. Of course, such a stand-up-and-be-counted approach would be less traumatic if your Committee would endorse the sensible Ichord compromise, which would clarify the mandate and collect the disparate security functions where they belong under one Committee's investigative and oversight control.

February 19, 1974

But whatever you do, for God's sake do it above-board, openly, and honestly. When my little child began to put her hand in the cookie jar when she thought no one was looking, I insisted that she pretend Mommy and Daddy were right there, watching, and then ask herself whether she'd do something like this, which she claimed she didn't know was wrong. Similarly, I think some people in Congress have their hands in the cookie jar on this matter and I wonder why they're afraid to do it with the American people watching.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. STANMEYER,
Associate Professor of Law, Georgetown
University Law Center.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanian-Americans and Lithuanians throughout the world commemorated the 56th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. I am pleased to join in paying recognition to this event. Ironically, the only country in which Lithuanians were unable to celebrate this historical occasion was in Lithuania itself, because of the continuing subjugation and oppression by the Soviet Union.

For 22 years, from February 16, 1918, until June 15, 1940, the nation grew and prospered before it was overrun and engulfed by Communist forces during World War II. It is to the everlasting credit of the U.S. Government that we have steadfastly maintained a policy of nonrecognition of the forceful incorporation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia into the Soviet empire. The courageous people of the Baltic States are still risking their lives in their quest for freedom.

We applaud the great efforts of people of Lithuanian descent in the United States who have kept alive the cause of liberty since 1940 for their countrymen at home. Tyrants in world history have not permanently enslaved nations and I predict the day is not too far distant when Lithuania, as well as Latvia and Estonia, will again take their position in the world with freedom, independence, and self-government.

STATEMENT: U.S. ASSISTANCE TO THE ARABS, 1968-73

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have gathered certain information on U.S. assistance to Arab Nations from 1968-73—especially prior to the Yom Kippur war—which I would like to share with my colleagues. I am therefore in-

serting several tables detailing my findings together with a statement explaining those tables:

STATEMENT: U.S. ASSISTANCE TO THE ARABS, 1968-73

I. SUMMARY OF THE DATA

A. Introduction: United States foreign policy in the Middle East has not been what it appeared to be. As the figures that I am presenting to you today will show, the U.S. provided more assistance to the Arab arms buildup that preceded the October, 1973, Yom Kippur war than did the Russians, generally thought to be the principal Arab supporter.

Taking the 11 Arab countries that participated in some way in the Yom Kippur war (Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Syria, Iraq, Kuwait, Egypt, Algeria, and the Sudan), one finds that from 1968-73 (prior to the Yom Kippur war) total U.S. assistance to the Arabs was 2.4 times total Russian assistance to the Arabs over the same period.

B. Direct U.S. contributions to the Arab arms buildup—1968-73. Total direct contributions—\$1927 million (Table I).

1. U.S. arms supplies (see Table I).

From FY 1968-FY 1973, U.S. arms supplies to Arab countries totaled \$803 million. Included are figures for the Military Assistance and Security Supporting Assistance programs and figures for deliveries of arms sales.

2. U.S. bilateral economic aid to the Arabs (Table I).

From FY 1968-FY 1973, U.S. bilateral economic aid to the Arabs amount to \$868 million. This economic assistance came from AID programs, the Food for Peace program, Export-Import Bank loans, and other official loans.

3. U.S. share of multilateral aid to the Arabs (Table I).

Total multilateral aid to the Arabs from FY 1968-FY 1973 was \$914 million. Most of this aid came from the World Bank and the International Development Association (IDA) in which the U.S. share is 28%. Therefore, the U.S. share of multilateral aid to the Arabs was estimated to be \$256 million, or 28% of the total.

C. "Invisible U.S. foreign aid to Arab countries—Tax credits claimed by American oil companies on Arab oil royalties, 1968-1973 (see Table II)

1. Total tax credits claimed by U.S. oil companies on royalties to Arab oil producers from 1968-73 are estimated to have been \$7,025 billion.

This \$7 billion estimate is probably low. First, Arab oil production has jumped sharply since 1968. Thus, 56%, as the estimated part of total foreign tax credits claimed by American oil companies that go to Arab oil producers, may well be low. Second, both oil prices and the take per barrel by Arab governments have jumped considerably since 1971. Therefore, foreign tax credits claimed by American oil companies for Arab royalties in 1972 and 1973 should be substantially higher than the 1971 level. However, the 1971 level of tax credits was used to estimate "invisible foreign aid" to the Arabs for 1972 and 1973.

I.C. 2. Question: Are U.S. tax credits for Arab oil royalties "invisible foreign aid" or simply part of a higher price per barrel which the U.S. is willing to pay for Arab oil?

Response: The U.S. system of dollar-for-dollar tax credits for royalties paid to Arab governments has enabled American oil companies to continue high levels of investment in the Arab oil states. This investment has led to higher levels of production and, with greater reliance by the West on Middle East oil, has greatly increased Arab oil revenues.

A different U.S. tax policy would have en-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

couraged more development of domestic resources and would have averted increased dependence on imported oil.

In fact, it is probable that the United States encouraged these massive investments in Arab oil countries by helping the Arabs write appropriate tax laws. (See quotation at end of statement entitled, "United States Government Role in Establishing Invisible Foreign Aid.")

These U.S. tax credits for royalties paid to Arab governments divert dollars from the U.S. Treasury to Arab treasuries through the American oil companies. There is no incentive for American firms to resist Arab royalty increases. In fact, an increase in royalties may help shield from U.S. taxes other foreign operations of the companies, such as refining and shipping—for years to come.

D. Russian assistance to Arab Nations from 1968-73 (see Tables III and V)

1. *Russian arms supplies to Arabs (see Table III).*

From 1968-73, Russian arms supplies to the Arabs were estimated to have been \$2.6 billion, not including the Soviet re-supply of Arab armies during and after the Yom Kippur war.

This \$2.6 billion estimate is probably low, for it uses the annual average of arms imports from 1968-71 as a base for estimating total Russian arms imports from 1968-73. However, Russian arms supplies increased substantially in 1972 and 1973 as the Arabs prepared for the October, 1973, war.

2. *Russian economic aid to the Arabs (see Table V).*

Russian economic aid to the Arabs from 1968-73 came to \$1.1 billion. Among the four largest recipients (1968-72) were Egypt, Syria, and Iraq, the three major Arab belligerents in the October, 1973, war.

3. *Total U.S. assistance to the Arabs compared to total Russian assistance to the Arabs (see Summary Table).*

Total U.S. assistance to the Arabs, 1968-73, was \$8.95 billion. Total Russian assistance over the same period was \$3.7 billion. Thus, total U.S. assistance to the Arabs was 2.4 times total Russian assistance.

E. U.S. Economic aid to the Soviet Union, 1972-73.

1. The figure of total U.S. assistance to the Arabs of \$8.95 billion does not even include \$1.1 billion in various forms of economic aid which the U.S. has provided to the Soviet Union over the last two years:

(a) \$316 million in Export-Import Bank loans with associated private financing and

(b) \$750 million in Commodity Credit Corporation loans over 3 years (July, 1972-July, 1975).

I. E. 2. The Soviet economy has been starved for decades in order to build up a vast military machine. Therefore, this \$1.1 billion in U.S. economic aid enabled the Soviets to avoid shifting resources from military expenditures to agriculture and industrial development and thus enabled the Soviets to give more aid to the Arabs than would otherwise have been possible.

II. Proposed actions

In general, we must rethink American foreign policy, especially in the Middle East. We must weigh the effects of our actions toward other countries such as the Soviet Union, on our Middle East policies.

We must revise our tax policies, as they affect oil.

A. First, I am calling for an International Conference to Limit Military Assistance and Arms Sales, especially to the Middle East. I have introduced a resolution in the House under the terms of which the United States would call such a Conference and would use all its influence to secure agreement by arms exporters to a substantial reduction of arms shipments, arms aid, and military training to the Middle East.

Why is such action needed?

Because the oil revenues pouring into Arab countries are creating an explosive situation. European nations, such as Britain and France, are begging the Arabs to barter arms for oil. Russia is always willing to sell arms. Thus, the Middle East arms race will accelerate.

The higher the price of oil, the more valuable are the untapped oil supplies, and the more insecure these Arab countries will become. Conflict may erupt among the Arab countries themselves.

Finally, another Middle East conflict may ignite World War III.

What pressure can we bring to bear? We can withhold further economic concessions to the Soviet Union—grain sales, loans for truck factories, supply of computer technology, etc.—until the Soviets are willing to help us calm tensions in the world, especially in the Middle East.

B. The second thing we must do is to change our tax policies in regard to oil to stop encouraging U.S. investment capital to go abroad.

I have just introduced a bill to eliminate U.S. tax credits for oil royalties paid by American firms to foreign governments, thus ending the major source of our assistance to the Arabs and providing an incentive for oil companies to develop domestic energy resources.

In October, 1973 I introduced a resolution calling for long-term solutions to our energy problem by increased domestic exploration and development of alternative energy sources.

U.S. GOVERNMENT ROLE IN ESTABLISHING "INVISIBLE FOREIGN AID"

"In fact when Saudi Arabia initiated an income tax they received considerable help in drafting of the tax legislation from the American government so that the tax could be used by American firms as tax credits, thus initially transferring tax revenue from the U.S. Treasury to the Saudi Arabian government rather than increasing the total tax burden of the oil companies."

From *United States Taxation and the Incentive to Develop Foreign Primary Energy Resources*, Glenn P. Watkins, Harvard University, prepared for Ford Foundation Energy Project, July, 1973; pp. 35-36 (citing J. E. Hartshorn, *Politics and World Oil Economics*, Praeger, 1967, pp. 198-200).

SUMMARY TABLE—COMPARISON OF U.S. ASSISTANCE AND RUSSIAN ASSISTANCE TO ARAB NATIONS, 1968-73

A. U.S. ASSISTANCE TO ARAB NATIONS

1. U.S. arms supplies, economic aid, and U.S. share of multilateral aid (28%), FY 1968-FY 1973: (Table I), \$1927 million.

2. U.S. "invisible foreign aid" to Arabs—tax credits for Arab royalties (Table II), \$7025 million.

Total U.S. assistance to Arabs, \$8952 million.

B. SOVIET ASSISTANCE TO ARAB NATIONS

1. Soviet arms supplies—not including Soviet arms resupply during and after Yom Kippur war (Table III), \$2603 million.

2. Soviet economic aid—with estimated figure for 1973 (Table V), \$1104 million.

Total Soviet assistance to Arabs, \$3707 million.

C. COMPARISON OF U.S. AND SOVIET ASSISTANCE TO ARABS—1968-73

U.S. assistance to Arabs equals \$8952 million equals 2.4.

Soviet aid to Arabs equals \$3707 million.

Thus, total U.S. assistance to Arabs (1968-73) was 2.4 times total Russian assistance to the Arabs over the same period.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 19, 1974

TABLE I.—U.S. ARMS SUPPLIES, U.S. ECONOMIC AID, AND MULTILATERAL AID TO 11 ARAB NATIONS, FISCAL YEARS 1968-73

[Figures in millions of dollars]

Country	U.S. arms	U.S. economic aid	U.S. share of multilateral aid	Total U.S. direct assistance	Country	U.S. arms	U.S. economic aid	U.S. share of multilateral aid	Total U.S. direct assistance
Jordan	\$370.5	\$73.8	\$12.3	\$456.6	Kuwait	\$1.2	0	\$0.5	\$1.7
Saudi Arabia	302.7	25.4	1.3	329.4	Egypt	.7	\$104.6	36.3	141.6
Libya	65.2	4.3	1.2	70.7	Algeria	.1	42.4	14.7	57.2
Morocco	39.4	315.3	70.4	425.1	Sudan	.1	26.8	17.4	44.3
Tunisia	17.7	272.5	51.5	341.7	Total	803.1	867.6	256.0	1,926.7
Syria	3.7	1.0	11.8	16.5					
Iraq	1.8	1.5	38.6	41.9					

¹ Multilateral aid figures are from fiscal years 1968-72 with figures for the World Bank/IDA through fiscal year 1973. Iran is not included in these figures because although it is a Moslem State it is a non-Arab State and did not participate in the recent Mideast conflict. It should be noted, however, that Iran has maintained a hard-line policy on oil prices and supply. Lebanon is not included as it has not been a participant in the most recent conflicts.

Sources: 1. U.S. arms supplies: (a) "U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants," July 1, 1945-June 30, 1972; AID publication (May, 1973); for security supporting assistance and military assistance (MAP) funds, fiscal years 1968-72. (b) "Military Assistance and Foreign Military Sales Facts," May 1973, Department of Defense; for fiscal years 1968-72 deliveries of government-to-government cash and credit arms sales: pp. 21-22. (c) Congressional Liaison, Department of Defense; for commercial

TABLE II—ESTIMATE OF FOREIGN TAX CREDITS CLAIMED BY U.S. OIL COMPANIES FOR ARAB OIL ROYALTIES TO LIBYA, IRAQ, KUWAIT, AND TO SAUDI ARABIA (1968-1973)

SOURCE: "Taxation of Income of Multinational Corporations: The Case of the U.S. Petroleum Industry," Glenn P. Jenkins and Brian D. Wright, Harvard University, January, 1974, an unpublished manuscript.

1. Foreign tax credits claimed by U.S. oil companies for oil royalties to four Arab countries in 1968

Libya, \$262.37 million.

Iraq, \$14.97 million.

Kuwait, \$182.01 million.

Saudi Arabia, \$443.54 million.

Total, \$902.89 million.

\$903 million is 56% of total foreign tax credits claimed in 1968 by U.S. oil companies (\$1609.36 million).

2. Estimate of foreign tax credits claimed by U.S. oil companies for royalties to four Arab countries above—1968-1973

a. take 1968 figure of \$0.903 billion.

b. take 56% of total foreign tax credits claimed by U.S. oil companies, 1969-1971 (total figures from IRS).

c. use 1971 figure for 1972-1973.

thus total . . .

1968, \$0.903 billion, 56% of \$1.609.

1969, \$0.996 billion, (56% of \$1.779).

1970, \$1.019 billion, (56% of \$1.820).

1971, \$1.369 billion, (56% of \$2.444).

1972, \$1.369 billion.

1973, \$1.369 billion.

Total, \$7.025 billion.

TAX CREDITS AS FOREIGN AID

1. U.S. tax credits for royalties paid to Arab governments have enabled American oil companies to continue high levels of investment in the Arab oil states. This investment has led to higher levels of production and, with greater reliance by the West on Middle East oil, has greatly increased Arab oil revenues.

A different U.S. tax policy would have encouraged more development of domestic resources and would have averted increased dependence on imported oil.

2. In fact, it is probable that the United States encouraged these massive investments in Arab oil countries by helping the Arabs write appropriate tax laws.

3. These U.S. tax credits for royalties paid to Arab governments divert dollars from the U.S. Treasury to Arab treasuries through American oil companies. There is no incentive for American firms to resist Arab royalty increases, as an increase in royalties may help shield from U.S. taxes the companies' other foreign operations.

TABLE III—RUSSIAN ARMS SUPPLIES TO ARAB NATIONS 1968-73

Source: U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency report, "The International Transfer of Conventional Arms," (A Report

to the Congress Pursuant to Section 302 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-352)), September, 1973.

A. How figure of total Russian arms supplies to Arab nations, 1968-73, was arrived at.

1. From Table III of ACDA report, obtained proportion of total arms imports (1961-71) by each country that were supplied by Russia:

Note: Figures in millions of dollars.

Egypt, \$2,080 Russian arms out of \$2,197 total arms equals 90 percent.

Syria, \$388 Russian arms out of \$443 total arms equals 88 percent.

Iraq, \$632 Russian arms out of \$760 total arms equals 83 percent.

Libya, \$60 Russian arms out of \$210 total arms equals 29 percent.

Morocco, \$10 Russian arms out of total arms of \$125 equals 8 percent.

Algeria, \$286 Russian arms out of \$311 total arms equals 92 percent.

Sudan, \$63 Russian arms out of \$136 total arms equals 46 percent.

Jordan, \$0 Russian arms out of \$289 total arms.

Saudi Arabia, \$0 Russian arms out of \$322 total arms.

Tunisia, \$0 Russian arms out of \$46 total arms.

Kuwait, \$0 Russian arms out of \$46 total arms.

2. From Table II in ACDA report, took total arms imports from 1968-71 and divided by 4 to obtain annual average of arms imports by country.

Then multiplied country annual averages by 6 to estimate total arms imports to each country for 1968-73 from all suppliers.

Finally, multiplied estimated total arms imports (1968-73) for each country by proportion of total arms flows to each country from 1961-71 that were Russian to obtain estimated total Russian arms flows (1968-73) to Arab countries.

Egypt, \$1,679 million in Russian arms, 1968-73.

Iraq, \$375 million in Russian arms, 1968-73.

Syria, \$324 million in Russian arms, 1968-73.

Libya, \$77 million in Russian arms, 1968-73.

Algeria, \$94 million in Russian arms, 1968-73.

Morocco, \$4 million in Russian arms, 1968-73.

Sudan, \$50 million in Russian arms, 1968-73.

Total, \$2,603 million in Russian arms, 1968-73.

TABLE IV—U.S. ARMS SUPPLIES, U.S. ECONOMIC AID, AND MULTILATERAL AID TO ISRAEL, FY 1968-FY 1973

U.S. arms supplies, \$1352.6 million.

U.S. economic aid, \$420.5 million.

arms sales deliveries, fiscal years 1968-73 and fiscal year 1973 foreign military sales (FMS) deliveries. (d) "Senate Hearings on Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations, fiscal year 1974," pt. II, pp. 1333-1386; for military assistance program (MAP) funds and security supporting assistance funds for fiscal year 1973. 2. U.S. economic aid: (a) "U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants, July 1, 1945-June 30, 1972," cited in 1(a) above; for all figures through fiscal year 1972. (b) "Senate Hearings . . . fiscal year 1974," cited in 1(b) above; for economic aid for fiscal year 1973. 3. Multilateral aid (U.S. share): (a) "U.S. Overseas Loans and grants, . . .," cited in 1(a) above; pp. 177-196, for fiscal year 1968-72. (b) "World Bank/IDA annual report, 1973" for World Bank/IDA fiscal year 1973 figures. (c) "Senate Hearings . . . fiscal year 1974," cited in 1(d) above, pt. 2 p. 1435 for U.S. share in World Bank/IDA.

U.S. share of multilateral aid, \$34.4 million. Total, \$1807.5 million. P.S. total multilateral aid to Israel, (\$122.7 million).

Sources: same as those cited on Table I.

TABLE V—SOVIET ECONOMIC AID TO ARAB COUNTRIES, 1968-1973

Algeria, \$189 million. Morocco, \$44 million. Sudan, \$42 million. Egypt, \$196 million. Iraq, \$365 million. Syria, \$84 million. Kuwait, \$0. Libya, \$0. Saudi Arabia, \$0. Jordan, \$0. Tunisia, \$0. Total ('68-'72), \$920 million. Estimated 1973 Soviet economic aid, \$184 million. Total Soviet economic aid to Arabs, 1968-73, \$1104 million. Source: "Communist States and Developing Countries: Aid and Trade in 1972," State Department, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Table 2.

THE CLAMOR TO DRIVE NIXON OUT

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all experiencing trying political times these days. We are hearing the term impeachment from both local and national press sources, and from the folks back home. The Chicago Tribune ran, on February 7, an article by Nick Thimmesch which I think my colleagues may find of interest. I submit that article for inclusion in the RECORD.

THE CLAMOR TO DRIVE NIXON OUT

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—The air crackles here with demands for impeachment, and sometimes I hear other cries underneath and behind that urging—cries like finish him off, run him out, hang him.

Richard Nixon's enemies, and they are legion, sniff blood. The other day, Father

*1973 Soviet economic aid to Arabs was estimated by dividing total Soviet economic aid to Arabs, 1968-72 by five to obtain annual average. This annual average (\$184 million) was added to the 1968-72 total to obtain total Russian economic aid to Arabs, 1968-73.

Robert Drinan, Society of Jesus, and Democratic congressman from Massachusetts, announced that he got a telegram reading, "If you can't impeach him, exorcise him"—thus a constituent suggests that the President is possessed of Satan.

The clamor for the End of Richard Nixon is on bathroom walls and bumper stickers. The crudest cartoons and marked-up photographs imaginable splash the walls of congressional offices. In a very real sense, we are in a time comparable to the worst hours of the Joe McCarthy era, for reason is diminished and passion flows freely. Then [when I was a college boy] and now, the hope must be that the reasonable will win out.

The difference between that hysterical period and now is that one man, then, a pirate on horseback, Joe McCarthy, flailed against the world, and now a world of opponents flails against one man, Richard Nixon. Where have all civil libertarians gone?

Well, the American Civil Liberties Union [which we all need] mounted and now conducts a huge campaign to oust Nixon, cluttering the mails with repetitive urgings and items like "Impeachment Speakers' Kit." The mighty AFL-CIO pours money into the impeachment effort. Other liberal groups mount campaigns like World War II generals.

Indeed, the press, which has pursued the Watergate story relentlessly [as it should have] now finds itself a victim of its own momentum; and for many in the press there is a vested interest in getting Nixon's head, to say nothing of his entrails.

Interestingly enough, the body which must first consider impeachment, the House of Representatives, isn't so noisy about all this. On the Senate side, some members refuse to discuss it on the logical grounds that they might have to vote on it one day.

Others have spoken out, and thus foreclosed impartiality. Sen. Edward Kennedy [D., Mass.] declared if Nixon denied access to Presidential tapes and Congress didn't impeach him, "It would be Chile, really, without the bloodshed." Sen. George McGovern [D., S.D.] declared: "Nixon should be impeached in order to save the country." Sen. Edmund Muskie [D., Me.] urged the House to impeach because "What the President has done threatens to destroy our system." Sen. Birch Bayh [D., Ind.], supposedly judicial, vowed that if Congress can't legislate itself a new Watergate prosecutor then Congress would have no alternative but impeachment.

To the aforementioned Father Drinan is often flamboyant, his resolution of impeachment [July 31, 1973] amounted to a plausible case for impeachment on a political basis without any evidence of crimes being necessary. Thus far, there is no evidence of Nixon committing any crimes. [Father Drinan, by the way, says he is available for weddings, baptisms, impeachments, but not for exorcisms.]

Anyway, when the yelling and rhetoric get too one-sided, reliable, classic liberals often stand up to defend the accused.

Murray Kempton, a long-time, respected sheriff over liberal behavior, recently observed on a CBS Spectrum commentary that "we seem to have entered one of those periods when virtuous men feel driven toward quite vicious devices." Kempton, while sharing the impulse to impeach Nixon, deplored the character of the ACLU campaign and its stampede-the-Congress tactic. He wondered whom Congress was moving too slowly for—"some mob of the moral betters of the accused"—and noted that "polluting is a very dubious remedy for pollution."

Columnist Milton Viorst, likewise no Nixon fan, wrote that the Nixon impeachment crisis is "also exposing some of the worst characteristics of some of his persistent enemies." Viorst went on "I wish the ACLU would go back to worrying about civil liberties. I wish the National Committee for an Effective Congress would refocus its attention to the effectiveness of Congress. I'd be happy if the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Americans for Democratic Action thought a little more about democracy.

"As for Common Cause, I have the feeling that its cause—the impeachment of Richard M. Nixon—has become so common that it's humdrum. I admired the organization more when it was more selective in its goals." Impeachment is "an act of religious devotion," for these liberal organizations, Viorst concluded.

That is quite an army lined up against Nixon. Three Watergate grand juries, the composition of each unfriendly to Nixon. A House Judiciary Committee chairman, Peter Rodino [D., N.J.], who accepted a whopping \$31,000 campaign contribution from AFL-CIO unions, which are fierce to impeach Nixon, and who must answer to a largely anti-Nixon constituency back in Newark.

The Senate Watergate committee, which is hardly leakproof, and is loaded with money and lawyers. And the special prosecutor's office, far better on confidentiality, but also loaded with money and legal talent.

If it all gets too lopsided against the President, people living in the more rational sections of the U.S.A. might react against this overkill clamor we have here, and Nixon might wind up in a briar patch.

DISASTER BRINGS HAPPY ENDING FOR VETERAN

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1974, the Arkansas Democrat carried a story about a disabled Vietnam veteran that I would like to share with my colleagues. While the circumstances which prompted the article by Mr. Jerry Dean, staff writer for the Democrat, brought havoc to the community of Conway, Ark., the article singles out that some good may sometimes come from tragedy. Following a tornado that struck his mobile home on November 22, 1973, the future looked bleak for veteran Gary Speer even though his wife and 3-month-old baby were spared. Through the cooperative efforts of the Little Rock office of the Veterans' Administration and the Arkansas National Alliance for Business, Gary Speer and his family are,

I am happy to say, on the road back—building for the future. I think it is noteworthy that some 3 years ago, President Nixon recognized the need to enlist the support of the private sector of our economy through the Jobs for Veterans National Committee to assist the returning Vietnam veteran. This effort has resulted in thousands upon thousands of Vietnam veterans throughout the country realizing the American dream of getting good jobs and building for the future. I want to take this opportunity to thank the President of the United States for his foresight, Mr. James Oates,

Chairman of the President's Jobs for Veterans Committee, and Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the thousands of dedicated employees that comprise these organizations for the splendid job they are doing as partners to assist America's veterans. The article is as follows:

ILL WIND BLOWS SOME GOOD FOR VET—DESTRUCTION OF MOBILE HOME LEADS TO JOB

(By Jerry Dean)

An extremely ill wind blew some good fortune in the direction of 26-year-old Gary Speer of Conway recently, shortly after a tornado destroyed his mobile home on Route 4 near that city.

Speer, a disabled veteran, occupied the mobile home with his wife and three-month old child. When the twister struck Nov. 22, Speer said, he was just completing the paperwork that would have allowed him to begin a workstudy program at a Little Rock electronics school.

"I heard the wind rising outside, but I didn't think much about it at first," Speer said. "Then it began coming in gusts, and I went to the window to look out. Couldn't see a thing."

SUMMONED WIFE

Speer said he called his wife to bring the Speers' child and told them to lie down with him in the middle of the floor.

"The next thing we knew, we were tossed in the air," Speer said. He said the 55-foot mobile home landed on its top about 30 feet from where its foundation blocks were still intact.

The only injuries sustained by the Speers were a few bruises. The child was uninjured.

ALTERS PLANS

Speer, a Nebraska native, said he counted his family fortunate that they had relatives and friends in Conway to assist them in recovering after their trailer was demolished. An insurance policy quickly replaced the mobile home, but the disruption drastically altered Speer's plans.

He said he felt he had to have a full-time job to help recover financially from the near-disaster, and so he wrote the Veterans Administration in Little Rock to tell them his situation had changed and that he wanted to postpone his VA-funded 25-month training program until he had regained his footing.

A VA counselor talked with Speer Dec. 13, and learning that Speer was looking for a good job, referred Speer's situation to Charles Parsley, acting state director for the National Alliance of Businessmen.

Parsley is a Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. official "on loan" to the alliance for one year to help administer the state's part of a nationwide program which helps veterans and disadvantaged persons obtain jobs.

Parsley contacted about 16 of the 130 member businesses in Arkansas before learning that his own firm had a vacancy in Little Rock for an employee with Speer's experience.

Speer said he was anxious to have the job, and the battery of tests he took showed him to have a high clerical aptitude.

He started work for Southwestern Bell as a service results clerk shortly before Christmas. After only one week of on-the-job training, Speer's supervisor, Cedric Williams, said that Speer had "shown an excellent degree of accuracy" in his work.

Speer now handles tabulations of telephone service operations for the Pine Bluff area.

At the time Speer wrote to the VA, that agency was participating in a random 20 per cent sampling of Vietnam War veterans who were questioned regarding any problems they might be having in employment, education and other areas.

GIVEN PRECEDENCE

A VA spokesman said that Speer was not one of those responding to the questionnaire, but that his situation had a sense of immediacy that gave it some precedence.

Speer's future now seems far brighter than it did a month ago. He and his family are re-established in a new mobile home near Conway; he has a good job and a car pool in which to commute; and he plans soon to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

reapply for VA benefits that will allow him to begin taking night courses in psychology at State College of Arkansas.

Parsley said that after Speer had been a Bell employee about six months, he would become eligible to participate in a program in which that firm pays a portion of its employees' tuition for study in job-related fields. Speer also is eligible for VA benefits.

JOBS LOCATED

Parsley said that the VA, NAB and state and federal employment agencies had helped locate jobs for 970 disadvantaged persons and 567 Vietnam War veterans at Arkansas NAB-member companies since July 1973.

Parsley said that the goal was now to help 1,600 disadvantaged job seekers, 400 veterans and 40 disabled veterans to find jobs by June 30.

The NAB works with the federal Labor Department and the state Employment Security Division in locating jobs. Jim Lloyd of Little Rock is the state ESD-NAB coordinator. He is assisted by ESD Russellville employee Harold Thomas and state JOBS program coordinator Pete Riegler of the ESD Manpower Training Office at Little Rock.

Veterans seeking job-locating assistance in Arkansas may contact the VA at 378-5971 in Little Rock or the state Veterans Service Office at 378-5680. Others seeking employment assistance should call their local state Employment Security Division office.

Employers wishing to hire veterans or disadvantaged persons may contact the NAB office at 374-3755.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK QUESTIONED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the recent financial support by the U.S. Eximbank of the Soviet Union, many who have not questioned this institution previously are beginning to. I am one who has raised questions about this institution which is subsidized by the American taxpayer. A recent column by Thomas A. Lane entitled "Eximbank Bleeds U.S. Taxpayer" raises many interesting points and should be given consideration by all concerned with the present policies of the U.S. Eximbank.

At this point I include in the RECORD this thought-provoking column:

[From Public Affairs, Jan. 2, 1974]

EXIMBANK BLEEDS U.S. TAXPAYER

(By Thomas A. Lane)

Recent reports indicate that the U.S. Export-Import Bank, which was established in the depression year of 1934 to promote exports to the recently-recognized Soviet Union and which now is doing a world-wide business, made direct loans of \$2.4 billion in fiscal year 1973. The bank financed U.S. exports for such projects as an Algerian gas facility and a Russian truck factory, charging 6% interest even when the prime rate was up to 10%. The U.S. exporter simply goes to his own bank which then arranges the Eximbank loan to the foreign buyer. Eximbank grants a credit to the commercial bank which pays the U.S. exporter. Thus the U.S. exporter is promptly paid in dollars, the U.S. bank is cut in on the deal, the foreign importer gets a subsidized interest rate; so all these participants in the transaction are happy with the arrangement.

Who pays the interest subsidy? The U.S.

taxpayer does through Treasury grants to the Eximbank. If the buyer defaults, who takes the loss? Again, it is the taxpayer who takes the loss.

How would you like to be in a business in which the government paid you in full for all sales and accepted the responsibility for collecting all accounts due? Would you be happy if in addition the government offered your customers a rate of interest 4% below the going rate? Wouldn't you think that a government which did this was pretty stupid?

Why is the prime rate at 10%? When Congress is depreciating the dollar at 5% per year, you have to charge 10% to make five. If a buyer borrows dollars at 6% for five years, and in that period the dollar has depreciated 25%, the buyer has only paid 1% per year for his loan.

In this system, the U.S. exporter has nothing to lose by sales to bad credit risks. The U.S. commercial bank has nothing to lose. The inclination therefore under our profit system is to sell products to anyone who will sign a loan agreement which you can run by the Eximbank. Irresponsibility is rewarded. A recent counsel for the bank has charged bank directors with approving bad loans under pressures from President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger.

It is an old story. Public money is nobody's money. As a sense of civic responsibility declines, the public money is used to private advantage. But more than that, the reckless profligacy of the Congress in providing funds for such purposes undermines the sense of civic virtue in our government.

The whole concept of the Eximbank is destructive of our political order. It places in government an authority which government cannot administer prudently and should not have. It is against the public interest to charge public officials with evaluating the risks of international trade. It is the proper responsibility of the corporations engaged in this trade to make the judgment, to charge suitable rates of interest according to the risk involved, and to negotiate the terms of payment.

In this operation, the inside operators of international trade have arranged a bonanza for themselves at the expense of the defenseless taxpayer. Whatever the depression purpose may have been in the thirties, the bank has long outlived its usefulness. Let our private bankers set up their own Export-Import Bank and charge an adequate interest rate to cover the risks involved. Let them depend on their own judgment of who is entitled to credit.

Congress should close the bank forthwith, putting industry on notice that there will be no loans nor guarantees after fiscal year 1974.

WHERE, BUT IN AMERICA!

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 17, I had the privilege of speaking at the dedication of the Frank E. McKinney Southside Boys' Club in Indianapolis.

Few persons have accomplished more in a life span of 69 years—a life accomplishment that could only occur in America.

Frank M. McHale, another great Hoosier and a lifetime friend of Frank McKinney wrote the following tribute to him and I want to take this opportunity to share it:

February 19, 1974

FRANK E. MCKINNEY—1904-74

Frank E. McKinney—a great Hoosier. His achievements were many. He was:

A bank messenger who became Chairman of the Board, Chief Executive Officer and principal stockholder of Indiana's largest bank;

A high school drop-out who became Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Indiana University;

A precinct Committeeman who rose to be National Chairman of the Democratic Party; A Hoosier who was appointed Ambassador to Spain;

A Catholic layman who was made a Knight of Malta;

A buck private who became a Colonel; A sandlot baseball player who became the owner of the Pittsburgh Pirates;

A Southside lad who was named the Outstanding Citizen of Indianapolis in 1968;

A recipient of the Boys' Club Horatio Alger Award;

An advisor and consultant to Governors and Presidents;

A devoted husband to a wonderful wife and a concerned parent;

All these he accomplished without losing the common touch. Indianapolis, all of Indiana and the Nation will miss him.

STUDENT BACKS NIXON

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Prairie Statement, a student publication of the Prairie State College in Chicago Heights, Illinois, printed a very effective commentary by Miss Mary Cummings, a reporter of this publication, in its January 17 issue.

Her article is an interesting summary of the effects of the controversy revolving around the President.

I am pleased to insert her article at this time:

STUDENT BACKS NIXON

(By Mary Cummings)

"Impeach Nixon." "How did he ever get into office, anyway?" "He has got to be the worst president we've ever had."

I have been hearing comments like this for a long time now and I'm not going to "grin and bear it" any more. I think the time has come for someone to speak for Nixon, instead of against him. I have chosen to do that. I imagine by now a lot of people have quit reading this just for the fact that I am not speaking against Nixon and they don't want to hear anything that doesn't coincide with their own opinion. I hope the rest of you hear me out.

First off, I want to make one thing perfectly clear (sorry, but I couldn't resist). I am not a Republican. Nor am I a Democrat. I vote for the man, not the party.

Why are we against President Nixon? Is it because you are a Democrat, do or die and are against any and all Republican presidents? If this is the case, you are the type of person that would no doubt vote for Hitler if he were running on the Democrat ticket. Are you against him because everybody else seems to be and, God forbid, if you are going to be considered "different"? I personally believe that this is true for the majority of the people. I have noticed some people being passive while listening to a "cut-down Nixon" discussion. How strange it is that that person will then speak up and throw in a single remark that they know will get a laugh or two. But, then, some people will do anything for attention.

Or are you against Nixon because of the whole Watergate mess? Because you believe he is "lying" and does "know all"? Do you know if he is lying for a fact? Can you be sure that he knew about the taping going on? This taping business has been going on ever since tape recorders were invented. That was in the newspapers many years ago. Why is it just now being played up? Could it be from hard feelings because a Republican is in office?

Now, about the question of him possibly not knowing that taping was going on. You think "how could the president not know about something like this" and "how could it be kept a secret without him finding out?" There is an analogy to this, though unrelated, still it proves the point somewhat. Have you ever had a surprise party? You did, you say? And was it a surprise? It was? Well, how could you possibly have not known, when under your own roof it was being planned? Or have you ever gotten presents and had no idea what they were 'till you opened them? Ah ha, but even though they were in the same house, and plans and secrets were going on? What I'm trying to get across to you is that just because this was going on right under his nose, he still might not have known because it was kept so secret; same as your surprise party was.

Because I happen to stand up for Nixon (while most of you have sat down) does not mean I condone this kind of behavior. Not at all. I believe if he is guilty he should be punished for it. However, I don't believe he should be constantly ridiculed for it. I don't think that is fair for any human being, no matter what the crime is, because by then the guilty would already know he had done wrong, and harping on it wouldn't help any.

Those of you who make me the angriest are those who voted for Nixon; were 100 per cent for him, but as soon as he gets in trouble you desert him when he needs your support the most. With this sort of attitude, I'd really hate having you for a friend and I'm sure most everyone else would, too. If you were a true friend, you wouldn't desert me if I were in deep trouble. That would be the time in my life I'd need you more than any other time in my life. I would need your sympathy, kind words, support and help. You would be the kind of "friend" I could easily do without.

One more thing and then I've spoken my piece. Everybody makes mistakes. Every person you see has made mistakes in his lifetime. I admit I have, and I'll be the first to admit this, too. We're only human. President Nixon is only human. He isn't a god or super-human like most of you seem to think. He is a human being, a person, just like you and me who has made mistakes, but can't do anything about them because they are all in the past. We don't dwell on past mistakes, we couldn't do anything about it, anyway. Whatever happens to Nixon, let him be able to forget too. Let him have peace of mind like we do. He isn't the first President who has made terrible mistakes, if he has made them at all, nor will he, unfortunately, be the last.

Until people start to care for their country again, and look up to and support the President no matter what party he is from, will a change ever be made. I hope a change is coming in politics and government, and I only hope I'm still around to see them made.

COMMODORE JOHN BARRY BRIDGE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Commodoore John Barry Bridge over the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Delaware River, which was completed in January of this year, honors the memory of one of America's great naval heroes.

Nearly 4 miles in length, it is the largest cantilever bridge in the United States and the third largest in the world.

The bridge was dedicated on February 1, 1974. At this time I enter into the RECORD a summary of the speech made on that occasion by John M. Elliott, a member of the Delaware River Port Authority.

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER JOHN M. ELLIOTT

This Bridge appropriately dedicates the Gateway of the Delaware Valley to Commodore John Barry, the father of the American Navy. John Barry, who shared his home county of Wexford Ireland with President John F. Kennedy, was a large and deserving spirit whose achievements are appropriately memorialized today. John Barry was a contemporary man—a Renaissance man of broad ideas and ideals. Two hundred years ago, Barry's ships of war sailed beneath today's bridge to defeat the enemies of our young nation. John Barry's diplomatic skills sailed to France with Franklin to protect the Alliance which sealed the seas against Cornwallis at Yorktown and won the American Revolution. John Barry's egalitarian spirit encouraged Thomas Jefferson's first draft of the Constitution which courageously sought to abolish slavery 80 years before a bloody civil war seared our national spirit. None less than the great American naval historian, Samuel Eliot Morrison reminds us that John Barry's vision led the Pennsylvania Legislature to ratify the United States Constitution on its last day of session.

Today the dedication of this great bridge commemorates John Barry's transcendent spirit. He was a man of war who sought peace. A son of both great states touched by this bridge, John Barry fought on land at Trenton; stored his naval provisions at Chester; and protected the Continental Congress by clearing the British from the mouth of the Delaware River.

Today if Commodore Barry stood at the apex of this bridge, he would easily see Philadelphia, Chester, Camden and the state of Delaware. In doing so, he would view the refineries, the ships, the great industrial complex that was developed and worked by millions of Americans. No doubt, John Barry would especially appreciate the strong dreams and dignified labors of thousands of his fellow Irish-Americans who brought their courage, stability, and vigor to all aspects of our American way of life. John Barry was a man of vision, a man of strength, a man of peace—and as one of our own—we take a special pride in this considerable tribute to his humanity.

SHIFTING THE BLAME

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am becoming increasingly tired of the advertising campaigns by which the giant oil firms are seeking to blame the current gasoline crisis on the failure of the Government to act in time to avert it.

This is a hollow claim at best. Under our free enterprise system, the companies supplying the needs of the Nation in any one field are presumed to be capable and responsible enough to keep their service functioning.

This has not been the case with the oil firms. They have not provided for the

contingencies which their businesses faced. They have allowed this country, which has been so beneficent to them in the way of tax advantages, to fall into a very critical situation.

No amount of advertised alibies can get around this fact. The effort to blame the Government by claiming that warnings were sounded and that Washington failed to act upon them is unjust. I believe, the public will be unpersuaded by such shenanigans.

The so-called warnings may have been issued but, they were discreetly soft-pedaled amidst all kinds of merchandising devices to increase gasoline sales at the service stations and to publicly convince that all was well.

In addition, the petroleum companies, as we now have learned, have been among the largest contributors to the Nixon political campaigns and to others over the last many years. If they were dissatisfied with what the Government was doing, or not doing, about a matter of such importance to them and to all of us, then why were they so anxious to retain in office those they now charge with responsibility for the energy crisis?

The answer, of course, is obvious. It is an attempt to pass the buck. And, I am sure, nobody is going to be fooled by an industry which has failed so badly on its obligation to a nation which has depended upon it and given it every opportunity and advantage to meet what should have been its primary responsibility—that of keeping the fuel flowing.

A 1953 WARNING ON THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, we are facing an energy crisis. Contrary to what we may read and hear, this energy crisis did not come as a surprise to some people. If we had listened to warnings given years ago, we could have avoided our present situation. One of those individuals who warned us against overdependence on overseas sources of petroleum was a Houston constituent of mine, Mr. J. R. Butler, in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in 1953, a warning given over 20 years ago. I include a copy of this prophetic testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF J. R. BUTLER

Although most of the time prior to World War II my activity was chiefly concerned with routine production operations, my work during the time just before World War II was directly connected with the planning and engineering behind the new mechanisms just coming into use in this country for the recovery of oil and gas, so that during World War II I was in a position to experience the tremendous responsibilities placed upon the oil producing companies and accepted by them, which resulted in there being made available for our war effort the products used in normal business activities and for normal uses in our war machine. I also witnessed our oil technology meet the necessity to develop rapidly processes to make available to our armed services the ingredients for explosives

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 19, 1974

and rubber and other products which we simply did not have and which we could nowhere else obtain during the early stages of that war.

If this tremendous effort made by the oil industry during the last war and its vital importance to the national welfare are understood, it should be obvious why this national resource can never be allowed to stagnate to the point where it cannot meet any similar demand which might be placed upon it in the future during a similar fight for our life.

I have seen the statistics concerning the volume of crude petroleum available to the world from the Near East Fields. They have over twice the amount of our domestic proven reserves immediately available in the ground. These reserves can be produced much under the cost of what they can be produced for in the United States. Knowing that the natural inclination of many would be to put these products on the market for our use, I see how dependent we might be on Near East and other foreign reserves for our economic existence plus the dependence we have on it in time of war. The Kremlin in plotting the destruction of this country would no doubt encourage greater use of this alien oil in the United States. If this should become a common practice and we become dependent upon it, it would then be a simple matter to deprive us of these reserves. It would then be too late, and the creation of any number of agencies, having any conceivable arrangement of the alphabet for a name, and having any number of billion dollars to spend, and being run by the highest quality of brains in the country, derived from the oil industry or otherwise, will not replace that oil until many years have passed.

I think it is the responsibility of the elected representatives of the people to find an answer to this problem. There can be no merit to saving our reserves for use in case of an emergency because reserves saved are never available. Only oil in commerce is of any value for our defense, for only through the sale of oil can we continue the necessary development."

MR. LARRY BROUSSARD SPEAKS OUT ON: "MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN"

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars conduct a "Voice of Democracy Contest." The contest theme for this year was: "My Responsibility as a Citizen." Over 500,000 students from over 7,000 secondary schools participated in this year's 27th annual "Voice of Democracy" program. The competition for the five national scholarships is consequently very fierce.

This year Mr. Larry Broussard, one of my young constituents, who attends Catholic High School in New Iberia, La. had the distinction of giving the winning speech for the State of Louisiana. And he will come to Washington in March, with the other State winners, to compete for one of the national scholarships.

At a time when the viability of our political process is under a barrage of critique, I think we could all do well to reflect on the ideas presented by Mr. Broussard in his speech: "My Responsibility as a Citizen." Mr. Speaker, I therefore, insert this speech in the RECORD at this time:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

"When we speak of patriotism, we generally think of soldiers carrying our flag through gunfire to destroy our enemies. But there are other kinds of patriotism. I think a man or woman who is willing to give time and energy for the betterment of our democratic system is a patriot!"

By these words, attorney Ralph Richards expands the concept of allegiance to country. To him, true citizenship is returning something to a country which gives so much. Steadfast service is patriotism.

All good citizens know that when they have rights granted by our Constitution, they also have equal responsibilities. Rights always carry parallel responsibilities.

Perhaps the greatest responsibility of any good citizen is to inform himself concerning the rights, liberties, and duties given him by the Constitution. He should understand the meaning of "individual liberty" as defined by our Founding Fathers. He should understand that these truly great men established a constitutionally limited power.

A basic principle of our Constitution is that our government is to be limited in its power and duties—limited in its control over the liberties of the people. It was the intent of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution that the rights of citizens should be secure, and the Federal Government was given "just powers" by consent of the governed. "Just powers" are the powers that the Government should "justly" have because they are given to the Government by the people—by its citizens.

All of us need to understand what the Constitution says about the preservation of rights. It is one's responsibility to understand the intent of the framing Constitutional Convention—to understand this great document as it was explained by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay in a series of essays known as the *Federalist Papers*.

The Government created by the Constitution was a Republic. In this form of government, power rests with the Nation's voters and is exercised by representatives elected by the voters and responsible to them. Nearly all adults are eligible to vote in the United States. Having a "voice" in one's government is what we call a democracy.

Individual liberties and rights are cherished in our country, but these are balanced by our responsibilities. In return for rights and privileges of citizenship, we, as young citizens, have certain duties to perform; moreover, we have a responsibility to prepare ourselves for duties which will be expected of us when we reach maturity.

One of our duties is education: we have to take our studies seriously and apply ourselves to the best of our abilities. Another duty is finance: when we become adults, we will have to pay taxes for the support of our National, State, and local governments. We, therefore, have a duty to study accounts of how public money is spent. This is a phase of economics one should understand so that he will be prepared to support sound programs and vice versa.

This "two-way partnership" idea fits into citizenship in our home, our school, church, local community, State, and Nation. It is our responsibility to live up to the duties, as well as the rights, of a citizen.

ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Alexander Solzhenitsyn is an inspiration to all of us who believe people should be free

to speak their minds and express their opinions.

Mr. Solzhenitsyn has been expelled from the Soviet Union because the Government of that country does not dare to let people say what they believe. The leaders of the Russian people are afraid of freedom and they do not know how to deal with a person who refuses not to be free.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn deserves our admiration and applause and we, as a people should do everything we can to make sure he does not suffer any more harassment.

Mr. Solzhenitsyn must now decide where he will live. If he chooses to reside in the United States or to visit this country, I believe we should permit him to enter without delay.

As the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship and International Law, I have asked Attorney General William Saxbe to process any application for entry into this country as quickly as possible. At this time I enter into the RECORD my letter to the Attorney General:

FEBRUARY 13, 1974.

Hon. WILLIAM B. SAXBE,
Attorney General, Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The press has reported today that Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn has been forcibly exiled from the Soviet Union and is presently in West Germany.

Mr. Solzhenitsyn, a Nobel prize winner, has been the object of severe persecution and harassment by the Soviet Government for expressing his beliefs about the actions of that Government.

In the event Mr. Solzhenitsyn applies for conditional entry to the United States under the provisions of section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, I request that your office consider this request as expeditiously as possible.

I believe that the circumstances surrounding Mr. Solzhenitsyn's situation bring him within the purview and intent of this section of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to offer entry into the United States to persons who have been forced to depart from a Communist country "because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion."

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JOSHUA EILBERG, Chairman.

PUBLIC'S OPINION OF CONGRESS DECLINES TO 69-21 PERCENT NEGATIVE

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1974, the Washington Post ran Harris study poll results on the effectiveness of the President and the Congress in handling various issues facing the country. The results indicate the public opinion; and I think my colleagues, and the leadership in this body, in particular, will find the results of this poll interesting. I would like to submit the text for public in the RECORD:

THE HARRIS SURVEY: PUBLIC'S OPINION OF CONGRESS DECLINES TO 69-21 PERCENT NEGATIVE

(By Louis Harris)

The public's rating of Congress fell to 69 to 21 per cent negative in January, the lowest recorded by the Harris Survey. This is lower than the over-all job rating for President Nixon, also at its lowest point, 68 to 30 per cent negative.

Between Jan. 18 and 22, a cross section of 1,594 households across the country was asked:

"How do you rate the job Congress is doing—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

[In percent]

	January 1974	February 1973
Positive (good-excellent)	21	38
Negative (only fair-poor)	69	45
Not sure	10	17

People were also asked:

"Now let me ask you some specific questions about Congress. How would you rate the job Congress has done on (read list)—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

[In percent]

	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Handling the Watergate case	19	72	9
Keeping the economy healthy	13	80	7
Handling impeachment proceedings against President Nixon	11	71	18
Handling relations with President Nixon	11	79	10
Inspiring confidence in government	10	82	8
Handling the energy shortage	10	82	8
Keeping spending under control	10	83	7
Controlling inflation	6	88	6

Earlier in January, the Harris Survey had tested public opinion on the President's handling of the same issues. Here is how Congress and the President compare:

[In percent]

	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Over-all job rating:			
Nixon	30	68	2
Congress	21	69	10
Handling Watergate case:			
Nixon	13	82	5
Congress	19	72	9
Keeping economy healthy:			
Nixon	19	73	3
Congress	13	80	7
Inspiring confidence in Government:			
Nixon	17	78	5
Congress	10	82	8
Handling energy shortage:			
Nixon	22	74	4
Congress	10	82	8
Keeping spending under control:			
Nixon	21	74	5
Congress	10	83	7
Controlling inflation:			
Nixon	12	86	2
Congress	6	88	6
Handling relations with (Congress/ Nixon):			
Nixon	18	77	5
Congress	11	79	10

The man in charge of the energy situation, William E. Simon, was also rated by the public:

"How would you rate the job done by William E. Simon, the new energy chief—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

Total

Public

Positive (good-excellent)	26%
Negative (only fair-poor)	35
Not sure	39

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL DAY FOR HUMILIATION, FASTING, AND PRAYER

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution to proclaim April 30, 1974, as a "National Day for Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer." An identical resolution, initiated by the senior Senator from Oregon, the Honorable MARK HATFIELD, was unanimously passed by a voice vote in the Senate last December.

The proposal is modeled after similar action taken by Abraham Lincoln in 1863—a year in which the Nation was badly torn apart by civil war. Even though today we are not at war, the mood of the country is not unlike that of 1863. Faith in the leadership of the country continues to deteriorate and the Nation lacks the spiritual foundation that would restore its vision and purpose.

President Lincoln had a profound sense of the sovereignty of God. He knew how the Nation stood accountable to God's judgment. In the midst of the Civil War, the Senate requested and Lincoln responded to resolutions setting aside a day for national humiliation, fasting, and prayer.

One such occasion was on April 30, 1863, 3 months after the Emancipation Proclamation, and 3 months before the Battle of Gettysburg. Seeing the effects of a Nation torn apart, President Lincoln did not appeal to any pretentious image of national self-righteousness; rather he called the Nation to repentance. He believed that only through the acknowledgement of our corporate guilt and confession of national sins could the country regain its national purpose and unity. Lincoln recognized that though the Nation had proposed, "we have forgotten God." Because the Nation had begun to believe that it had flourished through its own superior wisdom and virtue, Lincoln stated:

It behooves us . . . to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and for forgiveness.

Today, many say we have lost a sense of national purpose, that the country is "sick." There is a growing loss of faith in the leadership of the Nation. We tend to put our country beyond the reach of God's judgment and would rather believe that we merit God's blessing than admit that we stand under His judgment and in need of His forgiveness. But however difficult it is to admit our sin, the evidence of it is all around us, in the personal dilemmas of our lives and in the crises that afflict our Nation. Our refusal to acknowledge our dependence and need for a power beyond ourselves has severely damaged our national soul. I believe that only a national confession of corporate guilt can save us from the worship of our own finite power and the tragedies that this worship creates—we are in need of repentance.

That is why I am introducing a congressional resolution calling for a "Na-

tional Day of Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer," incorporating much of the original wording of President Lincoln's resolution. On that day, our government and the other institutions of our society would all cease business as usual so that we all would be free to consider actions appropriate to a time that would symbolize national repentance.

There is hope for a land and a people who have the capacity to recognize their sins and their faults, and turn from them. In so doing, we recognize that past events and present conditions cannot be rationalized or justified; rather they must be repented of, so a whole new way can be sought. This is how individuals and how our land can seek authentic renewal and transformation.

Despite national troubles, like Merrill Lynch, I am bullish on America. I believe 1974 can be a great year of accomplishment on a host of issues—if we can heal our spirits. So it is with hope that I commend to my colleagues in the House this resolution calling for a "Day of Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer."

HAROLD DUNBAR COOLEY

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the distinguished dean of the North Carolina delegation, the Honorable L. H. FOUNTAIN, and other colleagues in mourning the death in January of former Congressman Harold Dunbar Cooley.

My earliest recollection of political activity was at the age of 9 when Mr. Cooley was 1 of 6 candidates in the Democratic primary for the seat from North Carolina's Fourth Congressional District, the seat I am now privileged to hold.

That was in 1934, and I recall Mr. Cooley's campaign visits to my home county of Chatham and the support he had from my father and my father's friends. In that campaign, the saying went, "Don't you worry, don't you fret, Harold D. Cooley will get there yet."

And get to Congress he did—for 32 years, half of which he served as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. His was a distinguished career, and his service to agriculture is especially well remembered and appreciated by his many friends in North Carolina and elsewhere.

In paying tribute to this man whose service in this body spanned the middle third of the 20th century, I realize my personal debts to him.

He more than any other person inspired in me an early and abiding interest in politics and public service. It was my privilege to vote for him more times than I have voted for any other candidate.

Mr. Cooley was especially helpful to me this time last year, when I arrived in Washington, in answering my many questions and, most of all, in letting me stay with him until I found an apartment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

His death at the age of 76 caused in me and many others a deep sense of loss, yet also one of gratitude for him many years of dedicated service. At his funeral in Nashville, the sanctuary of the church was filled. Many others stood outside.

Those there remembered Harold Cooley's service to agriculture, to the Fourth District, to North Carolina, to the United States, and the world.

After the funeral, my office contacted a number of Mr. Cooley's friends, and they have graciously provided some eloquent tributes which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Bailey Williamson, tobacco farmer of Route 1, Knightdale, said:

As a young boy, I remember the hard fight Harold D. Cooley put up to become a public servant. As a Member of Congress for 32 years, he never quit fighting for the Democratic Party, the farmer, and all causes that were best for his congressional district, his state and this nation.

James A. Shepard, Raleigh realtor, said:

What I remember most about him was his loyalty to the Democratic Party, regardless of his circumstances, regardless of his opposition, regardless of what it meant to him personally. If a person was a Democratic candidate, that was all Harold Cooley needed to know. He worked for that candidate, and unfortunately we don't have many Harold Cooley types around today.

Jonathan Daniels, editor emeritus of the Raleigh News and Observer, said:

It is difficult to believe that Harold Cooley is dead. Despite his long service in the Congress, he kept the air and appearance of youthfulness all his days. But those whom he served need to remember now the long years in which he steadily tended the best interests of agriculture in America.

He was active and useful in other fields, but he saw the welfare of the farmer as the foundation of the welfare of the nation. So he contributed much to the happiness and prosperity of us all.

North Carolina Commissioner of Agriculture James A. Graham termed Mr. Cooley "the father and protector of the tobacco farmers in North Carolina," pointing out that he served in Congress in "the formative years of the tobacco program which has meant so much to the tobacco industry and is still felt today. This has been proven to be the best and most long-lasting farm program developed by the Congress."

B. C. Mangum, North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation president, Raleigh, termed Mr. Cooley:

A great agricultural leader and champion of the family-sized farm. Over the years he was responsible for keeping a sound tobacco program which meant so much not only to farmers in North Carolina but also to the total tobacco industry. He was one of my dearest friends.

Fred Bond, general manager of the Flue-Cured Tobacco Cooperative Stabilization Corp., Raleigh, said:

Everyone who knew Congressman Cooley respected him for his ability, leadership and basic knowledge of the whole spectrum of government operations. He possessed a unique capacity to quickly analyze issues confronting governmental committees under his chairmanship.

We owe him a great debt, as under his leadership and guidance there have come agricultural policy and legislation which have

provided the people of this nation with food and fiber—the basic necessities of life. He spent his entire adult life creating, building and maintaining agricultural programs which have made living in this great country the envy of people the world over.

Raleigh Mayor Clarence Lightner said:

I am convinced that Harold Cooley contributed more to the farmers and agricultural interests in general than any congressman I have known. We shall all be grateful for the fine service he rendered his country and for his friendship. We all suffer for a great loss.

Dr. John Caldwell, chancellor of North Carolina State University, Raleigh, praised Mr. Cooley for being "not only a sincere and intelligent champion of the agricultural enterprise and of the land-grant colleges and universities, but a most effective champion. My visits with him always found a good listener and an action-oriented congressman. He got the job done promptly and intelligently."

William S. "Bill" Humphries, former farm editor of the News and Observer and now food and agriculture news editor at North Carolina State University, wrote that Mr. Cooley "was dedicated to the cause of agriculture" and served this cause with distinction in his many years in Congress.

Mr. Humphries added:

He was one of the first members of the so-called "farm bloc" to realize that farmers, with their own political clout dwindling, needed to seek broad-based support from other groups. For this reason, he voted for many worthwhile non-farm programs in which he had no direct interest, and in return received widespread backing for agricultural legislation that he considered vital.

He believed that farm prosperity was essential to national prosperity and that the chief beneficiaries of government farm programs were not farmers but consumers, because they were assured of abundant supplies of food, feed and fiber at reasonable prices.

Now, at the time of his death, agriculture appears to be on the verge of its Golden Age. If that proves to be the case, a great deal of the credit rightfully belongs to a man who undeniably was one of the greatest farm lawmakers of this or any age—Harold D. Cooley.

Jack Riley, now of Raleigh, was editor of Graphic in Nashville, while Mr. Cooley was a young attorney there, and campaigned with him in his bid for Congress. He said:

Subsequently, I enjoyed the privilege of a close, personal friendship which I shall forever cherish.

Today we scarcely appreciate the despair of tobacco farmers of the early Thirties. Harold Cooley did and he set about to help. In Congress he established for himself a position from which to bolster the tobacco economy. The resultant price stabilization meant millions and millions to the agricultural South and the entire nation. Even when stabilization did not show a net profit, its benefits outweighed many-fold its minimal cost to government.

Had Harold Cooley accomplished nothing more, the tobacco program would stand as a monument to his service. However, he did accomplish much more: his support assured myriad programs such as soil conservation, crop insurance, cotton and peanut support, farm and forest research, farm credit, etc.

In private life, Harold Cooley was generous to a fault with family and friends. Those privileged to know him intimately will

February 19, 1974

treasure his memory as an outgoing extrovert and an irrepressible optimist.

Weldon Denny of Raleigh, former State ASCS executive director, said:

North Carolina and the nation have lost a great statesman in the death of Harold Cooley. No individual that I have known contributed any more to the welfare of American agriculture than did Harold Cooley. I deeply admired his brilliance, his open mind, and the concern he had for people in all walks of life.

John Winters, Raleigh businessman and current candidate for the North Carolina State Senate, called Mr. Cooley "a dedicated and fine public servant who took his responsibilities very seriously. He was always concerned about the forgotten man, and this was the farmer in our primarily agricultural state. He will be sorely missed, but appreciation will continue to be felt for his influence and his service in Washington."

Wiley J. Latham, retired, of Raleigh, noted Mr. Cooley's chairmanship of the House Agriculture Committee and praised him as "a very loyal Democratic Party man. He made many contributions to the progress of the Democratic Party, and he believed in the principles of his party and lived up to its standards."

Melvin H. Hearn, former North Carolina Farmers Home Administration director now with the North Carolina Department of Agriculture, recalled Mr. Cooley's "compassion and boundless energy which he spent without hesitation to help other people."

Mr. Hearn added:

During the 32 years he served in Congress, he was the prime architect of the most successful farm programs which this country ever developed. Farmers and non-farmers benefited from these programs. Congressman Cooley helped develop, even though many, unfortunately, were not aware that they were beneficiaries of his talents and service. His distinguished record of leadership will serve as a beacon to those that follow who would labor to improve our world.

John C. Williamson of Raleigh, former president of the Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers Association, said:

With the death of Harold Cooley, the people involved in agriculture lost a most true friend and advocate of a strong, healthy agricultural economy.

He often spoke of agriculture as the "mother of the arts," and for 32 years in Congress he worked to keep those who produce the food and fiber of this country represented and with a strong voice in Congress.

Closer home, the tobacco farmers of the South had a champion in Harold Cooley for he was always ready to do battle with the many people who attacked the excellent tobacco programs that were, in many cases, authored by him and have worked successfully over the years.

Clifton Daniel, native of Zebulon and now Washington correspondent and associate editor of the New York Times, said:

I always thought of Harold Cooley as my congressman, although I never had an opportunity to vote for him, and I moved out of his district 37 years ago.

There were several reasons for my attachment to him. He was the first congressman I ever met. He was young enough for us to be friends.

He came from a small town down the road from mine. I thought of my town as home

long after I left it, and Harold Cooley was the congressman from my home district.

Later I lived for 17 years in the 17th Congressional District in New York, and it had some good congressmen, but I still thought of Harold Cooley as my congressman. If I had ever wanted a favor in Washington, I suppose I would have gone to him. He would have obliged me.

Lawson B. Knott, Jr., a native of Wendell, has lived in the Washington area since Mr. Cooley's first term "when agricultural America was in deep trouble." Mr. Knott, former administrator of the General Services Administration, commented that Mr. Cooley "concentrated his great talent and energy in the improvement of this vital part of the American economy."

Mr. Knott added:

His dedication and grasp of the needs of agricultural America gained for him the respect and support of his colleagues in the Congress, and his legislative contributions in this field of endeavor stand as a memorial to him.

James B. Hunt, Jr., North Carolina's Lieutenant Governor, said:

Harold Cooley was one of North Carolina's greatest congressmen and one of our country's greatest agricultural leaders. He did more than anyone in Congress since the Depression to build a strong rural economy in America.

For years, he was the protector and defender of our tobacco farmers and the way of life that has meant so much to all North Carolinians. We will miss him greatly.

Horace Godfrey, of Washington, former head of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service both in North Carolina and nationally called Mr. Cooley:

The best friend that the farmers in North Carolina and throughout the United States have ever had. Through the passage of successful farm programs, which provided abundant supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices, he was also a friend of all the citizens of the United States and even the world.

He served unselfishly and we have all lived better, particularly farmers, as a result of his dedication and untiring efforts. He often said, "Agriculture is the backbone of this Nation, and I intend to keep it strong."

ELIMINATE CONSTITUTIONAL DISCRIMINATION FROM THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a proposed constitutional amendment which I have introduced to make all U.S. citizens eligible to hold the Office of President has generated considerable debate because of the successes of our distinguished Secretary of State, but there are obviously many thousands of Americans to whom it would also apply. As the following article by the distinguished columnist Clayton Fritchey aptly points out, the amendment would also eliminate any question as to whether a child born abroad to U.S. citizen parents might be disqualified from becoming President.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The article which appeared in the February 16 edition of the New York Post follows:

PRESIDENT KISSINGER?
(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—Why should the "most admired" man in America be barred from becoming President of the United States?

The question concerns Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who in a recent Gallup Poll surpassed everybody else in the regard of his fellow Americans. It is the first time any Cabinet officer, or few others for that matter, has ever topped the President in the history of the particular poll.

The question also concerns the U.S. Constitution, specifically Article II, Section 1. It requires the President to be a "natural-born" American citizen, which Kissinger isn't. He is a naturalized U.S. citizen, but he was born in Germany of foreign parentage.

Finally, it is a question that has long troubled Rep. Bingham (D-N.Y.), who has stirred up interest in the matter by introducing a constitutional amendment that would repeal the prohibitory article. Bingham was animated by general considerations rather than the particular case of Kissinger, but it is the latter which has provoked attention on Capitol Hill.

In this connection, Bingham remarked that while his amendment "does not amount to an endorsement of Henry Kissinger as President," he would have to say "in all candor that Kissinger's achievements as Secretary of State have highlighted the constitutional problem."

Naturalized citizens may serve in every other position in the government. In fact, as Bingham points out, "there would be great resentment if it were proposed that a naturalized citizen be barred from serving in the Cabinet or on the Supreme Court or in Congress." It makes no sense, he argues, that the Presidency should be any different.

Why, he asks, "should a citizen of Dr. Kissinger's talents be barred from the Presidency? More importantly, why should the American people be denied the right to elect a Kissinger to any office?" The same, he adds, could equally well be said of "many other distinguished naturalized Americans."

Bingham, regarded as one of the most thoughtful members of the House, is the son of a former Senator, the late Hiram Bingham of Connecticut. Back in 1928, the elder Bingham was mentioned for the Republican vice-presidential nomination, and this raised the question of his eligibility, for he had been born in Hawaii before the annexation.

Actually, the full meaning of Article II, Section 1 has long been debated inconclusively. There is no doubt that it bars naturalized citizens from the White House, but does it also rule out those who, by some quirk, happen to be born abroad of American citizens?

This troublesome question is still unsettled. It was last raised prominently when George Romney, the former Governor of Michigan, was momentarily the front-runner for the 1968 GOP presidential nomination. Romney was born in Mexico of American parents, but didn't live in the U.S. until he was 7 years old.

The question seemed so significant at the time that the New York Law Journal commissioned a special study by Prof. Isidor Blum, an authority on constitutional law. Citing legal precedents back to the 14th century, Blum concluded that the framers of the Constitution meant "natural-born" to mean "native-born." Hence, all those born outside the U.S. were ineligible to be President.

The prevailing opinion in Washington, however, was voiced by the late Edward S. Corwin, Princeton's famous authority on the Presidency, who said:

"Should the American people ever choose

for President a person born abroad of American parents, it is highly improbable that any other constitutional agency would venture to challenge their decision."

Perhaps so, but why not eliminate the uncertainty by adopting Bingham's amendment? His legislation, incidentally, was prompted by a Bronx constituent who has seven children, all of whom qualified as "natural-born" except one. The parents, both U.S. citizens, were unhappy that even one of their offspring was not eligible to be President.

It happened that the child was born in Ireland while the father was serving overseas in the U.S. armed forces. Rep. Bingham came to the rescue with a special bill making the youngster a full native-born citizen. It was passed by both the House and Senate and signed by the President.

"It is the hallmark of a great nation," Bingham said, "that it can take the time and trouble to vindicate the rights and feelings of one small child."

EDWARD SIMONE WINNER OF NEW YORK STATE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the voice of Democracy Scholarship program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary is conducted annually in our Nation's secondary schools during the fall term. It is a national broadcast script-writing program which provides an opportunity for 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students in our public, private, and parochial schools to think, write, and speak up for freedom and democracy.

This year, a young man from my hometown of Saratoga Spring, N.Y., Mr. Edward Simone, won the State title in this annual contest. Edward, the son of Mr. and Mrs. John A. Simone, is a senior at St. Peter's High School, Saratoga Springs, N.Y. In winning the State title, Edward is now eligible to compete in the national competition with winners from 51 other States and territories.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Edward Simone's outstanding speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I am pleased to call his appropriate remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY EDWARD SIMONE

If we wish to know what it means to be a citizen, we must first explore what citizenship is, and how it applies to our society.

From the earliest of times man has sought bonds with his fellow man. The cooperative groups initiated by prehistoric peoples were the first examples of organized societies with requirements for membership. With the later advent of language and religion men and women of similar tongues and beliefs pacted to form tribes. With the advancement of civilization these loose unions grew in size and number, varying according to speech, religious practices, and political philosophies. It is this form of unification that first used the concept known to us as citizenship.

A citizen, by definition, is a member. Just as a club member promises to uphold and strengthen his organization's code, a citizen pledges his support for the ideals of his nation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The pledge of support is the oath one takes to become a citizen. In swearing to abide by the principles of his country of allegiance, he is given all the privileges entitled a citizen by that country's laws. He also takes up the responsibility of keeping his word in the eyes of his fellow citizens.

In the United States, citizenship has always had a special meaning; this is because America was founded on a unique precedent of freedom and equal justice for everyone. There are those whose dream is to become an American citizen, many make unbelievable sacrifices to fulfill that dream, others were born into America's bounty; but all citizens, whether natural or naturalized, have a responsibility to the nation that gives them so much.

Because we live in a Democracy, each man has his own life to lead. He works for himself, and for the betterment of his family and dependents. He does not work solely for the state, yet he benefits the state when he works for himself. Thus he has a responsibility to make the most of his abilities, not only for his good, but for the good of others.

Though it could be said that, in the United States, each citizen in his own nation, whenever a man advances himself by some discovery or achievement, he also moves our nation onward. Likewise, when a number of citizens in our nation suffer, the entire Union suffers, and those that are able must work to pull those in trouble out of that suffering. These are only a few of the responsibilities we have toward each other as citizens of the United States.

Citizens must have leaders; those outstanding members of our nation, chosen by their fellows to guide the destiny of the United States, on both the national and local levels. Here there lies a twofold responsibility: The first is for the citizens to elect wise and dependable leaders, for they are, in electing these men and women, voting on their own future, and the future of all they believe in. Second, for those elected to serve well the citizens who chose them, and to remember that their offices exist to benefit the body of citizens, not just themselves.

There are many other responsibilities that we citizens must maintain, and they are as numerous as our liberties: to serve in the honor of our nation's defense, if what she stands for is challenged, to keep the soil on which our ideals were founded and are maintained clean and prosperous, and to speak out as our just conscience dictates in order to revise or support the position of our nation.

We, the young people of America, have the great responsibility of seeing that our unique system of freedom and trust is preserved and continued when the present generation passes its workings on to us, for we will be the leading citizens of the future, and the spirit of this country will be ours to uphold and renew.

From this it is evident that being an American is more than saluting the flag, or singing a patriotic song, it is much more! And if we examine the troubled times we are now experiencing, and look ahead to the situations we will face in years to come, we will see that the key to keeping the United States a free and secure nation, prosperous, unpolluted, and respected by the world, is to fulfill these obligations for ourselves and our fellow countrymen. It is then that we will have realized our responsibility as American Citizens.

THERE IS ONE THING WORSE THAN AN ARMS RACE: LOSING ONE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, during the past months I have read into the pages of the Record several important articles showing a growing recognition that the arms capabilities of the United States are becoming steadily inferior to those of the Soviet Union.

I think almost everyone is concerned that we, as a government, must spend more to meet military needs, wishing instead that we could spend those funds on other priorities. The reality of the situation, however, is that—the spirit of détente notwithstanding—we continue to be in the midst of a crucial arms race. Why?

Because the Soviet Union continues to build and build its military strength. Specifically, the Soviets have just unveiled four extremely powerful, new missiles, new strategic missiles, whereas all the U.S. missiles are a generation old. And, the Soviets rather clearly have the staggering total of around 12 additional missile designs in various stages of research and development. The fact is, too, that they have 10 army divisions for every 1 of ours, and much more and newer ships at sea as well.

There is only one thing worse than an arms race: that is losing one. Arms inferiority can be no substitute for a military strength sufficient to preserve the peace.

I insert into the Record this afternoon an article by the distinguished foreign and military affairs commentator, Joseph Alsop. Mr. Speaker, I commend his observations to all who are committed to a policy of preserving the peace through maintaining our strength. The article reads as follows:

NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

(By Joseph Alsop)

Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger's grave, disturbing explanation of the increased defense budget makes one thing abundantly plain. We are in for another round of talk about "arms races" and "de-stabilization" and "restraint." So it may be well to try to give some of the background of the present defense problem.

The best way to begin is simple indeed. We should not be in trouble with our defenses today, if gobbledegook-peddlers had not gained the upper hand in the area of defense theory for way too long a period. Rather early in the '60s, in fact, it became a popular doctrine that the Soviets would never bother to build large numbers of strategic nuclear weapons because it would cost too much, and would not help the Soviets anyway.

It is hard to credit, but this nonsense had extremely powerful adherents high in the U.S. government, especially in some segments of the intelligence community and among the "defense intellectuals." Furthermore, these people fought a powerful rearguard action against the facts, which some continue to this day, long after their arguments were all too visibly disproved.

February 19, 1974

Perhaps the most ludicrous episode was a row in the intelligence community some years ago, when the Soviets had already deployed something like 1,100 intercontinental nuclear missiles. In the prior period, 1,000 Soviet missiles deployed had become one of those sacred numbers the U.S. government sometimes goes in for. Probably because we had 1,000 Minuteman missiles, the doctrine was that the Soviets would never want more than 1,000—for such are the strange ways of bureaucratic rearguard actions against facts.

With 1,100 Soviet missiles deployed, of course, the sacred number was beginning to be substantially surpassed. Whereupon analysts with the most onerous responsibilities literally argued that we could still count on the Soviets to dismantle their extra missiles, in order to get back down to the sacred number. A row then occurred because this curious view was not universally persuasive.

Such are fragments of the intellectual history of the present defense problem within the U.S. government. You must then add the powerful and active anti-defense lobby in Washington. And you must finally stir into the mixture the follies of the left-wing intellectuals in the interwar years in Europe in general, and in Britain in particular—the follies which really gave Adolf Hitler the chance that nearly won the world for him.

Hitler's strongest aid, in fact, came from the left-wing theory that "arms races" are the main causes of wars. This was deduced from a remarkably false reading of the history of the First World War. In the British Labor Party, it was almost holy writ as late as Munich.

Because of the hold it gained in the House of Commons, this theory further reduced Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin to paltering and faking with British rearmament, when the menace of Hitler's arms program was only too plain.

Yet the plain truth is that in all of history, no single war has ever been caused by an arms race. No one who troubles to read the record can doubt, for instance, that the Germans started both the 1914 war and the Second World War with an overwhelming, quite intoxicating sense of their own military superiority.

Instead, history bristles with the stories of wars that began because arms races were recklessly lost, or were thought to have been lost, as in the two cases above-cited. Arms races are costly, wasteful and undesirable. But the worst thing of all is to lose an arms race.

None of this is exactly current news, to be sure. But as we go into the struggle over the increased defense budget that Secretary Schlesinger painstakingly explained the other day, it is essential to remember that in the crucial area of national defense, this town is still piled high with left-over intellectual garbage, and still full, too, of doughty fighters of rearguard actions against the facts.

The first fact is, meanwhile, that the Soviets have just unveiled four extremely powerful, brand new strategic missiles, whereas all the American missiles are a generation old. The second fact is that the Soviets rather clearly have the fairly staggering total of around 12 additional missiles in the stage of research and development. It is fact, too, that they have 10 divisions for every one of ours, and more and much newer ships at sea as well.

Yet we hear the cry that this country is starting an "arms race," and will be guilty of "de-stabilization" if we seek to defend ourselves. It was more accurate when someone said to Secretary Schlesinger that his new budget was still far from enough, like Stanley Baldwin's. "Oh, it's not as bad as that," he is reported to have replied, mildly.

THE GOVERNMENT INVADES INDIVIDUAL'S PRIVACY

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, during the President's state of the Union message to the Congress on January 30, he said of one of his priorities for 1974:

We will make an historic beginning on the task of defining and protecting the right of personal privacy for every American.

As a Member of Congress who has been especially concerned with fully protecting this precious constitutional right, I was pleased that the President was recognizing this urgent need. Article IV of the Bill of Rights, which became a part of Nation's Constitution on December 15, 1791, states that:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

I look forward to the initiatives by the President and his administration to support those actions which are in progress at the present time in the Congress to accomplish the goal of reaffirming the individual's right of privacy which has been guaranteed by the Constitution for nearly two centuries.

FARMERS' TAX RETURNS OPENED TO USDA

In addition, I would hope that as a first step the President will rescind Executive Order 11697, issued by him on January 17, 1973, and Executive Order 11709, issued by him on March 27, 1973, which authorize the Internal Revenue Service to turn over to the Department of Agriculture the tax returns of 3 million American farmers. Should the Department of Agriculture have a clearly, legally justified need for information which may be available via the IRS any Executive order issued by the President should carry authority absolutely limiting the information to be provided to the names, addresses, and taxpayer identification numbers of farmers as was recommended by the Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations on October 18, 1973.

That recommendation came at the conclusion of an investigation of the meaning, intent, and implications of Executive Orders 11697 and 11709 which I requested, as a member of the subcommittee, that it conduct.

In addition to the recommendation which I have just discussed, the subcommittee made two others:

That the Department of Agriculture, utilizing lists of persons having farm operations provided by the Internal Revenue Service, seek the voluntary informed consent of farmers in obtaining private financial information needed to design statistical mail surveys.

And—

That the appropriate Congressional Com-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

mittees consider legislation amending Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code to make tax returns explicitly confidential except as otherwise limited for tax administration enforcement and other purposes approved by Congress.

Since delivery of the state of the Union message, I have been informed by the Internal Revenue Service that it is attempting to work out agreements with the Department of Agriculture in compliance with the first two recommendations. The IRS also reconfirmed its support of the recommendation.

It is important here to make two points. First, the actions being taken by IRS do not meet the need for withdrawing the Executive orders issued by the President.

DANGEROUS PRECEDENT SET

Second, the implications for the future of all Americans contained in these orders are particularly chilling in the light of testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities that certain White House aides had sought to use the Internal Revenue Service as a political weapon against the administration's "enemies."

These Executive orders present the frightening prospect that the administration is attempting to begin the process of making personal income information of whole classes of people available to various departments and agencies without regard to the private nature of the information, or protecting individuals from possible abuses.

These are strange orders. They are so broad that any Agriculture Department employee could be authorized to go down to the Internal Revenue Service and inspect the tax returns of any farmer.

The name, address, social security number, size of farm, gross income, and expenses are in these returns.

They would allow Federal bureaucrats to examine such personal financial information with no other reason than for statistical purposes.

The opportunity for abuse of these Executive orders is obvious. The USDA said this data was vital to its operations. If this is true, then why did the same administration which issued this order totally eliminate funds from its budget for a farm census in 1974?

Such blanket authority to inspect individual tax returns of any group, as these Executive orders provide, clearly constitutes an invasion of the right of privacy of that group.

There is only one reason why a citizen submits a tax return to the Government and that is to compute taxes—it has no other purpose.

For the first time in American history, an entire class of our people could—as a result of these orders—have their privacy invaded.

INCREASING GOVERNMENT ENCRONACHMENT ON CITIZENS' PRIVACY ALARMING

I am alarmed by the technical capacity of and the increasing tendency of the Government to engage in invasions of the right of privacy of our people. Aided by computer technology, with its enormous storage and rapid retrieval capabilities, Government has at its fingertips the

power to compile a "profile" or dossier on any individual from bits and pieces of data gleaned from many sources.

With only a social security number, the most personal information can be compromised, can be manipulated, and misused for political or other purposes.

The classic atmosphere of personal privacy is a political climate where each person decides for himself what personal information he will share with whom.

In this instance, no one asked a single farmer in the United States whether he was willing to share this personal financial information with the Department of Agriculture.

There was no consultation with any farm organization, nor was there even a public announcement from the White House, or the USDA when the order was issued. It just popped up like Pandora in the Federal Register one day.

The House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information undertook, at my request, an investigation of the invasion of privacy implications of the order.

FIRST FARMERS' RETURNS, THEN WHOSE?

There were a number of questions in our minds. Is this first Executive order a model for the Department of Commerce to inspect tax returns of homeowners receiving insured loans through FHA? Is this a plan for the Department of Labor to pry into the tax returns of wage earners? Does it mean that HEW now inspects tax returns of doctors and teachers?

Is this evidence of a master plan of the Federal Government to oversee the private affairs of every group of citizens?

We were shocked at what we eventually uncovered. In response to an inquiry from the subcommittee a Department of Justice official admitted that the Executive orders favoring the USDA were specifically designed as prototypes, or models, for future snooping into tax returns by other Federal agencies.

Well, I for one, am not going to stand idly by while the first waves from 1984 wash over me and the fine people of Arkansas whom I represent.

During the subcommittee hearings, I could not help but remember the observation once made by the British statesman Edmund Burke:

All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing.

Let us, in Congress and throughout the Nation, not be among the "good men" who do nothing whom Burke warned against.

PRIVACY: THE ESSENCE OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. Justice Brandeis said that:

Every unjustifiable intrusion by the government upon the privacy of the individual whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the fourth amendment.

Now, I do not question the good intentions of the USDA and other Federal agencies in seeking statistics and other information. But, the road to tyranny is too often paved with good intentions. And, I do not think there is a Member of Congress who has not been impressed in the last year with how far allegedly good intentions can go astray.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Let us talk a moment about the right of privacy. Or, rather the concept of privacy. Privacy is the ability to be confident of security in our homes, persons, and papers. It is not only the bedrock of freedom. Privacy is the essence of democracy. If we cannot speak or transact business without being snooped on by hordes of bureaucrats—we soon will not be able to speak, or transact business without government permission. Every American must insist that government is the servant of the people—not our master.

THE OIL MASTERS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the current energy situation, Congress and the people of this Nation have begun to focus their attention on the disproportionate power wielded by the big oil companies. Today, I would like to share some additional information which has recently come to my attention concerning this concentration of power.

The following article, entitled "The Oil Masters: Captains of Our Fate," was written by Melville J. Ulmer and appeared recently in the New Republic magazine. The article was forwarded to me by a constituent of mine, Raymond Kaplan of Englewood, N.J., and offers additional insight into the influence a few corporate executives can exert over our economy and our lives.

In his article, Mr. Ulmer offers some recommendations concerning ways in which Congress and society at large can cope with this imbalance of power. For example, he argues that Congress must make certain that public lands, containing oil, oil shale and coal, are not leased or sold "in excessive amounts at give-away prices to the captains of the industry who are lusty after them."

Today, I would like to share the entire article with my colleagues. Mr. Ulmer presents some perceptive insights and interesting arguments which I believe in view of our current situation are worth considering.

The article follows:

CAPTAINS OF OUR FATE—THE OIL MASTERS

(By Melville J. Ulmer)

We resent the Arabian producers because of the inconveniences and high fuel prices we are suffering, but hardly a word is heard about the international cartel that has so carefully regulated the world's supply of petroleum, dividing markets and fixing prices, ever since the first and infamous Achnacarry Agreement of 1928. On the contrary, the administration, Congress and the public look for succor to our corporate petroleum giants, the leaders of that cartel. They are invited—ardently implored—to exploit the nation's public lands (containing more than half the United States' oil reserves) just as swiftly as they can, and never mind the environment. They are promised generously higher prices as incentives, not only for oil but for natural gas and coal, in

which years ago the same companies had prudently secured a dominating interest.

Though prices of petroleum are already 90 percent above a year ago, the Cost of Living Council last week saw fit to raise the selling price of crude oil by another 24 percent. Nor has either Congress or the administration yet contributed more than lip service to the noble objective of "taking the profit out of a national disaster." President Nixon's proposed "emergency windfall profits tax" is simply an excise tax on crude oil, nowhere near as large as that on cigarettes, that can be passed conveniently on to consumers. Even so, the President suggested that the tax might well be refunded to those patriots who "plowed back" some of their gains in "energy producing" investments.

Wrath against the Arabs for international blackmail is not unjustified, nor is the new US "war of independence" to loosen us from reliance on foreign sources unreasonable or quixotic. But both mask the fact that the United States can never be secure in its supply of energy until it controls the controllers. Those controllers—Exxon, Standard Oil of California, Texaco, Mobil, Gulf and a few other "major" producers—rank high among the 100 largest industrial corporations in the United States. They have acquired such enormous wealth and wield such awesome power, enough to strike fear in the most courageous of statesmen, that when necessary they can mobilize the machinery of government in the service of their balance sheets. Franklin D. Roosevelt once said, "The trouble with this country is that you can't win an election without the oil bloc and you can't govern with it."

The central fact of the petroleum industry is that the demand for its product is "inelastic." Its inelasticity means that the demand is built in our cars, roads, the configuration of our cities and suburbs, and our heating plants. Hence, even when the price of petroleum is raised out of line with other prices and incomes, the quantity purchased barely declines, if at all. So long as the oil barons can maintain discipline in their industry, as they regularly manage to do, it always pays to keep prices on an upward track. The opulence of the return is further enhanced by the skyrocketing energy requirements that can be counted on to boost demand from year to year. Promoted by commercially calculated waste as much as our wealth, the United States consumes about a third of the world's annual petroleum supply. In a single generation our total energy consumption has tripled, while that of the rest of the industrially developed world is catching up. It is no bolt out of the blue, then, to learn that profits in oil are the lushest of all, that several great American fortunes built up in this century mostly derive from oil, and that the influence this industry wields in government is second to none. The profits in 1973 of Exxon, which (in assets) is the largest industrial corporation in the world, were 50 percent above the year before and have doubled in eight years.

Because of the inelastic demand just described, it is financially advantageous for petroleum producers to keep their customers a little hungry. Here, government has cooperated magnanimously. The Hot Oil Act of 1935 enables the major producers to exercise collective control over the nation's output with the obsequious assistance of state agencies. A waiver of the antitrust laws permits them to integrate fully from oil wells through pipelines, tankers, refineries and retail outlets. The same governmental benevolence encourages them to buy up the sellers of potentially competing fuels, especially coal, and to join with British, French, Dutch and Italian companies in international "consortiums." Import quotas, administered by compliant government officials, serve to crown the perfection of their control over the nation's energy supply, and hence of the prices

at which it sells. No wonder, as Middle East expert Christopher Rand relates, the oil companies are able to "sell gasoline wholesale at 21 cents a gallon when it costs them only four cents a gallon to provide it." To cap the financial bliss of this sector of our free enterprise system, the 22 percent depletion allowance virtually absolves the oil companies from the corporation income tax.

The oil industry has been carefully planned, but in the interest of monopoly profits not the public. For example, the 22 percent depletion allowance is calculated on gross income from oil production, not refining. This arrangement stimulates the integrated producers to maximize their tax saving by keeping prices of crude oil at the well-head abnormally high. Since they "sell" much of the crude oil to themselves, this tactic is no inconvenience. However, aside from the tremendous saving in taxes, it also yields another significant contribution to their financial welfare. For the majors sell part of their crude oil to independent, nonintegrated refiners. By hiking its price they can squeeze these potential competitors at will, narrowing their profit margins until they cry "help!" Help means sellout or merger. Between 1950 and 1967, according to the Federal Trade Commission, the majors in this way absorbed 73 large independents with aggregate assets of more than six billion dollars.

The various tax benefits oil companies have received, like the higher prices they are now getting, have been justified as incentives for domestic oil exploration. They have indeed encouraged exploration in the past, but in foreign countries more than in the United States. That outcome is expedited by a convenient provision of the law that permits our producers to treat as "taxes" the royalties on oil output exacted by Middle Eastern countries. So interpreted, the royalties are creditable, dollar for dollar, against taxes the producers might otherwise owe the US Treasury. Meanwhile, even before the embargo, the normally low cost crude oil pumped out of the Middle East was sold at fat prices largely outside the United States.

Such observations take the zing out of the noble aspiration that by 1980 we may be free of reliance on foreign oil reserves. If all goes as planned, we may remain as we are now, in bondage to the oil barons. Maybe more so. For they are being offered access to the precious resources—offshore and onshore oil, oil shale and carefully developed techniques for coal gasification—still owned by the federal government. They are being enticed almost at any price, with almost no restrictions, to exploit them to the full.

In illustration of this point, over the last two weeks alone substantial tracts of oil shale in Utah and of geothermal land in California were turned over for private company bids by Interior Secretary Morton. The leasing of rich oil tracts off the coast of Mississippi, Alabama and Florida was accelerated over the objections of environmentalists. The Interior Department also revealed, reluctantly, that for 20 years it has been allowing Southern Oil of California and other majors to drain the Naval Petroleum Reserves by drilling near their boundaries in an apparent violation of federal law. Getting in on the act, the coal industry (with close financial links to oil) pledged last week to increase output by 10 percent in 1974, provided work safety as well as pollution standards were waived and the unions promised not to rock the boat.

In toto the oil shale on public lands is calculated to contain 350 billion barrels of oil, approximately equivalent to all Middle East resources, and enough by itself to satisfy our requirements for more than 40 years at the 1980 expected rate of consumption. But of course so huge a mining operation, in its entirety, will not be necessary in the foreseeable future. For there are other enormous unexploited and accessible resources in the

February 19, 1974

United States, Canada, the North Sea, the Barents Sea and elsewhere. Moreover, once readily available reserves are there, we will have no valid reason for not buying inexpensive Middle Eastern oil, which in the longer run the Arab countries will be forced to sell at prices in line with those of the rest of the world. Through the foreseeable future, the Middle East will remain dependent on others for the refining, transportation and marketing of their product. Finally, it is almost inconceivable that we, and to a lesser extent other developed countries, will go on in our profligate way, wasting energy, polluting our cities and ourselves, at the same astronomical rate as we have in the past. More mass transportation, smaller cars, more functional architecture, use of nuclear or solar energy where feasible, and similar economies are virtually inescapable.

The most stubborn and serious problem in oil promises to be institutional rather than technical. With the oil barons in command, and given their expertise at public deception and contrived scarcity, how can the American people be assured of an adequate fuel supply at reasonable prices? Regulation by government seems no more effective than hiring Boy Scouts to rout out the Mafia. The oil moguls have demonstrated their talent for cowing or confusing public officials, whether in the Interior Department, the state oil prorating agencies or the White House's Office of Emergency Preparedness. Nor has any government official, concerned with "truth in advertising," ever dared to suggest that the oil companies reveal the homogeneity of gasoline—the treasured trade secret that all gasoline of the same octane rating, like all aspirin, is the same regardless of the label under which it is sold. The consuming public isn't even permitted to learn the octane rating. In research for this article I found that basic statistical information on the oil business, available from federal officials is limited to the sketchy bits that the major producers from time to time have been willing to disclose.

Stronger measures are necessary. The most promising measure known to me is not without precedent or present supporters. It relates to the use of government enterprise as a yardstick for the performance of private enterprise—one of the seminal ideas introduced in the New Deal, though its initial formulation appeared in an article by Walter Durand in *The New Republic* of May 26, 1926. Among the very first elements in President Roosevelt's plan for recovery and redevelopment, the Tennessee Valley Authority had as one of its major objectives the production of public power as a competitive check, and also a cost standard, for assessing and influencing the service of private, monopolistic electric utilities. However, the TVA was a multipurpose project, eminently successful, and in ensuing years the yardstick function was largely overshadowed by its other activities. And of course, as a result of the Insull scandals, other legislation and regulatory agencies were strengthened or newly adopted to safeguard the public against abuse by electric utilities.

There are no such safeguards against abuse by the oil barons, a situation that most of our legislators have chosen to ignore, but not all. Most notably, Senator Adlai Stevenson III (D, Ill.) has addressed himself imaginatively to the problem and has suggested organization of a public corporation to exploit publicly owned oil and gas resources on public lands in free and open competition with the private companies. The chances for passage of his bill, or of overriding an expected veto if it is passed, are probably slight under present circumstances, with nearly everyone clamoring for the petroleum barons to save us. But to expose the proposal at the present juncture is an invaluable service. From an economic standpoint, the time for the idea has already arrived. From

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a political standpoint, its time will come in the not so distant future, for the yardstick principle may be the only effective tool available, barring total nationalization, to insure that the petroleum and other big business industries operate more in the public service. Meanwhile, it is essential in the present crisis that Congress muster the courage to see to it that public lands, containing an immeasurable treasure of oil, oil shale and coal resources, not be leased or sold in excessive amounts at giveaway prices to the captains of industry who are lusting after them.

POWER MAKES TODAY'S MARE GO

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today we are hearing a great deal about our energy crisis and its impact upon society. In the mandatory fuel allocations which were imposed January 15 by the Federal Energy Office, based on legislation enacted by this Congress, agriculture received a top priority for all categories of petroleum products. There may be some who wonder at the significance of this people living in urban areas and those engaged in other important segments of our economy.

An old friend, Mr. Ross Wurm, of Modesto, Calif., who has been associated with the agricultural industry for many, many years, wrote a piece entitled "Power Makes Today's Mare Go" which was published in the most recent edition of Dow Chemicals' magazine, *Elements*.

It is pointed out in this article which certainly is an easy reading piece, that properly directed energy is a great deal of what modern-day farm management is all about. There have been many names used to describe the great technological breakthroughs that enabled the American farmer to become the most efficient food producer in the world over the past half decade. Of these, "The Green Revolution" is probably the most familiar.

Mr. Speaker, so that I may share this well-stated article with my colleagues, I include Mr. Wurm's fine remarks in the RECORD at this point:

POWER MAKES TODAY'S MARE GO

(By Ross Wurm)

A farmer's yard is like a businessman's desk. An appraisal of either will give the visitor some clues about the man who parks his tractor in the yard, as it will about the man behind the desk.

Looks can be deceiving in the barnyard as well as the business office, and a quick first glance is not the only way to measure function. But that first glance can tell a great deal about what considerations are uppermost.

Most U.S. farm yards contain a gas pump. They also have a strong outdoor light and power-driven implements either in immediate view or closeted neatly in a shed. There is probably an electric transformer on a pole down at the end of the lane. A butane tank may sit beside the hired man's house. The ubiquitous pickup is parked nearby, decorated with a broom or a pitchfork, an external toolkit, and a trailer hitch. There may be a landing strip near the road.

Power—energy—in whatever form: gas,

butane, diesel, electricity—is what makes today's mare go.

If you are a farmer and want to get your corn kneehigh by the Fourth of July, you'll have invested a large amount of energy before that hallowed date. And you will have employed energy indirectly, in the forms of nitrogen fertilizer, pumped water, needed chemicals, tires, the effort it took you or your supplier to haul it to the ranch, and in a myriad other ways.

Properly-directed energy is a great deal of what modern day farm-management is all about. There have been many names used to describe the great technological breakthroughs that enabled the American farmer to become the most efficient food producer in the world over the past half decade. Of these, "The Green Revolution" is probably the most familiar.

The figures are well known, but nevertheless remain astonishing. To put it simply, one farmworker supplied farm products (mainly food, some fibre such as cotton and flax, and a few flowers) to seven people in 1910. Today it is estimated that he supplies himself and 49 others. The farmer's ability to feed us all has increased seven-fold.

There is about a quarter as much farm labor now as there was in 1910. Total cropland has actually declined significantly since 1930, with about 50 million fewer acres in production.

Of the breakthroughs, the coming of the hybrid grains has been the most dramatized. The geneticists have made contributions in both plant and animal life. But we note that genetic advances have all been accompanied by an increased demand for energy.

To cite a simple example, the use of superior germ plasm through artificial insemination calls for the use of liquid nitrogen storage and a small truck for the technician to make his daily rounds as a surrogate "Mr. Bull." A few mouthfuls of hay are all that is required to replace the energy burned up by more direct methods of gene implantation.

An acre of highly-productive hybrid corn or milo is going to take up more water, more fertilizer, and require more chemical protection than its less productive counterpart. Of course, in all fairness, no one has adequately measured the energy output of a row of hillside open-pollinated dent corn when converted to white lightning and stored in a clear mason jar, a traditional market for this most ancient of American home-manufactured energy foods.

Improved genetics have had their impact. So has fertilizer, the manufacture of which requires prodigious amounts of energy. So have herbicides that remove the unwanted vegetation from competing for water and soil nutrients with wanted varieties of foods. So have chemicals that protect crops from insects, nematodes, and rodents. So has farm credit. So has the American supply and service system that is often labeled by the coined word "agribusiness."

But, when you stand back and look at it, the real breakthrough came about when the horse and the mule left the farm.

The horse and the mule were mainstays until the end of World War I. In fact, countless fortunes were made in the horse business on the western ranges during the years 1913-17, when green-broke range horses were purchased at high prices by our Allies and U.S. Remount to perish in the shellholes of Picardy.

The horse and the mule were mainstays until the end of World War I. In fact, countless fortunes were made in the horse business on the western ranges during the years 1913-17, when green-broke range horses were purchased at high prices by our Allies and U.S. Remount to perish in the shellholes of Picardy.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that took it all the way to Minneapolis to the mills.

The replacement of the horse with the combustion engine—a process finally completed by the '40s—did something more than create larger power sources, and make it possible to farm larger acreages better. It took millions of acres out of production for oats, alike, timothy, ladino clover, swamp hay, and other roughages needed to fuel the horse. It gave the farmer more time to be a better manager, and more good land from which to choose in planting crops for human, not horse, consumption.

Northern Wisconsin and northern Michigan have many abandoned farm sites. They differ only from the other homeless homesteads scattered across the midwest and west in that some face on the Great Lakes. The homes were well constructed. So were the barns. Why are they no longer occupied? Why did the people leave?

There are many answers, both social and economic. One basic cause is that many of these farms produced hay for a profit. It was barged and lightered to cities like Chicago, Milwaukee, and Cleveland to feed the dray horses that were the transportation lifeblood of the cities.

There are still a lot of horses around. But not many are Clydesdales, Belgians, or Percherons. The draft horse was a worker. Except for a few cutting horses used in cattle range work or horses that pull hay sleds to feed beef cattle in winter, today's horse is usually a pleasure animal. When a Wyoming rancher acquaintance was asked why he used teams of horses with a driver apiece to feed cattle on a ranch that supports a good many tractors, hay balers, feed grinders, and other combustion-engine and electrically-driven devices, he had the following to say. "One, it is sometimes easier to get a horse started on a 40° below morning than it is a tractor. Two, you can't get a tractor to stop by yelling WHOA! at it, and finally, I guess I just like horses."

But whether it's boarded at a stable and ridden English style in a gymkhana or hauled in a horse trailer to the weekend barrel race or team roping, the horse is now a prime status symbol in an affluent society. It is not a primary source of energy on the farm.

As to the hired man, some had more energy than others. Those who worked hard and long without complaint and disappeared only on occasional weekends were rewarded by getting to stay over the winter. The others departed quietly after some late harvest payday to ride out as lonely companions of The Emperor of the North Pole.

Not only are the horse, the mule, and the hired man gone, but so is the sharecropper. He was the last to leave. The gas-powered cotton harvester made him "redundant" in an industrial society.

Before there were many tractors and before the REA had lighted up the countryside, cows were milked by hand; hay was pitched on a wagon with real pitchforks and not moved by machine in elegantly-framed cubes; barbed wire was stretched with arm power; and a man had to feed and water the horses as well as harness and hitch them. The traditional complaint of the hired man concerned "those few hours in the middle of the night when nothing seems to be going on."

Cream was separated on the farm by a device known in bucolic humor as "The Armstrong Motor." One of the women or a small boy usually provided the motive power. Getting in the wood, coal, and kindling, carrying water, preparing food, and attending to other household comforts and necessities were human-powered tasks.

Now, the small boy has been replaced by a smaller electric motor. The milk is hauled off to the creamery in a giant tanker truck and there separated from its cream 10,000 gallons at a time. The farm wife buys canned and

baked goods, gets her water from a tap, turns on the heat in winter without need to check the coal or wood pile, often has air conditioning in summer (sometimes even on the tractor), uses a gas or electric clothes dryer (one of the great underrated comforts of the age), and fights loneliness with television.

All of the evidence points to the fact that the farmer and his wife get much more done, certainly in fewer hours, and they do it with fewer people on the farm. What they get done is thanks to the availability of energy, shipped in from off the farm.

Even that last bastion of pioneer life, the western stock ranch, is far more dependent on energy generated off the ranch than the cowboy likes to admit. Yes, horns are cut off of dogies with electrically-powered saws, and, yes, alas, there are electric sheep clippers.

There are other more subtle and measurable advantages that power have brought to the western open range cattle and sheep ranch. Heated stock waterers have helped to open up winter ranges. Giant pivot irrigators increase the carrying capacity and total digestible nutrient output of summer pastures. And the pickup truck, not the horse, is what keeps it all hung together and manageable.

The farm and ranch uses of energy are innumerable. But we must look beyond the farm and ranch today to perceive that it is increasingly difficult to tell where the land leaves off and food processing begins.

A farmer or rancher who grows specified crops or animals on contract, or to the known desires of a buyer, is an integral part of the food-manufacturing process. Seller and buyer are moving towards each other and becoming inextricably intermixed. Whether the economist's version of integration is forward, backward, vertical, or horizontal, it all spells more handling, packaging, modernity in drying, processing, and refrigeration, and more applications of energy.

In these days of fast transportation, efficiency is going to dictate whether rice is dried on the ranch or at a commercial facility, whether peaches are graded in the orchard or at the cannery, whether green beans are harvested and hauled to the freezer by the new owner or the old one, or whether the packer takes over the animals on the ranch or in the feedlot.

The farm and ranch have become manufacturing plants. They no longer stand alone as a way of life. Agriculture and food production are part of a vast, indivisible business process that brings more high-quality food daily to Americans than is available to the residents of any other nation.

This great manufacturing plant, by whatever name we may call it, gulps in energy and returns it in massive quantities of food.

If in the months ahead it becomes apparent that the energy to power our nation's food plant is not going to be available, a bit of good advice is to start buying alike and timothy seed. They are both good horse feed, and we'll be needing lots more horses, soon.

JOHN C. GARAND: 1888-1974

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, John C. Garand, the famed inventor of the M-1 rifle, died last Saturday in Springfield, Mass.

Mr. Garand was born on January 1, 1888, in St. Remi, Province of Quebec, Canada. His family moved to the United

February 19, 1974

States when he was 12 years old. All his life, he was a prolific inventor in the field of firearms. The records of the U.S. Patent Office indicate 54 patents in which he is named as inventor. He was first employed by the War Department at the Springfield Armory in 1919 and there he devoted his superb inventive talents to the design and development of small arms. His engineering genius, disciplined mind, and dedication to his tasks led to the development and invention of the world famous M-1 Garand semiautomatic rifle. It is the consensus of those who worked with Mr. Garand that the birth of the M-1 rifle was "due to the inventive genius, energy, drive, and concern of Mr. Garand and that the M-1 results were unique in that for the first time, a semiautomatic rifle was being developed by a single individual while most thinking was still geared to the single-shot 1903 era."

Mr. Speaker, some 4 million M-1's were produced during the World War II years. Praise for the performance and battlefield efficiency of the weapon came from officer and infantryman alike. I cite President Eisenhower's message:

Thanks to your technical skill and diligence, the American infantryman has had your invention, the Garand Rifle, as a reliable and competent friend on the battlefield.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur proclaimed the weapon as, "one of the greatest contributions to our Armed Forces."

And Gen. George S. Patton said, "the greatest battle implement ever devised."

I am sure that John Garand was pleased with these tributes, but I know, too, that the most pleasing and satisfying accolades came from the very many battle-fatigued infantrymen who wrote to thank him for putting into their hands and saving their lives the superlative weapon that he invented.

Mr. Speaker, this remarkable man served his adopted country magnificently, devotedly, and patriotically.

I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that his adopted country, the U.S. Government, has not given him the recognition he deserved. A grateful government should have given him more than perfunctory promotions, small salary increases, and upon retirement, the small pension he earned for the many years of his Government service.

Mr. Speaker, as long ago as 1941, one of my predecessors in the Congress, the Hon. Charles R. Clason filed a bill to reward Mr. Garand with a \$100,000 grant. I have sponsored similar proposals in four difference sessions of the Congress. None of these efforts have been successful, because of the consistent opposition and adverse reports of the Department of the Army and War Department over the past 32 years. Like former Congressman Clason, I have constantly asserted that this is a moral obligation that the Government, in equity and good conscience should honor. For I am sure that Mr. Garand could have reaped a fortune from other governments and private manufacturers if his inventive genius had been available to them.

Mr. Speaker, the world, our country, Massachusetts, and my community

mourns the passing of this truly great and good man.

I include with my remarks editorials from the Springfield, Mass., Daily News and Springfield, Mass., Union commenting on the death of John C. Garand:

[From the Springfield Daily News, Feb. 18, 1974]

JOHN C. GARAND

John C. Garand, inventor of the M-1 rifle, was praised by generals and GIs alike for the gun he designed at the Armory here in Springfield and that became standard equipment for American servicemen for more than 20 years.

The Garand Rifle was the rifle of World War II—the weapon that Gen. George S. Patton described as the "greatest battle implement ever made." Allied commanders Dwight D. Eisenhower and Douglas MacArthur also lauded Mr. Garand's world-famous rifle which, because of its increased fire power, was one of the most important weapons used by U.S. combat troops.

Yet, the irony for Mr. Garand was that despite world wide acclaim for the M-1, he was "a prophet without honor" here at home.

The government never paid him for his invention.

This failure by the American government to compensate Mr. Garand was an inexcusable omission, since it is certain that—he had he sold his invention to private industry instead of giving it to the government—he would have been paid handsomely for the M-1 rifle design.

Recent attempts by Massachusetts legislators to obtain a \$100,000 grant from Congress for Mr. Garand also met with failure—with a sad commentary on the government's continuing indifference toward a man whose many inventions here at the Armory contributed so much to the country.

Fortunately, however, while Mr. Garand's scientific genius did not earn him the compensation he was entitled to, his work was recognized in many honors and awards that were bestowed.

In 1944, he received the Medal of Merit—the highest award given by the U.S. government to civilians for outstanding war service. And, when the Army decided to replace the M-1 with an improved weapon, the M-14, the new rifle was based on Mr. Garand's original design.

Springfield, where Mr. Garand worked and where he died Saturday, can take particular pride in the accomplishments of this man who served his country long and well.

[From the Springfield Union, Feb. 19, 1974]

JOHN C. GARAND

A man whose dedication matched his talent, John C. Garand probably gave as much as any individual to this nation's military superiority in three wars. The Garand M-1 rifle added spectacularly to the firepower of U.S. ground forces.

Garand, whose funeral is being held this afternoon, received numerous honors from professional groups, praise from top U.S. military leaders, and recognition from the government—which, however never saw fit to pay him for his M-1 invention.

He had reason to believe such payment would be made, and he discontinued negotiations with a civilian firm. In the absence of compensation, a bill seeking \$100,000 to pay Garand for the rights to the M-1 was filed by U.S. Rep. Edward P. Boland, but it failed to pass.

The inventor's own reluctance to press the matter was probably a factor. Certainly it reflected his quality of selflessness—and a brand of patriotism that has become all too rare in the years since World War II.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 56th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. The date was commemorated by free men around the world, but the captive people of Lithuania had no cause for rejoicing.

Every administration in the United States since issuance of the statement of the Freedom Charter of the Baltic States in 1940 has opposed the subjugation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Unanimous passage of House Concurrent Resolution 416 in 1966 reaffirmed our Nation's opposition to oppression of these liberty-loving people.

East-West détente moves closer day by day, but we must not let ourselves lose sight of basic human principles. Dr. Denis G. Mazeika, president of the Lithuanian Club, of Buffalo, N.Y., has again urged that we continue to fight forceful territorial incorporation, and as part of my remarks, I am inserting a statement from Dr. Mazeika:

DÉTENTE: ALTAR OF APPEASEMENT OR STEP TO FREEDOM

February 16 this year has an even more important meaning to Lithuanian Americans and Lithuanians throughout the world. This date marks the 723rd anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State and the 56th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania in 1918.

It has been 34 years . . . since 1940 . . . Lithuania's independence was terminated when the Soviet Union invaded and occupied the Baltic States and forcibly annexed Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia into the Soviet Union. The United States, true to its own basic principles, as well as the other Western powers, has steadfastly maintained a policy of non-recognition of the forceful incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Empire.

Today the text of the recently published new book "The Gulag Archipelago" by the Russian author Alexander Solzhenitsyn is being broadcast over Radio Liberty for the first time exposing communist inhumanities. Lithuanians, unfortunately, can not hear these broadcasts in their own language. However, Congress can rectify this situation by adequately funding native language broadcasts for Radio Liberty. To those who have always lived in a free society such revelations of the violations of basic human rights are reprehensible. But to those of us who were personally exposed to these inhuman conditions, such memories are still painfully vivid.

Détente—The new concept in East-West relations is the force which must now be realistically considered, with all its implications, and cautiously approached. Détente could mean a relaxation of the iron fist of communist regimes providing for the beginning of real religious and personal freedom within the Baltic States, and the start of a free flow of ideas with the Western world. This would provide the Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians a reprieve from the present environment of severe oppression.

Détente in its worst sense could mean the recognition of the territorial "status quo" in Europe—a complete violation of the right to self-determination of the peoples and the captive nations of Eastern Europe—tanta-

mount to U.S. recognition of the infamous "Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939". In essence, offering the peoples of Eastern Europe upon the altar of appeasement.

Détente is not and cannot be considered the final answer for the oppressed people of Eastern Europe. Time and time again they cry out for independence. The courageous people of Lithuania have provided numerous examples of this thirst for independence. Recent manifestations include the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, mass street demonstrations by thousands of young Lithuanians, a petition signed by 17,000 Roman Catholics calling the attention of United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim to Soviet persecution of their church and the unsuccessful escape attempt of the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka. Now, even the fate of Alexander Solzhenitsyn is perilous merely for documenting the inhuman conditions under which all people of the Soviet Union are forced to endure.

Congress in visible support of Lithuania should again urge the President to direct the question of the status of the Baltic countries in the United Nations and other international forums as it did during the 89th Congress, second session, when House Concurring Resolution 416 was adopted.

The lessons Lithuania and her people have heroically given to the world should not be forgotten and ignored today, under the guise of détente.

OUTRAGE AND FRUSTRATION OVER GASOLINE SHORTAGE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during recent trips to my district, I have discovered an increasing sense of outrage and frustration over the gasoline shortage and skyrocketing prices. The American people have always been willing to make the necessary sacrifices during times of crises; however, they are asking legitimate, hard-hitting questions, questions which demand answers: Is the oil crisis real? Is the allocation program fair and equitable across the Nation? What is the Congress doing to alleviate the problem? Are the oil giants benefiting from the sacrifices of the Nation?

Despite warnings from many of us, particularly those of us from New England, leaders in Washington have ignored the danger for years, and it took the Arab oil embargo to wake them up.

Now we are paying the price—with long waits at gasoline pumps, by paying double the price for oil to heat our homes, by sending our children off to school in the dark and praying they make it safely, by seeing our friends, neighbors and relatives lose their jobs because the factories where they work cannot get enough fuel.

The shortage is vividly real, but many ask me if it has been contrived by the oil giants who admittedly are reaping fantastic profits from the crisis. I wish it were that simple, but it was not contrived that the demand for energy in the United States has been growing at a rate of 4 to 5 percent a year for the past 20 years. It was not contrived that if the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

present trend continues, our energy needs by 1990 will be twice as great as last year. It was not contrived that domestic exploration peaked in 1956, and domestic production peaked in 1970.

The shortage is real, and even with an end to the oil embargo, we will still come up short. And no one really knows how short.

I find it appalling that despite the critical importance of petroleum to our economy and our national defense, our Government really has no hard, verifiable, data on the energy crisis. Instead, we are forced to rely on the information the oil industry sees fit to supply us. For this reason, I have introduced the Energy Reporting and Information Act setting up machinery in the Federal Energy Office to gather objective information so that the public can accurately gage the extent of the crisis and so that we can develop realistic programs to cope with the situation.

In addition, I have just launched my own survey of gasoline stations and suppliers in the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts to gather hard data on how severe the shortage is in the communities I represent.

I have met with William Simon, director of the Federal Energy Office, pleading for more gasoline shipments to my District and to the Commonwealth. He said he needed "hard data" before he could act on my request. I have gathered this hard data and presented it to Mr. Simon for his immediate attention. It is imperative that he respond without delay. We in New England need more gasoline and heating oil now, and I intend to do everything in my power to make officials in Washington understand how bad the situation really is.

I also told Mr. Simon that the present strategy of discouraging consumption by simply letting the prices of fuel skyrocket places a grossly unfair burden on the average worker, the senior citizen and those already having difficulty paying for the basic necessities of life as the cost of food and housing goes out of sight. The sacrifices demanded by the energy crisis should be borne equally by every segment of society. And that includes the oil giants.

I am deeply distressed at the unconscionable profits the industry is making, and I voted against taking up the Emergency Energy Act the oil supporters tried to rush through Congress on the eve of the Christmas recess after gutting it of its excess profits tax provisions.

Passage of emergency legislation is vital, but it must be effective. I intend to see that two major provisions are included: a windfall profits tax to prevent private profiteering at the expense of public sacrifice and a meaningful, well-funded program of unemployment insurance to assist workers laid off because of the energy crisis. I shall firmly support a strong energy bill which addresses the public need, strikes the proper balance between the needs of the economy and the needs of the environment, and guarantees an equitable distribution throughout the country.

Additionally, the Congress must push

forward with creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Energy and Natural Resources to bring together all energy related responsibilities into a coordinated attack on the energy problem. Our immediate thrust must be to alleviate the present petroleum shortage. Our future thrust must be to develop national sufficiency in energy so that the United States will not be dependent upon the Arab States, or any foreign powers, to meet our energy needs.

We already have begun establishing a permanent "conservation ethic" in America, and I am proud of the way my constituents, as patriotic and responsible citizens, have responded. They are turning down their thermostats. They are driving at 50 miles per hour. They are waiting in long lines at the service stations with a lot more patience than their negligent leaders in Washington have a right to expect.

The age of unlimited supplies of cheap energy is ended. We have been extravagant in the past: With but 6 percent of world's population, we consume 35 percent of the world's energy. Over 30 percent of our energy is wasted in one way or another—wasted in conversion from one form to another, wasted in transmission, wasted in unnecessary usage.

We must mount a major attack on waste; conservation of energy must become a permanent part of our lives.

America must push forward with the development of new sources of energy. Long, long before the Arab oil embargo made energy crisis a household word, I sponsored specific legislation to: develop commercially feasible processes for conversion of coal to crude oil and other liquid and gaseous hydrocarbons; harness solar energy, a particularly promising effort in that technology already exists to heat, and even cool, the average home with energy from the sun; provide further research in geothermal energy.

We must find ways to exploit our coal reserves more effectively. America has 1,500 billion tons of identifiable coal reserves, half of the reserves in the entire non-Communist world. We must develop ways to utilize this abundant resource, to develop ways to deep-mine coal and still protect the health and safety of miners, and to develop ways to mine surface coal without destroying our landscape.

America has an estimated 1,800 billion barrels of oil locked in shale. Further research and development can yield techniques for extracting this oil in environmentally sound ways.

Solving the energy crisis will require the commitment of every segment of our society. There is no reason why America cannot achieve self-sufficiency in energy. We are blessed with great natural resources. Our technological genius is the envy of the world.

What we need is strong leadership at the top. America has always risen to the great challenges that beset the Nation. I am confident we shall again. I have faith in the American people. And the American people, who are making the often severe sacrifices during the crisis, must have answers.

February 19, 1974

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 13 in San Francisco I addressed the 32d annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on the subject of the energy crisis and the role of nuclear power in its solution. That address follows:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE CRAIG HOSMER

You have asked that I begin the morning's program by appraising the factors influencing our Nation's energy problem and discussing the role of nuclear power in solving it. My task is unique because for over 30 years no American ever had to worry about or explain any energy problem.

Since colonial times, and extending all the way into the 1960's, the United States was self-sufficient in energy. How, then, did we get from that surplus position so quickly to the point where we do not have enough gas for our cars or enough oil to heat our homes or enough clean coal to generate our electricity? The answer is found in a series of complex and interrelated miscalculations.

GROWTH DEMAND

Miscalculations for instance as to consequences inevitable from the last 10 years' of sharply rising growth in total energy consumption. . . . An average 4.3% per year. . . . Which doubles total consumption in only 17 years.

Moreover, amongst different types of energy this growth rate has varied sharply. Consumption of refined petroleum went up rapidly. Likewise electricity, doubling in only 10 years. But the use of coal lost ground.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Let's take a close look at petroleum, in relation to the discovery of vast amounts of very low-cost oil in the Middle East. Much of this oil can be recovered at production costs of ten to twenty cents per barrel and delivered to the United States less than half the cost of U.S. crude. This has acted as a deterrent to our domestic oil industry. So has our yo-yo, stop & go, green light-red light vacillation in Washington over the oil import quotas.

Meanwhile domestic development of the Alaskan North Slope and our Continental Shelf, have been delayed by environmental objections. Construction of additional refineries and of deep water oil and liquid natural gas ports for super tankers has also been stalled.

While these factors adversely affected the supply side of the oil equation, the demand side ballooned from the use of ever heavier cars, additional accessories, and the unexpected imposition of efficiency reducing pollution controls.

COAL

And, what about coal? It is by far our most abundant domestic energy resource. But its share of the energy supply has been declining.

The Mine Safety Act of 1969 closed many small underground mines and the cloud of uncertainty over possibly punitive strip mining legislation acts as another deterrent. In addition, the Clean Air Act restricted the use of high sulphur fuel, causing 400 east coast electric power plants to switch suddenly from coal fired boilers to oil—and now oil shortages force them into another 180° turn, all because nobody bothered to anticipate the interrelationship between these two energy sources. The aggregate effect of such exer-

cises in do-good-mans-ship is a classic example of the kind of roto-rooter analysis that sometimes characterizes Washington.

NATURAL GAS

Here is another example. In the 1950's a Supreme Court decision allowed the Federal Power Commission to regulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead. To please consumers—voters—the FPC imposed an artificially low price on natural gas. Coal, especially, with higher priced b.t.u.'s couldn't compete. But eventually the goose that laid the golden gas egg started to roll over with its feet in the air. The price incentive for gas exploration to maintain reserves was weakened, drilling declined, creating a new gas energy shortfall that only increased the demand for oil.

HYDRO POWER

In this dreary diagnosis of our energy ills there's at least one bright spot, but it's a small one—hydro power. It supplies only 4% of the Nation's energy—but it does so steadily, cleanly, reliably, and cost-effectively. I have no doubt that this happy state of affairs is due in no small part to the wise and persuasive influence in Washington for over three decades of the Nat'l Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Congratulations!

NUCLEAR POWER

Oil, gas, coal and hydro—those are the conventional energy sources. To that now add nuclear power, currently supplying little more than 1% of our total demand—but with a potential for more than half—and for restoring the traditional American independence from foreign energy sources.

Currently, licensing and technical delays— together with shortages of skilled and dedicated craftsmen—have kept nuclear power from carrying the load it should be shouldering by this time. Remedial steps are in motion—but meanwhile averting large scale power blackouts has been accomplished only by diverting refinery capacity from gasoline to kerosine to power turbo-electric generators which represent more than 22% of the total electric generating capacity installed in the three years 1970 thru 1972.

ENERGY CRISIS CAUSES

These interacting factors I have just described produced what was called the energy "crunch," in which we faced a progressively tightening energy situation, particularly with respect to petroleum products. The dramatic Arab oil embargo involves only about 10% of U.S. petroleum requirements, but that was enough to turn the crunch into a crisis.

As I see it in retrospect—it took a whole string of short-sighted policies and miscalculations to transform the favorable energy picture of the mid 1960's quickly into today's crisis:

We failed to anticipate the impact of price controls on the gas industry and to assess the ability of the Arab nations to work together.

We failed to anticipate the impact of environmental regulations on energy supply.

We failed to develop offshore oil resources on a timely basis and to build the Alaskan pipeline, and new refineries and supertanker ports in time.

We failed to increase the efficiency of our automobiles or to develop any energy conservation ethic.

We failed to anticipate the need to develop coal gasification and sulphur removal technology and realistic timetables for coal mine safety and environmental impact reforms.

We failed to get into order our nuclear licensing and regulation mechanisms and we failed on the energy front in countless other ways.

Why? Well one sure conclusion from this only partial catalogue of failures is that the popular game of finding the energy villain is for ding-bats. There are enough tempting

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

targets to fit everyone's biases. But the reality is that the energy crisis was not caused by Arab sheiks, by environmental activists, by the international oil companies, by Federal energy planners, or even by profligate advocates of unrestrained growth.

GOVERNMENT ENERGY REORGANIZATION

To my mind, the principal cause of the energy crisis is the lack of United States institutional mechanisms capable of foreseeing and dealing with all of the complex interrelated elements of (a) the world energy situation and (b) as the world's largest energy user, the American sensitivity to the continuing kaleidoscope of geopolitical change which keeps that world energy situation both dynamic and dangerous.

Look—the environmentalists were right who pointed out that, as a nation, we pursued technological and economic progress without adequate regard for environmental consequences. At the same time the Santa Barbara Channel drillers were right who pointed out that it is provident to assume a reasonable environmental risk to get the fuel we need to propel our energy dependent society of over 202 million souls. It is a constant matter of balancing risk vs. rewards— costs vs. benefits.

And the economists were right who told us that dire consequences flow from pricing different sources of energy artificially low (as with natural gas) or artificially high (as currently with Arab oil). Lots of other wise voices warned us against every error we have ever committed in the mismanagement of our energy affairs.

The trouble is that for the most part, this government of ours simply is not cranked up to hear those warnings—or even if it could—to do anything timely or effective about them.

We clearly need new governmental arrangements in congress and the White House to provide the breadth of analysis necessary to develop sound policies—to balance risks vs. benefits promptly—and to decisively carry forward decisions once they are made.

In this energy area we've got to have arrangements which take into account the infinitely complicated interplay of multitudes of causes and myriads of effects—arrangements which collect data swiftly and totally—which analyze in real time—add the value judgments of experts—all to the end that future energy crises are averted and not invited.

It would be slow suicide to maintain the present fragmentation in which administration is scattered and in which nuclear policy, oil import quotas, natural gas regulation, air quality standards, petroleum exploration incentives and a thousand other factors are all developed in isolation.

Many proposals for governmental reorganization have been made—you've heard of the acronyms 'ERDA' 'NEC' 'FEA' 'FEO' 'D.E.N.R.' 'D.O.E.' and even more but this is neither the forum for defining them nor examining them. I just wanted to stress the basic importance of establishing a truly effective framework for energy administration in our country. In addition to what I have already suggested, that framework should, of course, include—

An efficient technology assessment function which tells us which energy R & D horses to bet on, and

A realistic time frame which distinguishes between short, medium and long term possibilities for payoffs in energy R & D and focuses first priority on those quickest to realize.

NUCLEAR ENERGY—HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

I would like to turn now to the one thing other than wise government organization that holds the greatest potential we know about for assuring, that for all time, America will have abundant power from domestic sources at reasonable cost.

And, that is the power of the peaceful atom—nuclear energy. We have the natural resources, the technology, the manufacturing base and the personnel beginnings to move ahead with nuclear power on an accelerated basis.

Already, today, this fledgling industry has 42 nuclear electric power stations licensed and in operation. Another 56 plants are being built and 101 more are on order. That totals 199 nuclear power stations with combined electrical generating capacity of 188,000,000 kilowatts or 188,000 megawatts of power.

Let's get those statistics in perspective—today's new nuclear power plants are at least a million kilowatts big. That's 1000 megawatts. So every time you think about 1000 megawatts of nuclear power, think of it in terms of one giant nuclear power station.

Recently the AEC forecast that by 1985 the United States "most likely" would have 300 such stations on the line, and by 1990 a total of 500. An atomic industrial forum study released just a few weeks ago indicates that these figures can be bettered. An accelerated program is possible. By 1985 we could have 365 stations instead of 300, and by 1990 we could have 700 giant nuclear power plants instead of the predicted 500—an added 200 nuclear plants, and additional new 200,000 megawatts or an enormous 200,000,000 more kilowatts of electrical generating capacity.

And, let's get those statistics in perspective. Today oil supplies 46% of our energy needs and gas supplies 32%, together that's 78%. An additional 200 nuclear power plants would displace the need for 6 1/4 million barrels of oil per day or its natural gas equivalent—almost the total of our import deficit now. Over the lifetime of those 200 extra nuclear plants they would replace the need for almost 50 billion barrels of oil. That is more oil than the proven reserves in all the United States, including Alaska and its North Slope. In the process, these 200 stations extra would wipe out our potential multi-billion dollar energy balance of payments deficit. And that's just the extra 200 plants—not the 500 that's predicted we'll get anyway.

FOUR IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Unfortunately, our nuclear energy trajectory isn't, in reality, leading us toward this increase in nuclear power. Momentarily, it's leading us toward a shortfall of 10%—approximately 50 plants below the 500 estimated by AEC for 1990. So, let me mention only four quick steps which might be taken to reverse this downturn and put us back on the accelerated track.

First, the regulatory process must be streamlined. It now requires 8 to 10 years to build a nuclear power station. If we work at it, we should be able to reduce that to about 6 years.

Second, the nuclear industry must persist in efforts to standardize designs and boost plant reliability and quality.

Third, new capacity must be installed for enriching uranium. This is the fuel burned by nuclear reactors. Uranium is enriched in plants owned by AEC originally built to supply no longer existing needs to make atomic bombs. The enriching capacity of those plants will soon be exceeded by new civilian nuclear power demands.

Uncertainty must be resolved as to whether Government or private industry or neither or both will add new enrichment capacity because utilities will hesitate to order new nuclear power plants unless they are certain fuel will be available for them years later when they are completed. And my fourth recommendation: plutonium is also a nuclear fuel, like enriched uranium. In the kind of reactors we build today some plutonium is made as a by-product. In reactors of the future more of it will be bred during the electricity generating process than consumed (thus the breeder reactor). Today there is uncertainty as to how to burn plutonium as

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a nuclear fuel. That uncertainty needs to be removed by research and development—and a parallel R. & D. effort carried on for safe and permanent disposal of high level nuclear wastes.

These foregoing steps are needed to enable us to realize the full potential of today's American light water reactors which have achieved worldwide acceptance.

BREEDER REACTORS

But, simply because uranium is a rare and limited resource, someday we will use it all up. Light water burner reactors will have to be replaced by breeder reactors which promise us an endless supply of nuclear fuel. I am proud to say that your organization is one of the patriotic American groups sensitive to this need to provide a means by which Americans of the future will be assured their requirement for nuclear fuel. N.R.E.C.A. is participating in the funding of the liquid metal fast breeder reactor demonstration project in cooperation with Uncle Sam and a large number of other U.S. public and private utility interests. Thereby, in these somewhat brief remarks, I have a second opportunity to offer you my congratulations for good works. However, I must be candid and state that I do not believe that the LMFBR program at the moment is moving as fast as it should. It is going through the birth pains of a new organization. But I am confident that its objectives will be met and that the time schedule for their accomplishment will be approached.

In closing let me say—

That when one speaks to an organization such as yours he realizes the richness and vitality of the American people. He cannot escape the conviction that whatever are our problems, the genius of that people will surmount them.

And thus, when one assumes this platform he cannot but be both humble and grateful for the opportunity to speak to so distinguished a gathering.

I thank you sincerely.

THE EFFECT OF AN OIL PRICE ROLLBACK ON SUPPLIES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, our national policy regarding energy must be twofold: first, encourage increases in the production of sources so that supplies will be adequate and, second, keep prices for consumers at reasonable levels. While these are our two goals, each is dependent upon the other and cannot exist alone. They are linked by the basic economic principle of supply and demand.

As a result, it is our duty, in developing policy, to attempt to establish a price that would, first, encourage oil companies, to produce more oil and, second, that would not further fuel the fires of inflation.

Mr. JACKSON's proposal would set the price of oil at \$5.25 per barrel except for oil from stripper wells and oil produced by secondary and tertiary recovery which could by Presidential action go to \$7.09 a barrel.

At this point, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters from several oil producers regarding the effect of a rollback on supplies of oil:

INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS PRODUCERS OF CALIFORNIA, Los Angeles, Calif., February 15, 1974.
Hon. GLENN ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Enclosed please find a copy of my letter to Congressman John E. Moss pertaining to California oil prices and the effect on California producers and consumers if the price of crude oil is rolled back.

This copy has been mailed to you for your information and consideration.

Yours sincerely,
GLENN C. FERGUSON,
President.

INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS PRODUCERS OF CALIFORNIA, Los Angeles, Calif., February 12, 1974.
Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOSS: In accordance with your request, the following information is in support of my statement, "Senator Jackson's price rollback proposal for domestic petroleum prices will adversely affect California independent producers and consumers more than any other state!"

1. The price of crude oil in California has been lower historically than in any other part of the country. In the past, there has been a valid reason for this marked differential in pricing. Except for the last few years, California refineries were tooled to produce a high percentage of fuel oil. The supply and demand for fuel oil at that time pretty well governed the price that could be paid for crude oil. This is not true at the present time. Major oil refineries by necessity were retooled and modernized to permit cracking of low gravity oils into higher percentages of gasoline and other products more profitable than fuel oil. This change over of refining procedures was accelerated by the banning of the burning of fuel oil by industry and the substitution of natural gas in many of the larger cities of California. The pricing policies nevertheless persisted because the additional profit was used to pay for the modernization of the refineries. Government, in freezing prices, froze them as they stood without permitting the proper readjustment after the cost of construction of the refineries had been recovered.

2. If the price of new and released oil (including stripper well oil) is rolled back to coincide with the price of old oil, the impact will be devastating on efforts being made to recover additional oil through secondary recovery methods. At long last, purchasers have started posting prices on the basis of a 2¢ differential per degree of gravity per barrel for new oil below 24°. To give you some examples, the price for old oil for 12 gravity ranges between \$3.85 and \$3.90 per barrel, while the posted price for new oil for 12 gravity ranges between \$8.54 and \$9.22 per barrel depending on the quality. You can well appreciate what effect this will have on costly secondary recovery projects. The average gravity of oil produced in California is 18.9, which of course commands the price for 18 gravity oil. The price for new oil for 18 gravity oil ranges between \$8.72 and \$9.34 depending on quality. The price for old oil for 18 gravity ranges from \$3.99 to a high of \$4.23. The price for higher gravity oils is more nearly comparable to that in other states. Rather obviously, a domestic price reduction of this magnitude will discourage not only secondary recovery projects, but will discourage exploration and development drilling.

3. In the case of my own company, all our plans for drilling some 14 development wells will be cancelled simply because the projected returns on the price of old oil will not pay for the greatly increased well costs

February 19, 1974

that have resulted since the price of oil has been increased. This is to say nothing of the fact that well costs had nearly doubled between 1957 and 1973. Furthermore we will be forced to look very carefully at new exploratory projects now being considered. We have already (if rollback is finalized) been "stuck" with the drilling and completion costs of one well approaching an expenditure of \$100,000 which would have been commercial at the higher price, but non-commercial at the lower price. Frankly, we are losing faith in our Government. When hundreds of thousands of dollars are involved, why should any operator take a chance on bankruptcy resulting from Governmental action. There are enough risks involved without having to risk an abrupt break in price by edict.

4. Reduced exploration and drilling of domestic development wells will obviously prolong the length of time it will take this country to become self-sufficient. Higher prices for crude oil merely provide the capital flow to obtain the objective more quickly. Lower prices will prolong the period of shortages.

5. The posted price is the amount of money being paid for the purchase of independently produced crude oil (by independent producers). Independent producers have historically drilled 75 to 80% of all exploratory wells, and the rollback of prices will have its greatest impact upon this segment of the industry and virtually not at all on the major purchasing companies. While the majors may lose on the production of their own oil, they will gain on the purchase of independently produced oil. The ill effect of the Jackson proposal will far outweigh the effects of its avowed purpose.

Respectfully submitted.

GLENN C. FERGUSON,
President.

P.S.—It has been estimated that a minimum of an additional 3,000,000,000 barrels of oil in California alone can be recovered through secondary recovery projects under the new prices that cannot be economically recovered under the old prices.

ARGO PETROLEUM CORP.,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 14, 1974.

HON. GLENN ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: We are currently drilling evaluation wells to gain the necessary reservoir information to make an economic study of a substantial lease block in the Wilmington Field. A great investment in time and money has been made over a period of two years to assemble this land, secure permits etc. This investment was predicated on the expectation of reasonable prices for crude oil.

As you are aware, expensive waterflood operations are necessary to recover much of the oil at Wilmington. Previously, the price of Wilmington oil would not justify the investment and operation of Argo's current project. A rollback in the price of new oil to old oil prices or near that figure may reduce this project to a marginal level and when compared to investment return in other areas, could preclude the project being developed to full potential.

The exact recoverable oil within the project is unknown, however it is of a magnitude in excess of 20 million barrels. We can ill afford to ignore this quantity of oil.

Costs of material, casing, fuel, drilling equipment and labor are increasing rapidly and the independent producer must be allowed a fair profit commensurate with the risk of oil finding and producing. Current prices for new oil are not out of line and only indicate the value of the product in the market place. Reasonable expectation of a fair return on investment on the part of the in-

dependent will permit continuation of the active search for new oil.

Very truly yours,

CECIL O. EASENBERG,
Vice President.

CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 13, 1974.
Hon. WILLIAM E. SIMON,
Administrator, Federal Energy Office, Treasury Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMON: We have read with interest the article in the Wall Street Journal of February 13, that you are seriously considering rolling back and setting a new ceiling price of \$7.87 per barrel for new oil. We have constantly opposed the roll-back of crude oil prices, however, we feel that your proposal is far superior to the proposal put forth by Senator Jackson. Any roll-back in the price of new oil should definitely be accompanied by the increase in the price of old oil to the same price level.

Your proposed ceiling of \$7.87 per barrel would generate capital from old oil production to make it possible for Independent Operators to explore for and develop new reserves. A great majority of the oil produced in California is old oil produced at costs which are skyrocketing. Much of the old oil in the United States is produced from high cost secondary and tertiary projects, the production from which is declining.

We feel that the two-tier system of crude oil pricing has outlived its usefulness and is discriminatory to the producers of old crude. All crude oil of like quality should be sold at the same price.

Yours truly,

C. C. ALBRIGHT, President.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 13, 1974]

ENERGY OFFICE IS STUDYING PRICE ROLLBACK FOR SOME OIL, BUT LESS THAN IN PENDING BILL

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Energy Office said it is seriously considering rolling back the price of some domestic crude oil, but it wouldn't go as far as Congress would in the pending emergency energy legislation.

The rollback is being considered only for "new" oil, that which is produced above 1972 levels and which isn't currently controlled by the energy office with the aim of stimulating added output. It has been selling for more than \$10 a barrel. Oil pumped at pre-1972 output levels is currently sold under a federal price ceiling of \$5.25 a barrel.

The emergency energy legislation would roll back the price of the uncontrolled crude oil to \$7.09 a barrel, but opposition to that has delayed a final vote on the bill.

An energy office spokesman said the agency is considering setting a new ceiling price of \$7.87 a barrel for the "new" oil, the level energy chief William Simon had been advocating all along. A final decision hasn't been made, the spokesman emphasized. Such a roll back would cut retail gasoline prices by one cent or two cents a gallon, energy officials said.

The effect that a price rollback by the Nixon administration would have on the pending energy bill isn't clear. One energy office official said that if a rollback to \$7.87 is decided upon, it's hoped that Congress would decide a further price drop isn't necessary and would strike it from the energy bill. Officials also said that options other than a set price of \$7.87 also are being considered, such as allowing the price of new oil to vary.

A price rollback by the administration could perhaps jeopardize the energy legislation, which also would give the government authority to ration gasoline and to make mandatory certain energy conservation meas-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ures the public is currently being urged to follow voluntarily. A Senate vote on the bill is scheduled for Tuesday.

The price rollback being considered by the energy office doesn't include oil from low-out-put stripper wells or oil from fields that needs costly efforts for continued extraction. Any change there would require legislation because Congress exempted such wells from controls last year. The energy bill would repeal that exemption.

Stripper wells account for 13% of domestic crude production and the "new" oil for another 12%, according to the energy office.

In another move, the energy office barred service station owners from selling gasoline only to regular customers or from selling large amounts by requiring prepayment. Such practices have been growing nationwide and are discriminatory, the office said.

CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 8, 1974.
Hon. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: The proposed rollback of all crude oil prices to the existing level of old crude controlled prices would be disastrous for the Independent Operators in California. Such action as proposed by the Jackson Bill would dull the incentives for further exploration and would immediately halt the movement that is now underway to rehabilitate and recomplete some of the State's 22,000 stripper wells that now only produce 102,000 barrels per day. A great percentage of those wells are owned by Independent Operators. The result of such action would be to stagnate the domestic producer and make us become more dependent on foreign crude.

We ask that you give this careful consideration and vote in opposition to the Jackson proposal.

Yours truly,

JEROME J. O'BRIEN,
Vice President.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a rather sad commentary to note that most of the February 16 independence day celebrations that Lithuania has held have been under the suppression of either the Nazis or the Russian Communists. This, however, has not been the whole story of Lithuania's past.

For a period in its illustrious history, Lithuania's boundaries extended from the Baltic in the north to as far south as the Black Sea. Since then however, she has suffered from the expansion of both Russia and Germany. The present Communist domination is not the first time Lithuania has suffered under the Russian yoke. From 1795 to 1918, Tsarist Russia controlled all of Lithuania and followed many of the policies the Communists do today. They replaced Lithuanians in high posts of the government with their own people and banned higher education, which had existed in Lithuania since the 1500's. As during the WW II occupation, many Lithuanians during the 1800's emigrated from their home-

land. Most of them came to the United States. Some returned to their mother country to preach of the freedom they had found in this country and others sent books which had been banned in Lithuania back to relatives.

Lithuanian resistance to foreign rule has never disappeared. Last March, over 17,000 Catholic Lithuanians sent petitions to the United Nations protesting religious persecution. In May of 1973, there were 2 days of rioting in Lithuania's capital, Kaunas, partly over religious freedom. The petitions which were sent to the U.N. stated that the systematic suppression of the church and other social institutions by the Soviet Union has brought with it, "a growing collapse of morals, and law and order." Alcoholism, suicides, and other social problems have increased drastically under Soviet rule.

Education as well has become a tool of the Communist regime's attempt to absorb the Lithuanian people into the Soviet Union. Article 78 of the Lithuanian Constitution said that the, "education of children is the highest right of parents." The Communists have not only denied this right, but perverted it to use the school system as an instrument of communist indoctrination. Subsequently education has seriously declined. Only 25 percent of the students who begin the 7-year program eventually finish. Through all this, even today the Soviet Union has shown little willingness to change its policy of suppression. In fact it is now asking for a vote of the European Security Conference to legalize the forced occupation of Lithuania, it has been carrying on for 34 years.

The United States has always supported the self-determination of a people and should not forsake the people of Lithuania during this time of détente. Many Americans of Lithuanian descent, such as Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Valiusaitis of Stamford, Conn. are deeply concerned that the United States should not forget the plight of their determined kin. I therefore give my support for the resolution to direct our delegation at the European Security Conference to oppose any attempt by the Soviet Union to legalize their takeover of Lithuania.

No country which has given so many of its people to the development of the United States and has admired our democratic system so, should be left unaided at a time of need.

THE THREAT OF CORPORATION FARMING

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, long before I came to the Congress, I was concerned about the issue of "corporation farming." In fact, while still serving in the Wisconsin Assembly in Madison, I introduced some of the earliest legislation to curb corporation farming. Since I came to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congress, I was pleased to join with Senators NELSON and ABOUREZK and with Congressman Bob KASTENMEIER and others in introducing the Family Farm Act.

I often wonder now whether those of us who have studied and spoken out on "corporation farming" were remiss in labeling it that. What we are talking about when we say "corporation farming" is not a narrowly defined corporate entity. We are referring to the takeover of farming by large, nonfamily operations—regardless of whether these operations are legally incorporated or not.

Unfortunately, for some time the USDA has neglected to recognize that, and has continued to minimize the threat of corporate farming, because they say only 1 or 2 percent of all farms are "incorporated."

But, as any farmer would tell you, it is not the legal status of the farm operation that is important. What is important is the share of the market which a farm operation controls. Our troubles with a few oil giants should make us realize that if a relatively few farm operations take over, they can manipulate the supply and the price of food to meet their convenience—not the consumers.

The USDA's seemingly unconcerned attitude does not make me any less wary of the potential disaster that could befall farmers and consumers alike if corporations take over food production and if decisions over food production are made in board rooms rather than in farmers' living rooms or ASC offices.

What we must remember, as a story in today's Wall Street Journal points out, is that bigness is not the be-all and the end-all in farming. It is clear, in fact, in more and more cases that a modern family farm is still the most efficient farm there is. I know that is true of dairy farms and there are thousands of them in my district. And the USDA studies show this is true of many other kinds of farming.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that the USDA stop looking at the problem of corporation farming as a narrowly defined legal entity and start looking at the problems which a takeover of the production of food would create in terms of the price and supply of food in this country. If they do not, I can see some very troubled times ahead.

For those who are not aware of what corporate agriculture involves, I am including a very descriptive article from the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMODITIES: IF PROPOSED CORPORATE HOG FARM SUCCEEDS, FUTURE OF SMALL PRODUCER MAY BE IN DOUBT

(By Gene Meyer)

CHICAGO—Charles McQuoid, a businessman here who has never fed a hog, hopes to be raising 2.5 million of them in six years.

If that happens, Mr. McQuoid's planned 6,000-acre hog farm in Kahoka, in northeast Missouri, would be producing and slaughtering 33% of that state's total, and in a given week, he would sell more pork than any other U.S. producer—enough pork, said one livestock analyst, to lower prices received by all other U.S. hog farmers as much as 8%. The proposed complex would employ 2,000 persons—or almost as many as Kahoka's population of 2,200.

Not surprisingly, Mr. McQuoid's plans are controversial. A Senate Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee is looking into them informally, and other observers are predicting that success ultimately will mean the end of the small independent hog producer. The project also is stimulating renewed attempts to assess corporate farming's impact on all of U.S. agriculture.

Mr. McQuoid's plans, however, appear to be a logical extension of trends that have decreased farm numbers 32% and increased national average farm size 34% since 1959. Farming has grown into a more complex business operation, which requires farmers to sharpen their managerial and technical skills and acquire more capital, as they try for a bigger share of the market dollar to make a living.

In doing so, some farming operations have grown dramatically. For example, the Agriculture Department said that just over half of the U.S. nearly 27 million feed cattle come from 711 feedlots; the other half come from more than 154,000 much smaller lots. Farmers have been joined by businessmen and corporations seeing a chance to make money by expanding on an even grander scale.

Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz and other department spokesmen steadfastly maintain that small, independent farmers will prevail, but other observers are less sanguine. They contend the same economics that have helped family farms grow are even more beneficial to large operations.

Mr. McQuoid, for instance, said he has gone to institutional lenders and to industry and colleges for technical aid, just as the family farmers does. The difference, of course, is one of scale—Mr. McQuoid's visits to the bank have produced more than \$115 million for his operation.

"All the components (breeding, feeding and killing) work by themselves," Mr. McQuoid said. "We're just putting them together," he added.

Mr. McQuoid has incorporated as Missouri Foods International Inc., with himself as major owner. Thus, though privately held, the Kahoka operation joins the ranks of the "corporate farmer," a sinister term to some farmers.

"But the corporate farmer is really something of a straw man," claimed William Scofield, an Agriculture Department economist. He added: "Most small farms which have vanished have been taken over by other farmers just down the road. Less than 22,000 farms (out of 2.75 million) are incorporated and 90% of these involve families who've done it for a tax break or some other advantage. There are less than 1,800 farms with 10 or more owners."

Richard D. Rodefeld, a Michigan State University rural sociologist, said those numbers may be misleading. "If farming interests are redefined according to their control over growing and marketing decisions," he argued, "the figures would show non-family farms sell more than half the country's farm products." He said family farms—meaning those owned by families that raise the money, supply the labor and make the management and marketing decisions themselves—have been getting less than half the national farm receipts since 1959.

Nonfamily farms get differing sales-receipt shares in different parts of the country, Mr. Rodefeld said. These range from over 70% in the Pacific states to 13% in the Corn Belt and to generally 45% or more elsewhere.

About 14% of the nation's crops and 36% of its livestock are sold under some sort of integrated or contractual arrangement, though percentages vary widely among commodities, some sources said. Nearly all feed grains, which dominate Corn-Belt farming, are sold on the open market, but 95% of the country's processed vegetables, more prevalent in the Pacific states, aren't. Similarly, about 95% of the U.S. broiler crop is sold

February 19, 1974

under contract but only 2% of all hogs are sold that way.

Some critics fear the hog picture could change radically because of Mr. McQuoid's project. "If that deal comes off," said Mr. Rodefeld, "it will be especially indicative of the nonfamily-farm take-over. Hogs traditionally have been the bastion of the family farmer."

About 1,000 of these family farmers rallied in Kahoka earlier this month to protest the proposed complex. They cheered gustily when Oren L. Staley, president of the National Farmers Organization, pledged, "We aren't going to allow a handful of corporate executives to control food production in this country."

The take-over feared by small farmers is far from assured, however, other critics said. Other integrated pork complexes, planned on more modest scales than Mr. McQuoid's, have folded within five years. And concerns such as Tenneco Inc., Furex Inc., Gates Rubber Co. and CBK Industries Inc. have steadily retrenched to cut losses or have gotten out of farm programs, which like hog raising, require lots of hard work and skilled management.

In addition, the Agriculture Department said studies increasingly show that a small farmer's size mightn't be such a drawback after all. In fact, the most efficient farm size, the department suggested, is that which can be handled by one farmer equipped with the best machinery and technological expertise available.

Figuring that is true, other farmers are more bemused than alarmed by the complex of hog houses, feed mills and packing plants expected near Kahoka. "If the man wants to bet his money that way, why that's his right," observes an American Farm Bureau spokesman.

STRONGER ENERGY DATA REPORTING AMENDMENT NEEDED TO FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer an amendment to the bill, H.R. 11793, the legislation establishing the Federal Energy Administration, in order to make the reporting provisions of that bill conform exactly to the reporting provisions adopted on the floor of the House in December 1973, in connection with the Energy Emergency Act, provisions which were accepted by the House and Senate conferees.

The present reporting provisions in the bill, H.R. 11793, are an abomination, as noted by my colleagues on page 48 and 49 of House Report 93-748.

I will point out that hearings I held January 16, 17, and 18, 1974, in my subcommittee on the Activities of Regulatory Agencies of the Select Small Business Committee, the chairman of the Federal Power Commission endorsed by reporting amendment and Mr. Sawhill, Deputy Administrator of the Federal Energy Office, testified that he could find nothing substantively wrong with it. He certainly did not endorse the blanket confidentiality provisions contained within H.R. 11793, the effect of which is to deprive the Congress, the public, and most Federal agencies of needed energy data.

The confidentiality and reporting provision of H.R. 11793 can only be described as "the oil companies' dream."

This amendment I will propose follows:

Amendment to H.R. 11793 as reported on December 28, 1973:

1. (a) On page 34, line 22, strike "(c)" and insert therein "Sec. 16." (b) On page 35, strike all beginning on line 11 through the period on line 21.

2. Strike all beginning on line 7 of page 33 through the period on line 21 of page 34, and insert therein the following:

REPORTS ON NATIONAL ENERGY RESOURCES

"SEC. 15. (a) For the purpose of providing to the Administrator, Congress, the States, and the public, to the maximum extent possible, reliable data on reserves production, distribution, and use of petroleum products, natural gas, and coal, the Administrator shall promptly publish for public comment a regulation requiring that persons doing business in the United States who, on the effective date of this Act, are engaged in exploring, developing, processing, refining, or transporting by pipeline any petroleum product natural gas, or coal, shall provide detailed reports to the Administrator every sixty calendar days. Such reports shall show for the preceding sixty calendar days such person's (1) reserves of crude oil, natural gas, and coal; (2) production and destination of any petroleum product, natural gas, and coal; (3) refinery runs by product; and (4) other data required by the Administrator for such purpose. Such regulation shall also require that such persons provide to the Administrator such reports for the period from January 1, 1970, to the date of such person's first sixty-day report. Such regulation shall be promulgated thirty days after such publication. The Administrator shall publish quarterly in the Federal Register a meaningful summary analysis of the data provided by such reports.

"(b) The reporting requirements of this section shall not apply to the retail operations of persons required to file such reports. Where a person shows that all or part of the data required by this section is being reported by such person to another Federal agency, the Administrator may exempt such person from reporting all or part of such data directly to him, and upon such exemption, such agency shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, provide such data to the Administrator. The district courts of the United States are authorized, upon application of the Administrator, to require enforcement of the reporting requirements of this section.

"(c) Upon a showing satisfactory to the Administrator by any person that any report or part thereof obtained under this section from such person or from a Federal agency would, if made public, divulge methods or processes entitled to protection as trade secrets or other proprietary information of such person, such report, or portion thereof, shall be confidential in accordance with the purposes of section 1905 of Title 18 of the United States Code, except that such report or part thereof shall not be deemed confidential for purposes of disclosure to (1) any delegate of the Federal Energy Administration for the purpose of carrying out this Act, (2) the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, or the General Accounting Office when necessary to carry out those agencies' duties and responsibilities under this and other statutes, and (3) the Congress or any Committee of Congress upon request of the Chairman. The provisions of this section shall expire, as provided in section 19 of this Act."

Mr. Speaker, I also plan to offer the following two amendments regarding

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

energy advisory boards and the positions held by Mr. William Simon, Administrator, Federal Energy Office and Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

On page 22, line 10, insert immediately after the period the following:

The membership of each such advisory board shall be fairly balanced in terms of points of view represented and the functions to be performed by such board and shall include consumer, small business, and environmental representatives. The advice and recommendations of each such board shall be the result of that board's independent judgment and shall not be influenced by the Administrator or any other Federal official or special interests. All such advice and recommendations shall, when made, be promptly made available to the public.

And, the following amendment:

On page 25, strike all beginning on line 5 through the period on line 13, and on line 14 change "(f)" to "(e)".

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues' attention Maine's winning essay in the annual VFW Voice of Democracy Contest. I am especially pleased to do so this year because Chris Stephens' essay, "The Responsibilities of the American Citizen," deals in very specific terms with some of the underlying problems facing our society and with what can, and must, be done to solve them. Mr. Stephens turns to the ideals of integrity, unselfishness, and dedication, and the lesson he draws is one from which we can all learn. Maine and the VFW can be very proud of Chris Stephens' essay.

The essay follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN

In the aftermath of recent political upheaval in the United States, it becomes obvious that there have been some vitally important qualities lacking in our social and political lives. There is an air of disillusionment with leadership and government in general. What are the basic qualities we look for in our leaders? What are the important characteristics we want our representatives to express?

There are three essential qualities that should be present in every good leader: integrity, unselfishness, and dedication. Most people expect these characteristics to be expressed by our political representatives, and are appalled when these high principles are compromised. However, many of us never expect these qualities of ourselves. If the people of this country were to make it their responsibility to consistently express these principles themselves, we could bring this nation much closer to the ideals upon which it was founded. It is the duty of every American citizen to try at all times to live the three qualities of integrity, unselfishness, and dedication. There are many ways that we can do this.

Integrity has always been one of the most important of the American ideals. By definition, integrity refers not only to honesty, but to moral soundness as well.

Both of these ideals seem to have been

pushed into obscurity by the emergence of the "with-it" generation, and the "new morality. Integrity needs to be a constant responsibility of all citizens. Americans need to be more honest in everything they do, and especially so with themselves. We can easily bring this close to home. We can obey our traffic laws, not because there is a policeman at the corner, but because we want to be honest, and we recognize the safety these laws represent. We can refuse to cheat on tests, to shoplift, or to falsify information on tax forms. Since integrity also involves moral soundness, we should be honest in our relationships with other people, and honor our commitments to those in responsibility, to our employers, and to business and personal contracts. No one is too young to begin to practice the basic principles of honesty in thought and deed.

Unselfishness, or the willingness to make a sacrifice for the good of something greater than one-self, is vitally important. We need to make it our responsibility not to be selfish with our energy resources, either in times of crises, or prosperity. We should not be self-indulgent with our other natural resources. Pollution is essentially caused by such self-indulgence; the placing of one's own desires and convenience above other considerations. Self-indulgence is seen every day in such petty things as hoarding or overuse of gasoline or oil, littering, and courtesy or recklessness in driving. A good example of a more selfless attitude is the person who is always ready to help perform a service for a community, with no thought of recompense for himself. This attitude illustrates that unselfishness is essential in our lives, because it helps to promote harmony between people, and progress in society.

As good citizens, we all need to express dedication. Dedication is a total commitment to a particular course of thought or action; it is the quality which carries an idea to completion. The commitment to express integrity and unselfishness takes a great deal of dedication. As citizens of the United States, we also need to feel a dedication to our country. This does not mean that we have to agree with everything that occurs in the country, but we need to be dedicated to the principles for which it stands. Because the founders of this nation were dedicated to the cause of freedom, we have the liberty and well-being we enjoy today.

The ideas of integrity, unselfishness, and dedication are the basis on which the many privileges of the American citizen are built, and they form a strong foundation of responsibility that needs to be reaffirmed in the United States today. The original signers of the Declaration of Independence went so far as to pledge their "Lives", "Fortunes", and "sacred Honor" to these principles. Can we do less?

CONSPIRACY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, four recent issues of the Warsaw, Ind., Times-Union, published by Mr. Reub Williams and edited by Mr. Norman Hagg, contained editorials which deserve the consideration of my colleagues. The first of the editorials, which was written by Mr. William K. Mollenhour, is entitled "Conspiracy," and it briefly but competently says some things that desperately need to be said. I include Mr.

Mollenhour's editorial, "Conspiracy," to be printed in the Record at this point:

CONSPIRACY

(By William K. Mollenhour)

MAIN STREET, U.S.A.—Conspiracy is the buzzword in Washington these days. More attention should be paid the word on Main Street, U.S.A. Our dictionary defines conspiracy as "a combination of persons for an evil purpose, a plot". Is there a real conspiracy in The United States? We believe there is, but its name is not Watergate!

Its evil face reflects the plot of Karl Marx. Take advantage of youth corrupted by drugs, adults befuddled with alcohol. Spend until the taxpayer can no longer bear the burden. Add socialistic scheme upon socialistic scheme. Discredit the government and the men in it. If they help the cause by stupid politics, so much the better for the Communist purpose. Fan the fires of dissension until neighbor distrusts neighbor, officials spy upon each other.

Attack all portions of our system. Make it look bad. Get government to control everything. Then take over the government. With

this plan you have won a nation without firing a shot. Is it happening? We think it is.

A few months ago, the dollar was under attack abroad. Fortunately it stood. More about that in later days. Take an 18 minute segment of tape no one ever heard about until a few months ago, and blow it into something out of all proportion to its true value and distrust multiplies.

We have an energy shortage. Ralph Nader goes before a Congressional committee and with a knowing look declares it is a device to raise profits of oil companies, but offers not one word of proof. He does create distrust.

One branch of government orders part of the economy to cease advertising its products and adds insult to injury by forcing the same companies to spend an equivalent amount to unsell their product!

After all this comes the most preposterous suggestion of all. While with one hand, liberals accuse the oil companies and utilities of profiting on a shortage, they rise in righteous anger in Congress and criticize the same companies for running ads urging consumers to conserve. You can't have it both

ways so confusion reigns. Communism feeds on confusion. We are playing the Karl Marx game unwittingly.

There is hardly a segment of our economy, our businesses, our government, our politicians, that has escaped the insidious erosion of confidence. This will result in apathy. The average voter is apt to say, "to hell with it" so only a few will go to the polls and rule the many.

If the Communist Party of the world had written the scenario of The United States for the past several years, the game plan of Karl Marx could not have been followed more closely.

The media cannot escape its share of responsibility either. National news gatherers have been so anxious for a headline, we hear on one day that loaded oil tankers are standing off our shores with plenty, and the next day that giant Con Edison of New York is running out of fuel.

Stop it Americans, you are committing democratic suicide. Every cloud has a silver lining. Tomorrow we want to write about ours, for which we Americans can take no credit.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 20, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1974.
I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN J.
McFALL to act as Speaker pro tempore today.
CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the
House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let integrity and uprightness preserve me; for I wait on Thee.—Psalms 25: 21.

Almighty God, our Father, unfailing source of wisdom, power, and love, we come to Thee conscious of our needs, aware of our shortcomings, and yet confident that Thou art with us leading us in the ways of justice, peace, and good will. Strengthen us to be diligent in doing our duties, give us wisdom to make wise decisions, and make us ready for the heavy responsibilities of these distressing days.

Bless Thou our country and the institutions of this free land. Sustain with Thy power and enlighten with Thy grace our President, our Speaker, our Members of Congress, and all who are entrusted with our safety and our security.

Increase the faith of our people in our Government. Help them to realize how truly sound it is and though it may be slow in some actions, it is nevertheless seeking the good of our people and the best interests of our country.

In this hour of our national life, give to us all courage, faith, and good will that we fail not man nor Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2589) entitled "An act to declare by congressional action a nationwide energy emergency; to authorize the President to immediately undertake specific actions to conserve scarce fuels and increase supply; to invite the development of local, State, National, and international contingency plans; to assure the continuation of vital public services; and for other purposes."

ELECTION OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE DURING THE ABSENCE OF THE SPEAKER

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 884) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 884

Resolved, That the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR. was thereupon sworn in as Speaker pro tempore.

THE HONORABLE TENO RONCALIO, VOICE OF REASON ON AEC MATTERS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, TENO RONCALIO, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has long been the voice of reason on AEC matters. He has recently prepared a brilliant detailed report on the AEC's Plowshare program which proposes natural resource recovery through underground nuclear explosions in the West. The report, "Plowshare: A Technology in Search of a Use," recounts past Plowshare failures and warns that the program wastes money and natural resources. It further warns that Plowshare may jeopardize public health and other alternative energy recovery programs.

In his column in the Denver Post, Leonard Larsen says this about Congressman RONCALIO's effort to incorporate sanity in the Plowshare program:

Almost alone in the Congress, Rep. Teno Roncalio, D-Wyo., has been taking a long look at the AEC Plowshare program and its appalling plans for underground A-bomb blasts—scores of them, hundreds of them, thousands of them—in an effort to produce natural gas in his state, Colorado and who knows where else in the West.

It goes on:

Roncalio, lawyer, banker and legislator who has never shed the instincts of a childhood battler in Rock Springs, believes it's time we ask the AEC and ourselves just what the hell's going on here.