

Secrest, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seeber, Bruce G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seely, Arthur D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sell, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sexton, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shadburn, Theodore H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaffer, Paul R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaffer, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaffran, S. J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sharon, Dennis P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shattuck, Lewis W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaud, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shelton, Franklin D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheppard, Jack W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shubert, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sigethy, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmons, Bland B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simon, Ervin P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sivils, Howard B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sizer, Frank E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Skeans, Ted L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Skur, Anthony L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Charles N. D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Dennis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Howard K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Joseph B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Paul G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Peter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snavely, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sparkman, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spohn, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stanley, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stebeck, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steere, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stefanelli, Mario J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stegall, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steinmiller, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stephensen, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stevens, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Harvey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stockstill, Floyd E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stone, Reed L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stone, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stout, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stout, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Straub, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strickland, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strom, Oren G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strub, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stuart, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullivan, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sumpter, Thomas W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sandquist, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swart, Samuel H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swords, Smith, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taffet, Harvey, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tapp, Marshall L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tarleton, Howard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Billie J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Taylor, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Donald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Stanley A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tarpensing, Russell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Terrell, Irby D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Florence K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Ray G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thornton, Billy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tibbetts, Larry N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tillotson, James A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tindall, J. D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tissaw, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tolbert, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tolman, Frederick G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toole, Clarence J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Treska, Milo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Troop, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, Alvin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, Joseph G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tyra, Joseph B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Underwood, William E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Valentine, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanerden, Thomas, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanloan, Jack L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanriper, Gerrit S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Voelker, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vogel, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waddell, Dewey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waddell, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagoner, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wall, Carl D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wallace, Bruce M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wathen, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watson, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watts, George O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webb, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wehling, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weiner, Arthur C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weseman, Henry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Westphal, Curtis D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wetzel, Emery S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wheeler, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whinery, Clarence E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitaker, Darrell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Dawson N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Joe M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wiggins, Jesse P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Gordon E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Peter D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Stuart J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willis, Giles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilmot, Charles L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilton, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wiltgen, Joseph N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wingate, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winter, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wolfsberger, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx

Wolverton, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woodruff, Wesley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woody, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wootton, Louis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wrentmore, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Jerdy A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wyatt, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yarbrough, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yeager, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zlenert, Clarence E., xxx-xx-xxxx

CHAPLAINS

Caudill, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cole, Newton V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cortese, Patrick S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kingsley, Earl J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wild, Phillip T., xxx-xx-xxxx

NURSE CORPS

Beaton, Frances A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boatright, Mary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foley, Eileen H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klajnowski, Martha G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Krauss, Teresa E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merrow, Jean T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peek, Lilith J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pulliam, Gladys C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shealy, Katherine L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shipe, Olive L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Studer, Joan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tyrrell, Marie V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vickers, Cassandra C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wellman, Crescentia C., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Baddour, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crews, James M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Currie, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fisher, Jackie V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gonzales, Norbert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harmon, Charles C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Illsley, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jacko, Paul P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kaplan, Burton, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klotsko, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marcotte, Victor H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marschall, Barton R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McAfee, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wells, Darius L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zimmerman, Rodney J., xxx-xx-xxxx

VETERINARY CORPS

Osborne, Donald V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shannon, Robert U., xxx-xx-xxxx
 West, Joe E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wise, David, xxx-xx-xxxx

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE CORPS

Carter, Donald I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deuel, Kenneth H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goldner, Teresa M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kittilstad, Owen H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDonald, Maynard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Penikas, Vincent T., xxx-xx-xxxx

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VOICE OF AMERICA SPEECHLESS
ON "GULAG ARCHIPELAGO"

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, in a column published in the Washington Post on March 7, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak point out that the Voice of America has broadcast very little concerning "Gulag Archipelago," the latest work by exiled Soviet writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

The failure on the part of the Voice of America comes despite a request for fuller coverage from the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, according to Evans and Novak.

The columnists indicate that the omission of details about Solzhenitsyn's work, which is an attack on the policies of the Stalin era, is the result of a conscious effort at the policy level of the U.S. Information Agency not to offend the leadership of the Soviet Union.

The Voice of America has a basic mission to get across the truth behind the Iron Curtain. Failure to communicate the content of "Gulag Archipelago" seems to me to represent an abandonment of this basic mission.

The Voice of America should not be subject to policy dictation based on the theory that all will be well if we are nice to the Kremlin. As Evans and Novak state:

Such a switch could destroy its credibility and lose its audience.

I ask unanimous consent that the col-

umn, "Voice of America Speechless on 'Gulag Archipelago,'" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

VOICE OF AMERICA SPEECHLESS ON "GULAG
ARCHIPELAGO"

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The Voice of America (VOA), this nation's overseas propaganda arm, has been strangely mute about Alexander Solzhenitsyn's monumental "Gulag Archipelago" despite pointed pleas from the U.S. embassy in Moscow to pass the dramatic word in detail to the Russian people.

When excerpts of the great author's work first appeared in Western newspapers last December, the embassy cabled the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) commending VOA's first handling of what was becoming a big international story. But the diplomatic cable also strongly pressed USIA, which runs

VOA, to be sure and get into "the substance" of Gulag—that is, to beam great gobs of it into the heart of Russia.

Yet, the USIA high command is so timid about seeming to undercut President Nixon's detente with Moscow that that telegram was never even answered.

Just how much of this policy has been dictated to USIA director James Keogh by the White House or the State Department is not known. Keogh told us VOA policy is made by him and his top aides in conformity with U.S. policy.

Whatever the answer, USIA's refusal to exploit Gulag is infuriating not only anti-Soviet hardliners but other politicians fearful that President Nixon's weakness at home may lead him into unwarranted concessions abroad in his search for foreign successes.

Thus, the policy of playing down news that might affront the White House was applied to Gulag. Actually, according to middle-level USIA officials, former chief Nixon speechwriter Keogh began subtly toning down VOA's coverage of the Watergate scandal when he took over USIA from Frank Shakespeare in early 1973 at the recommendation of then White House staff chief H. R. Haldeman.

But political reaction to Keogh's muted coverage of Gulag far transcends criticism of his kid-glove treatment of Watergate. Powerful politicians of both parties are quietly campaigning to force Keogh to tell millions of radio listeners in the Soviet Union far more about Solzhenitsyn's bitter outcry against the Stalin era.

The first congressional target was not USIA's treatment of Gulag but its apparent playing down in broadcasts to the Soviet Union of news about Soviet dissidents. In a January speech, Sen. Henry M. Jackson questioned whether USIA was trying "to accommodate the Soviet demand that we refrain from broadcasting about what Soviet authorities consider to be matters of an internal nature."

That elicited an overnight response from Eugene P. Kopp, Keogh's deputy director. Kopp wrote Jackson that the new regime at USIA was trying to "reach a wider Soviet audience with more news and information about the United States." In short, spare newsless Russians the harsher facts of Soviet life and give them goodies about America.

In line with this new policy of what middle-level USIA officials call the Keogh-Kopp clique, the USIA flatly ruled out proposals from both Congress and VOA itself that excerpts of Gulag be read over VOA. Instead, coverage of the shocking study of the Stalin era was limited to a rehash of stories, editorials and commentaries taken from the U.S. media.

In the past, VOA seldom if ever broadcast to Communist nations lengthy excerpts of published material. But Gulag is unique: the most powerful expose ever published of life under Stalin. That's why the Russian service of the British Broadcasting Corp. (BBC) has been reading lengthy excerpts from Gulag. Similarly, the German overseas radio, Deutsche Welle, has given its Soviet audience a regular dose of long quotations.

In public, Keogh says Soviet officials are complaining about present VOA coverage of the Russian dissident movement but boasts, "we are holding to it." In private, he tells associates inside USIA that one reason for playing down Gulag is fear of renewed Soviet jamming of VOA, which stopped last fall as a Soviet concession to detente. However, neither the German nor the British excerpts have been jammed.

Keogh, biographer and longtime idolater of Richard M. Nixon, takes the public position that USIA is committed "to support, not oppose, U.S. foreign policies." Responding last week to his critics, he said: "The principal goal of American foreign policy is to affect the foreign policies of other nations toward negotiations and away from

confrontation, not to transform the domestic structures of these societies."

That is a shocking admission that VOA is being switched from no-holds-barred news into a policy arm of the U.S. Such a switch could destroy its credibility and lose its audience.

NUCLEAR BLASTS FOR OIL SHALE

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on March 6 carried an excellent article summing up the Atomic Energy Commission plans to use underground nuclear blasts to recover natural gas and shale oil in the States of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado.

As the time approaches for Members of Congress to vote on the AEC request of \$4.4 million for the Plowshare program, this article is must reading:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1974]

AEC IS PLANNING NEW SHALE BLASTS

(By James P. Sterba)

DENVER.—Just as critics of nuclear tests thought they were winning, the Atomic Energy Commission has revitalized plans to expand research and testing of underground nuclear stimulation blasts to extract natural gas and shale oil in the Rocky Mountains.

Termed "dead as a doornail" last summer, more nuclear blasts are now planned as part of the national goal of energy self-sufficiency.

Reacting to news from Washington that the explosions were still being planned, Gov. John Vanderhoof of Colorado vowed recently to stop further testing, at least in his state. He said Colorado would take court action, if necessary. Other opponents are working toward a statewide referendum on the issue in Colorado, and opposition is also very strong in Wyoming, where the next test blast was originally scheduled.

Dr. Dixy Lee Ray, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has proposed spending \$224.1-million over five years to develop technology for natural gas and shale oil recovery. Of that, \$107.6-million is earmarked for applied nuclear research and development, including another nuclear blast to extract natural gas and perhaps one more to extract oil from shale.

TO KEEP PROGRAM GOING

In his budget, President Nixon earmarked \$4.4-million for the fiscal year 1975 to keep the program alive, although no blasts are planned in that year, beginning this July 1.

Dr. Ray's five-year program calls for \$56.2-million to be spent on nuclear natural gas stimulation and \$51.4-million on nuclear shale oil extraction. Opponents, including Teno Roncalio, Wyoming's lone Representative, a Democrat, have called the experiment wasteful and dangerous.

Project Rio Blanco was the third experimental blast since 1967 designed to free natural gas from tight rock formations. In it, three 30-kiloton nuclear devices were detonated simultaneously a mile underground last May 17 to create a single cavity into which natural gas could collect. Instead, three cavities were apparently created, one on top of the other. When workers drilled back into the top cavity, pressure was disappointingly low and little gas was produced.

Now, to connect the three cavities, a costly new well will probably have to be drilled, according to John Toman, the project engineer.

BY LIQUID PRESSURE

Another way to get gas from these tight formations is called hydraulic fracturing.

Favored by environmentalists because it involves no radiation, this technique involves cracking the rock layers by pumping in under high pressure a liquid such as water. The A.E.C. announced several weeks ago that it would help sponsor a massive hydraulic fracturing experiment near its Rio Blanco test site in northwest Colorado to compare results.

Meanwhile, a fourth and larger nuclear experiment called Project Wagon Wheel, had been planned in Wyoming. Shortly after the Rio Blanco test, however, Dr. Ray pronounced that project "dead as a doornail," although she hinted it could be revived.

Now, thanks in part to the energy crisis, it is being actively considered again for either Colorado, Utah or Wyoming.

Dr. Ray's five-year plan, which needs Congressional funding, calls for a test like Wagon Wheel in which five or six holes are drilled. Then three to five nuclear explosives are stacked in each hole and the holes are detonated in sequence so that the shock waves will be less severe.

For oil shale recovery, the A.E.C. plans call for an experimental blast on its Nevada test site followed by a similar one somewhere in the Rockies.

If tests prove successful, atomic researchers envision exploding hundreds of nuclear devices a year to extract both gas and shale oil in the Rocky Mountain region. Public resistance to such development could be high, they concede, but that will depend on the long-term effects of energy shortages.

Also, private companies planning conventional techniques to get out gas and shale oil in the same region are concerned that the nuclear blasts might endanger their operations.

IMPORTING CHROME

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the February 13 edition of the Atlanta Journal included an excellent column on the issue of Rhodesian chrome by John Crown, who is a staff columnist of that newspaper.

Mr. Crown makes the point that in voting to resume the embargo against importation of chrome from Rhodesia, the Senate last December was acting more on the basis of emotion than on reason.

I feel this is an accurate evaluation, and I hope that this mistake will not be repeated in the House of Representatives when the issue comes before that body.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the column, "Importing Chrome," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IMPORTING CHROME

(By John Crown)

The emotional violins are being tuned up once again on a matter which should be regarded objectively and pragmatically in the national interest—the importation of chrome.

Chrome is an essential ingredient in the production of military hardware. Ergo, it is vital to the national defense. It is necessary that we have a source of supply that is both dependable and reasonable in terms of prices.

There are two major chrome producers. One is the Soviet Union. The other is Rhodesia.

Through some sort of twisted logic the United Nations has imposed an embargo upon Rhodesia on the grounds that it has an oppressive regime in power, while ignoring the fact that the Soviet regime is one thousand times more oppressive.

Thus members in good standing within the United Nations are supposed to piously ignore Rhodesia while engaging in unrestricted trafficking with the Soviet Union.

The gut issue, of course, is not oppression. The people who advocate a boycott of Rhodesia couldn't care less about oppression as such. What they are opposed to is what they call white oppression.

To them, black oppression is okay. And if you doubt it, try to find some boycott efforts against the likes of that black racial despot, Gen. Idi Amin who has persecuted and expelled and expropriated the property of all nonblack Africans in Uganda.

Rhodesia has a white minority and a black majority. The white minority has brought the country to the stage of development where it stands today. But we are supposed to boycott Rhodesia until the white minority turns over the country to the black majority. Never mind qualifications. Never mind ability to guarantee stability. Just turn it over—and run for your lives.

Because it was so illogical for us to boycott Rhodesia on the grounds of "oppression" and have to turn to the oppressive regime that rules the Soviet Union with an iron grip, in 1972 Sen. Harry Byrd Jr., D-Va., initiated legislation which would remove us from the United Nations boycott insofar as chrome was concerned.

Sen. Byrd—and the Congress—took the sensible approach that from a security point of view we have nothing to fear from Rhodesia. So why be forced to buy something essential to our defense from our greatest adversary? And at inflated prices.

Thus we freed ourselves from the Rhodesian boycott insofar as chrome is concerned.

But apparently with the illusory atmosphere of détente sweeping Washington, a move has been initiated to repeal Sen. Byrd's pragmatic legislation. Repeal of that legislation has been voted by the Senate. It now comes before the House.

There is nothing logical about the matter. It is sheer emotionalism based on either racism or racism in reverse.

The despotic dictatorship in Moscow has committed more crimes against mankind than can ever be accomplished in Salisbury. And yet if we cannot import chrome from Rhodesia we are cast upon the questionable mercy of the Soviet Union for this vital defense ingredient.

In recent years the House has proved more sensitive to national needs than has the most exclusive club in the world—the United States Senate. We can only hope that once again the House will recognize the lunacy inherent in repealing Sen. Byrd's logical legislation.

In refusing to enact favorable trade legislation for the Soviet Union, Congress itself has expressed some foreboding over the illusion of détente with our adversary.

Yet the Senate has voted to make us totally dependent upon the Soviet Union for defense chrome.

It doesn't make any sense. But then emotionalism never does.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, abler Members than I have spoken eloquently on the

CXX—368—Part 5

life and work of our highly esteemed colleague, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, on the occasion of her announcement of retirement from the House of Representatives. I approve and applaud all the well-earned accolades paid to her.

Being privileged to serve on the Appropriations Committee with her was my good fortune for many reasons. My district and my State hold great interest in many matters that came under her jurisdiction as chairman of the Interior Subcommittee. These matters included a wide range of our natural resources but probably more important, some fairly extensive matters of human resources, our Indians.

JULIA HANSEN was not just a friend of the American Indian. She was a person who devoted enormous time and effort to knowing the Indian citizens of our land, seeking out their problems and then applying this knowledge to the positive action that got results. Despite the universal regret we all have at her departure, these Indian citizens are losing a great friend and benefactor, the equal to which we may not see again. Their health, their education, and their hope for a future all are better served today because Mrs. HANSEN came their way. I stress these points because I sat at a vantage point of knowing the inside story of a great deal of her devoted work.

As a friend, as a lawmaker, as a chairman, as a person, JULIA HANSEN meets every test. To have worked with her is to have had experiences that are worthy to be remembered and cherished. Her love for and devotion to the well-being of America is a lasting inspiration.

But perhaps most of all, to have known her is to have had the privilege of serving with a keen mind, a devoted heart, and a courage unsurpassed. And this crowned with a typical western ability to make the incisive statement that scored the victory. May she enjoy a long and happy retirement.

TRUCK WEIGHTS ON INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1974, I introduced H.R. 13117 which deals with truck weights on interstate highways. Due to the widespread interest that the bill has generated, I include it in the RECORD:

H.R. 13117

A bill to amend section 127 of title 23, United States Code, relating to vehicle weight on the Interstate System

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 127 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 127. Vehicle weight.—Interstate System

"(a) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year under section 108(b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the Interstate System may lawfully be used by vehicles or combi-

nations thereof with weight in excess of twenty thousand pounds including tolerances carried on any one axle, or with a tandem-axle weight in excess of thirty-four thousand pounds including tolerances, or with an overall gross weight including tolerances on a group of two or more consecutive axles in excess of that produced by application of the following formula:

$$W=500(LN/(N-1))+12N+36)$$

where W=overall gross weight on any group of two or more consecutive axles to the nearest 500 pounds, L=distance in feet between the extreme of any group of two or more consecutive axles, and N=number of axles in the group under consideration; or the corresponding maximum weights or dimensions permitted for vehicles or combinations thereof of using the Interstate System within such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on the effective date of this Act, whichever is the greater. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions shall lapse.

"(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, two consecutive sets of tandem axles may carry a gross load of 68,000 pounds providing the overall distance between the first and last axles of such consecutive sets of tandem axles is 34 feet or more.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny apportionment to any State which allows the operation within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof that could be lawfully operated upon the Interstate System within such State on effective date of this Act."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the atmosphere of détente which has pervaded East-West relations in recent times must not be allowed to obscure the tragedy of Lithuania's lost independence. Since 1940, the people of this brave Baltic nation have suffered under Kremlin rule as a state of the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet invasion and occupation of Lithuania in World War II followed an all-too-brief era of freedom and self-rule for Lithuanians. I refer to the period beginning with the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, 56 years ago, although the notable past history of Lithuania dates from centuries earlier. Following the declaration of 1918, the people of Lithuania showed what self-government can and should accomplish. Progress and prosperity, imbued by the spirit of liberty, brought unparalleled benefits until the Russian aggression 22 years later.

Events since have shown that the spirit of liberty in Lithuania cannot be quelled, efforts at suppression notwithstanding. The aspirations of Lithuanians for freedom and basic human rights remain strong.

It is to the credit of the United States that to this day we have steadfastly refused to recognize the Soviet takeover of this valiant land.

ENERGY CRUNCH PUTS PET 4 UNDER SCRUTINY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the current controversy over the release of oil from the Elk Hills reserve forces us to study alternatives. With the advent of the Alaskan pipeline from the North Slope, the Navy's reserves in that area become more meaningful. I am hopeful we can release oil from Elk Hills because of two factors: increased use of nuclear power by the Navy and the realities of further reserves of oil being available in Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent to make the attached article a part of my remarks. The article follows:

ENERGY CRUNCH PUTS PET 4 UNDER SCRUTINY

(By Bert Tarrant)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—For 50 years, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, on Alaska's north shore, has been left much to the lemmings and caribou.

But the energy crisis may change that.

The reserve covers about 23-million acres, making it about the size of Indiana. Estimates of its recoverable oil range from 33-billion to 100-billion barrels.

By comparison, Alaska's much publicized North Slope contains just under 10-billion barrels of recoverable oil. Current proven world oil reserves are estimated at 600-billion barrels, enough to last 30 years at present world consumption rates.

The reserve is bounded on the east by the Colville River and south by the river to near the 156 longitude where it drops south to be bounded by the Naotak River. The north boundary is the Arctic Ocean. The west is around the 162 longitude mark.

Known as "Pet Four," it got its latest batch of publicity when Sen. Adlai E. Stevenson III, D-Ill., charged it and Naval Reserve No. 1 at Elk Hills, Calif., had the makings of another Teapot Dome scandal.

Teapot Dome was the name attached to major scandals in the Harding administration in the 1920s. Naval reserves were first transferred to the Interior Department and then leased to private oil companies without competitive bidding.

A Stevenson aide, Les Goldman, says the senator is convinced federal officials are fudging on Pet Four boundaries to allow oil companies to drill in the reserve's two-mile buffer zone and thus tap the oil pool.

Specifically, Stevenson charged that original offshore boundary descriptions that included all bays have been changed to the shoreline. This would allow state ownership of major bays and, therefore, part of the reserve.

Stevenson claims major oil companies are getting ready to drill in the area.

The director of the State Division of Oil and Gas, Homer Burrell, says the offshore boundary question appears headed for litigation.

He says Alaska has issued leases right up to the Colville River but that no commercial oil has been found in several years of drilling.

"No oil has been found and no oil is being or has been planned to be produced," he says. "Any allegations that oil companies are draining oil from Pet Four are patently false."

The tract was set aside in 1923 as a Naval Petroleum Reserve for national defense purposes, after oil seeps on the land were found.

The Navy carried out a \$60-million, nine-

year program that ended more than 20 years ago and confirmed existence of at least 100-million barrels of oil.

The U.S. Geological Survey has estimated the reserve at 33-billion barrels and subsequent estimates have pushed the figure to 100 billion. The Navy dipped its official estimate to 33-billion barrels in May of 1973.

Current development on Pet Four has been held to six producing natural gas wells used to supply Navy operations and the needs of native villages and Barrow, at the northern tip of the state. Permission has recently been granted for two additional gas wells.

Drilling is conducted under the supervision of the Department of the Navy by contractors using Navy equipment.

A total of 36 test wells have been drilled on the reserve plus 44 core holes to study the subterranean shelf composition.

Original plans for development of Pet Four called for shipment of the oil from Port Barrow on the Arctic Ocean, a port open less than two months of the year.

But the proposed Alaska pipeline has offered an alternative.

Pentagon figures indicate the reserve could be connected to the trans-Alaska pipeline for \$38 million. Spokesmen say a separate government pipeline would cost \$1.9 billion with about \$500 million needed per year for maintenance.

The Department of Interior says the separate pipeline estimates are too low and impractical. By comparison, Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., the firm that would build and operate the Alaska pipeline, says its line will cost from \$4.5 billion to \$5 billion.

A Pentagon energy panel says full development of Pet Four would render the Department of Defense self-sufficient in meeting military petroleum requests for either peace or war within 10 years.

The Navy admits the reserve probably will have to be opened within the next 10 years. In January of 1973 it announced it has a 10-year plan for detailed oil exploration of the area.

A FULL PAYMENT TO VETERANS

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that one of the most sacred obligations of this Government is to pay to veterans and their widows and children the full measure which the law allows. Unfortunately many payments are less than they should be because in the computation of annual income for determining amounts to be paid as benefits, reductions are made for social security payments and other public pensions which they receive.

In order to make more clear the intent of the law and to insure the full payment to eligible persons, I am introducing legislation to amend certain parts of title 38 of the United States Code. This bill would direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to disregard Federal annuities, endowments, and similar non-Federal public and private payments in determining annual income for purposes of setting veterans' pensions.

Not only would this measure clarify the law in this area, it would be a reassertion of our intention to deal fairly with veterans.

Mr. Speaker I include this measure in the Record for the benefit of my col-

leagues and for others interested in this matter:

A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide that all Federal retirement and similar payments be disregarded in determining annual income for purposes of the veterans' pension laws, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 415(g)(1)(G) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(G)(i) payments to an individual under any Federal retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plan or program,

"(ii) 10 per centum of the amount of payments to an individual under public (other than Federal) or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs;"

Sec. 2. Section 503(a)(6) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(6)(A) payments to an individual under any Federal retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plan or program,

"(B) 10 per centum of the amount of payments to an individual under public (other than Federal) or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs;"

Sec. 3. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall disregard payments under any Federal retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plan or program to an individual in determining the pension payable to that individual under section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this Act apply with respect to annual income determinations for calendar years after 1972.

COL. FRANK M. BASHORE—FAREWELL TO A SOLDIER

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, on the occasion of his recent retirement from active military duty, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the distinguished service given to our country by Col. Frank M. Bashore, Infantry, U.S. Army, retired.

Colonel Bashore entered the U.S. Military Academy in 1947 as a young man from his home in Lancaster, Pa. Appointed at large to West Point, Colonel Bashore graduated in the class of 1951, having made a name for himself as a hard-hitting, aggressive football player and all-around athlete. On graduation, true to form, he chose to serve in the infantry, one of the most demanding of the combat branches.

Shortly thereafter, he headed for the sound of the guns and was fighting at the front in the Korean war as an infantry platoon leader assigned to the 7th Infantry Regiment of the famed 3d Infantry Division. In Korea, Frank Bashore distinguished himself in combat, was awarded the Silver Star and Bronze Star Medals for valor, and won the coveted combat Infantry Badge.

After Korea, Colonel Bashore then served progressively in the normal staff, command, and school assignments, both in the country and overseas, that are

typical to the career development of a Regular Army officer. During the following years, for example, he graduated from the Command and General Staff College, and served another tour in Korea. In recognition of his valuable service during these years he was awarded the Meritorious Service Medal and the Army Commendation Medal.

In 1969 Colonel Bashore again headed for the sound of the guns, this time in Vietnam. There he served as a "green beret" commander and staff officer in the famous 5th Special Forces Group.

After Vietnam, Colonel Bashore returned to the United States and served again the various staff and command assignments.

On February 28, 1974, after 23 years of devoted and illustrious service to his country, Col. Frank M. Bashore, accompanied by his wife, Irma, and their children, took the honors at a retirement ceremony at Fort Bliss, Tex. Frank Bashore's decision to return to private life is a distinct loss to the military service and the country. The many decorations, medals, and badges worn on Colonel Bashore's blouse are a symbol, however inadequate, of the thanks that the people of this Nation as well as Korea and Vietnam, owe to this gallant soldier. We wish him the best of luck in his next endeavors.

ECONOMIC INCENTIVES FOR TAXPAYERS WHO ADOPT SOLAR ENERGY AS HEATING AND COOLING SOURCE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, shortages of all kinds appear to have become a part of American life. From a world perspective, if this Nation is to have freedom of action, we must halt our growing dependence upon foreign nations for scarce fuel resources.

In order to achieve energy self-sufficiency in the United States; and, at the same time, end dependence on foreign energy sources, we should greatly increase research and development of new sources of energy.

One step in this direction has been taken. The passage of the Solar Energy Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1973 will do much to encourage commercial development and public acceptance of solar energy for the heating and cooling of homes and offices. However, I think that in order to bring about early acceptance an additional step is required—economic incentives.

I have introduced a bill (H.R. 13203) that will grant a tax deduction when solar heating and cooling systems are installed in homes and offices.

The legislation will permit home and office owners to deduct not more than 50 percent of the cost of such solar heating and cooling equipment.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that such tax incentives be established immediately in order to induce compa-

nies to invest in solar power. Without such incentives, it is estimated that it would take at least 30 years for solar power to capture an important part of the energy market.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted particularly that if only 10 percent of the sunlight's energy could be converted into electricity, all of the electrical power consumed in the United States in 1969 could be generated from .14 percent of the Nation's land area. Thus, if larger numbers of homes and offices throughout the country adopt solar heating and cooling systems, we could halt in a very short time energy shortages in this country and dependence on foreign energy sources. We must encourage such utilization of solar energy. It is my hope that passage of H.R. 13203 will be a significant first step.

GOVERNMENT FRAUD

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the needed shakeup of the Federal Housing Administration has long been overdue evidenced by the exposure of corruption of FHA officials across the country.

The Federal Housing Administration is intended as a key to effective Federal housing programs, but it is obvious that some administrative officials are guilty of a disservice to the public interest. This point is very well made in an editorial on February 14 by WBBM-TV Chicago.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT FRAUD

Less than two years ago a major scandal erupted in the state of New York concerning the Federal Housing Administration. Several FHA employees, some holding high posts, were indicted on bribery charges. The investigation by the Justice Department led to allegations that more than 200 million dollars had been stolen from the federal government in home loan insurance schemes.

That 200 million dollars, it must be remembered once belonged to taxpayers just like you. And now there is reason to believe that perhaps taxpayers in many other states, including Illinois, have also helped line the pockets of unscrupulous FHA agents, contractors, bank and mortgage firm officials.

The ever-widening probe by the Justice Department of FHA doings has now reached Chicago, and the preliminary news is not good; an estimated 50 indictments have reportedly been returned. Of course, indictments are not convictions, but the scent of wrongdoing is strong in an agency that is looked upon by many as their last chance for decent housing.

The Federal Housing Administration is supposed to be there to help people who don't have the wherewithal to deal with the high rolling mortgage bankers and lending houses on their own. Now, it seems, these people, and other taxpayers, have been ripped off by many in the FHA, working in collusion with others outside the agency.

The Justice Department owes it to all taxpayers to see that the probe is expedited with all due speed. Too many good people depend on the FHA.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prize.

In this year's contest the theme was "My Responsibility as a Citizen." The winner from Virginia, Miss Bonnie L. Brockwell of Petersburg, Va. lives in the congressional district I have the honor to represent.

Her outstanding essay on responsibility as a citizen is an excellent guide to young people's participation in our democratic process. I invite my colleagues to read this fine article:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

So? Who cares? This is the attitude of many young citizens today. We are living in a decade of apathy much like that of the fifties. This is a direct contrast to the sixties in which youth eagerly faced up to their tasks as citizens of helping to improve their country. The time has come to stop waiting for someone else to step in with solutions. It is up to me to do my part.

As a young American citizen, I have certain responsibilities which I must meet vigorously and sincerely. Only in accepting these responsibilities can I share in the ideals of freedom on which my country was founded and for which my forefathers gave their lives.

My major responsibility as a citizen is to get involved. I must care, and reflect my concern in my actions. It is my duty to aid my country in any way that I can, and to help her be the very best country possible. The first step is to become enlightened; to find out what is going on around me. Because I live in a democratic society, I am free to ask questions. When something happens that I do not understand, I can write to my local newspaper or my government representatives and ask for information and views on the issue. I can also educate myself by taking time each day to read the newspaper, especially front page reports and editorials. Magazines and other publications can help keep me informed as to the events taking place in my country.

Yet only by responding to this information can I actually fulfill my responsibilities. Again I can employ local media. It is my privilege to write to my local newspaper and express my feelings through editorials and public opinion polls. My right to freedom of speech allows me to discuss my views openly with others. Finally, my state delegates, national congressmen, and senators were elected to reflect the interests and desires of the people. It is my duty to let my representatives know what I am thinking and how I feel. In this way, they will be better qualified to represent me.

This involvement must not be kept in the dark. It is my job to spark concern in other young citizens and to help enlighten those around me.

I can take actions both now and in the future to fulfill my personal responsibilities. I believe that if each individual did his or her part as a citizen, many of the problem issues of today would not exist. Thus by my single contribution, I am helping to achieve the overall solution to my nation's problems.

Soon I will be granted the right to vote. It is my responsibility to use this privilege to elect to office leaders who will work to improve my country and insure its democracy to coming generations. I can assume the task of population control in my later life by planning my family.

I accept and deal with many responsibilities in my day to day life. I can turn my heat down, drive slower, and turn off lights not being used to do my share to relieve the energy crisis. I am also able to clean up my country by proper disposal of discarded materials. In school, I can take an active part in student government affairs, classroom discussions, and mock elections. This involvement helps prepare me to face the responsibilities my citizenship imposes.

In the community I can participate in clubs and service projects which deal with the issues that threaten my country.

I try always to be conscious of the fact that my citizenship places a great deal of trust in me and demands that I dedicate myself to my country. She deserves my support in both actions and thoughts; I must remain loyal despite the turmoil that she inevitably faces. It is my duty to continuously put forth my best efforts to try to improve myself by setting an example other young people will want to follow.

Who cares? I care, because I want to fulfill my responsibilities as a citizen.

DISASTROUS BUDGET CUT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I protest, in the strongest possible terms, the elimination of the general research support program from the administration's proposed fiscal year 1975 budget. Many physicians and hospital administrators have written me concerning this source of funds to medical schools and teaching hospitals. The general research support program has in the past provided funds both for teaching hospitals and medical schools to provide seed money for young researchers just beginning their careers. In addition, these funds have also provided support for joint ventures such as the acquisition of instruments which might be used by a variety of investigators in a given institution. There are many other uses to which the general research support grant funds have been applied.

The deletion of these funds proposed by the Nixon administration will definitely erode the quality of research in our academic institutions and will hamper the development of research in the future. None of us needs to be reminded of the major role which research has played in developing programs of medical care for the future.

The elimination of this program from the budget preserves only a minuscule fraction of the health budget. The loss will be disproportionately felt because the general research support program has been a major factor in the establishment and development of young physician-scientists and, therefore, an important tool used to advance biomedical science in the longer view.

Mr. Speaker, I have written to Roy L. Ash, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, protesting again in the strongest possible terms, the elimination of this program in the administration's budget for fiscal year 1975. I am hopeful that the chairman of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood), will insure the continued vitality of this program. This discontinuation of this program will have undesirable consequences for the quality of biomedical research and medical care delivery. I urge that these funds not be cut.

ENERGY AND DEFENSE INDUSTRY PROTECTION ACT

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1973, I introduced H.R. 12040, the Energy and Defense Industry Protection Act. This bill would amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prevent control of foreign persons of American companies engaged in vital industries.

This bill has apparently generated a great deal of interest, and I am informed that copies of it are very difficult to obtain. I am inserting a copy of the bill in its entirety immediately following my remarks:

H.R. 12040

A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prevent control by foreign persons of American companies engaged in vital industries

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Energy and Defense Industry Protection Act".

SEC. 2. Section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 781), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) (1) It shall be unlawful for any person—

"(A) who is not a citizen of the United States; or

"(B) who is owned or controlled by a person who is not a citizen of the United States;

to control any American issuer registered under this section if such issuer is engaged in the energy or defense industries.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'American issuer' shall mean any issuer organized under the laws of any State, or having its principal place of business in any State; or any person owning or controlling such an issuer;

"(B) the term 'control' shall mean the ownership, either directly or indirectly, of 10 per centum or more of an issuer's voting securities, but the Commission may, by rule, set a lower figure for particular issuers or classes of issuers;

"(C) an issuer shall be considered to be engaged in the energy industry if a principal business of such issuer is the production or processing of crude oil, residual fuel oil, refined petroleum products (as defined in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973), shale, natural gas, coal, geothermal steam, uranium, or electricity;

"(D) an issuer shall be considered to be engaged in the defense industry if it derives 20 per centum or more of its gross revenues from contracts with the armed services or the Department of Defense, or from contracts with persons who have contracts with the armed services or the Department of Defense, or if such issuer produces a product, service, or commodity which the Secretary of Defense designates, by rule, regulation, or order, to be vital to our national defense;

"(E) when two or more persons act as a partnership, limited partnership, syndicate, or other group for the purpose of acquiring, holding, or disposing of securities of an issuer, such partnership, limited partnership, syndicate or group shall be deemed a 'person'.

"(F) in determining any percentage of a class of any security, such class shall be deemed to consist of the amount of the outstanding securities of such class, exclusive of any securities of such class held by or for the account of the issuer or a subsidiary of the issuer.

"(3) The Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration may, by order, upon application or upon his own motion, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing (which hearing shall be on a record within the meaning of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5 of the United States Code and shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of sections 556 and 557 thereof), exempt either conditionally or unconditionally any issuer engaged in the energy industry from the prohibition of this subsection if the Administrator finds that the granting of such exemption would not adversely affect the production or supply of energy within the United States;

"(4) The Secretary of Defense may, by order, upon application or upon his own motion, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing (which hearing shall be on a record within the meaning of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5 of the United States Code and shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of sections 556 and 557 thereof), exempt either conditionally or unconditionally any issuer engaged in the defense industry from the prohibition of this subsection if the Secretary finds that the granting of such exemption would not adversely affect the national defense.

"(5) Any person who is in violation of the provisions of this subsection on the date of enactment of this Act shall have two years from such date to bring himself into compliance."

WRONG MOVE ON ENERGY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we hope to continue to grind out a new version of Federal Energy Agency, it is obvious that the Democratic leadership is more interested in oratorical flights of fancy than seeing to it that the energy shortage is solved.

I specifically refer to the vote yesterday to impose a rollback provision in the pending legislation, as soon as it was known that the President would veto the emergency energy bill, because of the mandatory rollback provision.

Therefore, I insert an editorial on March 1 edition of the Chicago Daily News, even though, I recognize that this

kind of commentary is destined to be ignored by many Members of Congress:

WRONG MOVE ON ENERGY

Congress discarded principle and went on an emotional binge when it passed the emergency energy bill with its mandatory rollback of some domestic crude oil prices. Responding to a plea to "help the little people, the poor people," the House followed the Senate and sent to the President a bill he has no choice but to veto.

If there were any chance that a rollback would help the people, that would obviously be the way to go. There isn't a motorist in the country who wouldn't like to see gasoline prices go down instead of up. But the rising price is directly traceable to the shortage of crude oil. What we must have is more of it, and the way to get more is to make it worthwhile to bring oil out of the ground. Forcing down the price by government edict would be a virtual guarantee that needed oil would stay underground and never reach the gas pumps. There's no help for anyone in that direction.

Most congressmen know this, but the chance to play hero by appearing to "help the little people" was too inviting to pass up. It was safe, too, for Mr. Nixon had promised a veto and the blame for high gas prices would fall on an already unpopular President and on everybody's villain, the big oil industry.

The result is that unless the veto is overridden—and it should not be—the many essential or desirable features of the energy bill are further delayed. For one thing, the Federal Energy Office still lacks the statutory authority to do the job it is trying to do and must learn to do better. Once the rollback question is settled, Congress should speedily return to a simpler energy bill and get the necessary laws on the books.

By now it should be apparent to everyone that the energy shortage is no short-term affair. If and when the Arab oil embargo is lifted the shortage will be relieved to some extent, but it will by no means vanish. Inescapably, Americans must learn to get along with less while pursuing long-range plans to discover and develop more domestic sources of energy, with oil high on the list. It is futile to pretend that prices can be rolled back at the same time enormous sums must be spent on drilling for oil and building more refinery capacity.

The government is properly concerned with preventing unjustified price hikes and under-the-counter profiteering, and it must have the legal tools to enforce adequate safeguards. But a misuse of government power on oil pricing could have an effect similar to that of government blundering on meat prices last year. The price of meat held steady but meat almost vanished from the stores. Low gasoline prices will be no bargain if there is no gas to buy.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11500, the antioil mining bill, rigidly imposes a requirement that the dirt or soil removed to uncover a strip mine's coal seam be put back essentially where it came from. Even if it can be hauled away someplace unobjectionable and the mined land put to equal or better use than before, H.R. 11500 blindly insists,

nonetheless and regardless of the cost, that it be put back.

This is reasonable environmental zealotry.

It will unnecessarily run up the cost of mining coal, in many cases to a level where it just will not be mined. This energy will be lost to this Nation which needs it badly and no compensating advantage whatsoever will ensue.

It is time to blow the whistle on that kind of foolishness. H.R. 11500 makes about as much sense as trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak.

WARFARE AND WELFARE DO NOT MIX, LET US NOT "WPA" THE DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger's recent testimony last week should give us all food for thought. The Secretary, testifying before the House Appropriations Committee, admitted that between \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion of the current military spending request is there to stimulate the economy, rather than to meet essential defense needs. The committee chairman, our colleague, GEORGE MAHON, says he understands the figure to be about \$5 billion.

Based on what I know of the Defense budget, I am more inclined to credit Mr. MAHON's version. The Defense budget this year carries an unprecedented number of new programs, and it is astounding now to gain the admission that they have been created only for the purpose of spending money. Dr. Schlesinger wants to build submarine-launched cruise missiles that will do nothing our existing submarine-launched ballistic missiles cannot do better. He wants to give our strategic warheads hard-target capability, which will insure that the Soviets will empty their missile silos before our warheads reach them. He wants a new generation of clean tactical nuclear warheads to make nuclear war in Europe more feasible; somehow he assumes our use of clean warheads will prevent the Russians from coming back at us with their dirty warheads. These programs are not cheap—Pentagon pronouncements to the contrary, true military spending is scheduled to increase 9.3 percent about the current year's level, even excluding the effects of inflation—and they will be even more expensive as they get rolling in the years to come.

But more to the point—defense spending is arguably not the best way to stimulate the economy. Compared to the civilian programs which Mr. Nixon is starving to varying degrees, defense spending is highly technology-intensive, when what we need is spending that is labor-intensive. Defense spending produces approximately one-third fewer jobs per dollar than does civilian spending; the multiplier and pump-priming

effects are therefore reduced accordingly, though admittedly there are a lot of aerospace workers out of jobs.

While it may be argued that the energy crisis has created a new need for high technology programs, this is an argument against increased military spending rather than for it. Perhaps we should sacrifice some short-term economic health to gain a long-term energy technology base. But it is obvious that a nuclear physicist or engineer working on these new nuclear warheads is a total loss to our energy programs. We need to transfer these men out of weapons research and put them to work bringing us safer, cleaner, and sooner nuclear power generation.

I am pleased to see that the committee chairman, Mr. MAHON, and other members of the committee, including the gentleman from Florida, Mr. SIKES, have expressed deep reservations about creating a warfare-welfare complex. I hope to see this concept decisively defeated as the year progresses.

In California, our congressional policy has always opposed WPA for defense purposes.

FREEDOM FOUNDATION AWARD WINNERS

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, a number of Maryland Fourth District residents and organizations were recent recipients of the 1973 Freedom Foundation Awards, and I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal pride, and that of Maryland, in their accomplishments. Their achievements mark a high level in the remarkable quality of patriotism reflected in Marylanders, and I would like to commend the following:

Vincent Godfrey Burns of Annapolis, Poet Laureate of Maryland for "American Poetry;"

Brooklyn Park Elementary School for their school publication, the B.P.E.S. Journal;

The U.S. Marine Corps at Fort George G. Meade for Governmental Unit Activities;

Master Sergeant Jack F. Holden of Fort George G. Meade for his Armed Forces Letter "Human Goals—Value for Living;"

Cadet Barry N. Breen of Laurel for his Armed Forces Letter "Human Goals—Values for Living;"

Captain Michael P. Nemchick, U.S.N.R. of Oxon Hill for his Armed Forces Letter "Human Goals—Values for Living;"

National Sojourners, Andrews Chapter of Temple Hills in the Community Programs Category;

Frederick Sasscer Junior High School in Upper Marlboro in the School Category; and

Cadet Martha Lewis, Air Force Junior R.O.T.C. in Upper Marlboro for Armed Forces Letter "Human Goals—Values for Living."

FEDERAL PROGRAMS WITH A HEART

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago I was able to observe three very fine and wonderful programs that get assistance from the Federal Government. It would do the heart good of every citizen in the country if they could see programs like these in action—where their money is spent wisely and for good purpose.

My first visit was to a half-way house for alcoholics in Daytona Beach, Fla. This program, Halifax Alcohol Court Oriented Program, Inc.—HACOP—was begun by my good friend Hal Marchman who is the minister of the Central Baptist Church in Daytona. The director is Mr. James Dawson and one of their very inspiring staff members is Robert Roden who coached three Olympic boxing winners, all of whom became world champions.

The phenomenal thing about this rehabilitation program is their 55 percent success record. Their action with an alcoholic is a revolving-door type process—contacting him as he is going to jail; getting the cooperation of the judge in releasing him to their mission to sober; and urging him to participate in the HACOP program. It's a no-nonsense program, with 22 hours of group therapy each week and lots of responsibility, both for the treatment center and for the individual being helped. They have nine buildings for their treatment facilities, as well as two retail stores which they have established. Many patients work in their retail stores, while others work outside the community in all walks of life—secretaries, construction workers, businessmen, medical technicians, et cetera.

Many times I have talked in speeches about the importance of work to a man. It is good to see a program that forces an individual to accept responsibility—first just for keeping himself and his room neat and clean; to perform small jobs; then finally to accept full-time work.

So far, in this one program in Daytona Beach, HACOP with Federal assistance since 1970 totaling \$18,315 has helped house some 248 at the mission house and helped rehabilitate 712 persons. These folks now hold responsible jobs—pay their taxes—but most of all, many of them are helping other alcoholics find the way back to normalcy.

Another federally funded program which I was able to see in action was our meals on wheels service. The Director of this program is Mrs. Shirley Ferguson and Mrs. Barbara Egan, nutritionist for the Volusia County Health Board, works with the group. Some of the top volunteers are Mr. and Mrs. Richard Zellar, Mrs. Anne Alberti, Mrs. Faye Weaver, all of Daytona Beach; Mr. and Mrs. Hubert Matthews, Holly Hill; Mr. and Mrs. H. S. Housh, Ormond Beach; and Mrs. Gladys Honaker, New Smyrna Beach.

Until you have seen with your own

eyes the needs of many of our elderly and sick citizens, you cannot begin to understand how much this one hot meal delivered to them 5 days each week means. To many, it makes the difference in being able to stay in their own place or having to find a place where they can be cared for.

Today, in the Volusia area alone, the Meals on Wheels program, provided for under the Older Americans Act, is taking a hot lunch to some 325 people. The balanced meal of meat, vegetables, milk, et cetera, costs from 25 cents to \$1.30, depending on ability of the person to pay. It is delivered by a gracious volunteer.

While the Federal Government can assist an elderly citizen by bringing hot, nourishing lunches, it will take action by neighbors, friends, churches, retired citizens' organizations, civic associations, youth groups—to see that they are given the warm human companionship that drives the stark loneliness from their lives. I want to urge everyone in the Fourth Congressional District who can possibly do so to devote at least 1 hour a week visiting these folks. I know you will feel just as enriched as I did by this experience.

A third program which deeply impresses me is the Retired Senior Volunteer Program—RSVP. Bringing assistance, compassion and fellowship to thousands, RSVP received a grant of \$38,350 in Federal funds for this year. Already they have their limit of 125 volunteers, with a long waiting list of others who want to serve. There are only three paid employees—all the others volunteer their time and effort for work in nonprofit organizations. Mrs. Pat Cleland is the project director and volunteers who have been recognized for giving 100 hours of their time are Mrs. Pauline Barto, Mr. Francis Bidwell, and Mr. David E. Winnerstrand.

The project which I visited was the Talking Library for the Blind. It is manned mostly by retired telephone workers. Other volunteers do hospital work; act as teachers' aides in the public schools; assist at four libraries; visit in nursing homes; do clerical and other work for the American Heart Association and Easter Seal; and additionally they show movies for senior citizens and do miscellaneous work for the Meals on Wheels program.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when some of the Federal Government's programs are criticized as extravagant, I am proud to report to my colleagues and constituents on three programs that exemplify the humanitarian attitude we had in mind when we created these programs. I wish to highly commend the three programs and the many wonderful volunteers that make them work.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve with JULIA

BUTLER HANSEN in the House of Representatives for the past 14 years. Her retirement at the end of this year will mean the loss of a colleague of great conviction and dedication.

Mrs. HANSEN has compiled a record of great accomplishment, particularly in the area of environmental concern. As chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee she has espoused national conservation legislation providing the development of governmental policy in the areas of reclamation of National Park and forest lands, hydroelectric power development, and fisheries conservation. Her efforts on behalf of the Indian people in the form of increased funding for hospitals, schools and employment opportunities are among her many achievements.

Mrs. HANSEN is the first and only woman to serve on our House Democratic Steering Committee, an example of her many "firsts" as a woman. As Democratic Woman of the Year in 1958, and by her example before and since receiving this award from the Democratic Party, she has paved the way for the inclusion of women and minorities in the policymaking bodies of our Democratic Party.

It is with mixed emotions that we accept her decision to bring to an end 37 years of public service. She will be missed in Congress and the Nation will lose an able legislator. We who have had the privilege of serving with her will miss her pragmatic leadership and wise counsel. Mrs. Zablocki and I extend our very best wishes for a well-deserved retirement with the hope that she will be able to do all the things she has planned and that her days will be filled with much happiness.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting to you a speech by Linda Mallon which won her recognition by the Veterans of Foreign Wars in their Voice of Democracy Contest in Montana. I feel that Linda exemplifies the young people of today which will be the governing citizens of tomorrow. Her speech is refreshing evidence of strength and character of America's young people. Linda having won the State contest will soon be in Washington, participating with other young Americans for national honors. It is a high privilege of mine to enter her winning essay into the Record:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

America is young and unfinished. It is like a skyscraper being built story by story with each generation adding new rooms, new levels. The sturdy foundation was built with the concrete ideas of freedom and of a democratic government. Upon this, each story was built and rebuilt with improvements and changes constantly being made. As a young citizen I am a carpenter helping to shape and build a place for our generation. I am a part of the designing and constructing of a beautiful America.

It is my responsibility to get all the education possible so that I will be able to do my work with skill and knowledge. Each one of us must take it upon ourselves to be aware of the many blue prints that our country can follow. Whether a conservative or a liberal format is used, is up to us. So it is important that we are aware of the world around us to see which designs have succeeded and which have failed.

It is my duty to state my opinion in the building of this country because every individual has the right to voice what he or she feels. The first step in the future is to begin forms of good citizenship. I will work beside and with my fellow man helping him when he falls, praising him when he is victorious. In one more year I will be given the right to vote—one of the greatest privileges of democracy. My vote *does* count, and I must try to use this vote wisely. To prepare myself for the task of being a good citizen, I must be able to tell what is right and what is wrong. I must decide for myself which design to follow.

I am obligated to America for all that it has given me: protection for myself and those I love, the freedom of religion, speech, press, the freedom to choose, to express myself and the right to be unique. I must realize that these gifts of freedom cannot be taken for granted.

Although sometimes our country seems wrong in the way it works, we must support it, for without this support it would fall. We have so much more than so many other people that everyone should be grateful. If someone or some power were to try to destroy our country, it could not be ruined—if the people would stand beside it and fight for it. The building of America is a difficult task, and with each generation the job seems to become more difficult.

As an American citizen I will work to the best of my ability to construct a story of our generation, and I hope that it will be the most wonderful of them all.

America, an ever-growing skyscraper, reaches toward the limitless sky, standing strong and united. America is young and unfinished.

LITHUANIAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OBSERVATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, the Cleveland American Lithuanian community commemorated the 56th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

While the Republic, and its neighboring States of Latvia and Estonia, was able to prosper and grow during the 1920's and 1930's, these small, free nations were caught up in the whirlwind of World War II. Marauding armies crossed and recrossed the land, and in the land, and in the end, Soviet Russia remained in control, snuffing out the independent existence of these nations.

For nearly 50 years now, these nations have been under the control of the Soviet Union.

Yet as free men, we must continue to remember the plight of these peoples. When any man loses his freedom through oppression, the freedom of all men is threatened.

We have particular cause to remem-

ber the plight of these peoples at this time—for their plight has just been re-dramatized by a Nobel Prize writer who describes the horrors of the huge prison state system which fell on Lithuania and its neighbors. Lithuania is a Gulag Archipelago—a massive prison camp.

As we welcome the freedom of Mr. Solzhenitsen, we should continue to remember those who are left behind—those who still look to use for the ideal and reality of freedom.

POLITICAL KIDNAPINGS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been somewhat surprised and little disappointed at the lack of much intense concern on the part of my colleagues in the kidnapping of Atlanta Constitution Editor Reg Murphy and that of Patricia Hearst.

These are political kidnappings and significant of more than has been recognized, therefore, I insert into the RECORD an editorial by Jim Alvord, managing editor of the Sun Journal of Lansing, Ill.

A MOST DESPICABLE ACT (By Jim Alvord)

The recent kidnapping of Atlanta Constitution Editor Reg Murphy prompted a well-intentioned reader to call the other day.

"Jim, what would happen if someone decided to kidnap the Sun Journal editor?"

"Funny you should ask. I had a talk with my publisher about that this morning and he made some advance policy decisions."

"And?"

"He will pay a ransom up to but not exceeding \$10. In addition, I am to be docked for any time away from the office."

While this conversation never really took place, the safe return of Murphy and capture of his abductors caused a brief sigh of relief to be heard across the country. It's only a brief sigh because the fate of Patricia Hearst remains an unknown factor.

Upon reflection, one gets the unmistakable impression that the kidnap craze may become a national malady, similar to the skyjackings of '72 and '73. There is apparently some perverse law of human nature that says sick minds travel in patterns. The Murphy kidnapping came fast on the heels of the Hearst case, and you can probably expect a few more in the near future. The question, why, must be asked, but as usual, there is no logical answer.

An even tougher question to answer is why do the poor people of California accept the fresh meat and vegetables given to them by Randolph Hearst. Even the slowest of minds can comprehend the fact that this food is blood money of sorts, a forced donation from an anguished father. In addition to violating the most basic of moral principles, the poor people are paying the way for future blackmail programs. The food giveaway, called People in Need, began last Friday and was punctuated by confusion and violence. People were actually fighting over their share of the ransom booty. It makes me think humanity has reached an all-time low in America.

Furthermore, where are the radical leaders now that we need them. Ever championing for freedom and fairness for all men, those

silver-tongued rebels are now conspicuously silent. If they were to rise up in unison, condemn the actions of the Hearst kidnappers and forbid their followers to accept the food payments, another kidnapping could be avoided. It seems that justice is a one-way street as far as they are concerned.

There are those who will say what do you know about being hungry. It is true I have been fortunate in this life, never facing an urgent need for food, clothing or shelter. And yet at the same time, I can say without fear of contradiction that I would rather starve than feed off the misery of innocent kidnap victims.

William Randolph Hearst didn't make the people of California poor. In fact, the reverse is true. The empire founded by his father has created jobs for hundreds of thousands of people through the years. People who rap the super rich and big business never give thought to the idea that their money makes money for everybody. If all the owners of large companies decided they didn't want the headaches of business and shut down in favor of lifetime vacations on the Riviera, there wouldn't be many people cashing paychecks on Friday.

We can only hope and pray for the safe return of Patricia Hearst. While the Bible teaches tolerance and understanding, I'm running a little short of both commodities as far as the Symbionese Liberation Army is concerned. I've been an opponent of capital punishment my whole life, but I'm beginning to think I was wrong.

MIKE AND MARK HEMBD 1974 POSTER TWINS FOR NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CITIZENS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues two recent visitors to Washington and the association they represent. Mark and Mike Hembd, 5-year-old twins from Cypress, Calif., were selected as poster children for the National Association for Retarded Citizens. Yesterday, they met with Mrs. Nixon at the White House, and I had the pleasure to meet them when they visited the Capitol.

This was the first public appearance for Mark and Mike. I am sure they will remember their visit to the White House with pleasure, and that their trip to Washington will be remembered for a long time.

NARC, whose name was recently changed from National Association for Retarded Children to National Association for Retarded Citizens to reflect its concern with both children and adults, is a 24-year-old association with 270,000 members. Mr. Marion P. Smith of Clearwater, Fla., president of NARC, accompanied the twins, their parents, Mr. and Mrs. James A. Hembd, and their brother Scott, to Washington.

Mr. Smith said NARC was created to provide services and programs for the 6 million mentally retarded persons in the United States, and to foster research

on the causes and prevention of mental retardation.

As a Californian, I have supported that State's efforts to improve the life of its mentally retarded citizens. I have been impressed with the success of these efforts to bring the mentally retarded into the community as productive and independent members of the society. Mark and Mike Hembd are fine examples of these efforts. Their selection as poster twins for 1974 underscores two principal needs of mentally retarded children: the reduction of the number of retarded persons in institutions through expansion of alternative services in the community; the need for more special education opportunities in public schools.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend NARC for the fine work they are doing in behalf of retarded persons. Mark and Mike are great youngsters, and will, I am sure, represent NARC well during 1974. The need for better understanding of the problems of our retarded citizens by the public is a vital one. NARC performs this task admirably. My best wishes to both NARC and the Hembd family for the future.

NUTRITION FOR ELDERLY

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would extend urgently needed funding for the nutrition program for the elderly through 1977.

Millions of our elderly citizens suffer from poor nutrition primarily because they cannot afford nourishing, well-balanced meals. In addition, their limited mobility makes it difficult for them to shop or cook for themselves. Even when they can, they often do not know what foods to choose or how to prepare them. Feelings of loneliness and rejection common to the aged compound the problem by killing any incentive to cook a meal only to eat it alone.

The nutrition program for the elderly was established in 1972 to combat this problem. It provides hot, nutritious group meals to senior citizens at a very low cost. Meals are served at centrally located sites such as schools, churches, and elderly housing projects.

Transportation is provided where necessary and means are home delivered to eligible shut-in individuals who would otherwise be unable to participate.

The program not only promotes better health among senior citizens and reduces their isolation but it also gives older persons and welfare recipients job training and employment.

Funding for this vital program expires June 30. My bill would amend title VII of the Older Americans Act to authorize extended funding at a rate of \$150 million for fiscal 1975, \$175 million for fiscal 1976 and \$200 million for fiscal 1977.

For most of the participants, this program has meant the difference between being sick, lonely and dependent or being able to continue living in their own place independently and surviving a few more years in the dignity to which they are entitled.

For former welfare women, the training, jobs and experience have meant the difference between being stigmatized by welfare or leading independent, productive lives in their communities.

I believe that termination of the nutrition program would be a tremendous setback in our efforts to improve the lives of our older citizens. Therefore, I urge you to support my proposal.

PRIESTS CALL FOR IMPEACHMENT

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the Oakland Association of Priests, an organization doing volunteer work in the diocese of Oakland, has sent me a copy of a resolution passed in their meeting of February 25.

I would like to call this resolution to the attention of my colleagues. First, it shows once again that the people who feel that our Government and our political system are being disgraced by the present administration are no small minority of congenital malcontents, but a wide spectrum of the American people.

Second, it shows that impeachment proceedings are necessary if the corroding spirit of distrust and dishonesty is not to triumph over a chance for a new start. As the poet William Blake said, we need—

To call down a great solemn assembly, so that he who will not defend the truth may be compelled to defend a lie, and so be snared, and caught, and taken.

The resolution follows:

ASSOCIATION OF PRIESTS,

Oakland, Calif., February 28, 1974.

Representative RONALD DELLUMS, California Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS: At its monthly meeting, held on February 25, the Oakland Association of Priests, passed the following resolution:

OAP RESOLUTION 2/74

Whereas, the stability and performance of government depends upon the moral and legal probity of elected and appointed officials, and:

Whereas, the present administration has, through various activities and involvements, diminished public trust in government, raised serious doubt in the public's mind as to the legality and morality of certain of its actions, and:

Whereas, the Constitution provides that in such situations officials may be impeached.

Let it be resolved therefore: That the Congress be urged to begin impeachment proceedings summarily against Richard M. Nixon.

REV. PAUL ROSS VASSAR,
Secretary.

COAL DEVELOPMENT MUST NOT BE BLOCKED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from my good friend, Andrew Freeman, manager of the Minnesota Power Cooperative in Grand Forks, N. Dak., which very vividly describes the great energy potential that lies in the North Dakota coal fields.

Andy also describes in no-nonsense fashion the serious dangers of several legislative initiatives that would inhibit our Nation's ability to make use of this vast resource located in North Dakota and several other States.

I believe Andy's letter should be read by every Congressman and Senator, and I, therefore, insert it in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

MINNKOTA, POWER COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., February 20, 1974.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: I know that you, along with other Congressmen and Senators of this upper midwest area, are aware of the fact that North Dakota and other western states contain vast deposits of coal and that these are now being considered as fuel for power plants, gasification plants and other petro chemical purposes.

I want to urge you to take no action which would block us from using these resources or placing an undue burden on our opportunity to employ them for they are vital to our own economic survival and to the welfare of the residents throughout a several upper midwest state area, if not the entire nation.

This energy crisis confronting the nation is real. It is not something that we are going to solve with a 68° thermostat or a 55 mile an hour speed limit or a price rollback. It is more than a political slogan. It is a national emergency and it's about time all of us wake up to that fact. All of us in fact, must begin to realize that we are in trouble and that our local coal deposits must be called on to take on some of the load now being carried by oil and gas, and do it quickly if we are to avoid some very serious economic repercussions.

There is no other way to keep our national integrity and economy in balance. We must, as quickly as we can, shift to an electric economy and use electricity made from coal or atomic plants in every way possible to displace some of the oil and gas that we are misusing to heat our homes, fuel power plants and supply industrial heat and the like.

Today 88% of our domestic fuel reserves are in the form of coal. However, they supply only 17% of our energy needs. On the other hand, known gas and oil reserves are being called upon to supply over 70% of our energy requirements with no known capability to sustain such a loading.

Coal cannot meet this challenge and serve as an effective weapon to combat the energy crisis if pending legislation in the Congress becomes law.

At this very moment, we are talking about achieving a self-sufficiency position with regard to energy, yet we have a Congress passing and considering legislation which is dangerously out of phase with what must be done.

How can we, in good conscience, consider outlawing the stripping of coal? Where would you get the miners or machinery to underground mine North Dakota lignite? Don't

people know that someone tried that 50 years ago only to find out that in the course of time, it rendered the surface useless?

Then there is the Seiberling Amendment calling for a \$2.50 increase in the cost of coal as a way to discourage strip mining. Aren't costs going up fast enough already without more aid to inflationary forces?

There is also congressional effort being expended which will require lands to be returned to their original contour. Why do that? In many cases a better contour can be had by changing the contour as is already in evidence in central North Dakota where strip mining is the only way much of our coal can be mined.

The Mansfield Amendment is another piece of legislation that doesn't make sense and could do much to destroy numerous coal fields that are in future power production plans. In western North Dakota there is much mineral wealth in the hands of the federal government. The enactment of such an amendment could greatly discourage and very likely kill any opportunity to mine such land.

I think this nation must realize that the energy crisis is real in that oil and gas are carrying a burden far greater than the known reserves warrant. We must switch a part of this load to an electric economy. This electricity must come in part from coal and in part from atomic power and come as quickly as possible.

Already you can see the great disruption that has come to our economy. Next year the impact will be greater. It could find its way into food production due to lack of fuel and fertilizer. When that happens, then widespread suffering will begin and trouble will be upon us.

From where I sit and based on my experience and knowledge, I can assure you the energy problem is real and our lignite coal can and must be a part of the answer. Every acre of lignite has the heat equivalent of 1,350,000 gallons of fuel oil. One million acres of North Dakota land contains 15 billion tons of lignite worth a trillion 350 billion (1,350,000,000) gallons of fuel oil or 30 some billion barrels of oil. Yet it represents less than 2% of the state's area, just a little more than the area of one of our small counties. If it were to be mined over a 40 year period it could supply all the heat, light and power that every farm, every home, every school, every church, every commercial place and every factory and still have enough left to take care of the growth that would occur. What's more, all the mined lands would be reclaimed. What a small price to pay for a tailor made contribution to the energy crisis that our nation is facing.

Please don't do anything to destroy our opportunity to use this valuable resource by hastily passing unrealistic laws that can only add to the troubles our nation is plagued with. What is more, work to see that your fellow colleagues don't do it either for this strip mined coal is badly needed if we are to overcome the challenges we face.

Yours very truly,

ANDREW L. FREEMAN,
Manager.

AMENDMENT TO VOTER REGISTRATION ACT, H.R. 8053

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, at such time as the House considers H.R. 8053, the Voter Registration Act, I intend to offer an amendment to section 5, requiring the States to publish lists of register-

ed voters at least 60 days prior to a Federal election. The text of my amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 8053

Page 16, immediately after line 21, insert the following new subsection:

(b) State officials in each State shall, no later than 60 days before any Federal election, prepare and distribute a list of the names and addresses of all residents in each State who are registered and qualified to vote in such Federal election.

Page 16, line 22, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

SOVIET ADVISERS MOVE INTO PERU

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, a very disturbing article recently appeared dealing with Soviet efforts to penetrate into Latin America. Even though the Communists failed in their efforts to transform Chile into another satellite nation like Cuba, they continue to probe for vulnerable areas among our Latin American neighbors. In a story which appeared in the Star-News, Fred S. Hoffman cites American intelligence sources as pointing out direct Soviet movements into Peru. Not only have substantial amounts of Soviet equipment been shipped into Peru, but also Russian military advisers have appeared. An arms race now appears quite possible among many of the nations of Latin America as a result of these initial actions taken by the Soviet Union. It is entirely understandable that Peru's neighbors have become quite disturbed by this Russian intervention and feel the need to protect themselves with comparable military equipment. A costly military buildup by the nations of Latin America would be detrimental to all their economics. Consequently, we must express our alarm over these dangerous developments in hopes of dissuading the Soviets from possibly precipitating warfare in our own hemisphere as they have done before in Asia and the Middle East. I include the Star-News article at the conclusion of my remarks:

[From the Washington Star-News, Feb. 25, 1974]

SOVIET ADVISERS MOVE INTO PERU

(By Fred S. Hoffman)

U.S. intelligence sources say Russian military advisers have moved into South America for the first time.

They report that Russian technicians have arrived in Peru to train Peruvian soldiers in the use of T55 medium tanks bought from Russia last year.

Soviet military advisers have been present in Cuba for about a dozen years, but they have never been accepted by a South American nation.

Peru's purchase of Russian tanks and other military hardware has alarmed Chile and other neighboring countries. The appearance of Russian military advisers is certain to deepen that concern, U.S. military officials said.

American intelligence is uncertain how many Russian tanks and advisers have reached Peru. There Peruvian government

has bought as many as 200 medium tanks, heavy artillery and other arms, and may be planning to order small SA7 antiaircraft missiles from the Soviet Union.

Russia has been trying for some years to gain an arms sales foothold in South America.

Moscow concentrated on Chile until the overthrow of the leftist Allende government by a rightist military junta last fall. Despite offers of low-price, low-interest, long-term arms deals, Russia was not able to open up a market there.

Then the Soviet Union switched its focus to Peru, and Peruvian President Juan Velasco acknowledged two months ago that his government had bought tanks and other weapons from Russia.

This was followed by reports that Chile's new military rulers were negotiating with the French for the possible purchase of more than 40 AMX30 medium tanks, which the Chilean army regards as comparable to the Russian armor bought by Peru.

Meanwhile, Chilean officers asked for American tanks and planes, arguing that these new armaments are essential to maintain an armed balance with Peru.

The Chileans have been telling American diplomats and military men that the Peruvians might use their new military muscle to try and take back territory lost to Chile in the War of the Pacific nearly 100 years ago.

U.S. officials appear to take little stock in talk of a new Chilean-Peruvian war, but they are disturbed at what is shaping up as an arms race in Latin America.

Ecuador, another neighbor of Peru, reportedly has indicated to American officials recently that it wants to buy arms from the United States. This came after it was reported that Peru is planning to form a new army division, and possibly an air force wing, to be stationed in a region bordering Ecuador.

NEED FOR A FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add my support to H.R. 11793, legislation to reorganize and consolidate certain energy programs and policies within a Federal Energy Administration. Events of the last few months have vividly demonstrated the need for strong and coordinated leadership to resolve the energy problems our country is now unfortunately facing.

H.R. 11793 is important for several reasons. First, it will resolve any remaining confusion concerning the proper lead-agency for implementing energy emergency policy.

Second, the bill allows the Administrator the flexibility he needs to resolve energy emergency problems on a short-term basis. For example, the committee did not outline the specific functions of the six Assistant Administrators of FEA, observing "that the emergency nature of the agency, quickly changing conditions, and the varied functions to be performed, require the utmost administrative flexibility."

Third, this legislation recognizes the need for more timely and relevant energy information across an entire spec-

trum of issues. The need for accurate energy supply and demand information has become painfully apparent during this energy crisis. The bill takes an important first step toward resolving the problem by expanding the Administrator's powers to collect and evaluate data.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11973 lays the foundation on which we can hopefully resolve the energy crisis and sets us on the proper course toward energy self-sufficiency. I urge immediate enactment of the bill before us this afternoon.

Thank you.

HOW NOT TO CURE AN ENERGY CRISIS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, if we are really concerned with solving the energy problems which now face the Nation we would do well to consider the manner in which these problems developed. It will do little good to make scapegoats of the petroleum companies or to call for dramatic new governmental interventions in the economy if such actions are irrelevant to the real causes of the problem. It is clear that they are indeed irrelevant to such causes.

Government intervention is, in fact, one of the chief causes of the problem. Before such intervention, no shortages existed. Once a ceiling price was set on natural gas, however, exploration was discouraged, usage was increased, and shortages developed. Once Government banned the use of coal with sulfur content, the supply was sharply restricted. Once laws were passed requiring drastic reductions in the engine efficiency of automobiles because of pollution related modifications, the use of gasoline dramatically increased. The list goes on and on.

Government has itself stimulated the excessive demand for energy in the United States. Dr. Gary North notes that:

The governments have subsidized cheap power for years. They have not permitted public utilities—themselves the monopolistic creations of governments—to raise prices on their various products. So the public has accepted as valid economically the one indicator they have to measure the value of the energy source, that is, the cost-per-unit consumed. The government has deliberately subsidized the public by keeping prices lower than the companies have insisted was necessary.

While many now tell us that the same government which caused today's crisis is the best agency for correcting our difficulties, Dr. North disagrees. He points out that:

The answer to the . . . crises lies in the re-establishment of the free mobility of risk capital, the free bargaining of private citizens with each other, the free mobility of prices, and the eradication of 'free' goods and the fallacious philosophy which undergirds them . . . Let the free market do the . . . rationing efficiently, and we will not need

to be burdened with the ghastly inefficiency of statewide or Federal economic planning.

If any event in our recent history has provided us with an example of how the free market works and how Government intervention distorts and destroys it, the question of our energy resources is that example. Hopefully, we will learn the proper lessons from this difficult time.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article, "How Not To Cure an Energy Crisis," by Dr. Gary North, from the February, 1974 issue of *The Freeman*, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

HOW NOT TO CURE AN ENERGY CRISIS

(By Gary North)

(NOTE.—Dr. North, economist, lecturer, author, currently is an associate of Chalcedon, an educational organization dedicated to Christian research and writing. His latest book is *An Introduction to Christian Economics*, Craig Press, 1973.)

President Nixon went on national television on November 7, 1973, to announce to the nation that we are in the midst of an energy crisis.

Since the mid-1950's, when the construction of Federal highway projects was seen as the eighth wonder of the world, we have now come full circle. Highways are bad; now we need rapid transit. Southern California, which had quite a serviceable electric trolley car network—the Pacific Electric—now must spend billions of dollars of taxpayers' money in order to achieve as good a system as we had in 1950, before the days when government-financed "freeways" were built.

We have the best possible highways—safe at 70 miles per hour on some stretches, safe at 65 virtually everywhere. Now we are told that we should only drive 50.

Unfortunately, as General Motors President Edward N. Cole has pointed out in a letter to Sen. Jennings Randolph (November 8, 1973 release), most of our driving is done under 50 anyway—around town or on country roads. United States Department of Transportation data indicate that only about 42 per cent of the driving is done at speeds of over 50—and I wonder if this takes into account the driving done at under 50 during traffic jams on the superhighways. So the new speed restrictions, even if imposed in all states, would only save the nation 45 million barrels of crude oil annually, or about two and a half days' worth of consumption. Terrific!

EFFECT OF NEW SPEED LIMITS ON THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Then, of course, there is the effect the new speed limits will have on the trucking industry. Shipments will be delayed, since truckers will not be able to drive at the higher speeds. Government regulations over rail transport, coupled with near-monopoly status of the "favored" railroads, now offer us another crisis. Some cities face both power shortages and shortages of other goods and services. Government regulations are like stones tossed into pools of water; they create ripple effects that not even the most sophisticated computer predictions can foresee.

So we return to the first half of the proposed crisis cure: restrictions, voluntarily imposed, on energy use. We turn of all neon signs, for example, as they have done in Oregon cities. A spokesman for the Outdoor Advertising Association of America informs us that this will save about 1 per cent of all electricity used in the country.

What about voluntary restraint on heating homes and businesses? Perhaps it may be healthier. It may encourage higher output. But why should a firm or a housewife keep the temperature down? By their own demonstrated preference, people like warmer climatic conditions in the winter, cooler in

the summer. Each man will always have that nagging doubt: I'm living less comfortably, but what about everyone else? What good does one uncomfortable family (or work crew) count in a nation of millions?

NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE

Indeed, the problem is very much like the smog problem or the traffic jam problem. How much pollution or how much used-up space will one additional automobile cause? An infinitesimal quantity, obviously. Literally unmeasurable by macro-economic tools. Each family or each driver or each business concludes that his presence or his use of power won't make that much difference. Each person is absolutely correct; it won't make much difference. All those micro decisions, however, produce macro crises in today's world.

Yet, in other areas of our lives, the micro decisions do not produce macro crises. The newspaper boy fails to deliver a paper one day. This is an inconvenience, but not a disaster. You can call up the local distributor, and a man will send out the paper. If this happens too often, there is an economic incentive for you to take another newspaper. The newspaper managers know this, so they take care to organize their staffs so that the paper does get delivered most of the time. It pays them to have built-in self-correction devices that operate against micro-economic errors.

There is an economic incentive for companies to see to it that micro failures do not become macro failures. And they have a reliable indicator to remind them of their task: the profit and loss statement. It works so long as there is the right to exchange property (including labor) on a market of freely changing prices.

These are outright micro failures. But what about micro decisions that should not be, in and of themselves, detrimental? Suppose pizza eaters who have for years ordered their pizzas with mushrooms should decide to order them with pepperoni. All of a sudden, pizza shops have to order more pepperonis and fewer mushrooms. As always, customers set prices. Their increased demand for pepperonis increases the price of the available supplies of pepperonis, for the customers are bidding (as always) against each other. Meanwhile, the price of mushrooms tends to drop.

Then entrepreneurs will concentrate their attention on increasing the supply of pepperonis more efficiently—more inexpensively—in order to reap profits. Up goes the supply of pepperonis, which is precisely what the public has demanded, while the mushroom producers are forced to cut production, freeing economic resources (such as capital) for more important uses. No "crisis" emerges—no television speeches by the President, no Congressional hearings, no paperbacks from Nader's summer vacation student lawyers—unless someone tries to impose price controls on the pepperoni industry.

BREAKING THE CHAIN

With price controls, however, the complex chain of economic events is disrupted: no one is quite sure just how much pepperoni should be produced or which pizza shops should get priority consideration in receiving the now short supplies—short in relation to public demand at the artificially low price of pepperoni. Soon the Italo-American Society will be picketing on the Capitol steps, the Pizza and Straw Hat Amalgamated Brotherhood will be petitioning Earl Butz, and the FDA will send out preliminary warnings against debased pepperoni quality to all the pepperoni producers of the nation. We will then have a full-blown crisis. The public will be asked to order at least one mushroom pizza for every three pepperonis, with rationing of pepperoni pizzas threatened if "voluntary" restraints—one's patriotic duty in the war against spiraling pepper-

oni prices—should fall. Then the Cost of Living Council will add a new department: the Pepperoni Control Division. A chain of underground black market pepperoni pizza parlors will spring up. All over America, certain unpatriotic citizens will be whispering into door-slits, "Luigi sent me." A simple shift in taste at the individual level, when coupled with price controls, can produce a national macro catastrophe.

Therefore, we can adopt a simple (though not infallible) principle: where micro decisions produce macro crises on a regular basis, someone—probably the civil government's officials—is probably interfering with the right to exchange property (including labor) on a market of freely changing prices.

WHO'S TO BLAME?

Are the Arabs cutting off our oil—variously estimated from 6 percent of our total supplies to 12 percent, which tells us something of the accuracy of statistical reporting—thus producing a crisis? Why didn't we have a reserve, such as the north-slope Alaskan oil? Because ecology advocates prohibited the construction of the pipe to transport it; they go government agencies to stop construction. Because ecologists stopped drilling for new oil in places like the Santa Barbara channel—again, by state interference.

Are persons using too much energy, that is, more than this week's crisis mentality in Washington would prefer? Well, why not? The governments have subsidized cheap power for years. They have not permitted public utilities—themselves the monopolistic creations of governments—to raise prices on their various products. So the public has accepted as valid economically the one indicator they have to measure the value of the energy source, that is, the cost-per-unit consumed. The government has deliberately subsidized the public by keeping prices lower than the companies have insisted was necessary. So the companies have not been able to afford to hire the best people available. In some cases, they have found it necessary to keep older, less efficient equipment, having it repaired by less skillful repairmen on their staffs. They have found it difficult to raise capital on the free market, for their bonds are rated low (and therefore the interest they must offer to pay must be higher) because some local public utilities commissions have had their eyes on the ballot box instead of the scarcity of capital.

SHIELDED FROM COMPETITION

Then, of course, there is the inefficiency of managements that are shielded from free competition. For years they have faced political battles with the public utilities commissions instead of economic battles with competitors that might otherwise have been able to enter the market. Who can say what alternatives might have been developed?

The public supposedly has been protected by these various power monopolies. Now the government finds that the public must co-operate in order to make the jerry-built government monopolies work more or less successfully. But the public is not given an economic incentive to co-operate. Are electricity rates boosted sufficiently to cut down the consumption of electricity? No, indeed; that might be politically dangerous! So we go to voluntary controls in the name of the national emergency. They are too much like the "voluntary price guidelines" that were scrapped on August 15, 1971. We co-operate voluntarily, or else . . . rationing.

There is another consequence of "voluntary" controls to consider. Citizens are asked to cut back on their consumption of power. Before this crisis, individuals were free to use up as much power as they chose, so long as they were willing to pay for it. With free pricing, the expenses associated with such physical comfort would have to be

borne by the user. But today men are warned that those who keep their homes warmed are unpatriotic, even immoral.

So now, instead of producers competing in order to give the customers what they want, we see the incredible spectacle of gasoline companies telling customers to walk more or to ride the bus! They spend millions of dollars to buy television advertising to ask us not to use their products! And because of the threat of direct rationing and the creation of a "temporary emergency control board," this advertising may be well spent by the oil companies. The competition we see now is not between the gas company and the electric company, but between the ecologists' political bloc and the energy-crisis political bloc. This, it should be noted, is precisely what Soviet Russia has developed: the only competition is that between government bureaucratic agencies. The consumer simply hopes and prays that the system will operate after the political dust has cleared, or at least has settled into another province's back yard.

The answer to the macro-economic crises lies in the re-establishment of the free mobility of risk-capital, the free bargaining of private citizens with each other, the free mobility of prices, and the eradication of "free" goods and the fallacious philosophy which undergirds them, whether in this country, Libya, Venezuela, or Japan. Let the free market do the micro-economic rationing efficiently, and we will not need to be burdened with the ghastly inefficiency of state-wide or Federal economic planning. Micro-economic decision-making is the primary device for keeping crises on a micro level. At least, under micro-economic crises, someone gives me a direct incentive for sitting in 68-degree semi-comfort: I don't wind up with a monthly bill that produces 72-degree financial discomfort.

NEW DEPARTMENT IS NOT NECESSARY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the executive branch of the United States presently has ample departments and legislation to handle the current energy crisis. Be that as it may, there are still efforts being made to establish another Cabinet-level agency. Such an office would prove to be an irresponsible move on the part of the Congress. We cannot let anything such as this happen.

An editorial in the Fort Worth Star Telegram of March 2, 1974, discusses the problem and should be noted by my fellow Members of Congress and the general public.

The editorial follows:

NEW DEPARTMENT IS NOT NECESSARY

A sound case can be made against the proposal in Congress (S. 2135) for creation of a new major bureaucratic entity called the Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

In the first place the addition at this time of any such new thick layer to the already massive structure of federal bureaucracy that was not absolutely necessary (and a Department of Energy and Natural Resources does not fall into that category) would be financially irresponsible and administratively unjustified.

This is a time for trimming the federal

hedges, not planting more to proliferate in years to come.

We cannot quarrel with those who point to the urgent need for better management of our energy need for better management of our energy and natural resources problems. What seems obvious, however, is that the federal government—the White House and its administrative arms—already has at its disposition enough bureaucracy in place to deal with them and to deal to the necessary degree with Congress in solving those problems.

What is needed is not another cabinet-level department, but strong and well-conceived use of the departments and the authority now resting in the administrative branch of government. What is needed is direct, effective action by enlightened, strong leadership within the present ample federal framework.

Those are some generalized objections to creation of the new department. But there are some specific objections that can be raised, too. The present proposal would, if adopted, transfer the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to the new department. This, as officials of the Trinity Improvement Association have been saying, would deprive the U.S. Corps of Engineers of its main source of review of projects for engineering, economic and environment feasibility.

All funding for water resource projects also would be lumped into the new department, thus interposing a new bureaucratic hurdle between Congress and the public in implementing needed projects all over the nation.

Our energy and natural resource problems are indeed pressing—more now than ever—but we do not agree that relying on an ill-conceived plan for a new cabinet-level agency of government to solve them is the way to go about it.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY—MACALESTER COLLEGE

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, March 5 commemorates the 100th anniversary of the chartering of Macalester College, located in St. Paul, Minn. The new educational institution was founded by Edward Duffield Neill as a grammar school and preparatory school for the University of Minnesota, as well as a religious education adjunct of the university.

It was named after a benefactor, Charles Macalester, who donated Winslow House, located on the eastern banks of the Mississippi River near St. Anthony falls.

The original property was later sold and a new college campus was located at St. Paul.

Over the years, Macalester has grown into one of the Nation's best liberal arts colleges. The college has contributed significantly to the educational and cultural climate in the Upper Midwest. It is noted particularly for its interest in international affairs, being the first college to fly the U.N. flag in the State. Macalester also developed the Student Project for Amity Among Nations—SPAN—under which students spend time in foreign countries learning about their cultures as well as their problems.

In recent years, Macalester has had a relatively high proportion of foreign stu-

dents and also operated a special program for foreign newsmen.

The college is planning to celebrate this milestone throughout the coming year and I wish it well as it begins its second century of service.

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD:
STATESMAN AND LEADER

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most astute observers of the national scene and as articulate a writer on matters of great public concern as we have in the American press corps today is Harry Hamm, editor of the Wheeling, W. Va. News-Register.

Today I call to the attention of my colleagues in Congress his recent editorial on the statesmanship of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, the distinguished majority whip of the U.S. Senate.

Senator BYRD has earned the respect of his colleagues through sheer dedication to excellence in the performance of his daily responsibilities. We are fortunate indeed to have a man of his caliber, reared in a coal mining family, experienced to Government, and attuned to the needs of America, occupy his present position of leadership. I have no doubt that he will be called to tasks of even greater magnitude in the years ahead.

Mr. Hamm's perceptive editorial follows:

BYRD'S RISE ON NATIONAL SCENE EYED

Not for many years has any West Virginian moved into the national political spotlight on the scale as has U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd over recent months.

The energetic Sen. Byrd has even been mentioned by several national publications as a possible contender for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1976. Certainly he must be considered as a strong prospect for the Vice Presidential spot on the next national Democratic ticket.

Sen. Byrd's rise into the American political limelight has not been contrived like the boomlet briefly attempted for Governor Moore in Republican politics. It is not press agency on the part of the popular West Virginia Senator that has caused network television shows to seek him out for appearances or various national publications to turn out major articles about Sen. Byrd. The attention he is getting results from his diligent work in the United States Senate and because of what he stands for in the political arena.

The Senator's straightforward approach to the issues of the day is what the people like about him. At a time when most politicians are held in low regard, it is refreshing to find a man such as Byrd who is not afraid to tell the people where he stands. He does not always seek out what appears to be the popular view. He does what he thinks is right and most of the time it turns out that the rank and file people are with him.

This explains his fantastic popularity in West Virginia where he won reelection with a 78 per cent landslide the last time out. He is the only West Virginian ever to serve in both houses of the state legislature and both houses of the Congress.

Depending upon which way Sen. Byrd decides to go in the future, there is little chance that he can be unseated even by Governor Moore, who some believe might decide to take him on in '76 when both of their terms in office expire.

Sometime between now and January 1977, Senator Majority Leader Mike Mansfield will retire from his post. No one doubts that Sen. Byrd can have this high position if he wants it. Winning the Majority Whip's post over Sen. Edward Kennedy demonstrated Sen. Byrd's strength with his colleagues. If anything, he is even stronger with them today because he tends to business and many of his colleagues owe him favors.

If the Majority Leader's position would come his way before 1976 that would place Sen. Byrd in somewhat of a bind in becoming a part of the national ticket. Even as a Vice Presidential candidate, Byrd would be forced to take to the campaign trail and he is not one who believes in shirking his Senatorial responsibilities. His amazing Senate attendance record bears this out for in 1973 he missed only one of the 594 rollcall votes, an attendance of 99.8 per cent. In fact, his percentage of attendance at rollcall votes since 1959 stands at a remarkable 96.7 per cent.

Nevertheless, Byrd is getting increased national public exposure. Today, for example, he will appear on the highly regarded NBC television program, Meet the Press, which is seen locally over WTRF at 1 p.m. In recent weeks he has appeared on several network television shows, including an interview program on the national educational television network, in which he was very impressive.

Byrd is being invited to appear as a speaker at more and more national meetings and conventions although he is forced to turn down many such engagements because of the press of duties in the Senate. Recently he did invade Wallace country when he was the featured speaker at the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in Birmingham, Alabama. Reports say he made a fine impression on Alabama Democrats during that appearance.

At no time, however, does the Senator neglect the problems and cares of his constituents at home. He maintains regular contact with various persons throughout the state, often telephoning them from Washington to chat about what is happening in West Virginia and sample how they feel about national issues of the moment. He is a fighter for West Virginia and responsible for the flow of millions of federal dollars into the state for worthwhile projects.

The national publications have assigned their top writers to do special feature articles on Sen. Byrd and even those who do not like him admit that he is a worker. "The New Times" a liberal magazine recently did a lengthy piece on Senator Byrd and while it was rather caustic the article admitted that he had a dedication to his constituents, a gargantuan capacity for work and a genuine yearning for self-improvement. The magazine noted how Byrd got his law degree at the age of 45 by going to night school.

U.S. News & World Report magazine frequently has carried stories about Sen. Byrd and lengthy interviews on timely subjects. Last January, Howard Flieger, editor of U.S. News & World Report wrote an editorial in which he was highly complimentary of Byrd's address before the National Association of Food Chains in Washington.

He quoted from that address as follows: "One of the most prevalent and frightening attitudes in America today is that of being complacent, apathetic and noncommittal—the absence of deep convictions on anything."

"We can condemn—and we do—the intellectual shortcomings of television and newspapers, we can decry—as we should—those who abuse the protection of the Fifth Amendment; we can deplore—as we do—the

vicious and senseless criminality that pervades our social structure.

"But how often do we hear our leading citizens, in all walks of life, stand up in public and declare themselves unequivocally on matters of real principle and consequences?"

"Ethics cannot thrive in a neutral mind, and the most dangerous enemies to our way of life are not only those who loudly threaten to overthrow the system; equally dangerous to our freedoms are those who say they don't much care, one way or the other."

Some observers claim that Sen. Byrd has tended to become more liberal in his political views as he bids for the Senate Majority Leader's post and moves into the national Democratic limelight. But I don't find that to be the case. The truth is that Sen. Byrd always has been liberal on certain issues and conservative on others. The secret to his success stems from the fact that when he is liberal or conservative most likely a majority of citizens stand the same way.

Naturally there are certain questions where Byrd has changed his viewpoint as times and conditions have warranted. Always a bitter foe of Communism, today Sen. Byrd realizes the necessity of detente with the Soviet Union and China. He also has advocated a more relaxed attitude towards Cuba.

When it comes to crime and lawlessness he continues as a hard-liner. That is one position where he rallies the support of most Americans. And that very well may be a significant point in boosting Sen. Byrd into the Democratic national spotlight even more in 1976. One columnist on the national scene noted the other day that the selection of the next President of the United States now is "very likely to reflect a renewed public demand for toughness" against criminals and terrorists.

Keep an eye on Sen. Byrd. He has the stuff that Americans are looking for in their leaders today.

TRIBUTE TO BARTON L. COLLINS,
CHIEF OF DETECTIVES, SAN JOSE,
CALIF.

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1974, friends and associates of Chief of Detective Barton L. Collins will honor his retirement after 38 years of distinguished service on the San Jose Police Department with a testimonial dinner. It is fitting that we, too, should pay tribute to this dynamic civic leader and outstanding police officer.

Born in Nevada City, Calif., on September 16, 1911, Mr. Collins and his family moved to San Jose in 1914 where he has been a resident ever since. He attended local schools—Horace Mann Grammar School, Roosevelt Junior High School, San Jose High School, and San Jose State College—and worked his way through all of them. He graduated from State College in 1935 with a bachelor degree in social sciences and three minors in police administration, photography, and psychology.

After graduation, he was appointed, as the department's first college graduate, to the San Jose Police Department on August 3, 1935. He continued his edu-

cation by attending the University of Santa Clara Law School for 2 years and quickly progressed through the ranks of the department. He was appointed chief of detectives in February 1947 and has served in that capacity for the last 27 years. Bart's record has been outstanding. During the entire time he was on the department, he has had a perfect attendance record with no absences from work.

He made it a point throughout his career to keep abreast of developments in his profession, and he attended numerous in-service training programs. He also graduated from the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy in 1957, where he was elected as class vice president, and has remained a member of the FBI National Academy Graduates.

His vast and valuable knowledge of criminal investigation has made him a much-sought-after lecturer in this field. He was an assistant professor at the San Jose State College School of Law Enforcement and Administration during the years between 1951 and 1970 and at the Coast Guard Reserve Academy during the summers of 1959, 1960, and 1961. He was also guest lecturer and panel member at numerous conferences and seminars dealing with criminal investigation, where his expertise in this field won him national recognition and acclaim.

Barton Collins is a firm believer in the advancement of the law enforcement techniques through worthwhile professional groups. He was a founding member of the California Safe and Burglary Investigators Association in 1950 and served as the president of the northern area in 1952. He was also a founding member of the Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit in 1963; vice chairman of the northwest zone, 1965-67; chairman, 1967-69; and was national vice chairman of the organization in 1969-71. And he was chairman of nine Bay Area Counties Task Force on Organized Crime for the California Council on Criminal Justice.

While it is obvious that Barton Collins has spent much of his life dedicating his enormous talents and energy to finding new and better ways of protecting the citizens of San Jose from crime, he also found time to become one of San Jose's most active and productive civic leaders. It would be impossible, Mr. Speaker, to list all of the civic activities Barton Collins has participated in during the years he has lived in San Jose. Even those in which he provided his leadership capabilities make a most impressive list.

He organized the Keith Kelley Club of the San Jose Police Department served as director of the Santa Clara County United Fund for 4 years, and was a member of the board of directors for 2 years for the mental health association. He was elected to the San Jose Police and Fire Pension Board in 1946 and has served continuously to the present including several terms as chairman of the board. He was also active in the Boy Scouts of America for 7 years and is a member of the San Jose Scottish Rite bodies, where he was venerable master in 1968 and 1969. Even with these de-

manding civic responsibilities, he has found time to be active in the San Jose Lion's Club since 1956 and served as their president in 1967 to 1968.

San Jose owes tribute not only to this outstanding citizen, but also to his wife, Mary, and his three daughters, Kathryn, Jeanne, and Barbara, who have so unselfishly shared Bart with the San Jose community. It would be a sad day, if the testimonial dinner on March 14 marked the end of Bart's service to the community. But I know he has already taken on new responsibilities as executive secretary of the San Jose Scottish Rites bodies and that he will surely continue to make Santa Clara County a better place for all to live.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have Bart Collins living in the Ninth Congressional District and I know my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to this dedicated servant of the people of San Jose. His long and extensive record of commitment to the civic progress of our community makes him well deserving of this tribute.

FEDERAL AID FOR MASS TRANSIT

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to strenuously object to the recent action taken by the Rules Committee which in effect killed the Senate-House conference agreement providing Federal aid for mass transit. The administration is up to its tricks again, and once more, it is the consumer who suffers. Just as the White House effectively delayed final congressional approval of the Energy Emergency Act for nearly 3 months while the people of New Jersey were waiting hours for 3 gallons of gasoline and paying unjustifiably high prices for fuel, the latest move by the administration will delay a positive attempt to save and restore ailing mass transit facilities in the Northeast.

When the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1973 was before the House, the administration tried to and almost succeeded in defeating the needed legislation. The White House was inalterably opposed to operating subsidies and effective mass transit aid. Then came the energy crisis, and "surprise" the office down the avenue was urging Congress to take affirmative action to see that there is further mass transit development and improvement of existing systems. I can only ask at this point in time, "Where were you?"

Mr. Speaker, heavily populated northern New Jersey, the site of daily mass intrastate and interstate commuting—a region inequitably bearing the brunt of a gasoline shortage—would have received \$35.2 million to revitalize its transit systems. The administration's proposal would reduce that to \$28.5 million. The New York system, which is very much a part of the metropolitan area's systems

and which also is in dire straits for financial support, would receive nowhere near the amount it would be funded in the Minish bill.

The administration bill will thinly spread the funds throughout the country. I realize there are mass transit needs in places other than the New Jersey-New York metropolitan area, but the needs are not as great. The New York Times of today correctly indicates that the administration formula would provide 9 percent of the total funds to New York City despite the fact that New York City "accounts for 40 percent of the Nation's transit passengers."

It is obvious, once again, that the President is still abiding by his earlier statement, rather announcement, that the urban crisis is over—that the problems of the city are no longer substantial. Mr. President, I beg to differ.

RECENT VISIT TO ISRAEL

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, last week, my very able Massachusetts colleague, JOE MOAKLEY, addressed the Jewish Community Council of Boston. Having recently returned from a trip to Israel, JOE offered his personal observations of the situation in Israel, as well as his incisive thoughts on America's Middle East diplomacy.

I insert his remarks in the RECORD so that others may have a chance to read JOE's excellent speech. The speech follows:

RECENT VISIT TO ISRAEL

I welcome this opportunity to be here today. It seems particularly appropriate to discuss my recent visit to Israel with you, as you prepare to celebrate the feast of "Poorem" on the 8th. Centuries have passed, yet the story of "Poorem" continues to provide models of courage and daring for Jews in Israel and throughout the world. Surrounded by the most formidable enemies, the children of ancient Israel remained steadfast. They refused to compromise their integrity or their faith. Nor did Queen Esther shrink from personal danger, but interceded with the king to save her people.

The current generation of Israelis is no less threatened by its neighbors and it is no less courageous. Also notable is the dedication of Jews in this country to the survival of Israel. Since my visit to the Holy Land, I understand more deeply your devotion and the reasons for your intercession.

I was impressed by the willingness of Israelis to walk away from their civilian careers to take up arms to protect their country without complaint. It was praiseworthy. It was moving, for I know that the dream of the "Halootseam" was to build, not to fight—to turn swords into plowshares.

Above all, I know that the overriding wish of Israelis is for peace. Shalom is their greeting. It is their farewell. Shalom is the true goal of Zionism.

I expected to find gloom in Israel. I had read that the war had been costly in many ways. In truth, I did find some disillusion with their leadership. People were discouraged because the war had not resulted in an

easy, clearcut victory as in 1967. The people were deeply disappointed that none of the African nations they aided had made even a gesture of friendship in their hour of need. They were hurt that the NATO nations not only turned their backs on them, but even refused to allow Americans to refuel on their land. Israel was also in the throes of coping with the adverse effect of the war on their economy. There was much sadness throughout the entire nation because of the war dead.

But all this is normal and to be expected. What surprised and touched me was the undaunted spirit I encountered. The people were tireless—willing to work 12 to 14 hours a day to restore their country. As we all know, they have been through four major wars in 25 years and will go through another four if necessary. But like all of you, I pray it will not be necessary. The cost of war on this tiny nation is high.

As I returned to my room in the King David Hotel in Jerusalem one evening, I tried to analyze why peace in the Middle East has been so elusive. Israelis that I spoke to were convinced that this most recent war was more a contest between Russia and the United States than between them and their neighbors. I partially agree, but I see other explanations as well.

U.S. policy in the Middle East has been sloppy. We have made certain guarantees to Israel and then in the crunch, not entirely lived up to them. We did this in 1967. We sat by while the Egyptians blockaded the Straits of Tiran. We did this again in 1970. When Soviet built missiles were installed on the west bank of the canal, Senator Henry Jackson tried to persuade then presidential advisor Henry Kissinger to insist upon their removal. Unfortunately, Jackson was unsuccessful.

I understand the U.S. leaders' reluctance to rattle sabres. But, I wonder if our leaders understand the Soviet tendency to test for softness with bayonets?

I understand the Nixon administration's particular investment in detente. I applaud their efforts to ease global tensions.

But I wonder if Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Nixon understand that one sided detente is more dangerous than no detente. The present detente has fostered some very fuzzy thinking. At the height of the recent crisis Kissinger said Soviet behavior in 1973 compared favorably to Soviet behavior in 1967. Yet it was in 1973, not in 1967 that the Soviets resupplied the Egyptian and Syrian armies. It was in 1973, not in 1967, that the Soviets issued calls to Iraq, Algeria, and other Arab countries to fight. In all, more than seven points of the formal detente were abrogated by the Soviets.

I understand and respect the wish to deal fairly with both sides in the controversy. But I wonder if the State Department understands how much the slogan "even handedness" is a creature of Soviet and Arab propaganda? Israel's very existence is called "aggression". Not to mention the territories gained in 1967. But who refers to Egypt's acquisition of the Gaza as aggression? Jordan acquired the west bank and the old city of Jerusalem by force in 1948. And need I remind you that the U.S.S.R. annexed over 272,500 square miles of territory through World War II?

The Israelis are called aggressors. They have been labeled arrogant and intransigent even in our press. Yet they have never been unwilling to negotiate. What has prevented any agreement in the past, has been Egypt's consistent refusal to accept any negotiations, direct or indirect.

Our wish for peace in the Middle East is strong. So strong that it has sometimes blurred our vision of reality. Hence, we have dismissed the public proclamations of Arab leaders as so much hot air. Yet, surely we

must realize that where feeling runs high, such proclamations create commitment.

We tend to ignore the radical Arab leaders and become mired down in the deliberately ambiguous statements of the moderates. Moderates talk of "secularization" or "naturalization" of the Middle East. At best this means Jews would be a tolerated minority under Arab rule. At worst, one need only consult the history of tolerated minorities throughout 13 centuries of Islamic rule.

Moderate leaders no longer talk of driving the Israelis into the sea. It is not that they have grown fond of them or resigned to their existence.

The Arabs simply see Israel's extinction as their ultimate goal, not their immediate one. Every indication is that the Arabs are following a strategy of isolating Israel diplomatically. The oil embargo was devised to drive a wedge between the United States and Western Europe and Japan. The goal is to weaken U.S. support for Israel. We are a country grown tired of war after a decade in Vietnam. The Arabs and their Soviet sponsors are capitalizing on this weakness.

I believe that Secretary Kissinger acted to avert a major crisis in the middle east. Yet I am sympathetic to the Israelis who are skeptical. Many feel that he moved too quickly. They fear he was motivated by the Arab oil embargo and the resultant strain on NATO. I personally agree with Kissinger that if the United States had taken a hard line position, we would never have gotten Egypt and Israel to sit down at the same table.

My own attitude is to keep a vigilant watch on the outcome of those negotiations to see how well the guarantees to Israel are honored. I do not for one moment assume that Arab antagonism to Israel is artificial. True, it is fanned by the Soviets for practical purposes. Other nations use it to secure their ends in the Middle East. Arab leaders capitalize on it to achieve solidarity. The Israeli feat of forging a viable nation in the desert sands is a painful reminder of Arab failures.

Therefore, I am not as sanguine as the administration is about peace being at hand. What I do believe, is that President Nixon needs some foreign policy successes to compensate for his domestic failures. I am certain that he is working very hard to achieve peace.

I do not wish to place all the blame for Israel's plight on U.S. foreign policy failings either. Other members of NATO have been at fault as well. Many of these nations have differed publicly from the U.S. on the issue of the middle east—obvious to the threat divisiveness poses to our alliance. Only the Dutch and the Portuguese can be proud of their stand in the face of Arab blackmail. History will surely find the rest of Europe short sighted.

On another score, we have to realize that since 1967 the Arab world has made progress. Undoubtedly the Israelis became over confident as a result of their 1967 victory. They underestimated Arab ability to unite and to wage war. We overestimated Israeli ability to overcome any obstacle.

The Israelis are a talented, hardworking people. I imagined that I saw in them, reminders of a young America where a devoted hardy group of people worked together and overcame many hardships to build a great nation. The spirit, the energies, the talents may be the same. The geography is altogether different. Israel can only survive with the help of our Government and private organizations. She is surrounded by unfriendly neighbors. Soviet policy plans to keep the Middle East cauldron boiling. The small, oil rich Arab nations are happy to finance Egypt's wars with Israel. It protects them from Egypt. The conservative monarchies are eager to rally their people against Israel. It strengthens their positions vis a vis the

opposing radical forces who seek to depose them.

In sum, we must be guided by the lessons of the past. Israel will be best protected by a firm, unflinching American policy of support. We must insist on a demilitarized Sinai. The October attack made this abundantly clear. Surely there is widespread resentment because of the coercive tactics used by the Arabs and the Soviet to organize the diplomatic isolation of Israel. Let us capitalize on this resentment, not join the boycott. Of all the nations we aid, none is more grateful than Israel. Let us dramatize this point with our commitment.

We must also recognize that the Arab-Israeli quarrel is a threat to world peace only because the USSR has exploited it. The Middle East has become a weapon for Soviet policy. Their plan is to radicalize the Arab regimes; break their ties to the West; gain control by outflanking NATO in the South, neutralizing Europe, and driving the United States out of the Mediterranean and Europe.

I want to encourage all friends of Israel to keep pressure on the administration. Nixon's firm stance in October had a salutary effect on U.S. public opinion. Over 75% of those polled in late October approved sending aid. Only 4% disapproved. This represents more widespread U.S. support than in 1967.

Most indicators suggest that the majority of Americans are sympathetic to Israel. They do not, however, want to become involved in another Vietnam. But Israel desires no such involvement. Moreover, polls reveal that Americans are unwilling by a 2-1 margin to sacrifice Israel for oil. And for this too, I am glad. Clearly this is as in other foreign policy matters, American public opinion is shaped by the actions and opinions of the political leadership in Washington. Let me assure you that my trip to Israel has deepened my insight into the Middle East. It has strengthened my already strong commitment to continue to work on behalf of a secure Israel. Shalom.

NATION NEEDS REVISED FHA

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues have long shared my concern for the future viability of FHA as an instrument to help working Americans become home owners. For those who have yet to realize the problem, let me say that the system developed three decades ago simply does not do the job in today's housing market. The regulations and statutes now dictating its operations are unrealistic in most of the growing urban and suburban areas of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which, while perhaps not the final or whole answer to making FHA viable again, will, I am confident, put the issue squarely before the Congress where it should be. FHA is dying by attrition. The Congress should decide openly and by direct action whether FHA is to be abolished or made effective. I offer this bill as a vehicle for bringing about a much needed debate. I do so at this particular time because the Housing Subcommittee on which I serve is currently making up a community development and housing bill. It is my hope that the subcommittee, will at an appropriate time in the next

few weeks, extend its consideration to the subject matter of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the majority of my colleagues will be persuaded as I am of the necessity of an FHA-like component continuing as a part of the overall dynamics of the housing industry. To construct such a vehicle is a task we can ill afford to neglect any longer.

SPEECH OF DR. ROGER W. HEYNS

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, there has already been an overabundance of words on Watergate. However, few persons have put the recent events in Washington in such vivid and constructive context as did Dr. Roger W. Heyns, President of the American Council on Education in a speech before the ACE Interns. His message on the responsibility for leadership is so profound that I take this opportunity to present it to the other Members of the House and to the country.

SPEECH OF DR. ROGER W. HEYNS

I am prompted to reflect on the uses of power as I think of the current calamities in Washington: those complex and pervasive events called the Watergate affair. It is not my intention to take sides, to present my conclusions about guilt and responsibility, to gloat or relish the discomfort of people in power, but rather to consider some of the lessons concerning leadership and authority which all of us can properly and usefully contemplate.

The malfunctions in Washington are not unique to exalted offices. They can be present in all institutions in our society and at all administrative levels. To the extent that these malfunctions reflect the frailty of mankind and the temptations to which we are susceptible—and I think they do—they are potentially possible for all of us. Anyone who has held a position of significant responsibility has experienced one or another of the maladies represented by Watergate. We have all had, or come close to having, our little Watergates. This observation in no way justifies anyone. It should serve to make us humble.

Let me be explicit about some of the aspects of leadership and the exercise of power which we are obliged to contemplate, particularly if we think of Watergate not in terms of what others did or did not do but, as I now urge, in terms of what we should learn.

First, we are reminded vividly of the age-old problem of means and ends and of the ancient wisdom that they cannot be separated. Noble ends pursued by ignoble means end in disaster—the results not just pragmatically unsuccessful but permanently harmful and destructive. While we may, in our desire to win or to show sympathy, discount unworthy acts committed for noble causes, we know this is hollow indeed. We are obliged always to be sensitive of the presence in ourselves and in others of excessive zeal for goals that seem worthy.

Second, we are reminded of the need, in the exercise of power, for the constant free and unedited flow of information and advice. We all know of the constraints and weaknesses that tend to interfere with the flow. Free exchange is time consuming; it confronts us with conflict. We know the unpleasantness of bearing and receiving bad

news. Yet we see how perilous is information and counsel fed through a screen too fine for the complexity of the problem and how dangerous an orthodoxy too strict for useful heresies to be heard.

The basic protection against this malfunction is the firm personal conviction that listening to others—in a basic posture of respect for them and humility for oneself—will improve the quality of our decisions. Conversely, the primary crime of arrogance is its adverse effect on the free exchange of ideas.

Third, let us reflect on the complicated problem of loyalty. There is substantial wisdom in requiring loyalty from those who work for us and giving it to those for whom we work. But we are reminded by Watergate that loyalty is an exceedingly complicated matter. One can have too limited a definition of loyalty so that mere disagreement during policy development or critical examination of a policy already developed results either in banishment or silence. Or loyalty may be too restricted—to a person rather than the office or the institution.

All of us have the responsibility to see that decisions, once made, are executed fairly, sensitively, and loyally, but not at the cost of a stoppage of other ideas, inadequate review, or abandonment of principled behavior.

Now, consider the matter of secrecy versus privacy. In the give and take of daily administrative life, there are times when the process of decision making must be essentially private. Primarily, the reason is to protect the decision-making process itself—the full examination of all ideas, no matter how fragile. Sometimes the knowledge that a particular discussion is going on may itself be harmful. But Watergate is not only a vivid reminder that secrecy can never protect a wrong act but, more important, that if one makes a decision or policy that is effective only if it remains secret or inconspicuous, one is doomed to disaster, and properly so. There is a useful distinction to be made between confidentiality and secrecy. We may insist, properly, upon confidentiality to protect a process of problem solving or the rights of individuals. Secrecy is quite a different matter. Its purpose is to prevent disclosure; it can be justified in only the most limited circumstances, such as national security, carefully defined. Certainly, it cannot be a way of life for the leader, and it can never be a protection for unworthy decisions.

Finally, contemplate the pervasiveness of leaders' p. Every bit as important as pronouncements made, orders given, or policies stated are the leader's values, attitudes, and style. No memoranda have to be written for decisions to be made, policies executed, or problems solved.

This fact of life, this pervasiveness, is a great advantage. Often we are proud when those who work for us reflect our values and attitudes and make decisions in their spirit. This response multiplies the leader's effectiveness and reduces the need for consultation. And we are pleased when we respond in this way to those for whom we work. There isn't anything we can or should do to change this. The important matter is to recognize that this pervasiveness exists and that it can malfunction. Above all, this new evidence of the pervasive nature of leadership requires us to examine what it is that we communicate to those who assist us about our goals, attitudes, and standard of style. What do those who work for or with us assume our attitudes to be toward people, fairness, failure, and disagreement? What do they conclude about the weight we give our promises? What ways of influencing others are acceptable to us?

Several recent studies have shown a progressive loss of public confidence in the leadership of virtually all institutions—the church, educational institutions, business, law, and government. The Watergate affair

has undoubtedly added to that decline. While the emphasis has been on the loss of confidence in the presidency and in the political process generally, we make a mistake if we conclude that these are the only areas in which the loss will be felt.

From among the many forces that have produced this decline in public confidence, I want to mention one in particular. There has been, for some time now, a slow and subtle elevation of craftiness, slickness, toughness, and pragmatism as desirable leadership characteristics. There has even been a grudging increase in the value attributed to dishonesty, violence, and hatred. These traits are made to seem to have a certain efficiency. I believe, however, that honesty, integrity, compassion, and cooperation are the virtues, that they are stronger and that they will prevail. I think we can be steadfast in that enriching belief without being maudlin or overly romantic about the nature of man.

But, given the pervasiveness of leadership, it is imperative that all of us in positions of power and responsibility communicate our commitment to these human values in everything we do. Only in that way will we play a part in restoring confidence in our institutions; only in that way can we strengthen the public belief that those in power will use that power for the welfare of all and not for themselves. Only by manifesting these values in our behavior can we respond to Watergate constructively, not only for the benefit of the institutions we serve but also for the good of all of society.

FAREWELL TO BILL DROWER OF THE BRITISH EMBASSY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to express my high regard and deep affection for one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known, Mr. William M. Drower.

Bill is leaving the British Embassy after having served as counselor for the past 9 years. The fact that he remained in Washington that long is a tribute to the tremendous job he did for Her Majesty's Government in functioning as the liaison for the Embassy with Capitol Hill.

From the comments of colleagues and other diplomats as well as my own observations, there is no question that Bill developed the justifiable reputation as the premier legislative liaison man within the Washington diplomatic community. His approach was always cordial and his responses to requests excellent. The friendships he made during his long tenure here gave him, I believe, an unique insight into both the American way of life and into our political and governmental system. The level of discernment he acquired was one that any reporter would wish he had and, in effect, made him indispensable to the British Embassy.

Like many other Members of the House, I have come to know Bill Drower very well and to consider him a friend. I am deeply appreciative of his many courtesies and cooperative efforts which I am convinced have contributed im-

mensely to the excellent relations between the United Kingdom and the legislative branch of the U.S. Government.

Bill leaves Washington with my very best wishes for his continued success. Without a doubt he will be missed in the Capital, of which he was an integral and valued part.

PROHIBITING IMPOUNDMENT OF HIGHWAY FUNDS

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, even though the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit has held that section 101(c) of Federal Aid Highway Act does not allow apportioned funds to be "withheld from obligations for purposes totally unrelated to the highway program," the impoundment of highway trust funds continues. In that same case, State Highway Commission of Missouri against Volpe, the Secretary made the argument that the precatory language of section 101(c), "It is the sense of Congress that under existing law" invested him with discretion wide enough to justify impoundment. The absence of such language in section 101(d) was one basis for that contention, but this entire argument was rejected as being wholly without merit and contrary to the clear intent of Congress.

In order to correct the defect of section 101(c) alleged by the Secretary, I am this day introducing anti-impoundment legislation. In form, the measure I propose is a reiteration of that section but with the precatory words deleted. Not only would passage of this bill place a clear and unequivocal statement of law on the books, it would be further strong evidence of the intent of Congress that this particular form of impoundment be discontinued.

Although there are good arguments for the legislation which deals with impoundment in a general way, there are equally compelling propositions for the elimination of this illegal practice by narrowly drawn legislation directed at specific funds. In fact, the ad hoc approach to this controversy effectively avoids the fact that in some cases and under some circumstances the withholding of appropriated money is justifiable. It also avoids the constitutional questions which may consume months or even years in being formulated and ultimately resolved by the Supreme Court. Indeed, there are no assurances that even when the question is placed squarely before the Court that it will not indulge itself in its penchant for avoiding constitutional questions except as a last resort.

Let us therefore address ourselves to particular problems of impoundment as they arise, and certainly none is more ripe than the one involving highway trust funds. The present status of this fund was displayed in a DOT release dated February 14, 1974. It is set out here to illustrate the extent of these impound-

ments which, as you can see, involves billions of dollars to which the States are legally entitled.

TABLE IV.—STATUS OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(In thousands of dollars)

	3 mo. ended Dec. 31, 1973	Fiscal year July 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1973
Balance at beginning of period.....	1 6, 192, 602	5, 590, 688
Income:		
Tax revenue:		
Motor-fuel taxes (net after re-		
funds).....	1, 141, 909	2, 322, 330
Less motorboat fuel revenue ²	6, 200	23, 400
Net for highways.....	1, 135, 709	2, 298, 930
Trucks, buses, and trailers.....	135, 015	289, 573
Tires, tubes, and tread rubber.....	220, 476	463, 234
Vehicle use.....	75, 414	158, 083
Parts and accessories, trucks		
and buses.....	29, 076	65, 290
Lubricating oil (net after re-		
funds).....	33, 833	64, 336
Total excise revenues.....	1, 629, 523	3, 339, 446
Interest earned.....	175, 642	184, 970
Total income.....	1, 805, 165	3, 524, 416
Disbursements:		
For highways.....	1, 321, 654	2, 418, 535
National Highway Traffic Safety		
Administration.....	23, 155	1 40, 611
Trust fund share other highway		
programs.....		3, 000
Total disbursements.....	1, 344, 809	2, 462, 146
Balance at end of period.....	6, 652, 958	6, 652, 958
Liability for unpaid obligations		
(Dec. 31, 1973).....	7, 310, 899	
Balance less liability for unpaid obli-		
gation.....	-657, 931	

¹ Revised.

² Transferred to the land and water conservation fund pursuant to title II, sec. 202, Public Law 88-578, effective Jan. 1, 1965.

Continued impoundment of these funds is prejudicial to highway safety, to highway maintenance, and to the entire highway construction industry. The entitlement of my State of Montana could very well exceed \$65 million which when translated into jobs, services, and material sales is substantial. Speedy action on this measure will convey a message to the administration which it will be unable to ignore.

I would ask that this bill be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and others interested in this matter.

The bill follows:

A bill to amend section 101 of title 23, United States Code, to prohibit the impoundment of highway funds

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 101 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) No part of any sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure upon any Federal-aid system which has been apportioned pursuant to this title shall be impounded or withheld from obligation for purposes and projects as provided in this title by any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, except such specific sums as the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, determines are necessary to be withheld from obligation for specific periods of time to assure that sufficient amounts will be available to the Highway Trust Fund to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund."

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE: LOUISIANA'S THIRD FOREST

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana's forests are one of the State's greatest natural resources. The economic activity generated by forestry and related industries total more than \$1.7 billion annually. Forestry is the largest single industrial employer in Louisiana, providing jobs for some 42,000 of our citizens.

Obviously, the forest industry is vitally important to our State.

A few weeks ago, several thousand Louisiana Boy Scouts participated in one of the most unique and valuable conservation programs in the country. The Scouts, under the guidance of their scoutmasters and industrial and public agency foresters, planted more than 300,000 trees on understocked, privately owned forest land in the State.

Tree seedlings, planting tools, and professional assistance for the program were donated by the forest industry members of the Louisiana Forestry Association. Foresters were on hand to demonstrate proper planting techniques, and to provide the scouts with brief lessons in forest management and forest environment.

Here in the Sixth Congressional District, more than 500 Scouts from the Istrouma Scout Council took part in the day-long project. It was an honor for me, as chairman of the Forests Subcommittee in Congress, to work with the Scouts and the forest industry to make this first in the field operation of Boy Scouts' "Third Forest Day" a success.

The encouragement of this program is important to Louisiana for several reasons. More than half of our State's total land area is forest land. About three-fourths is owned by private, nonindustrial landowners. Unfortunately, less than half of this usable land is adequately stocked with trees that can contribute to the manufacture of forest products to benefit our State and the Nation.

It is hoped that the Scout program will dramatize the need to improve this great natural resource, our forests. Certainly, the Scouts that I worked with that day became well aware of this need.

Our forests, under the multiple-use concept, provide not only timber for harvest, but recreation, wildlife habitat, grazing, watershed protection, as well as great natural beauty.

The national need for timber for use in home building and wood products is growing every year. To meet the expanding national demand for wood, Louisiana's forests must continue to be highly productive and to increase their timber yields.

Our forests bring millions of dollars into the Louisiana economy every year. In 1972 for instance, Louisiana's pulpwood production alone passed the \$100 million mark, ranking our State as the fourth largest pulpwood producer of the 12 Southern States.

Much of our State and the South are in what is known as the third forest. That is the third generation of forests grown in North America. In some areas the generations overlap somewhat, but they generally fall into the categories of: virgin forests growing before European settlement, the second-growth forests that grew back or were planted by man, and the modern, intensively cultivated forests being developed today.

Intensive forestry, which can produce more wood from less acreage, will become increasingly important in the decades ahead. It is estimated that by the year 2000 the world's wood consumption will double. Forest experts have told me that the United States has the potential to double its production of timber in that time through intensive management practices on all our commercial forest lands.

Louisiana and the South have a great opportunity to participate in the development of the third forest. Our climate and land conditions are highly favorable for intensive forest cultivation.

Some of the areas that could help develop our potential growth are: prompt reforestation of all understocked lands, the use of genetically improved planting stock, intensive timber culture such as thinning for optimum spacing, fertilization where necessary, and much more intensive utilization.

Our existing timber supplies can be stretched by salvaging dead and dying timber, for instance. More efficient methods of harvesting and manufacturing, as well as developing methods to use mill wastes and logging residues could also help. So would the greater use of preservatives to prolong the life of wood in use. The average American consumes almost 500 pounds of paper products every year. It is easy to see then that recycling and reuse of paper products and solid wood would go far in helping expand existing timber resources.

All of these things, if done on a continual basis, could probably stretch our existing wood supplies by 30 to 40 percent.

Timber is not like most natural resources, which are irreplaceable once they are used up. Most Americans are well aware that such natural resources as oil, gas, and metals are becoming in short supply. And when they are gone, there are no more sources being produced. Timber, on the other hand, is a renewable resource. With proper planning, cultivation, and management, we can supply our economy with the lumber and wood products we will need.

But we cannot rely on our existing sources alone. This is why the development of the third forest concept is so vital to our national and State growth. Without proper planning right now, getting future supplies of wood could become a serious problem.

Multiple use of forest lands, as opposed to the wilderness or set-aside concept of single use, is necessitated by the fact that the forest land base of the country is steadily shrinking. The boundaries of cities are expanding. New roads, airports, and other transportation rights-of-way, commercial, industrial and agri-

cultural use of land has caused a shrinking of our total forest land available.

The third forest will be managed according to the multiple-use concept, whereby a given stand of timber will be managed according to the use for which it is best suited. Other uses would be permitted to the extent that they do not interfere with the predominant use. An unusually scenic area, for instance, would be protected to the extent that its scenic beauty is preserved. But at the same time, some timber harvesting would be permitted as necessary to remove insect infested timber, for instance. Other areas considered to be most valuable as prime sources of timber would be managed for their maximum yields. Other uses, such as recreation, would also be permitted.

Sites best suited for commercial timber production can be managed just as intensively as other farm land is managed for annual crops.

As I said before, so much of the private timber producing land in Louisiana is not currently being used to its fullest capacity. This was one of the prime reasons that led me to begin work on a forest incentives program. More than 3 years ago I was one of a handful of Congressmen who introduced a similar proposal in Congress. This past year, working with the forest industry and the U.S. Forest Service, my Subcommittee on Forests held hearings which resulted in Congress passing a forest incentives program as part of the general farm bill of 1973. Its purpose is to encourage the small landowner to transfer tracts of up to 500 acres of idle land into commercial timber production by planting trees and timber stand improvement. The new law provides financial incentives and professional assistance to the private landowner who wishes to participate in the program.

An incentives approach was necessary, because many of these landowners are farmers, used to planting an annual cash crop. Timber, of course, takes many years to grow to full marketable maturity. For a landowner to agree to allow his land to be used for tree growing, it was generally felt that some form of financial compensation was needed.

Just the other day, I had the privilege of attending ceremonies memorializing the first tree planting under the forest incentives program in the entire country. The event was ever more important to me, because it was on land in Louisiana.

Our State has a great potential for forestry. This valuable resource can and must be developed to its maximum.

TRIBUTE TO JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to learn of the upcoming retirement from Congress of our distinguished col-

league from the State of Washington, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.

Mrs. HANSEN has served with distinction in this body and is the first woman to serve as chairman of a subcommittee, Interior Appropriations. She is the dean of the Washington delegation and has been a powerful voice on behalf of her region and its interests.

She is a most gracious lady and it has been my great privilege to know her during her entire career in Congress.

Mrs. HANSEN will be greatly missed in Congress when she retires at the end of this session. She will be missed by her constituents, by those who have served with her in this body, and by all those who believe in good and effective Government.

I heard her retirement statement and I am sure we can well understand her desire to return to her native State and do the things that I am sure she did not have the time to do during her very busy career in Congress.

I join with my colleagues in wishing JULIA BUTLER HANSEN a long, happy, and contented retirement.

POSSIBLE SERIOUS MEDICAL RISKS ATTRIBUTED TO USAGE OF MARIJUANA

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, John P. Roche, recently wrote some interesting observations on the changing attitude toward the damaging effect of the use of marijuana and the danger of comparing it to the consumption of alcoholic beverages.

I insert this article as a portion of my remarks at this point:

FIRST AVERSION TO "WEED" GETS SCIENTIFIC SUPPORT

(By John P. Roche)

By some bizarre process, smoking cannabis (marijuana) became in the 1960s a symbol of social "liberation." Indeed, one's attitude toward the ritual became a sort of litmus test of character: the real swinging adults, charter members of Adults for a Student Society, would demonstrate their freedom from the superstitious and reactionary "system" by joining the kids smoking "joints."

All very cozy.

In contrast, those of us who objected—for various reasons—to legalizing "pot" were written off as fossils. After all, didn't we realize that smoking cannabis was just like drinking?

I confess that my dislike for marijuana goes back a long way and is hardly scientific. During World War II we had a couple of characters in our barracks who grew the stuff. Not realizing that we were dealing with a symbol of human liberation, we made them smoke them outdoors.

I made a mental note that anything that stank like those reeferers couldn't be good for you.

When the marijuana cult burgeoned, my objection again was non-scientific: the practice struck me as the ticket of admission to the drug culture, the first step on the escalator to hard-drug addiction.

But this was a defensive response which was invariably countered by the alcohol analogy: "You don't ban whiskey because some drinkers become alcoholics."

However, if you pushed further and asked, "Is a joint equivalent to 2 ozs., 4 ozs., or a pint of hard booze?" the reply tended to be evasive. Or worse, you were simply excommunicated from the progressive sector of society.

Then, as I reported here about a year ago, some new precincts began to report. On Sept. 18, 1972, Dr. Olav J. Braenden, director of the United Nations Narcotics Laboratory in Geneva, appeared before the Internal Security subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Dr. Braenden indicated that the work done in his labs on cannabis indicated there were possibly serious medical risks attached to its usage.

A good scientist, he refused to go beyond his evidence, but he did note a sharp distinction between pot and alcohol (alcohol does not accumulate in the system) and concluded that he was leery of legalization because "it is better to be careful when it comes to medicine and drug policy than it is to be careless . . . much more research should be done so as to be able to take the right position in establishing controls over marijuana."

Well, that was 1972. Now in 1974 a new scientific report has appeared, sponsored by the College of Physicians and Surgeons at Columbia University, which devastatingly confirms Dr. Braenden's caution.

The head of the four-man research team, Dr. Gabriel Nahas, indicated that regular smoking of marijuana not only weakened the role of white blood cells in fighting off viral infections, but that it seemed to have a damaging effect on chromosomes, one which could adversely affect "the genetic equilibrium."

This is a scientific way of saying that it could lead to deformations in the children of pot addicts.

RETIREMENT OF JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my best personal wishes to my colleague and friend, the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, on her announced retirement from the House. Her retirement, though well deserved, will create a void in this body that will not be easily filled.

Throughout her 37 years in the service of the people, JULIA has shown her compassion and dedication to the needs of those she has served. Her accomplishments in public service are numerous, her admirers legion.

As chairperson of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, JULIA has translated her concern for the American Indian, the environment, and the arts into national policy. In addition, the House is indebted to the gentlewoman from Washington for her work as chairperson of the Hansen committee. Through her efforts, the House has made encouraging reforms in its rules and procedures.

JULIA's counsel and kindness will be missed by those who have served with her. The people of her district have done

this Nation a great service by sending such a remarkable person to the House as their Representative. The country and her colleagues are the beneficiaries of her largesse.

May her retirement be as fulfilling as her public career has been distinguished.

GI BILL

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said recently about problems some Vietnam veterans going to college have had receiving GI bill paychecks and a great number of Americans have been disturbed by these reports. While there have been bugs in the system, the vast majority of GI bill students have been receiving their checks regularly and proceeding in school without disruption, according to Administrator of Veterans' Affairs Donald E. Johnson.

On February 26, Mr. Johnson met with representatives of the press, radio, and television to put the reports of late pay into proper perspective. He pointed out that more students have gone to college under the Vietnam GI bill than went after World War II or the Korean conflict and that the Veterans' Administration processes some 13 million education checks a year, each of which requires correct information and correct action from VA, the educational institution, and the veteran. It is truly an operation of large magnitude.

Here is Mr. Johnson's statement:

STATEMENT BY DONALD E. JOHNSON

First, I want to thank you for your attendance this afternoon and this opportunity to discuss with you the Veterans Administration's G.I. Bill education and training program.

The current G.I. Bill program began on June 1, 1966. It has been long recognized, I believe, that our series of three G.I. Bills since World War II have been among the finest legislative investments we have ever made for the nation as well as for our veterans, and certainly our newest program is proving to be just that.

In the seven years and nine months this Third Generation bill has been in operation the VA has provided education and training for 4,576,220 veterans and servicemen. As of the end of last month there were 1,405,431 trainees enrolled under the G.I. Bill. More veterans will be trained during this fiscal year than ever before since the new program started in 1966.

A natural question has been: How does the current program compare with the two earlier ones?

At the higher education levels, there have already been more Vietnam era trainees going to college than there were during the entire 12 years of the World War II G.I. Bill. Through the end of last month, there were 2,230,000 total in World War II and 1,158,109 college trainees under the Korean G.I. Bill.

You often hear it said that the total participation rate under the present G.I. Bill is far below that of World War II.

As a matter of fact, the participation rate for Vietnam era veterans is precisely the same

right now as it was for World War II veterans at the same stage of their program. After the first 91 months of educational assistance under both programs the participation rate is an identical 50.4-per cent. The participation rate for Korean veterans was 42.5-per cent. The participation rate for Korean veterans was 42.5-per cent at the same period in time, and for Post-Korean veterans it has been 45.4-per cent.

With the extra "outreach" effort VA has invested in the current program—an effort we plan to intensify even further—and the probability of increased allowances paid to veterans, we confidently expect the present G.I. Bill will be the most successful of all in any terms of comparable measurements.

On the increased allowances, incidentally, I think most of you know that the President has recommended to Congress a cost of living increase of eight-per cent, and that since 1969 he has already approved increases passed by Congress totaling about 69-per cent.

I think you would all agree that we are talking about a program of very considerable magnitude. In the course of one year the VA processes something in the neighborhood of 13-million educational checks.

In order to process this huge number of checks the payment information must come not only from VA's own records, but also from the training institution and from the veteran himself. If any one of these pieces of information is not provided in timely fashion, or if incorrect information is supplied, then there is inevitably a delay in the payment of G.I. Bill allowances.

Complicating the payment procedure starting this school year has been a provision for the payment of allowance checks in advance to veterans instead of after each month's training was completed as has been true in the past.

The advance payment concept is a great idea, and is of great benefit to veterans. In fact, it was proposed by this Administration and was greatly favored by Congress. But the entirely new procedure has injected an additional element into the payment timetable, and—as with all new procedures—it has created some "bugs" which we believe we have now ironed out.

Last night at the President's press conference a question was raised about the payment of G.I. Bill checks. And earlier this week—on February 20—one of the TV network news shows had a segment indicating that late payment of these checks was almost epidemic.

It is my hope in holding this conference that I can put the payment of these checks into proper perspective.

The simple truth is that the vast majority of these millions of checks are paid right at the moment they are due.

In an operation of these proportions it is obvious that not every check is going to be paid on time every month. We strive for such a goal, of course, but it never has been nor will be possible considering such constant changes as dates of entering and leaving school, changes of address and dependency status, and the need for correct and timely certifying information from thousands of schools and millions of veterans.

Let me give you an example of some of the problems by referring to the network program I mentioned earlier.

Four veteran students were interviewed on the program. All of them blamed the VA for non-receipt of checks. And yet our investigation shows that in each case VA actions were correct for the information provided.

One veteran's checks were mailed promptly to him, but the Post Office had to return them, for the veteran had moved and left no forwarding address.

The second veteran complained of no ad-

vance payment, and yet he had never applied for such a payment. Even the fact he had enrolled on the 15th of last month was not certified by the college until six days later. His check paying him through to March 1 was received by the veteran on February 25.

The third veteran was issued a certificate of eligibility by the VA last December 3, but he never requested an advance payment and has informed VA he will not enroll in school until next summer.

The fourth veteran was earlier enrolled in a correspondence course under the G.I. Bill. Under the law a veteran must certify to VA that he has completed a prior course such as this before the agency can pay him for new training. This veteran was advised of this requirement last November and again in January, but the certification had not been received at the time of the broadcast.

The network program charged that only nine of 58 veterans at the Montgomery (Md.) Community College had received payments from the VA. A check of both school and VA records the day after the broadcast revealed not a single complaint from the college relative to G.I. Bill payments.

Furthermore, a VA staff member who visited the school learned that in 13 of the 49 supposedly delinquent cases payment had been made directly to the veteran. In 20 other cases, the school's certification of enrollment had been only recently received, or was not obtained until contact was made with the institution. Eleven other veterans counted in the 49 failed to enroll at all. One veteran failed to provide the necessary record of his military service, and in the remaining four cases either the claim numbers of Social Security numbers failed to match existing names and records.

This, I think, will illustrate some of the problems in making these payments, and I do not want to hide the fact that problems do exist—including errors on the part of the VA.

But I do want to reemphasize that the vast majority of these millions of checks are indeed paid in timely fashion, and that even this good track record will improve in the future as the agency, the training establishments and the veterans grow more accustomed to the new payment procedures.

With me today is Odell W. Vaughn, VA's Chief Benefits Director and the man who heads up our G.I. Bill program. Perhaps if we take your individual questions at this time we can better put in perspective the situation on our G.I. Bill payments.

THE REAL ISSUE BEHIND OIL'S ABUSE OF THE FOREIGN TAX CREDIT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the abuse of the foreign tax credit by the oil companies is generally acknowledged even by the tax experts in the administration. In fact, the Department of the Treasury has put forth revisions of the oil companies use of the credit. Treasury proposes that a ceiling be created beyond which oil company payments would be considered as deductions—rather than credits—for the purposes of determining U.S. tax liabilities.

The trouble with this and most other proposals for reform of the foreign tax credit now before the Ways and Means Committee is that they are superficial

reforms—they do not reach the real problems created by international oil investment. The implicit assumption underlying these proposals is that the basic concept of the foreign tax credit when applied to the petroleum industry is sound. Following this reasoning, all that is really needed is the establishment of some controls to curb the abuses that are now taking place.

But there are strong arguments to raise against allowing international oil and gas investments the privilege of the foreign tax credit. The objective of the provision is to guarantee "tax neutrality." That is, it is intended to allow the investor the same tax burden regardless of whether his investment is made here at home or in a foreign country. Given our goal of energy self-sufficiency, it is vital that we question whether we should allow tax neutrality to operate with energy investments.

Chase Manhattan Bank has estimated that the capital requirements of our energy industry will reach \$600 billion for the period from 1970-85. Many private industry estimates range much higher. Whatever the estimate, it is clear that our goal of energy self-sufficiency will create tremendous demands on our capital markets. In the past few years we have witnessed increased interest by multinational oil companies in developing foreign production primarily for foreign markets. If we are really serious about achieving energy self-sufficiency, we must reconsider extending the privilege of the foreign tax credit to our petroleum companies.

The issue of the foreign tax credit is a complex one. However, the public interest study group, tax analysts and advocates have presented a lucid explanation of the key elements of the controversy in a petition filed by TA/A with the Internal Revenue Service. I recommend this material to my colleagues:

PETITION

I. CREDITABILITY OF CRUDE OIL "INCOME TAXES" IS NOT ALLOWED UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Amounts paid to the principal OPEC nations in the guise of "income taxes" are levied without regard to actual company profits. Instead, they are fixed or almost fixed per barrel payments that constitute royalties. Therefore, these payments are not creditable foreign income taxes under either Section 901 or 903 of the Internal Revenue Code.

What a government payment is called by a foreign government does not determine whether it is classified as a creditable income tax for the purpose of Section 901. A foreign tax will qualify as a creditable tax under Section 901 only if it is the substantial equivalent of an "income tax" as that term is understood in the United States. Section 903, while allowing credits for foreign government revenues other than income taxes equivalent to U.S. income taxes, is restricted by its terms in its scope to foreign "taxes," and then narrowly only to those "taxes" imposed in lieu of income taxes which are the equivalent of U.S. income taxes. Therefore, as a requisite to being creditable under either Section 901 or 903, payments made to foreign governments must, in fact, be taxes.

Therefore, although the principal OPEC nations denominate the payments required to be made to them by oil companies as "income taxes," this foreign terminology by itself obviously does not allow the payments

to be treated as creditable taxes under Section 901 or 903 if they in fact are not taxes at all.

Since the OPEC countries both own the land where exceptionally valuable oil fields have been discovered and are also sovereign states, they have the option to collect revenues either in their capacity as sovereigns exercising their rights of taxation, or as ordinary owners of property from which they can collect rents or royalties, or as both. Although the OPEC nations denominate the revenues they collect in connection with the use of these oil producing lands largely as "income taxes," in fact, as the following analysis will show, they have chosen to collect all their revenues in connection with the oil production in a form which has only the elements of royalties. As such, these revenue payments are not taxes at all, and, therefore, cannot be credited under either Section 901 or 903.

In past years, the dual function of the oil producing nations as sovereign states and valuable oil property owners raised the problem in the minds of many persons outside the Treasury Department whether the amounts denominated as their income taxes were, in fact, royalties. Although no firm conclusions were reached in the past as to the exact nature of these amounts, events beginning with the 1970 Libyan negotiations described earlier in the petition have made clear that these payments now clearly constitute royalties and not taxes.

The fact that the principal OPEC nations divide their oil payment "takes" into amounts denominated as "taxes" and "royalties," does not mean, as is argued by representatives of the U.S. oil companies, that the amounts denominated as taxes must be true creditable taxes. The general OPEC royalty rate is 12-15% of the posted price, which is comparable to the predominant royalty rates paid to lessors on oil properties located in the United States. However, the cost of producing oil in the Middle East and North Africa is many times cheaper than the cost of producing oil in the United States. Under basic economic theory, profits stemming from efficient oil properties accrue to the owner of the mineral rights. Therefore, these efficient foreign wells should command very high royalty rates—not the minimal 12-15% currently charged. By comparison, when lease bonuses are spread over expected oil fields from U.S. offshore wells, the effective royalty rates, calculated on prices expected in early 1973, are about 50%; and these wells are much more costly and less productive than those of the Persian Gulf.¹

On the other hand, applying accepted economic theory, the concession holders should be allowed income sufficient only to keep them operating the concessions. Therefore, the profits resulting from the efficiency of foreign oil production should flow to the owners of the mineral rights—the foreign governments—in the form of higher royalties. However, for foreign tax credit purposes, large parts of these economic profits accruing to the foreign governments have been denominated as income taxes. The similarity between the dominant royalty rate in the United States and the royalty rate ostensibly imposed on the more efficient and more profitable foreign properties is of absolutely no relevance for the assertion that the amounts denominated as "income taxes" by the foreign governments are true income taxes creditable under Section 901 or 903.

The OPEC revenues denominated as income taxes actually take the form of royalties because they are per barrel payments unrelated to the income or gross receipts of the oil company concession holder. As described earlier in this petition, amounts

¹Footnotes at end of article.

received by the principal OPEC nations presently treated as creditable income taxes, are determined by reference to an artificial posted price. This price, in turn, is fixed by the OPEC nations by reference to the amount of total revenue ("income tax" plus royalty) each principal OPEC nation has determined it should receive per barrel of crude oil produced under concession agreements by foreign oil companies. Since the posted price is unrelated to the actual market price of the crude oil, the posted price is unrelated to the actual gross receipts received by the oil companies for their crude oil production. Thus, since the purported "income taxes" are a fixed percentage of this artificial price minus certain fixed costs (the amount denominated as a "royalty") and other costs which can vary, if at all, a minimum amount per barrel, the "taxes" in fact are fixed or almost fixed per barrel costs. This is obviously the form of a royalty rather than a net income, gross income, or gross receipts tax.

As previously stated in this petition, until recently, amounts paid by the concession-holding oil companies could vary at most by a few pennies per barrel from the targeted "take" set by the principal OPEC nations, as a result of unexpected changes in production costs. Only narrow fluctuations resulted, principally because costs are such a small fraction of the per barrel posted price. However, as described earlier in this petition, the December 23, 1973 OPEC press release strongly implies that even such minimal variations from the targeted take no longer will be permitted. Depending upon the extent to which such minor variations are tolerated, the so-called "taxes" collected from the oil companies by the principal OPEC nations constitute either almost pure per barrel charges or else absolute per barrel charges unrelated to either the gross receipts, gross income, or net income of the oil companies making the payments.²

The excerpt from the OPEC press release reproduced earlier in this petition indicates that the \$7.00 Persian Gulf "government take" was set with reference to the world market price of crude oil. The \$7.00 figure is widely regarded as the price at which these countries can maximize their revenues from oil production. Since the "income tax" paid by the oil companies constitutes a fixed or almost fixed amount of this \$7.00, it is clear that the amount of "income tax" due is set by the OPEC countries by reference to the potential value of the concession rights rather than by reference to the income of the concession holders. Again, this is an important aspect of a royalty, rather than an income tax law promulgated to provide revenues so that a nation can provide traditional governmental services to its citizens and residents.

Moreover, as indicated in the example set forth previously, the proportion of purported "income tax" paid by the oil companies to pre-tax income is so high (over 91%), that if the tax were a true income tax, this rate would preclude any foreign oil producing company from being able to operate profitably within OPEC nation borders. The high proportion of "tax" to total "pre-tax" income only can be explained as representing a large royalty element.

Sections 901 and 903 do not allow credits to be taken for part of a payment made to a foreign government.³ Under these statutes, either a charge is fully creditable or not creditable at all. Whether a charge is creditable depends upon the basis on which it is calculated. Therefore, it is totally unpersuasive from a legal standpoint to argue that since a foreign government which grants an oil concession to a foreign company could collect a true income tax from the company as well as a royalty, that even if the entire payment made to the government is calculated as a fixed or almost fixed per barrel

amount, the payment partially must represent a tax on production income earned by the company. Obviously, a sovereign nation owning valuable mineral rights within its borders has the right to determine the extent to which revenues required to be paid to the government by oil companies shall be in the nature of actual royalties, and the extent to which, if any, such companies shall pay taxes actually based their gross or net income.

However, imposing royalties on a fixed per barrel basis has the important advantage to the government of providing a fixed per barrel revenue without regard to the profitability and efficiency of the oil company operations. On the other hand, imposing a true income tax necessarily ties government revenues to fluctuations in the market price of oil which would affect oil company gross income, as well as to the operational efficiency of the company operations.

By deciding to collect a pure or almost pure per barrel royalty without regard to the actual income of the oil companies, the principal OPEC nations voluntarily have sacrificed the collection of income taxes in order to maximize fixed royalty payments. Whether payments to a foreign government are creditable depends solely upon the basis upon which the payments are collected, i.e., the actual nature of the payments. Forebearance by a foreign country from collecting taxes based upon income does not mean that any part of the amounts collected by the country in the form of royalties must "represent" income taxes and, therefore, to some extent is creditable. The fact that a country could impose an income tax but doesn't do so, does not mean that any part of the charges it does impose are creditable. Therefore, the per barrel revenues received by the principal OPEC members from the oil companies should not, even to a limited degree, be treated under Section 901 as creditable taxes.

It is also significant that except for purposes of the foreign tax credit, the so-called OPEC "income taxes" currently are consistently treated as royalties, which, unlike true income taxes, are viewed as costs of production that are shifted forward to purchasers of crude oil. International oil trade journals compare the relative cost of producing oil in the various OPEC nations by reference to the "tax paid cost" of each barrel of crude.⁴ This term includes the royalty payment per barrel, "tax" cost per barrel, and the average production costs per barrel. In effect, the "income tax" is viewed as a cost of production—a view patently inconsistent with the treatment of a true income tax.

Similarly, and even more importantly, it is understood that the IRS treats these OPEC "income taxes" like royalties or severance taxes, rather than as income taxes, in applying Section 482 to inter-company transactions between related oil company subsidiaries. Section 482 of the Internal Revenue Code authorizes the Internal Revenue Service to reallocate income and deductions between related companies to properly reflect income on such inter-company sales. This provision is used to ensure that sales between related oil producing companies and "off-taker" companies are made at prices which fairly reflect income earned by each company. It is understood that in allocating a fair profit to the producing company, the Internal Revenue Service treats the "income taxes" paid to the OPEC nations as part of the cost of producing the oil. The IRS treats as production company taxable income only the amount in excess of the sum of the production costs, royalty, and foreign "income tax." This treatment is inconsistent with the treatment of true foreign income taxes by the IRS. As a rule, foreign income taxes paid by a seller are not included in determining an arm's length price for a commodity sold to a related company.

A long-standing principle of tax theory is

that income taxes are absorbed by corporate taxpayers, whereas direct taxes such as excise taxes, sales taxes, and value added taxes are shifted forward in the cost of goods sold to purchasers, like royalties and other costs of production. As a result, the foreign tax credit mechanism, which was adopted in the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate the burden of double taxation that could fall on a taxpayer who would otherwise be forced to absorb taxes imposed by two different nations, only provides a credit for foreign income taxes. Double taxation can result when income earned by a U.S. taxpayer in a foreign country is subject to foreign income tax, and the remaining after tax income is then subject to income tax by the United States, which imposes tax on the taxpayer's worldwide income. Since direct taxes and other charges imposed by foreign governments are shifted forward in the price of goods and services, granting an ordinary deduction for such charges does not result in double taxation of a U.S. corporate taxpayer. Therefore, it is unnecessary to provide a tax credit for such costs.

From the foregoing brief summary, it is clear that failure to provide a U.S. taxpayer a credit for foreign taxes paid results in double taxation only where the incidence of the tax is not shifted forward to purchasers. Therefore, treating OPEC income taxes as deductible expenses rather than creditable taxes will result in double taxation only if those "taxes" are absorbed by the oil companies.

Although oil company executives assert that the foreign tax credits for OPEC country taxes are necessary to avoid double taxation,⁵ it is evident that the OPEC "taxes" are shifted forward to crude oil purchasers just like the OPEC charges currently denominated as royalties.

The recent worldwide increases in petroleum product prices resulting from OPEC "tax" increases clearly reflect the shifting of these "tax" costs. The Federal Energy Office has accepted the concept that these tax costs are shifted forward, in permitting OPEC "tax" increases on crude oil production to be passed on in downstream sales of crude imported into the United States. Even more specifically, a letter sent by Occidental Petroleum to notify its crude oil customers in the late summer of 1970 of increases in its Libyan crude costs indicated that by contractual agreement these increased costs, attributable solely to a higher posted price and increased tax rate (from 50-58%), were to be 100% passed on to consumers.⁶ The higher posted price incorporates higher "royalty" charges, but principally higher "income tax" costs. Thus, in what is understood to be a general oil industry practice, increased tax costs are contractually shifted forward to crude oil purchasers. Thus, in almost all ways except for foreign tax credit purposes, it is evident that OPEC oil production "income taxes" are treated as royalties.

The foregoing has been an analysis of the threshold issue whether the principal OPEC nations oil production revenues denominated as taxes constitute royalties, and therefore are not true taxes at all. Only if it is determined that these revenues are not royalties, is it necessary to analyze the second stage issue, whether these payments have the characteristics necessary to be classified as among the limited types of taxes which are creditable under either Section 901 or 903. In view of the compelling evidence to support the conclusion that these OPEC revenues are royalties, as well as petitioner's lack of access to complete and current compilations of the principal OPEC nation tax laws and regulations, this petition will summarize only very briefly the considerations relevant to determining whether these OPEC oil production revenues are creditable taxes under Section 901 or 903.

Footnotes at end of article.

Since the OPEC oil production revenues are determined with respect to sales calculated on a posted price unrelated to actual market sale prices, and therefore are unrelated to the taxpayer's gross receipts or gross income, these revenues clearly could not qualify as "income taxes" under Section 901. This term has been narrowly interpreted by the courts to include only net income taxes, and, at most, certain gross income taxes on income which is very much like net income (i.e., subject to very few, if any, deductions).⁷

Without careful analysis of the general tax laws and regulations of the principal OPEC nations, it is not possible to determine whether their oil production revenues, if not classified as royalties, could qualify as creditable "in lieu" income taxes under Section 903. In order to be creditable under this provision, it is necessary that the foreign taxes actually be imposed instead of, and not in addition to, a generally imposed national income tax.⁸ Assuming this difficult standard can be met, there is little judicial precedent on the additional important question of how much a foreign tax may differ from the form of a net income tax and still be a creditable tax under Section 903.⁹

However, it is unnecessary to definitively resolve these issues concerning the nature of foreign taxes creditable under either Section 901 or 903, since it is clear that the principal OPEC nation revenues presently collected in connection with oil production are not taxes at all, but rather are royalties which cannot qualify for foreign tax credits under Section 901 or 903. Petroleum. However, it is understood there are strong public pressures in the United Kingdom similarly to deny tax credits for "taxes" paid by BP to the principal OPEC nations. This raises the strong possibility that any minimal competitive disadvantages that might result from denial of credits for these OPEC "taxes" on a unilateral national basis could be eliminated by a multinational denial of tax credits for OPEC "taxes" by the governments of the nations in which the major oil companies have their home offices.

On the other hand, there are strong policy considerations in favor of denying tax credits for these payments. If these credits were disallowed, U.S. oil companies would be able to treat all payments made to the oil-producing countries as deductible costs of doing business. Therefore, the oil companies would treat the per-barrel payments made to foreign governments exactly the same as if they were producing oil in the United States where only deductions are available for royalty payments. As a matter of tax equity, there is no reason to continue preferential tax treatment, in the form of credits for what are not in fact income taxes, to foreign oil production income when the United States has announced a firm national policy to develop domestic and offshore sources of energy as quickly as possible.

In addition, continued granting of tax credits for these "tax" payments to the principal OPEC nations will result in a continued large annual loss of revenue to the United States Treasury. The only persons who appear to profit from these rulings are the oil companies and the OPEC governments.

According to Senator Frank Church, the Treasury Department acquiesced in the initial oil production "tax" ruling in order to provide the Persian Gulf countries with needed revenues in order to keep them from coming under Soviet influence.¹⁰ It is obvious that this policy consideration is no longer valid—the last thing in the world needed by the Persian Gulf nations is additional oil revenues. Instead, the IRS currently is left with the legacy of this outmoded foreign policy—a series of outmoded revenue rulings which still recognize a now widely acknowl-

edged artificial system¹¹ as resulting in creditable tax payments.

II. POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

According to the foregoing analysis, as a matter of law, the purported "income taxes" paid to the principal OPEC countries do not qualify as creditable taxes. Therefore, the rulings cited at the beginning of this petition should be revoked without taking policy considerations into account. Nevertheless, it is relevant to note that policy arguments recently raised by oil company representatives fail to present a compelling case for the need to continue the existence of the current rulings.

The principal contention of these companies is that denial of the foreign tax credit for OPEC "taxes" would subject U.S. companies to higher tax burdens than their foreign-owned competitors, and place them at a competitive disadvantage.¹² However, no evidence has been put forth in support of this argument, which is the same general assertion made when any proposal is made which would increase taxation of foreign source income. In fact, in view of recent extremely high foreign income of U.S. oil companies, it is just as reasonable to conclude that increased U.S. taxation of such income through elimination of the foreign tax credit for OPEC "taxes" merely would reduce the extremely high foreign profits to very high foreign profits with no detrimental competitive results.

Even if U.S. oil companies became less competitive abroad because of higher U.S. tax payments, there is no indication the interests of the U.S. would be harmed—only the oil companies would be harmed. Since only a small part of foreign crude oil production of U.S. based companies is imported into the U.S., increased tax costs would affect what, in essence, are totally foreign operations. Moreover, apart from high dividend income repatriated to the U.S. on high foreign production income, there is no indication that the U.S. benefits from having U.S. based companies hold foreign oil concessions. Oil produced abroad will be sold into the U.S. by foreign as well as U.S. oil companies if there is a market for the oil in the United States.

In addition, most of the leading international oil companies are incorporated in the United States. Any minimal detrimental competitive effects of denial of tax credits for "taxes" paid for the principal OPEC nations currently could benefit a limited number of foreign companies—principally Shell and British Petroleum.

III. CONCLUSION

Apart from being denominated as "income taxes," the payments made to the principal OPEC nations by the international oil companies in connection with their oil production activities no longer have anything in common with true income taxes. In this context, the old riddle traditionally attributed to Abraham Lincoln would appear relevant:

"If you call a tail a leg, how many legs has a dog?"

"Five?"

"No; calling a tail a leg don't make it a leg."

Similarly, a foreign government, merely by calling a royalty an "income tax", does not make the royalty a creditable income tax for purposes of either Section 901 or 903.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Dr. Gerard M. Brannon, Georgetown University, in statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations on January 30, 1974. BNA Daily Tax Report, January 30, 1974, at J-13.

² This conclusion is consistent with that of Dr. Glenn P. Jenkins, Harvard University, given in testimony on January 30, 1974 before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcom-

mittee on Multinational Corporations. BNA Daily Tax Report, January 30, 1974, at J-14.

³ See *New York & Honduras Rosario Mining Co. v. Commissioner*, 168 F. 2d 745 (2nd Cir. 1948).

⁴ See, for example, *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly*, January 21, 1974, at 8.

⁵ See, for example, Statement of W. L. Henry, Executive Vice President, Gulf Oil, on behalf of the American Petroleum Institute et al., before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 6, 1974, in BNA Daily Tax Report, February 6, 1974, at J-4.

⁶ *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly*, September 21, 1970, at 2-3.

⁷ *Bank of America National Trust & Savings Ass'n v. U.S.*, 459 F. 2d 513 (Ct. Cl. 1972); *Keasbey & Mattison Co. v. Rothensies*, 133 F. 2d 894 (3rd Cir. 1943), cert. denied 320 U.S. 739 (1943); *Santa Eulalia Mining Co. v. Commissioner*, 2 T.C. 241 (1943).

⁸ *United States v. Waterman Steamship Co.*, 330 F. 2d 128, 131 (5th Cir. 1964); *Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. v. United States*, 375 F. 2d 835, 839 (Ct. Cl. 1967); *Allstate Insurance Co. v. United States*, 419 F. 2d 409 (Ct. Cl. 1969).

⁹ *Lamman & Kemp-Barclay & Co. of Columbia v. Commissioner*, 26 T.C. 582, 589 (1956); *Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. v. United States*, 375 F. 2d 835 (Ct. Cl. 1967).

¹⁰ Opening Statement of Senator Frank Church, Chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations at Hearings, January 30, 1974, on International Oil Companies and U.S. Foreign Policy, BNA, Daily Tax Report, January 30, 1974, at J-10.

¹¹ "The artificiality of this [Libyan posted price] system is obvious and well known, but it has not been challenged by I.R.S." Excerpt from a cable sent on January 26, 1971, from an oil company tax expert to group negotiating with Libya on per barrel costs. Released by the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations.

¹² See Statement of W. L. Henry, cited in notes 17 and 22, which criticized the recent Treasury Department legislative proposal which would limit the creditable amount of OPEC "tax" on oil production income to 48 percent of such income, on the ground that it would place U.S. oil companies at a competitive disadvantage.

TWENTIETH CENTURY OPPORTUNITY

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are historians who believe that the 20th century will be recalled primarily as the dawn of the nuclear age. Others believe that it will be noteworthy as that point in time when man was first able to break the fetters of gravity and travel to the outer reaches of the solar system. Still others are of the opinion that future generations will regard genetic and medical discoveries as the greatest contribution of our generation to the mainstream of civilization.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have the opportunity to achieve in our time, a distinction which would be more important to the future of mankind than any of these.

We can become that generation in which mankind, for the first time, was wise enough to leave the Earth, its

waters, and its atmosphere in better condition than we found it.

Perhaps "opportunity" is misstating the challenge. More accurately, it is mandatory that we give a positive and perpetual control over those byproducts of civilization which are destroying our physical environment.

Since the dawn of history man has regarded the natural environment as a great bank from which to draw for his physical needs. He had also used it as a repository for his waste products. This has never been more fully realized than in the present decade when our economic and personal well-being demands that we extract and achieve maximum development of those abundant energy resources that lie beneath the Earth's surface.

Until relatively recent times man tended to regard the ability of the environment to sustain these functions as infinite. Today we know that every component in what we collectively term "the environment" is not only finite, but in some cases is tragically near depletion or, as the case may be, irreversible despoilment.

Insofar as the magnitude of this threat to future generations is concerned, I cite the following stark word picture, set forth by Dr. David M. Gates, director of the Missouri Botanical Gardens, as part of a congressional colloquium in the summer of 1968:

A future earth populated by "half starved, depressed billions gasping for air, depleted of oxygen and laden with pollutants, thirsting for thickened eutrophic water, struggling to avoid the constant presence of one another, and in essence continuing life at a degraded substance level. . .

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the time has come to take hold of and control those factors which are responsible for degrading our environment.

I do not imply that either the executive branch or the Congress have been blind to the threats or negligent in stepping out to meet them.

The aforementioned colloquium which was sponsored by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was one of a series of expressions of national interest for the environment made in recent years by the Congress and the executive branch.

It is incumbent upon Congress, in my view, to take a single-minded approach in providing the enabling legislation, the funding, and perhaps most important of all, eternal oversight as the environmental protection efforts begin.

In April of 1969, during the second session of the 91st Congress, I introduced a resolution which provided for the creation of a Standing Committee on the Environment in the House of Representatives. I reintroduced this same resolution in the 92d Congress and again in the first session of this Congress with a total of 215 cosponsors.

I was very pleased when, in the first session of this Congress, the intent of my legislation was partially realized and the House Select Committee on Committees recommended the creation of a standing Committee on Energy and En-

vironment as part of their reorganization of the House committee system.

The select committee takes a very big step in the right direction toward solving environmental problems. I do not believe, although, that consolidating energy and environment into one standing committee will provide these issues with the selective consideration they must have in the Congress.

These issues cover very substantial areas of jurisdiction and many times, as the select committee notes, will overlap each other's jurisdictional boundaries.

To handle this so-called "broad-gaged" legislation, the select committee has recommended that a mechanism of joint bill referral and review procedures for legislation be adopted. This is a mechanism that is necessary for the effective handling of so many bills that cover a wide range of issues.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is just as necessary that energy and environment issues, each covering such a wide range of public policy matters, be included in different standing committees. Many times legislation covering one of these areas will come before this body, and will have nothing to do with any other issue. In most cases, these bills reflect the interest and needs of many millions of Americans, and Congress would be doing a great disservice to the Nation by giving such legislation anything but priority consideration.

Accordingly, today I have introduced an update of my earlier standing committee resolution which takes all of the environmental jurisdiction proposed by the Select Committee on Committees for inclusion in proposed committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources and Energy and Environment, and combines them under one separate standing Committee on the Environment.

The standing committee which I propose would provide each of its members with an opportunity for meaningful participation in decisionmaking within a significant public policy field. These issues certainly deal with broad segments of public policy and would, therefore, attract a broadly representative membership.

As a result of consolidating all issues dealing with the environment into one standing committee, its members would be able to give coherent consideration to all pressing environmental problems whose handling has always been fragmented in the past.

This standing committee will provide a mechanism for more responsible legislative oversight when dealing with environmental laws being implemented by the Federal Government, and a professional approach in management of information resources supporting services and physical planning.

I have had the pleasure in the past weeks of working together with many of the major environmental groups in the country in preparing this legislation. These groups believe as I do that the principles outlined in this legislation are needed so that this Nation's environmental interests can be effectively represented in the Congress. They include the

National Park and Conservation Association, the Sierra Club, National Wildlife Federation, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Wilderness Society, National Recreation and Park Association, Friends of the Earth, and Fund for Animals.

Mr. Speaker, I envision the Committee on the Environment as one of the most important and prestigious assignments in Congress. Certainly, I could think of no greater responsibility than assuring a high quality of life for current and future generations.

THE 1975 DEFENSE BUDGET IS "SAFE"

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we must keep our defenses up at a time when it is most easy to lose our strength through lack of financial support for rebuilding our worn out military machine. I urge my colleagues to carefully review the following thoughtful analysis of the proposed defense budget by Ira C. Eaker, a retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Air Force:

THE 1975 DEFENSE BUDGET IS "SAFE" (By Ira C. Eaker)

The proposed defense budget which President Nixon submitted to Congress on Feb. 4 called for an expenditure of \$85.5 billion against \$79.5 billion spent last year by the Department of Defense (DOD).

Since the left-wing and pacifist press immediately trumpeted "a \$6 billion increase in military appropriations for 1975," it is appropriate to examine what this represents as a contribution to the so-called "arms race."

Of this \$6 billion increase for DOD for 1975, \$3.6 billion is to cover increased pay raises. Inflation, the increased costs of weapons and supplies, accounted for \$1.5 billion. The increased cost of fuel for the military (due to the Arab oil embargo) was \$500 million. This left but half a billion dollars as the true increase in defense costs for '75 over '74.

Defense continues to decline as a percentage of the overall federal outlay. In 1974 it represented 27.9 per cent; in 1975 it represents 27.2 per cent. By contrast, welfare and human resource programs represent 50 per cent of the federal budget for 1975, a substantial increase over 1974.

The allocation of the defense budget among the services is always of interest as it can record current changes in defense policy.

The following table shows these allocations in billions of dollars:

	1974	1975
Army	\$22.1	\$22.9
Navy (& Marines)	27.1	29.0
Air Force	25.5	27.5

Personnel costs continue to represent 55 per cent of all defense expenditures. Total defense military and civilian employment at the end of 1975 will be 3.18 million. This represents a 23,000 cut from 1974 in people strength. It is also 540,000 below the personnel strength a decade ago, and 1.65 million less than the peak strength during the Vietnam War in 1968.

Military personnel is cut 22,000 in the '75

budget while civilian personnel remains practically unchanged.

In numerical terms, our forces are at the lowest level in a quarter-century, more than 1 million below the peacetime year of 1950.

The Pentagon calls this a "readiness budget." It is designed to increase the immediate readiness and effectiveness both of the general purpose forces and the strategic nuclear forces. Significantly, it is also responsive to the lessons of the Vietnam War and the Arab-Israeli conflict.

There is an increase of \$300 million for communications and intelligence programs; significant sums are spent for improved sea- and air-lift, and new command and control devices and techniques receive added emphasis—all direct results of implications of the Middle East conflict.

Strategic forces get about the same budget increase as general purpose forces in the '75 budget, nearly \$1 billion.

Research and development funds are wisely increased more than \$1 billion in the '75 budget to ensure the modernization of our military capability and to prevent technological surprise.

The '75 budget might also appropriately be called a "holding budget."

Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, testifying in support of the new budget, recently told congressional committees that the action of the Soviet Union will necessarily determine the size of this and future defense budgets.

If on-going negotiations with the Soviet Union in SALT II (strategic arms limitation talks' second round) and in related mutual and balanced force reductions talks (MBFR) achieve meaningful mutual reductions in armaments and defense forces, the U.S. arms budgets will be promptly responsive.

The 1975 budget contains funds for the continual development of the strategic Triad programs, land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, Trident (the new underseas fleet) and the B-1, new strategic bomber.

The United States will then be in a position to deploy each of these essential systems without delay if the Soviets continue their vast arms expansion clearly designed to gain overwhelming superiority.

Secretary Schlesinger also expressed the hope that this evidence of U.S. determination might speed the negotiating process in SALT II.

The '75 defense budget is not an optimum budget but a minimum safe outlay if the United States is to maintain parity and effectiveness as a world power.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and its Ladies Auxiliary, conducts a Voice of Democracy contest.

This year, nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the contest, competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as top prizes.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C. for the final judging as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am gratified to note that the Minnesota winner in this contest is Miss Debra C. Bock of Route 2, Tracy, in our Sixth Congressional District.

For the edification of my colleagues, I insert her prize-winning essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By Miss Debra C. Bock)

DEAR DIARY: Just another ordinary Friday—eight hours of school and the bus ride home. Well, on second thought, maybe not an ordinary day—we commemorated Veterans' Day—the same program as in the past five years of high school, only today was the last time that I will participate!

Maybe that's what happened to great numbers of Americans—they reach the final leg of one segment of life and forget to go on. Will that happen to me—no interest in my government's decisions, actions, or needs until I'm ready for my social security checks. NO, that will not happen to me, for today I felt: "I'm going to be a part of this society in a few months. I'm 18—what am I going to do? Will I follow the apathetic mood of the 1950's, or will I get involved like the young of the sixties, who were very much concerned? But you see there is a difference, because I am the young of the seventies, a young adult who must make a decision as to how I will fulfill my responsibility—that of being a United States citizen.

You know its a funny thing, I've never starved,—or worked long hours in poor conditions for little pay,—I've never been on a battlefield or I've never heard a machine gun,—or have I witnessed anyone die,—every day of my life I've had a warm bed to sleep in, a television to watch, a radio to listen to and every other middle class luxury of an American family.

Yet, I have heard speaker after speaker tell me how important citizenship is,—how great our government is,—how important it is to die for it,—to stand up for it,—and to salute it,—but I think the most important and the hardest ordeal is being 18 and never having had to pay just a little for my right of being an American citizen.

My country has given me a school to go to where I have studied and learned practically everything I know about our government, how it functions, what citizenship entails, but as the old cliché goes, "You never know how great something is until you lose it."

And I am telling you now that I do not intend to lose it. Oh, you can say it is easy to say something like that; but to carry it out is the hardest part. But I feel that just knowing its going to be hard, is the first step.

I intend to enter the military service where I plan to continue my education and learn all I can, because I want my children to inherit the social, economic, and political standards that I have lived with, and for them to be able to improve upon them. I want them to run on that beach, and I want them to be able to speak out their feelings and I want them, most of all, to have the freedoms I have had.

But you see,—this means I have a responsibility,—I know today that I want to exercise my right to vote, to select the best leaders for my country, and to stand up for those in office. I intend to be a concerned citizen who will objectively analyze the news of our world, the actions of our government, and the people therein. This is not for someone else to do; but for me as an individual citizen.

If this means driving down the road 50 miles per hour, or going to a city council meeting, or turning off that unneeded light, then that is what I must do.

This is my responsibility as a citizen,—to be involved with my government's affairs. Maybe breaking away from my peer group and to cry and salute Old Glory the next time she passes by won't be easy, but you see,—the creation of this ordinary Friday wasn't so easy either.

HISTORY SHOWS FAILURE OF CONTROLS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, wage and price controls, in various forms, have been tried in many countries throughout history; each time they have been tried the results have not been what the planners expected.

President Johnson tried wage-price guidelines. The guidelines failed and were abandoned. The British tried a wage-price board; it failed and was abolished in 1970. The Canadians tried voluntary wage-price controls. In 1971, their Prices and Incomes Commission announced the program was unworkable and would be abandoned.

The Nixon administration has just announced it will recommend the end of almost all controls on April 30, 1974. The reason for this, of course, is that these controls also have been ineffective and have resulted only in distortions of the economy.

The record is clear:

During Phase I (August 1971 to November 1971) the rate of increase of prices was 2.0% (which indicates a freeze can have an effect for a short period). However, during Phase II (November 1971-January 1973) the rate of increase was 3.6%. During Phase III (January 1973-July 1973) the rate of increase was 7.4%. And during the present Phase IV (July 1973) the rate of increase has climbed to 11.1%. (U.S. News and World Report, February 4, 1974, page 18.)

Wage and price controls have failed to stem inflation, because they have attacked its symptoms and not the causes. Inflation is caused by increases in the money supply combined with increasing demand and decreasing supplies. That is, more money in circulation is bidding for less goods; therefore, prices—and then wages—are pushed up. Attempts to stop the upward push of prices through imposition of controls is the equivalent of trying to stop a raging fever by breaking your thermometer.

Although, as we have seen, wage and price controls have little, if any, effect in controlling inflation, they do have a number of negative side-effects. As the distinguished economist, Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, has pointed out:

The controls affect productivity in three ways: (1) millions of man-hours in government and industry devoted to administering controls constitute pure and unadulterated waste; (2) insofar as any wage rates are prevented from rising, workers have less incentive to do their best and employers are hampered in hiring as many and as high quality workers as they demand; (3) insofar as profit margins approach the permitted ceilings, businesses lose much of their incentive to keep down costs. (Newsweek, May 22, 1972.)

Many of my colleagues and I have been pointing out these basic facts for years. It is good to know that the Nixon administration, through its recent experience, has come to the same conclusion

as did the Continental Congress on June 4, 1778, when they declared that—

Whereas, it hath been found by Experience that Limitations upon the Prices of Commodities are not only ineffectual for the Purposes proposed, but likewise productive of very evil Consequences to the great Detriment of the public Service and grievous Oppression of Individuals. . . . Resolved, That it be recommended to the several States to repeal or suspend all Laws or Resolutions within the said States respectively limiting, regulating or restraining the Price of any Article, Manufacture of Commodity." (Journals of the Continental Congress, 1908 edition, vol. 11, pg. 569.)

HON. DIXY LEE RAY SPEAKS ON ENERGY CRISIS SOLUTIONS

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Honorable Dixy Lee Ray, was recently in the Third District of Tennessee, and I had the honor of appearing with her at meetings in Oak Ridge.

During the course of her visit in Tennessee, she appeared before several groups in east Tennessee, one of which was the 2-day meeting of the Welding and Testing Technology Exhibition and Conference—WATTEC—at the Regency Hotel in Knoxville. At this meeting she reviewed the role of the Oak Ridge plants in helping solve the energy crisis and also explained what the AEC is doing generally to come up with solutions.

A summary of her remarks appeared in the February 25 edition of the Oak Ridger, the daily newspaper of Oak Ridge. What Chairman Ray had to say will be of interest to all who are working to break the back of the energy crisis. I, therefore, feel it is appropriate to include excerpts of her remarks as reported by the Oak Ridger.

Chairman Ray called for expanded manpower training programs in engineering and said the training and technology program—TAT—in Oak Ridge "could well serve as a model for many others that will be necessary in every aspect of energy development." She reported that the TAT program has graduated more than 200 skilled workers in the last 7 years.

The TAT program in Oak Ridge is supported by State and Federal funds and is conducted at the Y-12 plant.

HON. DIXY LEE RAY SPEAKS ON ENERGY CRISIS SOLUTIONS

She said that, because of shortages in nuclear engineering and other engineering fields, more manpower training programs are needed. She also supports the plan of Gov. Winfield Dunn, whom she visited with Thursday morning, to develop a vocational school system in the state to train craftsmen.

Chairman Ray said that there are 33,000 engineers in atomic energy now. She added that, based on nuclear power growth projections, 3700 new nuclear engineers should be added every year for the next decade or two.

"Of the total engineering degrees granted," Chairman Ray said, "nuclear represents only two percent and this is not nearly enough in order to sustain increased manpower needs."

Chairman Ray was introduced by Aubrey Wagner, chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, with whom she spent much of the day Thursday. Master of ceremonies for the WATTEC banquet was Robert Hart, manager of AEC's Oak Ridge Operations.

Hart presented a citation to Floyd Culler, deputy director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, who served as acting director for nearly a year, "in recognition of outstanding achievement." The citation was awarded by the engineering and technical community of Oak Ridge, as represented by more than a dozen engineering society chapters.

The WATTEC program also included a number of exhibits. Among these exhibits were:

1. An energy-environment simulator built by Oak Ridge Associated Universities;

2. An ORNL fish tag attached to a largemouth bass in order to measure the rates of temperature change in the water where the fish swims;

3. A prototype mirror for a laser fusion machine developed by the Y-12 Plant. (The Y-12 mirror would be used to focus the concentrated light from a laser to heat pellets of heavy hydrogen isotopes to millions of degrees so that explosive fusion reactions occur, contained in a chamber.)

According to the Y-12 exhibit on mirrors, "The Sandia Corporation (in New Mexico) is designing a demonstration solar energy system to collect and store five million BTUs (British Thermal Unit, a measure of heat content) per day. A hundred reflectors with a total surface area of 10,800 square feet will be needed."

"The Y-12 Plant is assessing the feasibility of options to manufacture high quality reflectors at an economical price."

In her general talk described as "inspirational" by Hart, Chairman Ray called engineers "a wanted commodity" and the nation's "prime problem solvers."

She said that engineers are needed to help the nation achieve two goals identified in a report she led in preparing for the President on how to spend billions of dollars for energy research and development in the next five years.

These goals, Chairman Ray said, are to increase the efficiency of known technologies to reduce the cost of developing energy self-sufficiency, and "to develop new technologies to guarantee our energy self-sufficiency over the long run."

Chairman Ray said that the federal government plans to spend \$11.3 billion over the next five years for energy research and development, excluding pilot plant construction.

If the President's budget for fiscal 1975 is approved by Congress, she said scientists and engineers can expect the government to spend \$1.8 billion for direct energy research and development next fiscal year, which begins July 1.

Another \$200 million would be spent for basic and supporting research and for environmental effects, she added.

Chairman Ray said that the proposed expenditures for energy research follow closely the recommendations she made in her report to the President last December. This report, she added, had input from more than 400 people from private industry, national laboratories, private foundations and universities.

The report, she said, listed five tasks to be met if the U.S. is to achieve the goal of getting all its energy from domestic sources by the next decade.

These tasks include:

1. To conserve energy. Chairman Ray said

that our society should continue to be based "on mechanical machines and good engineering practices" rather than be shifted back to a slave and servant society. She lashed out at "self-flagellating words that bemoan the fact that we use energy."

Energy conservation, she added, includes improving the efficiency of machines and conversion processes involved in energy use. "Here is where the engineer has a tremendous role to play," she said.

2. To increase the domestic production of oil and gas as rapidly and reasonably as possible so that the U.S. can rely less on fuel imports.

3. To increase the use of coal and to perfect economic processes to make fuel oil and gas from coal so as to supplement and later substitute for diminishing oil and natural gas resources.

4. To expand nuclear energy so that atomic fuel can eventually replace fossil fuels for producing heat to make steam for generating electricity.

5. To foster the use of renewable resources, such as heat from the interior of the earth, from the sun, and from thermonuclear fusion as well as power from hydroelectric sources.

Chairman Ray said the national goal is that "nuclear power and the use of coal will be the prime basis for the production of electricity throughout the remainder of this century."

She added that the U.S. owes it to future generations not to burn up all the earth's fossil fuels now for heat and electric power generation. These fossil fuels, she added, are probably more valuable as sources of hydrocarbon chemicals for fertilizers, plastics, other synthetics, petrochemicals, and feedstock.

Chairman Ray, a marine biologist with a Ph. D. from Stanford University, began her talk by saying, "I think I know more about nuclear engineering than any other marine biologist in the country."

She said that, because of her studies of how ocean microorganisms cause the deterioration of wood structures in the sea, she was offered membership in the American Society of Corrosion Engineers.

This society, Chairman Ray said, called her Miss Deterioration.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this year a significantly large number of House Members have announced their retirement and intend to return to private life. Among the many fine Members the House will lose this year is Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN of Washington. Congresswoman HANSEN has decided to retire after 37 years of exemplary public service at the city, State, and Federal levels of government.

Widely respected for her forthrightness and integrity, she has represented her State and served her Nation with vision and compassion for 14 years. As chairman of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, she was the first woman to hold a subcommittee chairmanship in either the House or the Senate.

Today, most of us have become sensitive to and well aware of the women's rights movement. However, those who have had the privilege of working with this fine person, knew long ago of the vital and dynamic contributions women could make to Congress and to society.

During her tenure, she devoted herself to issues concerning the environment, national parks, forest lands, fisheries, energy resources and the needs of the Indian people, in addition to providing outstanding service for the people of her district.

We, in Congress, will miss Congresswoman HANSEN. I am sure that as a private citizen, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN will continue to work for the things in which she believes and continue to help the people whom she has served.

OIL TANK CONSTRUCTION AND CLEANING—SIGNS OF MASSIVE HOARDING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today my staff investigated the availability of oil storage tanks and their sales in the Greater Cleveland, Ohio, area.

The findings indicate that there is a possibility of hoarding on a massive scale.

All the tank supply and construction companies we surveyed informed us that their sales have increased from 20 percent to 50 percent since the energy crisis began. The companies also informed us that a much greater increase in sales could have been made if the supplies for constructing these tanks were available. For example, one company said that the normal order-to-delivery period was 6 to 8 weeks before the energy crisis, but now this period is 10 to 12 weeks. This same company said that November and December have traditionally been the industry's slow period with usual layoffs of workers. This year there were no layoffs. This year the company gave overtime.

Another company informed us that usually 10,000-gallon tanks are the "big sellers," but since the energy crisis, 20,000-gallon tanks have been much more in demand. The spokesman for this company also noted that orders for 8,000- to 10,000-gallon tanks are usually made in quantities of 1 or 2, but in the past year orders of 8 to 10 tanks of this quantity are common.

My staff also contacted oil tank cleaning companies. We found that business for tank cleaning has slowed down considerably. This is a possible indication of tanks that cannot be cleaned, because they are full.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that we must undertake an immediate survey of possible speculation, hoarding, and the creation of artificial shortages that hurt the general public.

GOV. JOHN WEST'S LETTER TO MR. SIMON

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Gov. John C. West has written Hon. William Simon an excellent letter, which I call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. We commend the Governor for his splendid statement. What has been going on is no solution. The answer is less controls, not more bureaucracy. We respectfully urge that the present Government role in petroleum distribution be ended at the earliest possible moment.

Governor West's letter follows:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
February 21, 1974.

Mr. WILLIAM E. SIMON,
Administrator, Federal Energy Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMON: During the past three and a half months, the Federal government and the States have embarked on a momentous new adventure, one on a scale of novelty and importance that has no parallel during the postwar era. The decision to take over the critical operations of the petroleum distribution system was made only after the Arab embargo caused the nation to fear catastrophic shortages affecting the vitality of our economy.

These catastrophic results have not taken place, both because the American people have voluntarily cut back on their consumption and because the actual shortage has been less than initially feared. From my admittedly local point of view, government regulation of the distribution system has done little positive to alleviate the situation. In fact, I have observed such massive confusion that my faith in the superiority of the free enterprise system has been greatly reinforced.

Do you honestly believe that, once the Arab embargo is terminated, we should continue our belated efforts to operate the petroleum distribution system? Both the States and the Federal government have made superhuman efforts to undertake this laborious task. We have diverted some of our best staff and our limited executive attention from other vitally important matters. I am not saying that if we continued to sacrifice our valuable administrative resources we could not meet this task. In fact, I believe that the problem is that "the best and the brightest" can always figure out how unlimited numbers of persons like themselves could accomplish almost anything. Unfortunately government, federal and local, does not have unlimited numbers of such exceptional persons and we need them ever so badly to work on the problems of economic development, environmental protection, human resources development, etc.

With this in mind, shouldn't we admit that once again "the best and the brightest" have led us into the trap of "governmental overload" and that, as quickly as possible, we should return petroleum distribution to persons experienced in such work. If there are some specific inequities and injustices that require remedy, surely "the best and the brightest" can find a way for us to remove them without trying to run the entire petroleum industry.

In summary, I hope very much that we can terminate our joint adventure in petroleum distribution as soon as the Arab embargo ends.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. WEST.

GOVERNMENT LAWLESSNESS—ABOVE AND BEYOND WATERGATE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, it is not a particularly radical statement to say that Government officials and politicians commit crimes. Watergate saw to it that the phrase "they're all crooks" became tragically common in the American vernacular.

Yet, crimes both large and small in significance have often been adversely affected the way in which people are allowed to live their lives. It just happened that this reality failed to reach the national consciousness. Back in June of 1972, the Congressional Black Caucus held public hearings on the subject of Government lawlessness. The information that was brought out at those hearings should have been heeded. It was, however, virtually ignored and it took Watergate to shock the collective illusion of this country.

Today, politicians, writers, and ordinary citizens are coming to realize that Watergate followed a long history of Government abuse of the law. In a particularly fine column, in a recent edition of the Washington Post, Colman McCarthy considered the subject of "Government Lawlessness." I now submit the column for the consideration of my colleagues:

GOVERNMENT LAWLESSNESS
(By Colman McCarthy)

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

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

These examples are in the open, well reported by the press, even though, as the trend of lawlessness continues, new examples tend to be less newsworthy. Less noticed, though, are countless other examples, still important because they affect people's lives. In late January, the AP reported: "Four months and 18 days beyond the date required by law, the Agriculture Department has filed with Congress the government's goal for the development of rural United States." The Washington Post reported that the Food and Drug Administration broke the law last year by banning the growth hormone DES from cattle feed. The Wall Street Journal reported that a U.S. district court ruled that the Forest Service broke the law by allowing a West Virginia national forest to be clear-cut for wood. These three cases are from but a one-week period in January; other examples are easily found for the other weeks of January, even the other weeks of every month. The lawlessness in government is not confined to Washington; on the state level there is Agnew's Maryland and among cities Adonizio's Newark.

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

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

Occasionally attention in Washington is given to government lawlessness. In June 1972, the congressional Black Caucus held hearings on the subject. After four days of learning the details of the crime wave, Rep. Charles C. Diggs (D-Mich.), said: "To say that we have the existence of government lawlessness would be a supreme understatement. To say that it is even larger than we ever anticipated is also an understatement . . . One thing seems evident: we are seeing a war right here in America, a real war, waged between government officials and agencies who openly refuse to follow statutes and regulations and those citizens who should receive the benefits of those programs and who have to fight like hell to get them, and many times they don't." The Black Caucus hearings received almost no coverage

in the media. Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.) recalls that "at the time of the hearings a Democratic party credentials fight was going on across town, and the media and the politicians convinced each other that this was the important news of the day. Yet, for me, the hearings on government lawlessness were the most explosive ones I ever heard." As for the agencies whose lawlessness was detailed by witnesses and confirmed by facts, the hearings were as easily ignored as the law itself.

What is the solution? For the moment, none appears evident, especially when so many in the government refuse to admit there is a problem. How can a criminal be rehabilitated if he is deluded he has done nothing wrong? The attitude is pervasive, not only in cases the government loses in the highest courts but even in traffic violations. The day after Attorney General William B. Saxbe was sworn in, he was stopped on the street and received a citation because his Cadillac had an illegal sticker. Saxbe first tried to talk his way out of it; but that tactic failed. Then the nation's top law official tried the do-you-know-who-I-am argument in an effort to bully two of the nation's lowest law officers. But the latter gave their mighty boss a ticket anyway. Two days later, a news story said the Attorney General "joked about the incident." Perhaps that is the solution to government lawlessness—enjoy a good laugh. If so, it would be logical at a time when the law is being treated as a joke anyway.

ISRAELI PRISONERS OF WAR IN SYRIA

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the testimony I intend to submit to the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs on the subject of the treatment of Israeli prisoners of war in Syria.

The testimony follows:

ISRAELI PRISONERS OF WAR IN SYRIA

Mr. Chairman: I was happy to learn that on February 27, after months of stern rejections by Syria of Israeli offers aimed at solution of the prisoner situation, the Syrian Government agreed to take the first steps toward compliance with the Third Geneva Convention of 1949. Their decision to release a list of prisoners and to permit Red Cross inspection of the treatment of the prisoners is a long overdue but welcome measure.

The prisoner of war situation remains the key issue for Israel. There exists all but irrefutable evidence that the prisoners in Syrian hands have been mistreated. Last week, before this same subcommittee, Israeli witnesses testified as to the brutal murder of 42 Israeli prisoners by the Syrians, the Syrians' total lack of cooperation with the Red Cross up to that time, and their ignoring of the Geneva Convention of 1949 relating to the treatment of prisoners of war. These allegations are not based on hearsay or rumor, but on eyewitness fact. There is no refuting the fact that a man, found bound, denuded and riddled in the face with bullets, has been killed in cold blood.

There would be less trepidation about the fate of the missing men if Syria were abiding by the Third Geneva Convention. Article 13 of the Convention provides, in part, that "prisoners of war must at all times be humanely treated." Article 17 prohibits

torture, coercion, and extortion of information from prisoners. Other provisions provide that prisoners shall be enabled to write directly to their families, that the Red Cross or other representative of the Protecting Powers shall be allowed to visit the prisoners, and that the prisoners shall be repatriated without delay upon the cessation of hostilities. But the Syrians have proven themselves impervious to humanitarian considerations and deaf to the appeals advanced by a procession of international representatives.

The Syrian record of treatment of Israeli prisoners of war in the past 25 years has enough witnesses to support the Israeli fear that prisoners are being physically and psychologically mistreated, the most recent being the three Israeli pilots returned in an exchange just before the October war.

As for the behavior of Israel, she released the names of all the prisoners she holds to the International Red Cross 3 days after their capture, and allowed the Red Cross access to the prisoners weeks ago. Syrian prisoners in Israel are reportedly treated well by Israel. Non-partisan reports indicate that the Syrian wounded in Israel are treated as well as Israel's own wounded soldiers.

The Syrians do not seem concerned about the return of their own 377 men in Israeli hands. Many public and private offers for repatriation have been turned down by Syria. Instead, Syria cruelly flaunts the prisoners they hold in an attempt to use them for political gain.

On December 3, 1973, I wrote to Secretary of State Kissinger asking him to instruct our representative at the United Nations to introduce a Security Council resolution calling on Syria to fulfill Geneva Convention requirements in the exchange of wounded prisoners. I urge our Government and the International Red Cross to exert all their influence through other nations and appropriate international bodies to persuade the Syrian government to abide by the accepted norms of civilized conduct in war.

War is in itself tragic and inhumane. However, there are relatively well-established international agreements with respect to the handling of prisoners of war, and it is assumed that responsible governments will honor these obligations.

The Geneva Conventions of 1949 were based on the idea of respect and dignity for human life. Some day, I hope, there will be a Geneva Convention against war itself. Until there is, there remains this standard of morality and behavior in time of war. Syria must be made to live up to it.

PRESCRIPTION FOR FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FINANCING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost concerns in the wake of the 1972 political campaigns has been the increasing demand from citizens representing a wide spectrum of American society for legislation to cure the curse of campaign financing and accountability.

During the past year or so, many interesting concepts have been advanced to change the methods of financing campaigns, as well as appropriate ways of accounting for expenditures. Various proposals have elicited much diversity in thinking on just what is needed. But, there is one definite point of agreement—

refinement in our present system is high-priority unfinished business of the Congress in the 2d session of the 93d.

Several years ago, Mr. Speaker, one of our more candid House Members was quoted in *Esquire* magazine as saying:

The primary and overriding duty and responsibility of each Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate is to get reelected.

In my judgment, the primary and overriding duty and responsibility of each Member of the 93d Congress is to restore the faith of the American people in the democratic processes of their Government. What better way is there to get reelected than by those acts which show the people we represent that we deserve to be reelected?

The 92d Congress made the first comprehensive revision in campaign finance legislation to be accomplished in almost half a century. Few would dispute the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 was not a major improvement over the inadequate Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 which it replaced. Conversely, most Members of Congress, as well as the public at large, would heartily agree there are yet some loopholes to be closed.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, last month I introduced a bill, H.R. 13144, designed to eliminate some of the more obvious flaws which became apparent during, and following, the last Federal elections.

I noted in President Nixon's televised press conference last night that his recommended campaign reform legislation which he intends to offer Congress tomorrow is very close to my bill. The main emphasis of my bill is to tighten up on reporting and the disclosure of campaign contributions and campaign expenditures; to limit campaign contributions and to close some of the loopholes of the 1971 act so as not to permit a replay in the 1974 and 1976 elections of some of the corrupt and deceptive acts of the 1972 elections.

My bill would seek to do this by requiring a candidate for Congress to designate one State or Federal bank as his one and only depository for campaign contributions. All campaign contributions and campaign expenditures on behalf of a candidate would have to go through this one bank account, with the bank statement being made a part of the candidate's campaign report.

With my bill a contributor would know that a candidate for office, or those acting in his behalf, had violated a Federal law if his contribution was not listed among those deposits in the one named bank depository. By the same token, anyone accepting payment for a campaign expense in excess of \$100 in any form other than a check from the one named bank would also know that a Federal law was being violated. It is my understanding that the campaign reform to be suggested to us by the President tomorrow has the same unique approach to identifying all campaign contributions and expenditures.

My bill established a limit on campaign

contributions at \$3,000 which I understand is also part of the President's proposal. My bill makes illegal any campaign contributions in cash in excess of \$100. I understand the President's proposal sets a limit on cash contributions at \$50.

To safeguard against the frequently used practice of making contributions in different names such as John Smith and J. P. Smith, my bill requires the listing of the social security number of any contributor whose contributions total in excess of \$500.

Another feature of my bill prohibits contributions from any individual or group in excess of \$500 5 days before the election. The purpose of this is to prevent candidates from seeking large campaign contributions from special interest groups a few days before the election, knowing that through the slow reporting process the voters would not know of the contribution until after the election.

So as to reduce the chance of suitcases full of cash or \$100,000 contributions held in a safe for a candidate for a couple of years, my bill requires that any contribution in excess of \$100 must be deposited in the designated bank within 15 days after receipt of the contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I suffer no illusions that my bill, if enacted, will end corruption in political campaign practice. One can not legislate character.

In the 1972 campaigns, the Attorney General whose lofty position proclaimed him to be the No. 1 law enforcement officer in this country said, "Don't listen to what we say, watch what we do." That was a campaign promise and indeed the eyes of America are still upon what they did, though some of the verdicts are not yet in.

While we cannot legislate character, we can write legislation which will be less tempting to those seeking high office. We can also write legislation which will provide greater guarantees against those acts which would undermine our free election process. Could some not say that our failure to properly legislate against those acts which have disgraced our election process might not represent as much dereliction of duty as does the violation of the election laws themselves?

We must keep in mind that out there in our districts across this land are others who stand ready, willing and able to fill our seats and the American people, who more decisively than ever in the days to come will exert their will at the polls, have about had it with dirty politics which they are fast thinking includes almost all in government. Today the people express anger at those who violate election laws. Tomorrow they may express their anger against those who are unable to write effective and enforceable election laws.

The patience of the American people has grown thin. We should not expect them to withstand another national election like the last one. The time for us to act is now.

BUSING: FOR WHAT?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I recently signed a discharge petition that would provide for the discharge of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibiting the assignment or transportation of pupils to public schools on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. The issue is of major significance to the people of this Nation and demands immediate attention.

An editorial that appeared in the *Dallas Morning News* of February 25, 1974 discusses busing and presents an opinion with which I concur. I recommend it to you, my fellow Members of Congress and the general public.

The editorial follows:

BUSING: FOR WHAT?

A school desegregation study recently released by the Health, Education and Welfare Department makes two findings:

- (1) That desegregation does not substantially improve student achievement.
- (2) That students of any race learn better in schools where racial tension is absent.

Well, who can wonder? Had racial-balance busing not become gospel with so many federal judges in recent years, the truth of such propositions might have manifested itself much earlier.

The judges decided, after much metaphysical musing, that busing is a Good Thing. This is because Negro teachers are presumed incapable of instructing Negro youngsters and the Negro youngsters incapable of learning except they sit alongside a number of whites proportionate to the whites' share of the population.

And yet there was never any solid evidence for such a view. A study almost a year ago by Dr. William J. Webster of the Dallas Independent School System reviewed the effects elsewhere of "induced desegregation." Webster concluded that "it is not possible to cite a single example of a large-city school system which could serve as a model of the effectiveness of busing, pairing, etc."

Why so? Sociologists increasingly are coming to realize that family and home environment are the governing factors in the learning process. Harvard's Christopher Jencks, though himself a dedicated leftist, nevertheless submits "that the character of a school's output depends largely on a single input, namely the characteristics of the entering children. Everything else—the school budget, its policies, the characteristics of the teacher—is either secondary or completely irrelevant."

What is even plainer, perhaps, is that education—any kind of education—suffers whenever students are brought together for no other reason than racial balance and accordingly resent it.

Only in the 1973-74 school year did the schools at the end of the bus routes settle down to something approaching normality. But the worst may not yet have come. Should the Supreme Court authorize intercity busing, the reaction is sure to be loud and angry. And disruptive of education.

The pity is that disruption should occur because key federal officials are intent on implementing a policy that doesn't work nearly so well as people expected it to. It is as though we tried to shave with a meat cleaver—and wondered why we kept cutting ourselves.

ENERGY PROBLEMS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, certainly the most vexing problem facing us today is the need to find both immediate and long-term solutions to our rising demands for energy. The following article, "How To Solve Our Energy Problems," by Dr. S. S. Penner, offers concrete alternatives for dealing with the current energy crisis, as well as developing future sources of energy without our present dependence on fossil fuels. Dr. Penner, professor of engineering physics at the University of California, San Diego, is the coordinator of energy studies at the university. In view of the great interest and the variety of energy measures which have proliferated in the Congress during the past few months, I would like to share Dr. Penner's article with my congressional colleagues and commend his observations to their close attention:

HOW TO SOLVE OUR ENERGY PROBLEMS

(By S. S. Penner)

A reasonable approach in searching for adequate long-range supplies of energy sources is to assign first priority to minimization of the economic impact of embargoes on foreign fossil-fuel shipments to the United States and second priority to the early construction of facilities for abundant energy production in the United States without the use of fossil fuels (gas, oil, coal).

That we must learn in time to live without fossil fuels is certain.

Eighty percent of these resources will be used up in a period of about 300 years (counting the beginning as about 1850, when coal first came into widespread use), almost independently of any fuel economies that can reasonably be effected.

Considering their limited supply, it would be wiser if we reserved the use of fossil fuels for petrochemical and pharmaceutical manufacture rather than burning them for energy generation.

The sudden withdrawal or price rises for foreign oil shipments have provided us with the needed incentive to accomplish a necessary task.

Historically, the increases of gross national product (GNP) and of per capita income in the United States have been closely linked with energy consumption.

About \$30 billion of GNP has corresponded to the utilization of the energy-equivalent of one million barrels of oil per day. Thus, the loss of four million barrels per day might be considered to imply a GNP decline of \$120 billion.

Although this last conclusion has been drawn by a number of observers, it is not a law of nature or of growth in our economic system.

What has been true historically under our particular version of the free enterprise system need not be true and has not been true in other, closely related, advanced economic systems.

For example, each of the following countries has achieved in recent years a much more rapid growth of GNP with increased energy utilization than we have: Japan, France, F.R.G., the United Kingdom.

In 1964, France used only about 54 per cent of the energy per person and F.R.G. only about 75 per cent of the energy per per-

son which was utilized in the United Kingdom for nearly the same per capita income.

GNP and per capita income do not simply depend on total energy utilization; they depend on how the available energy is used.

We have not learned how to optimize economic value for a given energy usage rate.

This challenge faces us now and we must learn how to respond intelligently.

We are a very rich nation indeed.

Our remaining energy-resources base is very large.

We probably have left under our control conventional oil and gas resources more than double those now readily available in the Middle East, not including the enormous and only partially explored Alaskan reserves.

In addition, the oil in oil shale in the U.S. may ultimately yield from five to more than 100 times the oil in the known Middle Eastern reserves, depending on the extent to which this oil can be recovered economically.

The tar sands of Alberta, Canada, have a near-term potential (i.e., for recovery over the next 30 years) at least equal to the Middle Eastern reserves.

We own about 25 per cent of the world's vast remaining coal reserves, enough to last for hundreds of years at the current energy use rate if we were to change to an all-coal economy.

We have about 6.5 per cent of the world's hydroelectric potential of which only about 28 per cent is currently fully developed.

We can harness abundant wind energy and smaller energy reserves in selected tidal basins.

We probably have more than 50 per cent of the world's high-grade uranium oxide and a still larger percentage of the identified thorium oxide ores to make nuclear-fission energy for all of our needs for hundreds of years, once we have learned how to build large-scale nuclear breeder reactors.

Our country is large with abundant sunlight, which alone could be adapted to take care of our foreseeable energy needs.

The temperature gradients in our coastal waters, created by the sun, may allow the development of solar-sea generators for energy production.

We have some hydrothermal energy resources (naturally occurring steam and hot water) and a likely enormous potential for geothermal energy generation (using the heat of the earth to produce steam and hot water).

Finally, we are working on fusion reactors to burn the abundant deuterium (discovered by U.C. Professor and Nobel Laureate Harold Urey) in the waters. If we succeed in this endeavor, we may anticipate an energy base so vast that it will supply the world's energy needs at the anticipated year 2000 use rate for perhaps one billion years, and possibly without serious environmental damage.

We are a very rich country with an enviable energy potential. But we must learn how to use it efficiently and without destroying our environment.

The energy industries (oil companies, utility companies, coal companies, etc.) are so complex and big that only a very large, long-time, and very costly development program can have a sizable impact on energy sources.

No significant change can be made within months or even years because of the staggering required investment costs.

It has generally taken from 10 to 20 years just to change the 10 per cent use level to a 20 per cent use level when the fuel type was changed.

It took that long when wood was replaced by coal before coal burning accounted for 20 per cent of the total energy generation after coal burning had already accounted for 10 per cent of the total energy generation.

The introduction of oil and gas to significant levels required many years.

Nuclear energy, which began shortly after World War II, contributed in 1970 only about one third as much energy as wood burning. Investment costs are staggering.

Our domestic refinery capacity was short by about four million barrels of oil per day in 1973. It will take at least two years and a capital investment of perhaps \$8 billion to develop this refining capacity domestically.

Investment-cost estimates in energy production and utilization to the end of the century exceed our entire gross national product for 1973.

It was estimated in 1972 by the National Petroleum Council that more than \$500 billion would be needed by 1985, and this estimate was made without allowing for an oil embargo or the enormous 1973 price increases.

The energy industries are very big and it will take many years and a great deal of money to change to new supply bases.

Probably the best way to facilitate new energy-resource development is to make it profitable to do so in a free, competitive market.

Because most estimates of new domestic fossil-fuel development costs were pegged well above prevailing prices in early 1973, it is unrealistic to think of a return to the price base prevailing a year ago.

But there were no estimates for oil recovery from the tar sands, from oil shale, for coal liquefaction, even remotely as high as the current foreign crude prices (\$11.50 per barrel and higher).

To encourage and protect the development of new domestic fossil-fuel resources, a permanent government tax to bring imported oil to a price level of \$6 to \$8 per barrel might be justified. This type of control would appear to be preferable to outright subsidies.

Given the present economic stresses, we must develop a mixed strategy for early production of energy resources within the United States and friendly countries, while developing complete long-term solutions to our needs for cheap and abundant energy.

The nature of the current crisis dictates immediate emphasis on offshore and mainland oil and gas exploration, on increased coal production, on construction of the Alaskan pipeline, on oil recovery from the Athabasca (Alberta, Canada) tar sands, on construction of nuclear fission reactors, on expansion of hydroelectric facilities, on exploitation of hydrothermal facilities on the development of electrical-power-generating plants using selected tidal basins, and perhaps application of magnetohydrodynamic power conversion (using combustion gases with high electron concentrations in a channel with a large magnetic field in place of a turbine electric generator).

These are technologies which we can apply now in order to relieve shortages during the next decade. In addition, a concerted and continuing program for energy savings should become a continuing national objective.

By the year 2100, our current problems with energy generation should be totally resolved.

Adequate energy supply can be assured by full development of one or more total long-term solutions: controlled nuclear fusion reactors, geothermal power generation using the outer earth mantle as a heat source, the solar-sea generator, land-based solar-generating stations, all combined with a hydrogen-fuel technology.

This is the fossil-fuel-free energy resource schedule to which we must change. Knowing where we are and where we are going, we can construct a long-term energy-development map for effecting the change from a fossil-fuel-dominated economy to a fossil-fuel-free economy.

Ultimately, our "fuel" for transportation may be a light-weight efficient battery, recharged with energy supplied from a nuclear reactor, a solar-electric generator, or a geothermal energy source.

Alternatively, we may use hydrogen made from water as a universal, non-polluting fuel. Synthetic hydrogen fuels represent a third alternative.

Knowing that there is long-term relief does not help us tomorrow when we have to pay too much for a commodity that is in short supply.

But at least we should have the satisfaction of knowing that we are the terminal beneficiaries of a transient technology that is being replaced on an optimal schedule.

Unfortunately, it is not now apparent that we have really embarked on a defined national course with the assurance needed to get the energy independence that we must have.

"THE NEXT HUNDRED YEARS"—A CENTENNIAL EDITORIAL

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., last week commemorated a century of public service with an extraordinary edition of the morning newspaper, which depicted in selected front pages the triumphs and trials of the Nation and in news features "100 Years of Progress" in our community.

It is illustrative of the progressive philosophy of this newspaper and its management that in its anniversary editorial the Greenville News chose not to dwell on past achievements, but to look forward to the establishment and realization of a new goal for Greenville and the Piedmont region.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate J. Kelly Sisk, chairman of the board and publisher, Edmund A. Ramsaur, president and copublisher, B. H. Peace, Jr., honorary chairman of the board, Rhea T. Eskew, vice president and general manager, James H. McKinney, Jr., editorial page editor, R. G. Avakian, managing editor, Aubrey Bowie, associate editor, Carl D. Weimer, executive news editor, and all the outstanding men and women who are contributing and have contributed to the success of this newspaper and to share with my colleagues the Greenville News' centennial editorial:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Feb. 26, 1974]

THE NEXT HUNDRED YEARS

Presenting today's special edition commemorating the 100th year of The Greenville News, we look more toward the next 100 years than at the past century.

We record the progress of this newspaper and the city and region it serves. We are proud of the people who built the newspaper and the other institutions of Greenville and the South Carolina Piedmont. Names like Williams, Smythe, Chapman, the dynamic Peace family and many others are engraved in our history.

Studying their accomplishments reveals one outstanding attribute—the ability to

look ahead, never to live in the past. As they grappled with the problems of their present, they also worked for the future, which has become our present. Therefore, a glance at the past impels us to turn quickly, pausing only to draw experience and inspiration from history in order to cope with the present and the future.

A comparison of Greenville and the Piedmont region of 100 years ago and now reveals one great similarity and many differences. Then, as now, the chief concern of the city and region was of growth. There the similarity ends.

One hundred years ago Greenville was a small, one-industry city. The County of Greenville was predominantly agricultural, as was the region. The objective then and throughout most of the succeeding years was to stimulate growth—almost any kind of growth. The struggle was severe. Competition for growth was keen. Economic conditions often were stark.

Looking forward, our forebears—on this newspaper and in many other institutions—worked for growth. They succeeded. They made us a strong economic and social entity, in many ways a national success story.

But the nature of the growth problem has changed in recent years. Whereas the need of the past was to promote growth, now it is to control a growth which has become automatic.

Now growth must be managed, lest it overwhelm us, destroy our beautiful natural setting, ruin our ways of living, break down our institutions, turn this God-favored Red Hill country into a human jungle. We now must be selective, and careful about placement of industry and other institutions of society, and about population distribution as well.

We must cope with rapid change, not only at the small community level, but all across the Piedmont region. In order to cope, we need to think, plan and cooperate regionally, as well as in our local communities. Communities now have to cooperate with each other—and compromise with each other—as individuals have in the past. We must learn to live and help live in the regional community which has developed.

One task is to strengthen local institutions and to build regional ones able to handle complex problems beyond the capacity of any local community. We have to regulate our affairs in order to retain space and a proper atmosphere in which we can live and breathe, not merely exist. We must create better bonds of understanding and cooperation along all elements of our society, alleviating conditions which breed misunderstanding and dissension.

A special dream for the South Carolina Piedmont region is to build a strong, comprehensive knowledge industry. The purpose would be to create new frontiers—to push back the bounds of knowledge—and to use the products of knowledge at home and for profitable "export."

We have the building blocks for such an industry in our higher educational and research centers, public and private. Strengthening, adding to and coordinating them cooperatively can open the way for advanced study in many areas. The field is limitless. It ranges from the infinity of invisible smallness to the infinity of the undefined cosmos. The dream is not impossible, although it is difficult to attain. We can achieve it, or at least partially fulfill it, if we try.

Our goal is to maintain and improve the quality of life in Greenville and the Piedmont region. Looking ahead to the next 100 years, we dedicate ourselves, in cooperation with many others, to the new challenges of dynamic growth in material ways and in the priceless human spirit.

GRAIN FOR THE ARABS—NO OIL FOR US

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the American citizen, confronted by newspaper reports on our burgeoning wheat exports and the dire predictions of coming bread shortages, has good reasons to wonder whether his Government is operating in his interest or in the interests of certain peoples abroad.

I cite these recent examples. The United Press International said the other day that exporters are forecasting total U.S. wheat shipments by June 30 will exceed Department of Agriculture estimates by some 100 million bushels, making 1.313 billion bushels the total for the marketing year ending on that date.

In response to this, the UPI quoted Dawson Ahalt, an Agriculture Department economist, in what seemed to me less than reassuring terms. Mr. Ahalt conceded, the UPI said, that the domestic wheat supply is "tight" but that the Government has plans to buy back our wheat from Russia. And at the current inflated price, thus giving the Russians a whopping profit on their deals with us.

Meanwhile, in the same news period, the American citizen read that the American Bakers Association, certainly a knowledgeable organization in matters of bread and wheat supplies, feared there will be no wheat around by June 30 and that bread prices may soar to as high as \$1 a loaf. Mr. Ahalt has branded the bakers' claims "wholly inaccurate," but he has not been too convincing. A Pittsburgh bakery official said he could see a 75-cent loaf in the offing—or 25 cents more than the current average price.

This then, is the news on the state of the Nation's vital wheat supply. Admittedly, it is precarious and fraught with new dangers to the household budgets of Americans. I shudder at what could be the housewives' reaction to \$1-a-loaf of bread.

The impending wheat crisis has its roots, of course, in our bargain-basement sale of what was termed the U.S. "surplus" to the Russians back in 1972, a deal still in the process of being fulfilled by our exporters. As we have learned, it was reckless and disastrous. Not only wheat, under the impact of the Soviet sale, shot up in price, but virtually every other food item in the grocery stores. Booming grain prices meant soaring meat costs, and so forth.

And what are we doing about it now? One thing we are doing, judging from the news reports, is compounding the problem by more and more exports while, at the same time, subjugating the American interest to a new level of absurdity. Scripps-Howard, in the "Weekly Sizeup" column by its Washington staff, reports that our grain sales to the Middle East, mostly to the Arab nations, will top \$800 million this year, or double last year's totals. The Scripps-Howard breakdown:

Egypt, \$100 million worth; Saudi Arabia, \$100 million; Algeria, \$144 million; and Iraq, \$60 million. The rest is scattered over the region.

Of pointed interest to me is the Scripps-Howard assertion that our grain sales to the Arab States are running at a rate 25 percent higher than the estimates made before the Arab oil boycott brought about the oil crisis here. In other words, we are lifting the export of our critically needed grain to the Arabs while they continue to deny us the oil which we critically need from them. Has there ever been such an example of placing the American consumer last? I doubt it.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, how long it is going to be necessary for us in the Congress to meet the protests of our constituents on this and other matters in which Americans are getting the runaround. I think it is time we quit accepting these situations as having some esoteric value in the exercise of our foreign policy and look upon them for what they actually appear to be—abrogations of the prime responsibility of any government to work in behalf of its own people. We have had this principle violated time after time since our diplomats started out on their abortive mission of buying up friends abroad by giving away or sharing the substance of this Nation. It has been a one-way street, as we see again in the U.S.-grain-for-the-Arabs and no-Arab-oil-for-us arrangement. And it has not worked. And the American people are the victims.

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT R. COKER

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Robert R. Coker of Hartsville, S.C., is the Nation's most outstanding expert on the growing of cotton. This distinguished American is a life member of the Clemson University Board of Trustees, a champion of private enterprise, and leader in American agriculture. Recently, Dr. Coker delivered a superb address to the National Cotton Council's annual meeting at St. Louis. This great address has special significance at this time when we are faced with possible food and fiber shortages. Our textile industry needs cotton and the world needs more cotton. Dr. Coker's address to the Cotton Council received world attention, and I commend this timely and great address to the attention of our colleagues, agronomists, and agriculturalists the world over:

NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR BOLL WEEVIL
ELIMINATION
(By Robert R. Coker)

The state of Oaxaca, Mexico, is situated some 200 miles to the south and east of that beautiful, sub-tropical playground of Acapulco. It was in a cave in Oaxaca that in 1968 Dr. C. Earl Smith, a botanist of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, discovered a small batch of seed cotton along with Indian pottery from a known period of Indian civilization. In examining this sample of cotton, Dr. S. G. Stevens, geneticist of North Carolina State University, found a

perfectly preserved boll weevil. Through the use of radioactive carbon 14, together with the dating of the Indian pottery, it was determined scientifically that this boll weevil had lived a thousand years previously, or in approximately 968 A.D. This finding established the fact that this insect existed in South and Central America long before civilization there began, where it fed on wild cotton growing in those areas.

About 1519, this Aztec civilization was brought in contact with that of Europe, and went down in defeat with the Spanish Conquest. No one ever dreamed that this little insect would some day take from North America many times the value of the gold and other treasure that the Spanish took from Central America and Mexico.

The boll weevil was first brought to the notice of the world in 1843 when a specimen collected near Vera Cruz, Mexico, was sent to Europe and given the name *Anthonomus grandis* by the Swedish entomologist, Boheman. About 1892, it crossed the Rio Grande near Brownsville, Texas, and entered United States territory. By 1894, it had spread to a half dozen counties in southern Texas, and since has extended its range north and eastward until in 1928 almost all of the important cotton producing sections, except the western irrigated areas, had become infested. The areas of the Cotton Belt which are now affected by this insect comprise about 11 million acres of cotton.

Most of us look upon Sherman's devastation of large sections of the South with fire and pillage some 100 years ago as the greatest catastrophe which the area ever experienced. Perhaps it was, but the value of the destruction which the cotton boll weevil has caused during the past eighty-one years is far greater in dollars and cents loss to our economy.

From 1909 through 1954, the U.S. Department of Agriculture made annual estimates of the crop loss to the boll weevil. By projecting these loss figures through 1971, we find that for this period—1909 through 1971—the total loss of cotton and cottonseed directly attributable to the boll weevil amounted to 85,393,000 bales of cotton, and 36,335,000 tons of seed. Based on the farm prices during this 63-year period, the lint and cottonseed lost amounted to more than \$11,000,000,000, or an annual average of \$175,000,000.

The 36,300,000 tons of cottonseed would have produced one and a half billion gallons of cottonseed oil, and would have required 190,000 railroad tank cars to transport it. Domestic disappearance of food fats and oil is nearly 52.7 pounds per capita annually. At this rate, the cottonseed oil lost would have provided the total food fats and oil requirements for the total population of the United States for an entire year. The cottonseed lost would have produced 16,500,000 tons of high protein meal, and 9,000,000 tons of hulls. Ninety-three pounds of cottonseed meal used with the proper amount of silage will produce one hundred pounds of beef. Thus, the meal that was lost could have produced enough meat to have provided 169 pounds for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

The 85,393,000 bales of cotton destroyed between 1909 and 1971, if placed end to end, would extend in a straight line 72,799 miles long, and would reach around the earth at the equator almost three times. It would reach approximately one-third the distance from the earth to the moon.

From each bale of cotton can be produced 640 long-sleeved, combed cotton shirts, 3408 medium-weight diapers, or 5,485 handkerchiefs. According to the 1970 census, there are 71,500,000 males in the United States fourteen years or older. The cotton lost to the boll weevil, if made into shirts, would have provided these individuals with 764 shirts each. If made into diapers, it would have provided each of the 8,000,000 children

in the United States under two years old with 36,000 each. If this cotton were made into handkerchiefs, it would have made 130 handkerchiefs for each of the 3,600,000,000 inhabitants of this planet.

Against the background of these continuing losses, it appeared that the time had come for due recognition on the part of the Federal Government of its responsibility for attacking the problem at the source. Accordingly, seventeen years ago at the Annual Meeting of the Council in Phoenix, Arizona, a resolution which I authored was passed by the delegates. The resolution read as follows:

"That the National Cotton Council recognize that the cotton boll weevil is the No. 1 enemy of efficient cotton production in large and important areas of the U.S. Cotton Belt, and is taking an annual toll of tens of thousands of bales of cotton and of many millions of dollars, and that, in recognition of this, the Council pledge its best and most vigorous efforts to obtain fully adequate research funds and research effort aimed at eliminating the cotton boll weevil as a threat to the U.S. cotton crop at the earliest possible time."

The interim years from the date of that resolution to the present time were years of dedicated effort by a great many people. These efforts resulted in an appropriation of \$1,100,000 made by the Congress in 1960 to build a research facility at State College, Mississippi, dedicated to the sole purpose of conducting research aimed at the elimination of the boll weevil. This laboratory was dedicated on March 22, 1962, and I should like to quote briefly from a statement which I made on that occasion.

"Just as we dreamed of acquiring facilities and funds for research on the eradication of the boll weevil, we now envision the time when our scientists, making use of the knowledge and these facilities in utilizing the funds made available for that purpose, will be successful in driving the boll weevil from our cotton fields and helping restore cotton to its rightful place in the nation's economy."

During the thirteen years of its existence, the boll weevil research laboratory has been under the able and dedicated direction of Dr. T. B. Davich. The research conducted at this lab, together with valuable related research carried out at other federal labs, has resulted in the development of striking new knowledge, methods, and techniques for the control and elimination of the boll weevil. These research findings have resulted in the development of a synthetic boll weevil sex attractant, Grandlure, which provides a new method of detection and suppression. The male sterility technique was developed and perfected, and is a new way to eliminate low weevil populations. More effective ways of using available insecticides have also been developed, and a number of other important research findings have been made.

Because of the substantial research progress, a special study committee on boll weevil elimination was appointed by the National Cotton Council in 1969. This committee consisted of leading cotton producers from all affected areas of the Belt, together with leading entomologists and other scientists from the USDA, state experiment stations, and Cotton Incorporated. It was my privilege to serve as chairman.

On May 6, 1969, the committee met in Memphis, Tennessee, to review the status of current knowledge and to determine whether or not enough progress had been made to consider plans for a national program to eliminate the insect. Following the review, the committee decided it would be necessary to experiment on a scale sufficiently large to determine whether it was technically and operationally feasible and practical to stamp out the pest.

A subcommittee was appointed to consider requirements for the pilot experiment, and

to select the location for it. A site centered in South Mississippi was selected, as it was generally agreed that because of the seriousness of the weevil problem in that area, to eliminate the insect there would offer positive proof that a national elimination program could be successful. A total fund of \$5¼ million was made available jointly by USDA, Cotton Incorporated, and the State of Mississippi. The pilot experiment was initiated in 1971 and terminated in August 1973.

Based on results and experiences gained in this experiment, which extended into Alabama and Louisiana, the Technical Guidance Committee for the test unanimously concluded that it is technically and operationally feasible to eliminate the boll weevil as an economic pest in the United States by the use of techniques that are ecologically acceptable.

In 1969, when it appeared that research had developed the know-how for eradication, a study was begun to fashion a sound plan for moving ahead. By May of 1972, we saw the need to develop an overall approach in considerable detail, so a technical committee was structured to tackle this job. This committee was made up of the best experts on the boll weevil in the country. It was headed by Dr. E. F. Knipping and Dr. J. R. Brazzel of the USDA, with other scientists from USDA, states, and industry as members.

The committee had ten subgroups at work for 17 months. Its report was reviewed with our parent committees in Memphis on December 3, 1973, where it received our strong endorsement. The report is entitled, "Overall Plan for a National Program to Eliminate the Boll Weevil from the United States."

The program would consist of applying a series of integrated weevil suppression treatments—chemical, biological, and cultural. The principal ones are the fall use of insecticides, sex-attractant traps and trap crops, and the release of sexually sterile weevils as a final mop-up.

The U.S. boll weevil belt would be programmed by zones over a period of eight years, starting in 1975 for Zone 1 in West Texas. Operations would move eastward the following year to adjacent Zone 2. By the third year, a second front would be opened in the Virginia-Carolina zone, with the two fronts converging in subsequent years.

In advance of the actual elimination program, we strongly urge the Extension Services to assist producers in expanding organized diapause control programs and other weevil management procedures. The effort should start in 1974 and continue until the elimination program reaches their zone. This would not only slash weevil losses, but would also create better conditions for elimination, and cut program costs sharply.

The total cost of the elimination program for the eight years is estimated at \$655 million, including 20 percent for contingencies. This is an average of \$60 an acre for the approximately 11,000,000 cotton acres in the boll weevil belt. Many of us farmers spend almost this much in a single year when infestations are heavy.

I want to emphasize our full expectation that research advances in technology and operating experience as the program proceeds will reduce the estimated total cost by \$100 to \$200 million.

As a result of the untiring efforts of the Council and other cotton industry groups, with the valued assistance of our Southern Congressional leaders, Section 611 was included in the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (PL 93-86). This section authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out programs to destroy and eliminate the boll weevil.

On December 12, 1973, a copy of our overall elimination plan was presented to Secretary of Agriculture Butz at a meeting presided over by Mike Maros, president of the Council. The session was attended by a dozen Congressional leaders, representatives of the

cotton industry, Council staff members, the president of Cotton Incorporated, Mr. Dukes Wooters, and others.

We have also sent copies of the 102-page report to a large list of industry and government leaders, requesting that any recommendations be sent directly to Secretary Butz. He and his staff are giving the report careful consideration, and we are urging a decision to get the program started not later than 1975. We are all mindful that each year of delay will cost the industry \$200 to \$300 million.

I have already mentioned several overwhelming reasons for moving ahead to rid the nation of boll weevils. On the surface, most of these may seem to be of benefit only to the South. A deeper analysis, however, points toward ultimate benefits throughout the Cotton Belt and the nation.

Elimination of the boll weevil would reduce the amount of insecticides used on all crops in the United States by one-third, thus benefiting the environment. It would remove the threat of the weevil gaining a foothold on the Texas High Plains and in the irrigated West. It would remove many problems related to insect resistance to insecticides and the control of other insects. It would pave the way to similar elimination efforts on other susceptible insects such as the pink bollworm. It would free research funds for use on other pressing industry problems. The program, itself, would point the way for new concepts and approaches toward better pest control in all of agriculture.

I could cite many other reasons why we need to go forward with the weevil elimination program. But, I want to mention only one more—the matter of follow-through in using research results. More than \$21 million have been spent on boll weevil eradication research since the early 1960's. Much of this was provided by cotton growers all over the Belt through their dollar-a-bale contributions to Cotton Incorporated. The research job has now been essentially completed, and we have the opportunity to put the results to work. Unless the elimination program proceeds, most of this research expenditure will have been wasted and the benefits I have mentioned will never come to pass.

I am confident that the cotton industry will do its part to move the elimination program forward on a sound basis. Our president, Mike Maros, has already appointed an Industry Action Committee to follow through and work toward obtaining the funds necessary to implement the national program at the earliest possible time. This committee consists of leading producers from every cotton-growing state, and advisory members representing important producer and industry organizations throughout the Belt. This committee had its initial meeting here last Friday and will be working hard in the months ahead on the federal, state, and local level. Each of us on the committee realizes fully that the elimination program will be a major undertaking, requiring the support and cooperation from the entire industry, and federal and state agencies. We know, too, that a major effort must be made to acquaint everyone involved with all aspects of the proposed program. In this connection, I am pleased that a three-day conference on the whole subject will be held at the Holiday Inn-Rivermont, Memphis, Tennessee, on February 13-15, 1974. This comprehensive conference will serve as a sort of kickoff in supplying information, and I would urge all industry leaders who can to attend.

The boll weevil elimination program holds a bright, new hope for the cotton farmer. Its success will be the fulfillment of a dream of increased income from cotton production through lower costs, higher per-acre yields, better quality, and of improving cotton's competitive position with synthetic fibers. It will be the time when the boll weevil will belong to history, and bring to an end the staggering losses experienced ever since the

boll weevil began its devastating march across southern cotton fields.

Then will dawn a new day for cotton, and it can make its full and rightful contribution to the economy and the nation.

GEORGE "DUKE" TABLACK OF STRUTHERS, OHIO, IS HONORED

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of attending a testimonial dinner in honor of former State Representative George "Duke" Tablack, which was held at the Sokol Center in Youngstown, Ohio.

George D. Tablack was born March 26, 1901 at Hawk Run, Clearfield County, Pa. His family moved to Struthers, Ohio in 1916. He married the former Helen M. Durick on January 26, 1922. They have seven children, Mrs. June M. Donchess, Mrs. Norma May Katusic, William G., Robert E., George D., James E., and John N. Tablack. George and Helen Tablack are very proud of their 22 grandchildren.

George was elected as a councilman in the city of Struthers in 1935 and served in that position for six terms. He became a State representative in 1946 and remained to serve 10 terms in the Ohio House of Representatives. In 1949, he was appointed chairman of the House Reference Committee, and in 1959, he was appointed chairman of the House Finance Committee. He has also served as a member of the State Control Board, Sundry Claim Board, and Capital Improvements Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving in the Ohio General Assembly with the Honorable George "Duke" Tablack for 16 years. He was a veteran member of the house of representatives when I first was elected to the senate. Representative Tablack was never too busy to help me when I had a problem, and he taught me a great deal about the intricacies of the legislative process. Duke Tablack was a true liberal who really cared about the average citizen and the working people of his district and State.

Because of his many years of dedicated service as a State representative, Ohio is a better place in which to live and work. I am proud to be counted among the many friends of George "Duke" Tablack. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the program and an article which appeared in the Youngstown Vindicator:

PROGRAM

Pledge.

Invocation, Rev. Victor G. Romza, St. Michael's Byzantine Catholic Church, Campbell, Ohio.

Toastmaster, Stephen R. Olenick, Mahoning County Auditor.

For Remarks: Jack Sullivan, Chairman, Mahoning County Democratic Party.

Resolutions, Michael Soldak.

Introduction of Main Speaker, Charles J. Carney, Congressman, 19th District.

Main Speaker, Eugene (Pete) O'Grady, Director of the Ohio Department of Highway Safety.

Introductions, George Tablack, State Representative.

Introduction of Guest of Honor, Thomas Barrett, County Commissioner.

Guest of Honor, George "Duke" Tablack. Remarks, Judge Joseph O'Neill, 7th District Court of Appeal.

Benediction, Rev. David Rhodes, Chancellor Diocese of Youngstown.

COMMITTEE

Dominic A. Rimedio, General Chairman.
Stephen R. Olenick, Joseph Garea, Mike Zoldak, Jack Sullivan, Joseph E. O'Neill.
Edward Brown, John McCarthy, William Coleman, Mario D'Alesio.

GEORGE TABLACK HONORED FOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICE

Some 400 state and area political figures, friends and family of former State Rep. George (Duke) Tablack gathered at the Sokol Center Sunday night to honor the veteran legislator for his many years of service.

Among those present to pay tribute to Tablack, who served for 20 years in the Ohio House of Representatives, were guest speaker Eugene (Pete) O'Grady, director of the Ohio Department of Highway Safety, and U.S. Rep. Charles J. Carney, D-19th District.

Framed resolutions were presented to Tablack for his service "to his fellow man and the community."

READ PROCLAMATION

Resolutions were presented by Mahoning County Commissioner Thomas J. Barrett on behalf of the commissioners; State Sen. Harry Meshele, D-33rd District, from the Ohio Senate; Struthers Mayor Thomas Creed on behalf of the Struthers City Council; State Rep. Thomas P. Gilmartin, D-51st District, representing the Ohio Legislature; Youngstown Councilman William Wade R-5th, a resolution from Youngstown City Council, and Frank Leseganic, director of District 26, United Steel Workers of America, on behalf of labor in the Mahoning Valley.

State Sen. Tony P. Hall of Dayton read a proclamation from Gov. John J. Gilligan declaring Sunday "George Tablack Day."

Jack Sullivan, Mahoning County Democratic chairman, singled out Tablack as a true public servant as compared to some who have cast a shadow on the profession.

"Watergate has caused many people to look down on politics and politicians and I can't blame them. But the vast majority are true public servants," Sullivan said. He recalled that in 1946 the county party first endorsed candidates and Tablack was one of the nine endorsed that year.

Referring to Tablack as "Mr. Legislator," Sullivan compared the political figure in the Ohio House to the late U.S. Rep. Michael J. Kirwan in the U.S. House of Representatives—"a legislator's legislator."

Of Tablack, Rep. Carney said he "started exposing some of the evil" that began during the Rhodes administration. Also, O'Grady, during his brief remarks, referred to Tablack as having many of the qualities of former President Harry S. Truman.

CITED HUMILITY

Seventh District Court of Appeals Judge Joseph O'Neill said Tablack, a former Struthers councilman, "served with humility. Duke did more for his fellow man and community office, he has served as administrator for the county commissioners and on the Ohio Liquor Commission."

During his tenure in the House, he served as chairman of the House Reference Committee and in 1959 was chairman of the House Finance Committee. He also has served as a member of the Control Board, Sundry Claim Board and Capital Improvements Committee.

Mahoning County Auditor Stephen R. Ole-

nick was toastmaster and Dominic A. Rimedio was general chairman.

The Rev. Victor G. Romza, pastor of St. Michael's Byzantine Catholic Church in Campbell, gave the invocation and the Rev. David Rhodes, chancellor of the Diocese of Youngstown, the benediction.

TRIBUTE TO JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to pay special tribute to the lady of the House who has done so much to help properly guide fish and wildlife programs of this Nation.

Since Congresswoman HANSEN became chairman of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee in March of 1967, the annual spring trek to the Hill to convince the lady from Washington and her colleagues of the need for funds to run the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has been an experience deeply imprinted upon the memory of a succession of Bureau directors and their staffs.

There usually emerged from the groups a collective sigh of relief when the appropriation hearings were over. For Mrs. HANSEN was a stern task master, and an extremely knowledgeable one. With the aid of a highly competent staff Mrs. HANSEN had always done her homework before hearing time and would abide no lesser degree of preparation by those who testified before her. A witness was never quite sure whether he would be hanged or hamstrung by the purse strings so deftly, yet fairly, manipulated by "Madame Chairman."

Yet, beneath this formidable and sometimes seemingly blunt and decisive demeanor was a genuine and compassionate feeling for the needs of all living resources. Her deep understanding of the requirements for proper management of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources is undeniable. Nor was this interest parochial. It extended far beyond the boundaries of her congressional district into the great Pacific Northwest and the Nation as a whole. She was an ecologist long before the term attained its present popularity and despite her well-earned reputation for fiscal frugality during the 7 years she headed the Appropriation Subcommittee Federal moneys made available by the Congress for fish and wildlife management and conservation rose by about 80 percent—from approximately \$100 million annually to more than \$180 million in the current fiscal year.

Perhaps Mrs. HANSEN's greatest contribution to the cause of fish and wildlife conservation was that she literally forced Federal managers to agonize long and hard over the best ways to approach and discharge their responsibilities. It was an unwise bureaucrat who appeared before her without a head scratching, soul

search rethinking of his objectives and a reordering of his priorities. Mrs. HANSEN played the adversary role with consummate skill and the job being done by natural resources agencies such as the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is the better for it.

Chairwoman HANSEN's manner was sometimes elusive, perhaps deliberately so. At times she spoke with facetious disparagement of the "magnificent sparrow palace" being proposed for the endangered California condor when American Indian peoples often lacked such minimal necessities of life as food and clothing. She also viewed with mock sarcasm and amusement fund requests for the preservation of such oddly monickered endangered species as the unarmored thick-spined stickleback, the Santa Cruz long-toed salamander and the Morro Kangaroo rat. Yet these animals have a chance for survival today partly because of her support of legislation protecting threatened and endangered species and funds to carry out this effort.

Without question there would be no refuge today for the nearly extinct Columbia white-tailed deer which inhabits both sides of the Columbia River in Oregon and Washington nor for the beleaguered dusky seaside sparrow whose home is Merritt Island off the coast of Florida if it had not been for the efforts of Mrs. HANSEN.

Mrs. HANSEN also was a firm advocate of research, believing that the more man increases his knowledge the better our Government and world will be.

Many of Mrs. HANSEN's most significant contributions to the wiser use and management of fish and wildlife resources resulted from her compassion for and empathy with the Indian peoples of the Pacific Northwest—my people as she referred to them, knowing that the feeling was reciprocal.

She was among the first persons of influence to recognize and push for fish and wildlife developments that would benefit not only the individual Indian reservations but the economy of the entire Pacific Northwest.

For example, she:

First. Supported and obtained funding for the Quinault National Fish Hatchery which is located on the Quinault Reservation and will be of tremendous benefit to the Indian tribe and the surrounding area.

Second. Supported and obtained funds for land and planning for the proposed Makah National Fish Hatchery to be located on that tribe's reservation. Benefits from this facility will be similar to those resulting from the Quinault Hatchery.

Third. Together with Congressman ULLMAN of Oregon was principally responsible for establishment of a large modern salmon hatchery on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.

Fourth. Was a force to be reckoned with in operation of all the facilities of the vast Columbia River fishery program, sport as well as commercial.

The positive force of JULIA BUTLER

HANSEN's stalwart efforts in behalf of all phases of fish and wildlife programs will long be felt. Though many of her contributions were often unheralded and remained unexposed to public attention, the Nation, and especially professional fish and wildlife managers, owe her an immense debt. Her tough-minded, but constructive, scrutiny of how Federal funds are spent for fish and wildlife purposes provides constant assurance that these expenditures will be made with studied forethought, accountability and in the best public interest.

PROGRESS COMES TO THE COUNTRY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the poem below was written by a talented constituent of mine, Anthony K. Carbone of Bluemont, Va. The poem concerns the county of Loudoun in my congressional district, but the sentiments are appropriate to many other such areas in the United States. I feel it is appropriate for this poem to be presented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The poem follows:

PROGRESS COMES TO THE COUNTRY

Progress is a large parking lot, neatly organized shopping centers, and standing-in-line. Progress is a plethora of houses, crime, and more policemen. Progress is neat concrete curbs, traffic lights, and accidents. Progress is larger county offices, more "hearings," and higher taxes. Progress is, "How soon can I sell my land, make a fortune, and move away from progress?" Progress is, after all, inevitable.

Here is a poem entitled by the above or "Inevitable."

A home is needed
out in the country where the air is clean.
The lawn is seeded,
the garden weeded
and roofs are everywhere to be seen.

After a while
the doggie romps and plays.
Your neighbor's child,
not knowing he's wild,
pulled his tail and got rabies.

To court you went
where the judge did say,
"What, no fence.
Shame, shame, from hence
you shall have to pay."

A boy grows up
out in the country where the air was clean.
The mountains he saw
are now obscure
by the fumes of your noisy machine.

He goes to school
much too small for your communities
needs.

What no swimming pool?
How come its not cool?
Let's float a bond to pay for these deeds.

Taxes went up
out in the country where the deer ran
free.

The farmers said, "Yup!"
Just got to stop
Can't afford to live in this here county."
"Oh, what to do!"

CXX—370—Part 5

Cried politicians immersed in their way.
Let's sponsor a group
to seek out and coo
a new tax base called light industry.
Down Richmond way
not a helping hand could be found
"Farms were okay."
They all did say.

But only on our more southern ground.

Up in the north
you folks don't have a prayer.
We need your stores,
your tons of cars,
to support our clean air.

The little county
cried out loud and proud.
Don't let me
die and bleed.

I don't want this ungodly crowd.

They came in droves.
Out to the country where the air was clean.
Pushing their loads
over fast, blacktop roads,
bringing money that was very green.

Bulldozers too,
moved rich topsoil around and aside.
Dug holes for you.
Two-by-fours flew.

The county's earth all littered, just cried.

Millions were made
by people whose holdings were large.
Drooling with greed,
hurry and speed,
tun my acres—yes, that's my charge.

Build faster roads
shopping centers, and large parking lots.
Bring them in loads.
Cut loose all holds.
Rezone that parcel for shops.

As they did come,
your gentle and tender pace,
the birds that sung,
the pile of cow dung,
were so easily and swiftly replaced.

The promise of country
to avoid those things of suburbia,
they came to flee.
Taxes rose proportionately
to pay for the demands of disturbia.

The teachers did cry,
"Whatever happened to educating him?
We spend our time
in chaos, not rhyme.
There is no more discipline."

It came to pass
all that has been said
so very fast
it could not last
and the old county was dead.

A. K. CARBONE.

NO-STRIKE BARGAINING IN THE STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when so much seems to be wrong in our society it is indeed refreshing to learn that both the United Steel Workers and the big ten steel companies are determined to effectively implement the experimental negotiating agreement—ENA—so as to avoid future strikes in the collective-bargaining process.

The March 3 edition of the Pittsburgh Press Roto carried an interesting

article concerning the optimism shared by both Mr. I. W. Abel, president of the United Steel Workers and the top executives of the United Steel Corp., toward contract negotiations covering 500,000 steel workers to be conducted this year.

I take great pride in the fact that both Mr. Abel who was most instrumental in bringing the experimental negotiating agreement into existence as well as a sizable portion of the operations of the United Steel Corp. are constituents of mine in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The text of the Pittsburgh Press article follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press Roto, Mar. 3, 1974]

LABOR: "THE SECOND TIME AROUND WILL BE THE TEST"

(By Edward Verlich)

Steelworkers—from I. W. Abel to the cast-house laborer beneath the giant blast furnaces—are confident of the new no-strike bargaining approach with the basic steel industry. But they have reservations.

The unique pact—the Experimental Negotiating Agreement (ENA)—was signed by the United Steel Workers and the steel coordinating companies, known as The Big 10. It will be first used this year. Steel contracts covering 500,000 steelworkers expire Aug. 1, and under the ENA, arbitration, not a strike or a lockout, will be the ultimate weapon.

Both sides, according to USW President I. W. Abel, are determined to reach an agreement without resorting to arbitration.

"Both sides have stated it is preferable to resolve our own differences in our own ways, because we know our problems best," Abel reasons. "With both sides entering the talks in this frame of mind, we can be optimistic that a settlement can be reached without utilizing arbitration," he explains.

While the talk is "confidence," even Abel allows the ENA could prove not successful. Down the line in the union, there are more reservations.

EXPENSIVE PROBLEM

If the new bargaining procedure proves successful, "and both sides believe it will be," Abel adds, "then we shall have solved a most perplexing problem that has cost our members and the industry money through prolonged layoffs and plant shutdowns. If the new procedure does not prove successful on this experimental basis, then we will continue the search for a bargaining procedure that will meet the test."

Joseph Odorcich, USW District 15 director in the Mon Valley, and a member of the union's top-ranking executive board, indicates the unique agreement came as a surprise:

"That Tuesday morning when Abel presented the ENA to the board, most board members didn't know discussions were being held in the area. Most of the board was taken aback.

"We kicked it around for three or four hours.

"Abel said 'This is my answer to the problem. If you've got something better, let's hear it.'"

The problem to which Abel referred was stockpiling. Steel users—such as the auto companies—began stockpiling steel long before the strike deadline, often buying imported steel. Thus, no one needed steel for months after the deadline—strike or not. In addition, some of the foreign producers tied up business for additional months by demanding that the American steel users sign long-term contracts for imports.

"I came up when the strike was a weapon—

and was used effectively," Odorcich continued.

However, he allowed that due to imports, "the strike has become less of a weapon."

"And when the steel mills began closing a month ahead of time during the last negotiating period, the problem really came on target," Odorcich said.

1971 LAYOFFS A FIRST

He referred to 1971 steel contracts when 100,000 steelworkers were laid off, many of them a month before contracts expired. It was the first experience when union members were laid off prior to a contract expiration. Steel plants previously kept rolling steel products up to the last minute before an expected walkout. Many steel experts predicted a strike in 1971. Many layoffs lasted six to eight months.

Odorcich was joined by Edward Galka, president of McKeesport Local 1408, and Jack Walk, a sheerman helper for 26 years in U.S. Steel Corp.'s National Tube Works in McKeesport, in expressing reservations about arbitration for settling unresolved disputes.

ARBITRATION DISPUTED

"I'm not quite satisfied with the arbitration procedures we do have," Walk said.

Walk noted that the steel companies disputed an arbitrator's award handed down in 1970 spreading incentive, or bonus pay, to 90 per cent of the steelworkers.

The union had to seek a clarification from the arbitrator to implement the award. Some disagreement still exists over the incentive award.

"If this situation would come up in negotiations, it would be disastrous," Walk suggested.

Asked if he meant disagreement over an arbitration award could spark a walkout, Odorcich interrupted to say, "I would say that's more than just a possibility."

Walk said he is "more than willing to give it a try."

Galka was a member of the USW's Basic Steel Conference made up of 600 local union presidents who ratified ENA after the board approved it.

He said he has no reservations over his affirmative vote.

"We never gained by past strikes. We know how our members suffered. Some were forced to go on public assistance. Now, they can have peace of mind and plan ahead," Galka said.

After the 1971 settlement, 800 members of the Local 1408 were laid off for eight months.

"We were one of the hardest hit plants in the area," Galka recalled. "I endorsed wholeheartedly the new concept on an experimental basis. We'll have to come up with some other means if ENA is not satisfactory."

He said he has "utmost faith in Abel to come up with another solution" should ENA fail. Galka lauded the Abel administration for establishing "progressive ideas."

Walk, Galka and Odorcich all said they expect ENA to pan out for another important reason—the steel companies have as much, if not more, to gain as the steelworkers.

Odorcich said in his contacts with steelworkers in his district, "a few militants think we've made a mistake."

"It's easy to say maintain the strike as a weapon. The most difficult (task) is to reach a contract without a strike," Odorcich said.

Under ENA, steelworkers are guaranteed at least a three per cent annual hike, a \$150 cash bonus and other benefits.

"COMPANIES WILL SAVE"

Walk noted that union leaders described the three per cent as a down payment. "I think the companies are going to save a lot of money. This is okay for a down payment, but this doesn't wipe the slate clean."

Odorcich said the union feels 10 per cent amounts to the "substantial increase" the USW has set as a bargaining goal.

The director noted that most settlements in other industries have been in the 6 to 7 per cent range.

The USW is expected to pattern its basic steel aims along the lines of the union's three-year contract reached Feb. 1 with major aluminum companies, then duplicated by can companies.

That pact, called the "most significant of my entire labor career" by Abel, provided for an average 70 cents an hour wage over the three years, plus pace-setting pension improvements.

Some future retired aluminum workers will receive more than 85 per cent of their wages when their pension benefits are added to Social Security benefits.

The aluminum workers received their first-year wage boost of 28 cents an hour four months before their old contract expired. Steelworkers will be looking for the same kind of treatment if their pact comes early as expected.

NOT SATISFIED WITH LESS

"We aren't going to be satisfied with less than others," Odorcich said. We won't entertain too many words in that direction. Look at the steel industry's profits. Wow! Maybe I'm being conservative with 10 per cent."

Odorcich and Galka joined Abel in saying that they believe disagreements can be settled without any issues going to arbitration.

For the first time, local unions in the USW have the power to call a strike over local issues—apart from the national contract—if they feel it is necessary.

Galka said he sees no issue big enough between Local 1408 and National Tube to spark a strike.

"We have been fortunate here in our discussions with management," Galka said.

One issue that could have led to a walkout by Local 1408—foremen working—was recently settled, he said.

Odorcich said an issue that could be "sticky" in some District 15 plants is the unpaid lunch period where workers have to put in an 8½-hour day, the extra half hour for a lunch break.

"Some plants have been reluctant to go to a straight eight-hour day," Odorcich said.

Walk concluded, "The first time around, it (ENA) should go pretty good. Both sides will try to make it work. The second time around will be the real test."

MANAGEMENT: ALREADY A BONANZA IN WORKER ATTITUDES

(By William H. Wylie)

A century ago, Andrew Carnegie went into the steel business, launching the industry we know today.

He built his first mill at Braddock on the banks of the Monongahela River. Shrewd instincts told him the Pittsburgh area was the best place to make steel.

Of course, Carnegie was right. He reaped a half-billion-dollar fortune from his wisdom and sweat.

Is Pittsburgh still a good place to make steel?

The industry must add at least 25 million tons of new capacity by 1980. Will this area get its share of new mills?

Is the historic no-strike labor agreement working?

These and other questions were put to the four men who run U.S. Steel—the corporate colossus that bought out Carnegie in 1901 and today makes a billion-dollar annual contribution to the Pittsburgh area's economy.

Joining chairman Edgar B. Speer around a large desk in his 61st-floor office in the U.S. Steel Building were R. Heath Larry, vice chairman, Wilbert A. Walker, president, and David M. Roderick, chairman of the finance committee.

All were born in the Pittsburgh area. They believe it's the first time the nation's largest steel company has been bossed by a team of all Pittsburghers.

All agreed Pittsburgh still boasts many of the assets that attracted Carnegie. But that doesn't mean the future is secure.

PLENTY OF PLUSES

High on the list is coal, which Speer said "will continue to be a major asset so long as we don't legislate ourselves out of the use of it"—an obvious reference to stringent health, safety and environmental codes.

Other obvious advantages are river and rail transportation, nearness to steel markets and an abundance of skilled labor.

So much for the pluses—and Pittsburgh has no monopoly on them. Other areas—the Great Lakes, the Southwest and the East and West coasts—can match Pittsburgh in many respects.

"A lot of factors must be considered when we decide where we'll spend our money," Speer said. "Community attitude is critical," he continued, noting that the corporation prefers to do business in places where it is welcomed as an asset.

"In my own opinion, Allegheny County as a whole doesn't regard U.S. Steel as an asset, and it's a little bit too bad. I don't think many people know what U.S. Steel's contribution is," he said.

And that contribution is considerable, as "big steel" sees it. U.S. Steel estimates it pumps a billion dollars annually into the district economy in payroll, related employment, purchases and taxes.

With 45,000 employees and a \$515 million annual payroll, the company is the metropolitan area's largest employer. And there are an additional 30,000 related jobs here.

"HARD TO OPERATE"

Also, 19,000 pensioners collect \$54 million annually and 30,000 stockholders receive \$8 million a year in dividends.

Speer stressed he wasn't directing his criticism at these people, but rather at the public and government.

"Look at the tremendous harassment this company gets from the environmentalists. Look at the harassment in the Frick district, in our coal mines, under the massive army of inspectors OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Act) sends in. It almost makes it impossible to operate," he charged.

But is Allegheny County any different from any other industrial area in these respects?

"I certainly think it is," Speer replied. "It is one of the real marginal areas in my opinion as far as community attitude goes."

Nevertheless, he said there are "some major installations" planned for the Pittsburgh area, although he refused to be specific.

Since 75 per cent of the steel made here—by U.S. Steel and other companies—is heavy stuff, it's a good bet new miles will be additions to existing facilities.

Plates, structurals, bars, railroad products and tubing are district specialties. Sheets that go into cars and appliances play a smaller production role here than in other steel centers.

In spite of the energy crisis and recession talk, industry is expected to spend \$110 billion in the United States for new plants and equipment this year. This will require a lot of steel—the kind Pittsburgh makes.

Yield on investment in plants and equipment is a key yardstick in determining where corporations spend their money. How does Pittsburgh compare to Chicago, the other big steel-making center, in this respect?

Roderick said, "I would say that over a period of time it would be a horse for a horse. It will vary from time to time as we develop better productivity in one place or another. But over a period of time the facilities are quite comparable. We should get about the same results."

HIGH CORPORATE TAX

Taxes are another matter. At the state level, Pennsylvania is one of the most expensive states to do business in, Speer said, citing the 11 per cent corporate income tax.

Walker added, "Pennsylvania isn't bad at the local level. We are getting rid of the machinery tax. But in Gary (Ind.) that's the main source of revenue."

How badly was Pittsburgh hurt by steel imports?

"Probably the West Coast suffered the most," Speer said. "Then Chicago and the Gulf Coast were hit hard," he added, noting that markets near sea lanes were most vulnerable.

Imports dealt the decisive blow to Donora's wire mill, Larry said, but it was more a victim of obsolescence than cheap foreign steel.

"There was a market shift at that time," Speer said. "We replaced Donora's capacity with a new rod mill at Fairless (near Philadelphia) to be near our customers."

Pittsburgh probably felt the sting of imports less than other steel-making centers. But the district hasn't escaped unscathed.

In the third quarter of 1971 the devastating impact of imports combined with the recession of the year before hit home. Steel shipments plunged to pre-World War II Depression levels, forcing massive layoffs. And the slump dragged on into the following year.

"In 1971 we ran out of business two weeks before the potential strike date," Larry said. Steel customers had stocked up in anticipation of an industry-wide shutdown.

Many buyers had committed themselves to foreign steel because they knew it would be available if there was a domestic strike. As it turned out, the walkout was averted by a last-minute agreement.

But "crisis bargaining" already had done its damage. There was very little domestic steel made in the last half of 1971.

"It took us a year and a half to get Youngstown back on stream," Speer recalled.

These were the conditions that paved the way for the no-strike agreement with the United Steel Workers union.

"The impact of unemployment and the dues loss made it possible to convince the union there was some self-interest in such an arrangement," said Larry, the industry's chief labor negotiator.

At the same time, the union agreed to work seriously with management to improve productivity. Are they making any progress?

"There's a dialogue going in both directions," Larry said. "Management is learning from the guys on the floor and vice versa."

Speer pointed out that workers are most interested in boosting productivity when mills are operating "flat out"—as they are now—than when they're limping along at 70 per cent capacity.

"At full production a guy is thinking how he can get that extra ton. At 70 percent, he's afraid if he gets it his shift will be cut from five days to four," he explained.

REAL TEST TO COME

The real test of the productivity effort will come when operations slacken off. Actually, it will be years before any real achievements show up, Walker said.

But management already has reaped a bonanza in new worker attitudes through the no-strike pact, Speer said. "When there's a strike threat every three years," he explained, "workers are lost to us mentally for nearly half of that time."

"For seven or eight months before the contract expires, they regard their jobs as something they really aren't so interested in," he said.

"And you spend another seven or eight months getting them back to work after the contract is signed," he added.

Will the no-strike clause work?

Larry believes it will. So do his colleagues. The proof will be an American steel industry that can hold its own in the domestic market place against foreign competition.

That would assure jobs for workers and profits for management, which is what it's all about anyway.

ILLINOIS STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY SEEKS REPEAL OF PSRO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State Medical Society, which last year endorsed professional standards review organizations—PSRO—recently reversed its previous position and has urged repeal of the controversial HEW program of rationed medical care.

The Illinois doctors have long been committed to the establishment of "a superior peer review program" and plan to move ahead with this plan independent of HEW and PSRO.

Peer review is an established medical practice. However, peer review and HEW's plans for PSRO are distinctly different. Peer review seeks to provide the patient with the best medical care and treatment available. PSRO has as its primary aim, the lowering of the overall medical costs for medicare and medicaid. Lower costs, brought about by diagnosis, care, and treatment through HEW established "norms," may not necessarily coincide with the best medical interests of the patient.

At this time, more than 30 Members of the House have either cosponsored my bill, H.R. 9375, to repeal PSRO or introduced legislation of identical nature. Senator CARL T. CURTIS of Nebraska has introduced an identical bill in the Senate.

There is little doubt that as HEW continues to unveil its bag of tricks known as PSRO, more medical professionals will realize the true nature of the program. It will not be too long before the patients under medicare and medicaid treatment discover that the health care services they receive are being rationed by PSRO bureaucratic decisions, and not based on the medical knowledge and experience of their physicians.

I ask that the related news clippings follow:

[From the American Medical News, Mar. 4, 1974]

ILLINOIS VOTES AGAINST PSRO

Reversing a position it adopted last year, the Illinois State Medical Society has decided it wants nothing more to do with the Professional Standards Review Organization (PSRO) program.

The society says it wants repeal of the PSRO law and other federal regulatory proposals, and it has asked its 11,400 members to chip in \$10 apiece to finance an information campaign designed to build support for repeal.

In addition, the society has resolved to move ahead with plans for a statewide peer review program in Illinois, a program that will be independent of PSRO.

All this was approved Feb. 24 during a special session of the Illinois State Medical Society (ISMS) House of Delegates in Chicago. The session was called several weeks ago after federal health planners announced that Illinois would be carved into seven PSRO districts.

The ISMS House last year endorsed a single, or "unified," USRO plan for the state, implying that its support for PSRO would hinge on federal acceptance of this concept.

In January, following disclosure of the multiple-PSRO plan for Illinois, the ISMS board of trustees halted all work on PSRO

implementation and adopted a tentative position of non-compliance with the law. That position has now been endorsed by the house of delegates.

A resolution adopted in special session last month declares that ISMS "is committed to the establishment of a superior peer review program and will therefore refrain from involvement in the federal PSRO initiative." The statement authorizes the society's board of trustees "to proceed with a plan outside the purview of the federal PSRO law to organize a statewide medical peer review program emphasizing and safeguarding local physician autonomy..."

The resolution also urges other medical groups in the state to withdraw any PSRO applications already submitted to the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, "Mo" UDALL put it best when he said that people and legislators like JULIA HANSEN do not come along very often.

JULIA has shown all of us how to mix together warmth, compassion, and hard-headed realism in just the right amounts. As a political leader, as a legislator, as a public servant—in all these roles JULIA has provided a model that we can well emulate.

Since 1967, JULIA has served as chairman of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. In that capacity, she has moved boldly and effectively to shape public policy in a wide range of areas including the arts, natural resources, pollution control, and energy management.

I have worked with her most closely on issues affecting American Indians, where she has provided an extra measure of compassion, sensitivity, and understanding. I think it is safe to say that no one in the House has done more to aid American Indians than she. Leon Cook, former chairman of the National Congress of American Indians, says of her:

We have no better friend and advocate in Washington.

Just last year, JULIA, along with Senator SAM ERVIN, was awarded the first annual Henry Teller award by NCAI for her tireless efforts on behalf of native Americans. In my district, the Indian people of Minneapolis know JULIA as the person that made possible the first urban Indian health project in the country.

In addition to her work on the Appropriations Committee, JULIA has made landmark contributions to the cause of congressional reform. In 1970, she was assigned the job of chairing the Democratic Committee on Organization, Study and Review, later known as the Hansen committee. As a result of this group's efforts and JULIA's leadership, the Democratic caucus was able to democratize the seniority system at the start of the 93d Congress.

All of us will miss this great and good woman when she returns to Cathlamet, Wash., next year. It will never be the same here without her.

WHEAT SHORTAGE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1974, I held an ad hoc congressional hearing in New York City on the continued wheat and related grain exports and the projected shortages of these grains this spring. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the interesting and important testimony that arose from this hearing, that resulted from my serious concern over the unconscionably high food prices and the rumors of such a severe wheat shortage this year that the price of a loaf of bread will skyrocket to \$1.

The testimony that follows comes from the men in the baking industry who are in vital positions to judge the extent of the wheat exports and the deleterious effect that our continued expansion of those exports have on their own industries and on the American consumer. Before we hear from the baking industry, I insert a copy of my opening remarks at the hearing, at which over 40 representatives from the baking industry's unions, the retail baking industry, and the large biscuit and cracker manufacturing companies attended, in the Record.

The material follows:

OPENING REMARKS BY LESTER L. WOLFF

In the last few weeks we have witnessed the lifting of United States import quotas for wheat—an irresponsible move designed to permit increased purchases of foreign grain while ships still pass in the night carrying our own diminishing domestic wheat supply abroad.

We have heard, too, from Secretary of Agriculture Butz (and I quote him) that, not only are these increasing exports of grain to the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China required "to prove our reliability as an overseas supplier" but are "footing the nation's oil bill." How much longer does the American consumer have to swallow this hog wash? We've beefed up our balance of payments by having the consumer pay higher prices for beef—that's my beef!

The double-talk reasoning advanced by Secretary Butz that, since our oil imports last year cost X number of dollars and this happens to be the exact amount received from farm exports in the same year, we are pursuing a "perfect" trade policy, convinces me that Mr. Butz' slick talk about oil just continues to grease the skids for the American consumer. Attempting to compare oil barrels and wheat baskets proves only one thing to me—both can be empty.

The real truth is that, by deliberate Executive action, this Administration has permitted two of the most powerful blocs in the nation, oil and agriculture, to completely alter the American standard of living in two ways: one, by depriving Americans of their mobility, and two, by depriving the consumer of ready access to not only the basic food staples, but to the variety of choice in the market place that has made our life style the envy of the world.

I believe we must reassert ourselves at once and again prove America's reliability to first supply the American consumer with the products he needs, at prices he can afford. We must dispell the conflicting theories foisted upon him by the Administration in its flimsy attempt to answer the question—why are food prices soaring out of reach?

There is no doubt that the consumer is bearing the brunt of the grain deals with

shortages and unprecedented price increases for bread, flour, cereals, dairy products, meats, poultry and end-products such as cooking fats and oils. He is experiencing sheer chaos in the supermarket and neighborhood store as he is compelled to pay more and more each day for nearly every commodity.

The answer, of course, lies—as it always will—in the age old law of supply and demand, the economic equation that dictates the rise and fall of costs and prices in the market place. Very simply, if we continue to deplete our supplies through ill-conceived export policies, then our demands will have to be met by other means—namely by imported goods at prices the American consumer cannot readily pay. The American consumer deserves better, he already has been asked to make too many sacrifices with his pocketbook.

Today, my colleagues and I are meeting with the millers, the bakers and the distributors of grain products, primarily to gather as much up-to-date information as we can on the conditions resulting from the foreign grain deals.

We are told by newly released Department of Agriculture figures (1/31/74) that a record 714 million bushels of wheat were exported during the six month period, July to December, 1973, mainly to Russia and Red China, and that these exports are expected to rise to 1.2 billion bushels by June 30, 1974.

At the same time the USDA admits that the domestic reserves of wheat have shriveled to 178 million bushels, the lowest level since 1947. Export figures for corn, soy beans and rice are equally staggering. And, now we are doubling our sales of food to the oil producing states of the mid-East. They cut off our oil, why not cut off their food? Why not, because we have Butz instead of guts.

I am hopeful, therefore, that the data and the comments we assemble today will help to regenerate efforts in the Congress to control these shameful exports until our at-home needs are adequately filled. There is precious little time left to act before additional long-range export arrangements are initiated—deals, I fear, would be the harbinger of economic disaster.

STATEMENT BY JAMES A. BYRNE, DIRECTOR AND TREASURER, RESPECTIVELY, OF THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURING RETAIL BAKERS, INC. AND ASSOCIATED RETAIL BAKERS OF QUEENS, NASSAU, SUFFOLK & AFFILIATES, INC.

If the Congressman will recall members of the Baking Industry appeared before a delegation of New York Congressmen on September 21, 1973 and October 10, 1973 to appeal for relief from the disastrous results of this wheat deal. A bill was prepared and I understand it is now in committee or should I say "limbo". When we make inquiries regarding the status of the bill we are told—a survey is being conducted—studies are being made—reports have been requested. Surveys, studies, reports, all this while we daily attend the funerals of our members. Seven closed last week, 2 today, how many tomorrow? We need help now, today, this minute. It is already too late for many, don't let it be too late for all.

Let us be realistic and look at the results of this wheat deal. After the "deal" wheat was in short supply. This naturally caused the price to rise. A simple case of supply and demand. Other farm producers, quick to learn, jumped on the band wagon. Selling abroad and having a short supply at home doubled or tripled the price of many food items. Short supply became a byword whether it was true or not. Holding an item back from the market doubled its price. Now it is merely simple arithmetic and is likely to cause chaotic conditions if permitted to continue. For example: merely to illustrate let us suppose it takes 10 men to produce 10 potatoes. The potatoes sell for \$1.00 each.

Allowing 10% for spoilage or leftovers the producer will receive \$9.00 for his crop. Taking a lesson from the wheat-deal he now produces only 5 potatoes with only 5 men and now being that they are in short supply they are gobbled up at \$2.00 each giving him \$10.00 for less work, less labor, less storage, less trucking, etc. Other industries are following suit, cotton, plastics, etc.

Let us not overlook labor's part in this inflationary trend. The ideology of labor unions that they must get something for their members each year is against all the laws of economics. There must be a limit to a particular category. To go further, one must "learn to earn". Mr. Stein, a so-called expert in economics for our Government says that a 5.5% annual increase is fair. Did you ever stop to think what this 5.5% really means, and not that labor is satisfied with it. Let's take a New York City Sanitation-man's salary for example: His salary is \$250.00 per week. An increase of 5.5% a year will bring his salary to \$501.00 in 12 years. In less than 50 years our garbage man will be getting \$4,006.00 a week. Remember it doubles every 12 years. This would be funny if it were not true.

There must be a roll back in prices and wages. There must be a limit for a particular job category. There must be an excess profits tax imposed immediately and made retroactive to penalize those who have taken advantage of an abominable situation.

In conclusion may I suggest that you inform your colleagues, especially those from the farm and oil states that they are Americans and part of these United States and that what is best for the great majority of the American people is in turn best for our Country and that the Wheat-Bill now in the Banking Committee, The Hon. Wright D. Patman of Texas, Chairman, be voted out on the floor of the Congress and let the American people, by a majority vote of their representatives, decide as to its passage. Our bakeries are closing in farm and oil states as well as in other states. Unemployment is rising at an alarming rate. A small segment of our Country shall not long remain healthy if the rest of the Country is destroyed. (If you think this is strong language ask the people who have lost their jobs and businesses what they think.) Congress has the power, regardless of what our President does, to correct this condition. Don't have it said that, I was a member of the Congress of the United States of America who sat idly by while our Country was destroyed.

STATEMENT BY GEORGE ROSENTHAL, IBA WHEAT COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN AND PRESIDENT OF FINK'S BAKING CO., LONG ISLAND CITY, N.Y.

We are grateful for the opportunity today to focus upon the serious wheat supply situation.

IBA consists of approximately 150 independent wholesale bakery plants located throughout the United States, representing a majority of the independent wholesale bakers who do an estimated \$3¼ billion of a \$6 billion industry (S.I.C. Code 2051).

We believe that there will be a scarcity of wheat in this country this spring. The U.S. Department of Agriculture's own statistics as of January 6, 1974 indicate a carryover July 1, 1974 of minus (3) million bushels of wheat. When added to carryover requirements to fill the U.S. pipeline this adds up to a shortage of over 300 million bushels.*

Existing and predicted transportation problems will exacerbate the problem making such estimated shortage extremely conservative this crop year end.

* Yesterday the price of wheat for delivery next month reached an historic high of \$6.11, up the daily limit, based upon additional sales for export to Brazil this March, April and May of 10 million bushels.

For six months IBA has been urging the Federal Government to act to assure an adequate domestic supply of wheat. Present limited actions by U.S.D.A. are too little, too late. We urge immediate Congressional hearings on the need for an adequate U.S. reserve of wheat.

Congressman Wolff's bill H.R. 10844 would assure an adequate domestic supply of wheat and other agricultural products for the American consumer. Senator Humphrey's grain reserve bill is another approach. But only the Administration can act immediately.

Let us look at the record. U.S.D.A. statistics show that the U.S. carryover was 863 million bushels on July 1, 1972; it was 430 million bushels on July 1, 1973; later U.S.D.A. statistics indicate a scheduled carryover of minus 3 million bushels of wheat on July 1, 1974. We believe this is reason enough for legitimate concern.

During these same past six months the U.S.D.A. has predicted an "estimated" carryover of 300 million bushels lowered to 250 million bushels, lowered to 210 million bushels, lowered to 182 million bushels, lowered to 178 million bushels, which is their most recent estimate to our knowledge. Considering the inaccuracy of U.S.D.A. predictions this past year and a half, we do not feel it unreasonable to ask to understand the basis for estimates and optimism.

Furthermore, for purposes of analysis, if it were concluded that their newest estimate is accurate, it is anticipated by the trade that there will still be serious disruptions in supplies.

It should be remembered that following the Russian wheat deal and subsequent foreign demand, the carryover went to 430 million bushels July 1, 1973, resulting in a poor quality of flour with improper blends of new and aged wheat. The price of wheat went from \$1.60 a bushel in June 1972 to the present range of \$5.00 to \$5.80 in January 1974.

"Yesterday there has been a concomitant increase in the cost of bread, meat, milk, etc. To measure it another way, the price of flour before freight has increased 350 to 400% and the price of bread 25 to 30%. Bread will increase in N.Y.C. this week.

We are not in favor of an embargo, but we are in favor of a guaranteed minimum supply of food for the American consumer.

Farmers were faced with fertilizer shortage because of excessive exports. U.S. export controls have been imposed on the shipment of ferrous scrap. All wheat exporting countries, except the U.S., now have restrictions on exports. We understand that Canada, for example, is selling exports as high as \$6 per bushel, while keeping the price to Canadian mills at \$3.50 a bushel. Canada is also reported to be ready to sell the U.S. wheat at a \$1 premium, but only if we can provide the necessary transportation equipment (such as hopper cars), which is now a dubious proposition.

In order to salvage the present situation, we respectfully suggest that the following three steps would be most productive:

1. Restrict shipments of all wheat sold without identification in this crop year.
2. Prohibit additional law wheat export sales for this crop year.
3. Defer shipment of existing wheat export sales for the remainder of this crop year, and license so that no more than 15 million bushels of wheat per week be permitted to be shipped for the remainder of this crop year.

We fear that if these steps are not taken, there will be serious shortages of flour causing many bakers to shut down, some never to reopen; and that the price of wheat, flour, bread and other foods effected by the cost of feed, will rise to new heights. The consumer will in effect be asked to pay an even greater price to support our favorable balance of payments.

It appears to us that the obligations of the Department of Agriculture are twofold:

1. To protect the interests of the American farmer, and
2. To see that the American people have an adequate supply of food at reasonable prices.

We understand that this is the President's stated policy, but we doubt whether the present direction, if unaltered, is serving that end. It is time to stop wishful thinking and to act to save the baker and the consumer from a bread shortage this spring.

STATEMENT BY RICHARD E. BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INDEPENDENT BAKERS ASSOCIATION

We are appreciative of the opportunity to testify at your request regarding the effect on the American Consumer which has developed as the result of sales of wheat particularly to the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China during the past year.

Since it has already been documented that record amounts of wheat have been exported resulting in prices for wheat, flour and bread that have reached historic highs, our statement will be confined at this time to actions and policies on the part of U.S. Department of Agriculture and high officials of that department which should be brought to the attention of members of Congress and the consuming public.

Since early December 1973 members and staff of the Independent Bakers Association have repeatedly brought to the attention of members of Congress, officials of USDA and other government agencies, the Association's concern that because of record exports of wheat the supply situation at the end of the 1973-1974 crop year would be in such a depleted condition that there would be disastrous interruptions in the supply pipeline from the farm to the miller, to the baker. We believe that even at this late date that if the Congress of the U.S. were to enact legislation which would impose immediate limitations on wheat exports the disaster of dislocated if at all available bread supplies still may be avoided.

Our appeal, as supported by facts which are available from the Statistical Reporting Service of USDA which in its latest report dated January 20, 1974 admits to a negative carry over position on July 1 of minus 3 million bushels. It is most pertinent to point out that the Statistical Reporting Services data has been available to high officials of USDA during all the times during the past 7 months when certain officials of the department were stating carry-over figures in variance to SRS reports of some 200 million bushels. It is indicative to note that in September the Department estimated carryovers in excess of 300 million bushels. This figure has been revised downward several times and the last official public statement to the press and industry stated a figure of 178 million bushels.

We believe that immediate inquiry should be made by members of Congress as to why with other figures in their possession officials of USDA continue to ignore and fail to admit to the existence of SRS data which now points to a minus carry-over on July 1. It would appear to us that this conduct if not scandalous is, indeed, irresponsible.

TIME TO ACT ON RAPE BILL

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months, articles in local newspapers in my congressional district have indicated that rape continues to be a serious

problem, especially on the campus of the University of Kansas. As these senseless crimes continue to go unchecked, the need for preventive legislation becomes even more clear.

Just a few weeks ago, a television movie depicted a rape case which emphasized the problems rape victims often encounter while trying to be "good citizens." In all too many cases, when a woman reports such a crime, she is intimidated to the point of accepting all the guilt for a crime she did not commit.

In my mind, this situation must be changed.

The time has arrived for Congress to take action to remove the threat of rape from the lives of American women. H.R. 11520, a bill which I have cosponsored, purports to do just that.

The National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape, which would be established by this legislation, would be responsible for financing and conducting research programs into the causes, consequences, prevention, treatment, and control of rape.

The Center would focus national attention on the growing threat of rape in the life of every American woman. Additionally, it would develop a fuller understanding of the crime of rape, at the same time presenting methods of treating the victims and the accused.

In conjunction with the Department of Justice, the Center would be responsible for studying rape laws and the low rate of rape convictions, with the overall goal being the drafting of a model rape law.

Hopefully, this legislation will help our Nation move toward a more responsive, more humane system for dealing with rape victims, and lead to a more effective law for dealing with the perpetrators of this crime.

With the hope of spurring my colleagues along and at the same time urging immediate action on H.R. 11520, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time three articles which have appeared recently in newspapers in my district. The first is from the University Daily Kansan, the student newspaper at the University of Kansas, the second from the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, and the third from the Kansas City Star.

The articles follow:

WOMEN ALTER ACTIVITIES FROM FEAR OF ATTACKS

(By Ann Gardner)

The threat of rape has caused many University of Kansas women to alter their routines in various ways.

Several women interviewed recently said they thought it was unsafe for a woman to walk alone on campus at night. Some said they wouldn't leave their homes after dark alone; others said they would walk alone only if it was necessary.

According to Faith Lubben, Shawnee freshman, women in her scholarship hall usually ask friends to walk with them if they must walk to an evening examination.

"You never go to a play or a concert by yourself," Lubben said.

She said many women had been influenced by recent attacks that had occurred in the area.

"When things like that have happened," she said, "you can't ignore it."

Janet Westlake, Wichita senior, said she was especially concerned about the possibility

of rape because she had known women who had been attacked.

"I don't like to go up to Strong to work any more," she said. "I kind of feel like my freedom has been curtailed."

Some women said that they didn't like to walk alone but that they didn't have a choice.

Kay Turner, Hays sophomore, said that because of recent attacks on women, she was more alert when walking alone.

Turner said she hoped the recent attacks would make women realize they must become able to defend themselves.

Terri Rupert, Topeka senior, said an attack on her roommate last spring had made her much more aware of the dangers of rape. Since then, three of the four women living in her apartment have taken some kind of self-defense course.

Although Rupert conceded that recent attacks made it more dangerous to walk on campus, she said she hadn't really changed her habits.

"When I walk across campus, I'm more frightened," she said, "but I refuse to let my paranoia curtail my activities."

Some of the women interviewed said they still walked alone. However, they said they took precautions such as walking in well-lit areas and taking different routes when walking home.

Many of them said they were unhappy with the present security situation.

Joanna Patterson, Derby sophomore, said, "It personally makes me very angry that I feel as if I can't walk alone at night."

[From the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, Feb. 21, 1974]

SENSITIVITY

A Wednesday night television movie reflected the problems that a female rape victim encounters above and beyond the attack itself when she tries to be "a good citizen" and get some semblance of justice. The film showed, as have others before it, how in some cases a victim can wind up more of a suspect, and more ostracized, than the attacker.

The handling of such difficult cases, particularly in larger cities, is often so callous and so degrading to the plaintiff and her family that it has frightened many women from even reporting sexual assaults. The long and frustrating process of trying to get a rapist off the streets is sometimes so devastating to the victim that many, noting what can happen, decide "what's the use?" or choose to let it pass, hoping they can at least escape with a little dignity.

Some positive steps have been taken in recent years to combat the problems of plaintiffs in such cases by having trained women in key portions of the investigation. But still much needs to be done.

Yet while the picture is less than satisfactory in many cities, important steps have been taken in the Lawrence community through a cooperative effort by law enforcement people, concerned women's groups and Kansas University officials.

Emily Taylor, dean of women at KU, points out that the Lawrence approach to the problem is perhaps one of the better to be found. There is less reluctance of women here to report assaults because they are aware they will not be subjected to the degradation the victim in the Wednesday TV movie suffered.

Because steps are being taken to help women prepare to deal with difficult situations as well as to be treated sensitively after rape occurs, there is a good chance the incidence of rape can be lessened here.

During 1972 in Lawrence, there were 26 reports of rape to law enforcement people and KU authorities, and 21 of these were cleared. In 1973, the same total of 26 cases occurred, but only 11 of them were cleared by investigation. The big difference is that one man

is suspected of guilt in a large number of 1973 cases. To date he has not been apprehended.

Deterrence, of course, is the best solution to crime. One way is for women to be well enough prepared, through discussions and clinics, to discourage attackers by screams or appropriate physical action. Then if would-be rapists know that women needn't fear character assassination when they report attacks, that should help dissuade some assaults. And if potential rapists know that the law is direct and firm in dealing with attackers, that also can cut the incidence.

Lawrence and KU do not have all the answers, but they have more than a good many other communities seem to have. The underlying theme, of course, is a sensitivity to the plight of the victim.

The rate of rape is rising throughout the nation and will continue to do so until it is dealt with more intelligently. As of now, Lawrence seems to be meeting the situation much better than other cities, with the prospect that the rate may begin to decline here, even though it is on the upswing elsewhere.

ELUSIVE RAPIST ON K.U. CAMPUS

LAWRENCE, KANS.—Women at the University of Kansas and in Lawrence aren't safe in daylight or in darkness from a man police believe is responsible for at least 20 rapes since May.

Of 26 rapes reported on the K.U. Campus and in Lawrence in 1973, about half occurred at daylight, Sgt. Francis Alexander of the Lawrence police said. Eighteen rapes reported last year were in the city and eight were on campus.

Alexander said police think one man is responsible for at least 20 of the rapes because all victims reporting rapes or attempted rapes have given similar descriptions of the man.

"The rapist always walks by the woman, then walks back to her and makes casual conversation, such as asking what time it is, and then he attacks her," Alexander said. The rapist was described as a white man, about 6 feet tall, weighing 150 to 175 pounds and in his early 20s, clean-shaven, with brownish wavy hair cut just below his ears, but not reaching his collar.

Most attacks seem to be concentrated on the northeast side of the campus and the rapist has never attacked anyone before noon or after midnight, Alexander said.

"We don't believe he is a student, or one of the rape victims would have recognized him by now," Alexander said. "We don't think he has a car, either, because we've never found a trace of one."

Lawrence and K.U. campus police have checked out more than 50 leads since May.

"But we just aren't even close to catching him yet," Alexander said. "The rapist seems to be just as willing to attack during the day as at night."

Lt. Vernon Harrell of the Lawrence police department said the rape situation in Lawrence wasn't any worse now than at any other time, but he did advise women to walk in pairs. All of the rapes and attempted rapes have occurred when the victim was alone. In 1972 there were 31 rapes in Lawrence and on the K.U. campus. There were only eight rapes in 1971 and three rapes in 1970 in both the city and the campus, Harrell said.

Sgt. Alexander suggested women "be more observant" when they are walking and immediately report a rape or attempted rape to the Lawrence police or the campus police. Capt. Robert Ellison of the campus police suggested that women not take unnecessary chances and that they avoid poorly lit areas.

Ms. Casey Elke, an assistant to the dean of women at K.U. and a rape counselor, recommended that the victim immediately report the rape to police and then go to a hospital

for a vaginal smear, a venereal disease test and a morning-after contraceptive pill. There are six rape counselors at K.U. and one of the counselors once was a rape victim, Ms. Elke said.

Ms. Shirley Pearson, K.U. campus police-women, said she has talked with nearly all the rape victims and she said most seem embarrassed at first and then scared that they might have to go to court and testify against the rapist.

"Most of the victims just don't believe that it could have happened to them," Ms. Pearson said.

"None of the recent rape victims has been hysterical when they have contacted the rape counselors," Ms. Elke said. "But many of the women feel guilty because, perhaps, they could have hit the rapist harder and he would have been frightened."

"In many cases, if we detect guilt in the victim, then we try to induce anger in the woman against the rapist," the K.U. aide said.

Many K.U. women have complained that there isn't sufficient lighting on campus and that there should be a foot patrol at night on campus.

One possible deterrent to rapes in Lawrence has been a suggestion by Ms. Jodi Deutsch, New Shewsbury, N.J., senior, that women wear a whistle at all times, on a chain, on their neck or on a bracelet. The whistle has been endorsed by Miss Emily Taylor, K.U. Dean of Women who currently is meeting with leaders of women's organizations, both on campus and in the community, to purchase whistles for distribution at low cost.

Police said whistles had been distributed to women at the University of Colorado in Boulder, with good results.

A slide show titled "Women Take Warning" is being shown at women's residence halls, sorority houses and various campus meetings sponsored by the dean of women's office and campus police. The programs instruct women to be aware of the danger of attack and how to take defensive action, Ms. Elke said.

TO CREATE AN ENERGY SHORTAGE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, seldom has the Congress passed legislation as ill-considered as the recent conference-reported Energy Emergency Act.

The purpose of this legislation allegedly was to establish, for the first time, a coordinated Federal energy policy aimed at correcting present shortages. If signed into law its effect will be the opposite.

It would assure the continuance of energy shortages and guarantee them into the foreseeable future.

Under the guise of "consumerism," the act would roll back domestic petroleum prices but not foreign and world prices which are beyond its reach. In this country most of the known, easily recovered, relatively inexpensive to drill petroleum deposits have been used up or are on line. The remaining deposits are substantial, but require costly secondary and tertiary recovery technology such as water injection under pressure, and so forth.

Imposing an artificially low price by law—as has been the case with natural gas—merely insures that the costs of secondary recovery cannot be met. This means the oil will stay in the ground. The lines at the gasoline stations will grow longer.

This is not responding to the needs of the consumer.

That our present shortages are in large part due to shortsighted, fragmented Federal energy policies and laws of the past is dramatically emphasized in the following article by Bruce Henderson.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to act to correct these mistakes. We need legislation to avoid the need for gasoline rationing, not legislation that will force us to ration. Such measures as my bill to allow dealers to adjust emissions controls on cars to improve gas mileage where not needed for public health is a specific example of what Congress ought to enact immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the country is looking to Congress for some responsible legislation on energy. It is past time Congress provided it.

The article follows:

TO CREATE AN ENERGY SHORTAGE

(By Bruce D. Henderson)

NATURAL GAS

Set a ceiling price on natural gas. This discourages exploration and increases use. Keep the prices down in spite of inflation. This amplifies the effect and guarantees a shortage eventually.

COAL

Ban the use of coal with sulfur content. This sharply restricts the supply. Sharply restrict strip mining for cosmetic reasons. This further restricts the supply. Then suddenly impose drastic new safety rules which will substantially cut output from existing mines. Freeze prices so no one can offset cost increase from reduced output or justify further investment.

ATOMIC POWER

Delay construction a matter of years by uncertainty about licensing requirements. Delay operation at full power after construction. Delay start of construction by environmental suits.

OIL

With natural gas, coal and atomic power all severely restricted that leaves only petroleum. First, grossly increase automotive consumption of gasoline by requiring drastic reductions in engine efficiency because of pollution related-modifications. That alone will insure a severe shortage of energy. Then ban the use of oil containing sulfur. This severely reduces refining capacity. Put into effect new pollution objectives which make refineries far more expensive. At the same time, introduce great uncertainty into the requirements that must be met. That will virtually stop refinery construction or expansion. Eliminate practically all new refinery sites because of environmental legal delaying tactics. Further curtail refinery investment by making supplies of crude oil very uncertain. Block the use of Alaska North Slope oil by arguments on the cosmetic effects in uninhabited and unreachable regions. Stop the use or search for oil offshore in California because of potential leaks. Slow all offshore operations for environmental reasons. For good measure, hold down the price of gasoline to half that in Europe. This encourages large cars.

To be sure that all of the above is misunderstood by the general public, bring a law suit which charges all the largest energy

companies with being non-competitive and therefore causing the energy shortage.

The above scenario has actually occurred in the U.S. Each and every action described above has been the result of public policy. Each act had laudable objectives. In the aggregate these actions will prove to be very punishing to the general public for years to come.

Such program management by a private business would justify charges of gross mismanagement. The whole task of management is optimization of value delivered from the resources available. False weighting of values or misallocation of resources are equal failure.

All the ultimate objectives can, in due course, be achieved by coordination, by scheduling, by value/cost optimization and by resource allocation priorities. That, however, is what management is.

The object of management is optimization of benefits from the use of the available resources. The objectives of public policy also require management to achieve optimum results. Impulsive, extremist, poorly timed and uncoordinated actions produce inevitable frustration, waste, and cures that are worse than the disease.

Whom do we blame when mismanagement in public policy is imposed by the Congress and amplified by the Judiciary? This kind of mismanagement is occurring at all levels of our government in all areas of public policy.

PROF. OTTO ECKSTEIN REPLIES TO POLICY QUESTIONS ON OIL TAXATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks the Ways and Means Committee has been considering windfall profits taxation of the oil industry. In an effort to develop a substantive record on the complex issues surrounding the tax treatment of income from oil and gas production, I sent a series of questions to several noted economists and asked for their comments. These questions focused on matters of oil policy now before the Congress. By virtue of the extreme importance and intricacy of these policy matters, it is vital that we in Congress make the most effort to seek expert advice.

In the days ahead, I will place the responses I have received to this questionnaire in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. In the first of these responses, Prof. Otto Eckstein of Harvard University punctures several myths surrounding the issue of oil taxation. In answer to the question, "Are existing tax subsidies essential to meeting the capital requirements of the oil industry?" Professor Eckstein replies:

At high prices the industry will be able to attract all the capital it needs, and then some.

With regard to the depletion allowance, Professor Eckstein comments:

The trouble with the depletion allowance is that a large part of the benefit goes to high income families to whom it is a tax loophole. It is possible to stimulate oil exploration in other ways, indeed the high prices that are inevitable will be a massive stimulus. In my opinion, the depletion allowance is simply obsolete.

Finally, on the matter of subsidies generally for the production of oil, he states:

There is no need for government subsidies with their corrupting effect on the various branches of government.

The entire text of Professor Eckstein's comments follow:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,
Cambridge, Mass., February 18, 1974.
Congressman CHARLES A. VANIK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VANIK: Here is my reaction to the interesting set of questions that you sent me.

Question. The Administration is proposing that the market price for crude oil reach a "long run equilibrium price." The Treasury Department estimates this price level to be about \$7 a barrel. The Department also estimates that this equilibrium price will be achieved in three to five years. Are these realistic projections? As far as you can determine, are the assumptions underlying these projections valid? In an industry in which price has been closely regulated through such mechanisms as state prorationing and import quotas is it justified now to have confidence in the price mechanism to allocate available petroleum supplies?

Answer. Yes. The future price of crude oil is uncertain, but \$7.00 is a reasonable estimate. It is currently slightly higher, averaging domestic oil controlled oil and the uncontrolled foreign and domestic oil, but the current price is created by the suddenness of the Arab cutoff. On the other hand, it would be premature optimism to look for declines that go below \$7.00.

Question. It appears to me that the Administration's windfall profits tax is engineered to prevent wild fluctuations in the domestic price for crude, while at the same time allowing this price to reach its "equilibrium" level. Is this a correct interpretation of the primary function of the tax? What is your opinion of the Administration's proposal? Is it correct to label this tax an excise tax on the price of crude oil? If so, is the tax likely to be shifted forward to consumers? How regressive do you think this tax is likely to be?

Answer. It turns out that any tax on oil profits has numerous difficulties, and it is therefore difficult to pass a quick judgment whether one form of this tax is better than another. The Administration's windfall profits tax is, in the technical sense, an excise tax on the price of domestic crude oil. I think it is impossible to maintain a large spread between the price of foreign and domestic oil for more than a year or so, therefore if it is the political decision to limit the profits on domestic oil, an excise tax is a practical solution. On the other hand, even the excise tax will run into problems of avoidance and evasion, and will involve a considerable enforcement machinery.

Question. Does the Administration's goal of achieving a long run equilibrium price for crude undercut in any way the case for production subsidies, such as the depletion allowance? I understand that the impact of such subsidies is to bring forth more supplies than a given price alone would justify. Accepting this interpretation, do you see a "price" policy as an adequate substitute for a "tax" policy? Would not the pursuance of both simultaneously be contradictory?

Answer. The trouble with the depletion allowance is that a large part of the benefit goes to high income families to whom it is a tax loophole. It is possible to stimulate oil exploration in other ways, indeed the high prices that are inevitable will be a very massive stimulus. In my opinion, the depletion allowance is simply obsolete.

Question. In your opinion, is the percent-

age depletion allowance an efficient means of guaranteeing our domestic production capacity as one component of national security? Should the depletion deduction be terminated altogether? If so, would you advise an immediate repeal of the depletion allowance for domestic properties? Or as an alternative, would you favor a gradual phasing out of the deduction?

Answer. Of course, the termination of the depletion allowance has to be seen in the light of the total new tax treatment of the oil industry. If the price of domestic crude to be received by the producer is held down to pre-crisis levels by a very steep windfall excise tax, then there would still be a need for the depletion allowance. But I think such a steep tax would create such difficulties that it is impractical anyway. Thus I would recommend an end to the depletion allowance and a substantial increase in the price of domestic oil.

Question. If you feel that some sort of subsidy for domestic oil production is warranted, would you favor substituting a direct cash payment system for tax subsidies? The advantages I see in such an approach is that such a cash system would be easily managed and accurately targeted to exploratory activity.

Answer. There is no need for government subsidies, with their corrupting effect on the various branches of government. The need for the subsidy will only develop out of excessive taxation; it would be much better to let the price do the job.

Question. A major argument against removal of the depletion allowance and other tax advantages for petroleum production is that these reforms would undermine the industry's ability to attract new capital. Could you evaluate this argument? Are the existing subsidies essential to meeting the financial requirements of the industry?

Answer. At high prices the industry will be able to attract all the capital it needs, and then some.

Question. Would the national security be better served through the establishment of a national defense petroleum reserve (in situ or in above ground storage) on the public lands of the U.S.? Do you feel it is wise to establish inventory requirements for producers and/or refiners?

Answer. The national security argument has always been a dubious one in connection with our oil policy. Once we are over our present difficulties, we may wish to consider the policies used by more exposed countries in Europe and Japan to insist on some national minimum reserve in private and/or public hands. But it is certainly not an issue for policy at this time since we have no way of building up a reserve.

Question. The Administration has recommended the repeal of the depletion deduction on foreign properties. Do you favor this step?

Answer. The depletion allowance on foreign properties is simply incongruous at this time and should be promptly done away with.

Question. The foreign tax credit has been criticized as an irresistible incentive for foreign investment by the petroleum companies. Do you agree? Do you feel that the foreign tax credit, in general, is a sound policy? Do you find the oil companies use of the credit as an unjustified abuse? If so, would you favor outright repeal of the credit for the oil companies or do you recommend that an effort be made to define what is a royalty payment and what is a tax?

Answer. Similarly, the foreign tax credit raises the bargaining power of the oil producing governments. It is not that easy to terminate the credit, and it must be kept in mind that the oil companies are truly multinational companies even though many of them are headquartered in the United States. I would defer to specialists more experienced in the oil taxation field on the exact method of reform.

Question. Do you recommend any change in the intangible drilling expense provision?

Answer. The intangible drilling expense provision has some similarity to depletion in this sense: it is a major tax benefit to upper income people who get a loophole to avoid income tax, with the benefit to the supply of oil rather uncertain. This particular set of tax provisions should be reformed to reduce the benefit to the high income taxpayer without seriously affecting the incentive to look for new oil.

Question. It has been said that many producers shut down marginal wells and declare them as dry holes in order to expense their cost. To prevent this abuse, would you recommend that dry hole costs be placed in a special capital account and be depreciated over five or ten years?

Answer. The shutting down of marginal wells and dry holes is an unfortunate by-product of the present tax treatment. It is probably unreasonable to say that a dry hole is a capital item, since in fact it is presumably worthless. But perhaps one could insist on the grouping of well activity to eliminate the perverse incentive. There may be other solutions to this question.

I hope you find these reactions useful.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO ECKSTEIN.

THE NUCLEAR POWER PLANT SITING BILL—H.R. 12823

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are 42 nuclear powerplants licensed to operate in the United States today. The capacity of these plants is 25,000 megawatts.

However, there are 56 more plants being built, and 101 additional are on order. These 157 additional nuclear plants will have a capacity of 163,000 megawatts, almost 20 percent of this Nation's electric production capacity when they come on line. One of the problems that this Nation faces in responding to the energy crisis is the need to reduce the long lead-time in getting these nuclear plants operating. At present, the leadtime required from the moment a utility commits itself to build a nuclear plant until the power is on line varies from 8 to 10 years. This includes the tragic loss of from 2 to 4 years in totally unnecessary delays that have nothing to do with public safety or with protection of the environment.

To understand the impact of these delays, it is instructive to compare the amount of energy that will be produced by these 157 plants that are already ordered or being built. We would have to burn 5 million barrels of oil per day to produce this much electricity. At only \$10 per barrel, the saving from getting these nuclear plant on line 1 year sooner would be \$18 billion.

Obviously it is essential that we enact appropriate legislation to eliminate needless delays in getting nuclear powerplants on line, while still protecting public safety and the environment.

On February 14, I introduced H.R. 12823, a nuclear power plant siting bill designed to accomplish these ends. Joining me in cosponsoring this legislation

were Chairman MEL PRICE of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD and CRAIG HOSMER of the committee. On March 3 the identical bill (H.R. 13204) was submitted with the cosponsorship of all the House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The purpose of this legislation is to eliminate duplication and unnecessary delays in approving sites for nuclear powerplants, preserve States' rights, provide a greater degree of local participation in decisionmaking, and maintain the maximum standards for protecting the environment and the public. I anticipate that if such a siting bill is adopted, and if the Atomic Energy Commission establishes a program of licensing reactors simultaneously with site selection by individual States, we may reduce the time required to get a nuclear powerplant on line by from 1 to 2 years.

The entire emphasis on this legislation is to transfer as much authority as possible for siting nuclear reactors to the individual States. However, each participating State must agree to meet all of the safety and environmental standards of the AEC, and to act promptly and decisively on requests by utilities for nuclear powerplant sites.

I believe that the incentives that are included in this proposed legislation should attract broad support. It provides: First, for industry—increased reliability in the expansion of utility systems.

Second, for the States—a preservation of States' rights; an opportunity for responsible and constructive involvement with maximum autonomy; and an orderly process for handling problems that have, in many cases, seemed insurmountable.

Third, for all responsible environmentalists—an opportunity for local participation in working out the environmental factors involved in siting nuclear reactors, without the expense of hiring legal counsel; a built-in assurance of continued high quality environmental protection; an opportunity to help develop and plan integrated regional power programs, including the thoughtful consideration of alternate sites and transmission corridors.

Fourth, for the public—a vast savings of money through lower electric rates; a significant economy in time in getting need electricity on the line; local participation in siting plants, and protecting the environment; an increased reliability in utility systems; and an increased assurance that electric energy will be available on schedule.

Fifth, for the Congress—a clean and simple bill, unencumbered by endless involvement in non-nuclear industrial siting decisions; an opportunity to offer the States a partnership plan in solving their problems, rather than the threat of coercion; a greater efficiency in the use of technical manpower; a guarantee of environmental protection; and, above all, action now to help solve the energy crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the serious consideration of all Members of Congress to this legislation, and I invite the consideration of it by the administration,

the electric industry, and all persons seriously concerned with helping to solve the energy crisis while protecting the environment. I am convinced that if we all unite behind this legislation we can this year make significant progress in this matter.

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION OF H.R. 12823

To clarify the precise changes which would be made in the Atomic Energy Act, I want to describe, in some detail the six sections of H.R. 12823 which either add new sections to or amend existing sections of the Act. These six sections are:

(A) New section 275, "State Environmental Review of Proposed Nuclear Power Reactor Sites," (minor amendments to Sections 274 and 185 support this addition).

(B) Amendment to Section 189, "Hearings and Judicial Review."

(C) New Section 193, "Early Site Approval and Standardization."

(D) New Section 276, "Interstate Cooperation and Compacts."

(E) New Section 277, "Nuclear Power Park Survey."

(F) New Section 278, "Long Range Planning."

The interaction of the first three sections must be clearly understood to fully comprehend the impact of this bill.

The first section (A) establishes a procedure whereby certain qualified states are granted responsibility and authority to make environmental reviews and certify sites. If any state elects not to participate in this program, the AEC will retain its authority and responsibility and perform the environmental reviews (NEPA) as follows.

The second section (B) authorizes AEC to change its regulatory review, licensing, and hearing procedures (radiological safety and environmental review) to streamline and shorten the overall process. Regarding radiological safety it will apply to all sites. Regarding environmental review it will apply only if State certification does not apply.

The third section (C) authorizes AEC to make reviews and approve sites in advance of construction permit application if state certification does not apply.

The third section (C) also authorizes AEC to approve standard nuclear power plants or standard major components a major systems of nuclear power plants. Such approval is independent of early site approval or state certification.

A. The bill adds a new Section 275, "State Environmental Review of Proposed Nuclear Power Reactor Sites." This section authorizes AEC to enter into an "agreement" with any qualified State or regional agency under which the agency has authority to:

(a) conduct an environmental review of;

(b) issue or deny an application for a site certificate for any proposed nuclear power reactor site within the State or region within which the agency has jurisdiction.

To qualify for an agreement the agency must have authority to make conclusive decisions regarding siting, land use, public convenience and necessity, aesthetics, and any other State or local requirements.

Decisions required by Federal Law to be made by an agency other than the agreement agency are exempt from the jurisdiction of the agreement agency. State water and air quality programs established pursuant to Federal Water and Air Quality legislation are examples of exempted programs.

By requiring the agency to possess authority to make conclusive judgment on all other aspects of State or local law this bill approaches true one stop siting at the State or regional level.

The bill also allows the State or regional agency to issue certificates on sites for which:

(a) specific reactors have been proposed;

(b) "black box" reactors from which emissions and effluents have been described; and

(c) standardized units approved by AEC. An environmental impact statement is required to be completed by the agreement agency. AEC is required to supply sections to the statement dealing with radiological health and safety subjects. Other Federal agencies are required to cooperate with the agreement agency in the preparation of the statement.

If a certificate is issued pursuant to an agreement all agencies of the Federal Government are deemed to have satisfied all requirements described in Paragraph A through D of Section 102(2) of NEPA.

The AEC is required to establish agreement and certificate guides and criteria within six months after the bill becomes law.

The present AEC procedures and requirements regarding NEPA will continue in the non-Section 275 agreement states.

The AEC will continue its authority to review and make decisions regarding all radiological health and safety matters.

B. The bill amends Section 189 of the AEC Act to provide flexibility in regulatory review and licensing nuclear power reactors. Namely, regarding a construction permit application the AEC may divide the proceeding into two parts; environmental review and radiological safety. Where the environmental review has been completed (or a site certified pursuant to Section 275) the CP can be issued without a hearing after Federal Register notice.

In the case where the applicant proposes a standardized unit the radiological safety hearing may be a legislative type.

The bill also allows the AEC to issue an operating license without a hearing if the construction permit has been issued after a hearing, except where certain questions have been left unresolved or where unconsidered technology changes have taken place.

C. (1) The bill adds a new Section 193, "Early Site Approval and Standardization," to the AEC Act. It will authorize AEC to grant or deny an application for a site in advance of the need for the site. In doing so the AEC is required to base its decision on established site technical parameters and is required to so condition the approval.

The AEC is authorized to issue a construction permit or operating license on an approved site if all site conditions are met. The AEC may do so without a hearing unless new information is brought forth.

(2) The bill also provides for AEC review and approval by rule of preliminary or final designs of parts of a nuclear power reactor (so-called standardized). The bill clearly provides for the formal approval by rule making procedure of a standardized plant within certain limitations.

(3) Under this new Section the AEC may grant a construction permit and/or operating license without a hearing provided the facility will be constructed on a site previously approved by AEC or certified by an agreement state.

(4) The bill also provides that if the site has been subject to NEPA (under AEC review) or certified by an agreement agency then no further environmental review is necessary prior to AEC action granting or denying the application for a construction permit.

D. The proposed bill clearly calls for closer cooperation among the states and between interstate organizations (i.e., compacts) and the Federal government in effort to resolve nuclear power plant siting issues. The bill gives Congress final consent to such compacts.

E. The proposed bill requires AEC to make a national survey to identify and designate sites for Nuclear Power Parks in each of the electric reliability regions. The bill also defines Nuclear Power Parks as being a site large enough to support utility operations and other major elements of the final cycle.

The bill establishes the elements of the survey. It also requires that Federal properties be specifically included in the survey.

F. Finally the bill requires the regional reliability councils to organize and analyze the long range planning data supplied by its utility members and on an annual basis issue a report listing all nuclear power reactor sites and candidate areas for nuclear power reactors within its region.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 12823 (H.R. 13204)

THE PROBLEMS

Duplication of environmental review of nuclear power plant sites between States and AEC.

Multiple independent and sometimes conflicting approval process at the State level.

No provision for early nuclear power plant site approval.

Delays in regulatory approval of needed nuclear power plants.

Lengthy litigation caused by regulatory hearing process.

Non-standard facilities cause repetitive and time consuming first of a kind reviews.

No mechanism for resolving regional siting issues.

Nuclear power park concept and sites not moving forward.

Utility long range planning information and siting data not readily available to the general public.

The Proposed Legislation Will:

Simplify site environmental review process by allowing qualified States to complete this action at the local level.

Place responsibility and authority for certification of nuclear power plant sites into qualified State or regional agencies.

Streamline AEC licensing procedure and reduce licensing delays by: authorizing separate environmental and safety hearing; and providing for legislative rather than adjudicatory hearings (under certain conditions).

Authorize AEC to consider sites prior to construction permit application and thereby designate sites in advance of need.

Provide AEC with authority to review and by rule approve standardized plants or major components or systems thereof.

Require AEC to make a national survey, identify and designate sites, for nuclear power parks in each electric reliability region and thereby bring together major elements of the total nuclear fuel cycle onto one site.

Urge AEC to cooperate with States and regional agencies to resolve site issues and give Congressional consent to Compact organizations for this purpose.

Require the electric regional reliability councils to issue annual reports to the public which list designated nuclear power plant sites and candidate areas for nuclear power plants.

SITE REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION

State or Regional Agency Role

Establish agency with authority to make environmental review, judgement regarding need for facility, land use and other matters of State or local law and binding decision on site certification.

Request, negotiate and implement Agreement with AEC and thereby assume total Federal environmental impact review responsibility and authority.

Receive applications for site certification from any interested party or on its own motion.

Consider environmental impact, balance against need for the facility, issue an impact statement, consider comments from interested parties, and make final conclusive decision granting or denying the application.

Sites may be certified for specified nuclear reactors or designated in advance for standardized units.

Federal Role

AEC will issue criteria for Agreement. AEC will sign Agreement with qualified States and thereby relinquish authority to do environmental review.

AEC will maintain radiation health and safety responsibility and authority.

AEC will continue NEPA responsibility in States where no Agreement is in effect.

CHANGES TO AEC LICENSING PROCEDURES

AEC is Authorized to:

Receive applications for construction permits and separate the proceeding into parts covering environmental matters and radiological safety, respectively.

Proceed with separate environmental review.

Proceed with radiological safety matters if site has been certified pursuant to Section 275.

Issue a construction permit without a hearing, if the site has been certified or if the AEC has completed its environmental review.

Hold a legislative hearing if requested on radiological safety questions or where standardized plant is used.

Issue an operating license without a hearing unless substantial unresolved health and safety problems exist or major changes in technology have occurred during construction.

ADDITIONS TO AEC REGULATORY AUTHORITY

AEC is Authorized to:

Consider and grant or deny applications for sites in advance of need and prior to receiving construction permit application (where certification does not apply).

Condition site approvals with site related restrictions on construction and operation of the reactor(s).

Assure that no construction permit is issued unless all site related restrictions are complied with.

Grant or deny an application to approve standard units or major components.

Grant a construction permit and/or operating license without a hearing provided the site is approved or certified and standard units are used.

Follow provisions of Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA in the review for approval of early sites.

NUCLEAR POWER PARK SURVEY

The Congress finds it in the National interests to develop Nuclear Power Parks.

The AEC is required to make a National survey to identify and designate a Nuclear Power Park site in each electric reliability council region.

The survey must include Federally held property excluding such property being used or to be used for public purposes.

The AEC is required to report the survey results within one year after enactment of this Act.

LONG RANGE PLANNING

Each electric reliability council is required to issue annually a report to the public

which lists all nuclear power plant sites and candidate areas for nuclear power plant sites within its region.

INTERSTATE COOPERATION AND COMPACTS

Encourages cooperative activities by States to resolve issues causing power plant delays.

Grants Congressional consent to States to form interstate compact organizations to resolve regional siting issues.

FOOD PRICES**HON. DICK SHOUP**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention and that of the membership of Congress to a letter I received from a leading rancher-businessman of my district. Mr. Moore brings up some interesting points concerning the plight of the agricultural sector of our Nation in regards to the marketplace and profit margins available for promotion of the farmers and ranchers causes. Mr. Moore's letter deserves your attention and scrutiny:

WESTERN BROADCASTING CO.,

Missoula, Mont., February 28, 1974.

DR. DON PAARLBERG,

Director, Agricultural Economics, Agriculture Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. PAARLBERG: I very much enjoyed your article in U.S. News & World Report concerning food prices. I felt both your questioner and you yourself were quite fair to the segment of America which has been all too often forgotten. I speak of rural America—the farmer and rancher. I believe you brought in interesting figures concerning the farmers share of the food dollar. I do have the following questions:

1. For each of the past six years, what has been the average increase in prices paid for beef, pork, lamb, wheat, barley, oats, and corn for the same year, and what has been the average percentage increase in wages paid in the agriculture sector, in the industrial sector, in the government and white-collar industry. Also, what has been the average increase including fringe benefits in the auto, transportation and utilities industries.

2. What has been the average increase, percentage-wise, in net spendable income per family for each of the six years versus average percentage increase in food, generally, and in beef, pork, lamb and chicken specifically.

3. If bread has gone from where it was, which was approximately 25¢ when wheat was \$1.80, to 35¢ when wheat is \$6.00, and if wheat represents 15%, as you say, in the cost of bread, then certainly it wasn't the so-called high cost of wheat that caused

a 50% increase in the cost of bread, and most certainly if your estimates that it would take a \$33-a-bushel wheat to justify a \$1-a-loaf bread, then I think it is the responsibility of government generally and the Agriculture Department specifically to make more so-called headlines, to the point that the increased cost of wheat certainly does not justify the prices currently being charged for bread, but rather it is the cost of the packaging delivery, and labor which comes back to the unions' exorbitant, inflationary wage and fringe increases as contrasted to the "at the mercy of the market" farmer and rancher.

4. I appreciated your point on page 43 concerning 15.7% as a percentage of take-home pay versus 15.9%, but frankly, this was almost lost in the total impact of the article. I think it's high time for the government generally and the Agriculture Department specifically to go on a real positive, hell-bent-for-election program to tell the people how little the increased costs of these farm products really bear to their percentage of their take-home pay. I am sure much could be made about the low percentage of the total American income that is spent for food versus England, Japan, China, Russia, Germany, etc. I think it's time this department of government of agriculture starts stressing this and making the other purveyors, manufacturers, packagers, deliverers, processors, and others more accountable for the exorbitant prices we are paying, even though in the total, it represents an insignificant percentage of the total family budget costs.

The farmer and rancher of America today still faces the same basic problem—that he has since time immemorial—that problem is continuance of penury doesn't leave much of an opportunity for slick advertising campaigns, public relations staffs, advertising/promotion/marketing programs. When you look at the battery of lawyers, advisors, staff, public relations, promotion, advertising people connected with a union, manufacturer, an automobile company, an electronics manufacturer, a bureaucracy of government or any other manufacturing or production sector of our economy, and then look at what the individual farmer, rancher or any group that you can speak of, has for comparable budgets for personnel, then you realize the real scope of the problem to which I am addressing myself. Just as there is no quick way to gain legitimacy, so also there is no quick way for the farmer and rancher of America, representing 7% of the population, can turn around his plight.

Thank you for your consideration of the above and I would appreciate your comments and answers to my questions.

Sincerely,

DALE G. MOORE,

Chairman.

P.S. Since farm subsidies will drop from four to five billion to about 150 million, will number of people and cost of administration also drop drastically? It sure shouldn't cost nearly as much to administer and parcel out 150 million as it does four or five billion.

SENATE—Friday, March 8, 1974

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT T. STAFFORD, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for the power of the silent forces all about

us. We do not hear the Moon rise or set. We do not hear the great force of gravity holding us to the Earth. We do not hear the life-giving warmth of the Sun. May we learn from nature that reason and persuasion are more powerful than boisterous, bombast, or noisy emotion. Teach us that "the still small voice" in the moment of prayer is the most powerful force for personality in the universe. May wisdom, comfort, and hope be

Thy gift to us in the sacrament of silence as we open our hearts to Thee. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter: