

homestead program under which single-family dwellings owned by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may be conveyed at nominal cost to individuals and families who will occupy and rehabilitate them; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUBER:

H.R. 13584. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to temporarily reduce the excise tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels by 2 cents per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13585. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a beneficiary who dies shall (if he is otherwise qualified) be entitled to a prorated benefit for the month of his death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 13586. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax credit for any individual who performs voluntary service for any organization engaged in the treatment, care, or rehabilitation of the physically handicapped or the mentally ill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 13587. A bill to assure that weather modification activities and the collection of hydrometeorological information necessary to the management of water resources can be conducted in conjunction with the management and administration of wilderness areas and other Federal lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 13588. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to establish a new urban transportation formula grant program, to amend related provisions of law dealing with mass transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming:

H.R. 13589. A bill to expand the Glendo Unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program to provide for the rehabilitation of a road relocated by the Bureau of Reclamation in the vicinity of Glendo Dam and Reservoir, Platte County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 13590. A bill to direct the U.S. Postal Service to issue regulations prohibiting the use of collect-on-delivery mail service for the mailing of certain animals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13591. A bill to amend the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13592. A bill to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to authorize and require the President of the United States to allocate plastic feedstocks produced from petrochemical feedstocks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 13593. A bill to provide for the termination of certain oil and gas leases granted with respect to land located in the Ocala National Forest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself and Mr. MINISH):

H.R. 13594. A bill to extend on an interim basis the jurisdiction of the United States over certain ocean areas and fish in order to protect the domestic fishing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. CLARK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. GROVER, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. BAUMAN):

H.R. 13595. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, to authorize appropriations for bridge alterations, to authorize for the Coast Guard and end-year strength for active duty personnel, to authorize for the Coast Guard average military student loads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 13596. A bill to improve the quality of health care for American Indians by providing health care educational opportunities encouraging maximum involvement of Indians in the creation, planning, and implementation of health care programs directly affecting their needs, by improving substandard health care facilities, by encouraging research into all facets of Indian health care problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER VEEN:

H.R. 13597. A bill to reimburse the States for all unemployment compensation paid to individuals whose unemployment is attributable to the oil crisis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13598. A bill to amend the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13599. A bill to provide for a temporary program of special unemployment compensation in areas of high unemployment and to amend the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 13600. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public financing of certain political campaign advertising expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. WINN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FULTON, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr.

BELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. BURGNER, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 13601. A bill to establish a Bureau of Missing Persons to strengthen interstate reporting and interstate services for parents of runaway children and to provide for the development of a comprehensive program for the transient youth population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 13602. A bill to provide assistance and full-time employment to persons who are unemployed or underemployed as a result of the energy crisis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 13603. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide adequate financing of health care benefits for all Americans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 941. Joint resolution making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 942. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Res. 989. Resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of a report of the Select Committee on Committees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WAGGONER (for himself, Mr. FLOON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BREAUX):

H. Res. 990. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

388. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the tuna industry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

407. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Congress of Micronesia, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to the appropriation of additional funds to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESEARCH AND TREATMENT FOR THE PROBLEMS OF HUMAN GROWTH

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged to call the

attention of my colleagues to Mrs. Bill J. Schneider and her views on the relative funding priorities in the field of health research, training, and care. Her son was successfully treated for his problem as a part of a National Institutes of Health program in St. Louis, Mo., for research and training of doctors.

Mrs. Schneider was concerned that this program and similar ones would be cut back to provide increased funding for the war on cancer which has

received so much publicity. I was of course happy to check on this matter for her and even happier to be able to report back such positive news from the National Institutes of Health on the future of human growth research and training.

Mr. Speaker, I request that Dr. Donald Whedon's letter to me be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to bring attention to this work. I think any effort to share this good news and to call atten-

tion to the hope for parents of children such as Mrs. Schneider's is worthwhile.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Bethesda, Md., January 30, 1974.

HON. JAMES R. JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JONES: Your letter of January 16, 1974, to Mr. George Hopper, Special Assistant for Congressional Liaison, and a copy of a letter from Mrs. Bill J. Schneider regarding human growth hormone, have been referred to me, as Director of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, a component of the National Institutes of Health. This Institute is concerned with clinical and basic research investigations of human growth hormone, which is produced by the pituitary gland.

As Mrs. Schneider knows, this Institute sponsors, through financial support, the National Pituitary Agency, at the University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland, which conducts a program for human pituitary gland collection at post-mortem examination and for preparation, from these glands, of human growth hormone for fundamental and clinical research. The Agency distributes the hormone to interested and qualified scientists investigating the physiologic effects of the hormone, its molecular configuration, and the effects of human growth hormone in problems of short stature in children.

In answer to Mrs. Schneider's question, the National Pituitary Agency will certainly not be phased out. In fact, its budget has increased slowly but steadily throughout the years, and we see no reason for this to change. I must add a personal note that we are very pleased to learn of the good results obtained with Stan Schneider in the research studies in which he participated.

Regarding training support, your constituent will be pleased to know that a \$30 million program of Research Training Fellowships has been established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to strengthen the nation's biomedical research capability. Scheduled to begin this fiscal year, the program will receive additional funds over the next three years, bringing the total allocation to approximately \$90 million. The Research Training Fellowship plan is designed to meet, in a coordinated manner, the total research manpower needs of the present as well as the future, and to channel training funds into specific areas of need.

I shall be happy to hear from you further if you require additional information or if I can be of assistance to you in any other way.

Sincerely yours,
G. DONALD WHEDON, M.D.,
Director, National Institute of Arthritis,
Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases.

ENERGY CAN BE MADE CHEAP AND ABUNDANT

HON. WILLIAM L. SCOTT
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, a conservative newspaper, Human Events, in its March 16 issue included a special supplement entitled "Energy Can Be Made Cheap and Abundant." This article is by Dr. Petr Beckmann, a professor of electrical engineering at the University of Colorado. It is a detailed article obviously written after a consider-

able amount of research which discusses various facets of the energy problem and, in my opinion, is well worth reading by every Member of the Senate. There is a philosophical undercurrent in the article about which there could well be a difference of opinion. The writer indicates that recent laws enacted by the Congress and regulations of various Government departments and agencies have interfered with the free enterprise system and contributed to the shortage of energy we have today. Dr. Beckmann is critical also of what he considers to be unwarranted attacks upon corporations attempting to meet the energy needs of the country and of environmentalists who he feels show little concern for the maintenance of our standard of living or the capitalistic form of government.

Again, Mr. President, I do not suggest that any Senator will agree with every phrase in the article, but I believe that it will stimulate the thinking of all Members of this body. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in its entirety in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ENERGY CAN BE MADE CHEAP AND ABUNDANT (By Petr Beckmann)

One of the biggest brainwashing campaigns ever is now under way.

You are being saddled with a guilt complex. With 6 per cent of the world's population, you are being told, the United States is consuming 33 per cent of the world's energy. That is the truth, but not the whole truth.

You are being told that the world's energy resources are finite and rapidly dwindling; that they will be depleted if we do not use them carefully. That is not even the truth, let alone the whole truth.

You are being told that the present energy crisis will force Americans to do with less energy, that it will rid America of "too much technology," and that this is a healthy thing just like curing a patient of obesity. That is, a cure of obesity that drains the patient's life blood.

You are being told that more technology and more energy consumption means more pollution. That argument says the more vacuum cleaners, the more dirt on the carpet. The truth is that a clean environment needs more and better technology; in particular, large amounts of energy are needed for the present forms of pollution control.

LIMITLESS SOURCES

The harnessable energy sources on this planet are limitless. To give but two examples, the sun will shine for some 50 billion more years, and nuclear fusion can never run out of fuel.

To give but two examples of proven processes with "limited" fuel supplies, breeder reactors can run on uranium for the next 200 years, on thorium for the next 2,000 years; and oil, natural gas, hydrogen, methanol and other fuels can be synthesized from domestic coal for many centuries.

Obviously, then, the low thermostat settings and the cars now lining up at the gas stations do not mean that we have reached the bottom of the energy barrel; we have merely reached a bottleneck.

How did this country get itself into it? Consider first a classic little case. It does not explain the energy crisis by itself, but it is typical of what caused the crisis. It is the case of steel pipe for oil well casings.

The proven oil deposits under the surface of the United States are sufficient to satisfy

present demand for the next 50 years; and this estimate does not consider the untold amounts in the continental shelves, nor the vast deposits of oil shale in the mountain states, which contain more oil than the deposits of the entire Middle East.

Most of this enormous underground wealth remains unexplored and untapped. Back in the '50s, in a shortsighted, vote-pleasing move, Congress controlled the price of oil and gas. In the long run, this did not give the consumer cheap oil, but an oil shortage; for oilmen do not work for charity, but for profit, and the number of new wells declined drastically from year to year as the costs went up and the prices of oil and gas remained frozen. At the same time, oil and gas became cheap fuels to be burned under power plant boilers. While demand for this artificially cheap oil increased by 7 per cent a year, domestic oil production has actually been declining since 1970.

If anyone doubted that governmental price fixing chokes off production, he had a new opportunity to look at the alternative: In May of last year, the price of "new" (newly discovered) oil was decontrolled, and the incentive of the new price, now \$6.75 a barrel and moving up, immediately spawned a new and successful search for oil. Hundreds of new oil wells sprang up in Texas, Louisiana and Oklahoma, and a veritable flood of oil was in the offing within a year or two.

But the boom soon ran out of steam, or rather out of steel pipe for well casings. Under Phase IV regulations, profits in the steel industry are limited by bureaucratic formulas, and since the steel industry is in business for profits, too, it naturally prefers to produce more of the goods with less severe profit limitations, and this does not include tubular goods. But there are no controls or exports, and so steel pipe for well casings is now being exported abroad while drilling rigs in Texas are being shut down for lack of it. And 15 per cent of these exports go to Arab countries which have embargoed oil exports to the United States.

There is more to this snafu by government regulation of the market. A single Houston supplier of steel pipe sits on two million feet of casing, but he can't sell it for fear of violating Phase IV regulations. Some senators pleaded with the Cost of Living Council to grant an exemption for well casings, and the exemption was finally granted. But a cobweb of bureaucratic regulations cannot be untangled by cutting a single thread. The next thread was another regulation keeping the price down to December 1972 levels, which would still entail selling at a loss, and so those two million feet of casing keep sitting there while the company president explains to his frantic customers why he cannot sell it to them.

But if American steel pipe is exported to Arab countries, perhaps American wells can be cased by British steel pipe? No; large deposits of oil have been found under the North Sea in the last four years, but the countries on its shores who have been scrambling for that oil are much further gone along the road to the Socialist welfare state, and they have been stifling their industries with taxes in the public interest. Up to now, they have been getting their supplies in Houston. No longer; America has joined the public interest, too.

WELL CASINGS SHORTAGE

So what is happening with well casings in Texas and Oklahoma? This is what is happening: Used casing is being sold at prices 80 per cent, and sometimes 100 per cent, above the price of new casing, which is unavailable; abandoned wells are being stripped of their casings in the hope of salvaging some that survive the operation; new wells are being designed not for maximum efficiency, but for minimum casing requirements; one small company says it will be lucky to get

casing for half of the 100 new oil sites it has discovered since "new" oil was decontrolled; supplies of steel pipe in the field are being closed off by barbed wire fences and put under armed guard; the sheriff in Odessa, Tex., is using a helicopter to spot a new type of criminal from the air—the pipe rustlers.

And all this, remember, is due to regulations that were supposed to protect the consumer.

The case of casings is but an insignificant typical for one of the major roots of the shortage: bureaucratic regulation of the market place.

The way in which bureaucratic regulations have blocked access to abundant energy could fill a whole book, and only the very minor case of steel casings has been described in some detail, but there are all too many other, and more important, examples.

There are 46 billion barrels of oil, together with 228 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, under the Atlantic continental shelf (says the U.S. Geological Survey), no more than 100 miles offshore, and no more than 600 feet under the surface of the ocean. That is more than the entire proven reserves of the United States under dry ground. It is also more than the deposits under the North Sea, where the first oil was found only four years ago, and where 28 mobile rigs are now drilling for this treasure, with 50 more on order.

Unlike many of the more exotic sources of energy, this vast reservoir could begin to yield the black gold within two years; but the federal government is keeping it closed to exploration, and its timid moves toward lifting the ban run into a plethora of more laws, decrees, regulations and guidelines, from environmental impact statements (with years of environmental suits to follow) to a suit against the state of Maine, which claims 200 miles of offshore waters on the basis of yet another decree, this one by King Charles in the 17th Century. Oil, yes, says the state of Delaware, but get it from the oil shale in Colorado. Oil, yes, says the state of Colorado, but get it off the coast of California. Oil, yes, says everybody, but let's have more laws preventing it from being produced in my back yard.

Or take the electric utilities. They switched from coal to gas—which would have been an economic absurdity in a free market—and when the gas ran out, they switched to oil. Their profits are regulated by a myriad of regulations put out by the government agencies mothering energy matters—65 of them, by last count.

The utilities' struggle to fund research of new methods of generating electric power in the squeeze between rising costs and frozen rates has been no less than heroic, but it has been a losing battle. And even orthodox power plants get swamped in red tape. There were no less than 28 large nuclear plants scheduled to go on line in 1973, but they did not make it because of ever changing regulatory requirements, environmental suits, and more red tape shackling the contractors and subcontractors.

Natural gas? There are gas wells in Louisiana where it is being flared, and it is bubbling up through the waters of the Gulf of Mexico, with nobody bothering to capture it. Would you bother for a regulated well-head price of 25¢ per thousand cubic feet?

In transportation, government regulation has ruined the energetically most efficient means of transportation: the railroads. They were forced, "in the public interest," to run unprofitable trains, and they had to compete against the tax-supported network of roads. Some went bankrupt, others carry only certain types of freight, and all now lack facilities for convenient and fast passenger transportation.

On the roads, the Interstate Commerce

Commission's rules and regulations often force truckers to ship freight by a crooked route and return with empty trucks; and the freight for the return trip is often carried by another crooked-route-empty-return truck in a monumental waste of motor fuel on the interstate highways.

Apart from this direct interference in energy conversion and access to primary energy sources, government regulation has also been stifling the production and conversion of energy in a number of other ways, of which shortsighted taxation is one of the most detrimental.

There is a time-honored way of making the man who is being kicked a little happier: Give him somebody that he can kick, too. It is an age-old recipe used by the power-hungry throughout history; and however abominable it may be, the sad truth is that it usually works. It would of course no longer work if the Jews or the Negroes were made the scapegoats, but it works when the scapegoat is made more fashionable; big business in general, and the oil companies in particular.

The world owes you a living, brother, go get it from those who make more than you do. The oil companies are making huge profits, which proves that they are raping you. Nationalize the bloodsuckers! There will be plenty of energy once they are handed to the whiz kids who are running the U.S. Postal Service.

This type of propaganda has become so commonplace that it has almost obliterated some simple facts. The oil companies have had a string of lean years, and only in 1973 did they make a respectable profit. Even then, the after-tax profits were well below the average for all of manufacturing. Besides, the oil industry is one where investments are extraordinarily high in price and slow in paying for themselves.

You can build an awful lot of refrigerator factories for the price of one refinery and this is, in fact, what has happened, because taxation and other regulatory policy has made refineries only marginally profitable, and few of them have been built in the last few years. Last summer's gasoline shortage was a refinery shortage, not a crude oil shortage. But there was no shortage of refrigerators.

WRONG TAX BREAKS

What tax breaks the oil companies are given are often of the wrong kind. For example, tax credits of various kinds made it profitable for the oil companies to become increasingly dependent on overseas refineries, and if tomorrow someone found a magic wand to turn water into oil, the energy crisis would not be over, for U.S. refinery capacity would still fall short of demand by some two million barrels a day.

But all this is merely scratching the surface. The real refutation of the "guilty of profits" argument is that profits are the driving force behind research and development of new energy sources, and however heretic the statement may be today, the oil companies need more, not less, profits for imaginative research programs.

It was not the Federal Power Commission or the Environmental Protection Agency, but the Occidental Petroleum Co. that found a method of retorting oil shale *in situ*, with minimal environmental impact. And the oil companies need not be told by bureaucrats to reinvest their profits in long-term research, for they are unlikely to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs: Exxon has just doubled its 1974 capital spending budget to more than \$6 million.

There are more and more examples of stifling energy sources by taxation, price regulation and other bureaucratic interference, but the examples tend to get boring, and perhaps the point has been made.

But consider one more point, which is per-

haps more eloquent than any other. If the price of domestic crude oil had been free to rise from its controlled level of \$4.25 (now \$5.25) a barrel, it would have risen in harmony with world prices to a level which not only would have encouraged more exploration and made the supply more plentiful. It would also have risen to a level where power plants would not have burned it under their boilers, and more important still, it would have risen to a level where synthesis of fuels from coal (oil, gas, gasoline, hydrogen, methanol) would have become competitive with natural crude oil and the products refined from it.

In other words, a free market would not only have made the supply of natural crude more plentiful; it would also have seen to it that less of it was needed. And the reduced demand would not have been due to pricing crude oil out of reach, but due to cheaper alternatives becoming available.

A second major cause of the present energy bottleneck is closely intertwined with government regulation and sometimes indistinguishable from it. Ecology, until the late '60s, was the name of a respectable scientific discipline; since then the word has become meaningless in the mouths of hysterical pseudo-scientists, frustrated housewives and affluent do-gooders on messianic ego-trips.

Their campaign became a mass movement embraced by their politicians—for who in his right sense would oppose clean air or clear water?

But it soon turned out that the leadership of the ecological crusade was not so much after clean air and clean water as it was on a corporation-bating binge and on a campaign against technology, which had wounded "involved" intellectuals with the ultimate insult: They could not understand it any more.

Of course, keeping the environment clean needs more and better technology, not less; and curbing economic growth curbs the economic muscle for keeping the environment clean. No wonder, then, that the doomsday prophets and environmental fanatics keep tottering in self-defeating circles of inconsistency. At the moment, they are driving the energy horse with a whip in the right hand, while pulling the reins back with the left; and when the horse collapses, they scream "We told you so!"

Unfortunately, the environmentalist myths are not only fallacious, but also widespread.

It is, for example, widely believed that the present troubles with energy and other shortages are rooted in the run-away demand of an exploding population. But there is no population explosion in the United States. The replacement rate has been steadily declining for the last 10 years; last summer it crossed the zero-growth rate, and it is now heading for the point where not even immigration at present rates will prevent the U.S. population from declining when the average lifespan of 70 years of the present population has run its course.

The population controllers with their "too-many-of-you-others" mentality have therefore already run out of their goals unless they want to start killing off the living. They have yet to explain how sterilization in the United States can prevent a population explosion in India.

Even more widespread is the myth of the bottom of the barrel. Resources, we are told, are finite, and we will deplete them if we don't watch our step (we are never told how eventual depletion can be prevented by this theory even if we do watch our step). But non-renewable is not irreplaceable, and most raw materials that have disappeared did not vanish by depletion, but by replacement and subsequent lack of demand.

Copper, for example, is going to be in short supply in a few more months; not so much due to Salvador Allende's legacy as due to U.S. price controls, which have forced

industry to reduce imports by 25 per cent. But let that pass; the main industrial use for copper is due to its high electrical conductivity. However, there are higher conductivities around: platinum, gold, silver.

The reason why telephone lines are not made of gold is that there are other things than conductivity to consider, and when copper gets short, they will be made of aluminum (as done by many countries already), which is in plentiful supply for a long time. And when aluminum runs out? They will be made of glass fibers, because by that time electrical communications will be carried by guided laser light. And glass will last for as long as there is sand in the deserts. And so it goes; the barrel has a very elusive bottom.

DEPLETION MYTH

Depletion of resources is perhaps the most successful of the environmentalist scarecrows, and the danger is that if this myth is accepted, it can eventually become true. If fossil fuels are regarded not as something to be explored and replaced, but as a sacrosanct last bottle of water in the desert, they may become just that; and instead of moving forward to cheap and abundant energy, we will live in a stunted economy draining its dwindling resources.

This myth of the empty barrel is being constantly harped on by the ecocult. It forms the basis of a computer program financed by the Club of Rome, which has inspired much awe among the gullible, though it is a pseudoscientific piece of unmitigated nonsense. It is based on false premises and shamelessly manipulated input data, but even so, it proves no more than that if you keep drinking from a finite bottle, the bottle will eventually be emptied. For such wisdom, most people need neither a computer nor a MIT degree, but others are awed when they hear the word "computer."

Now energy is always conserved, it can be converted, but not destroyed; in addition, the source of solar and nuclear energy are for all practical purposes unlimited. That will not fit the theory of the empty barrel, so a new gimmick by the name of "thermal pollution" was thought up. This is little more than a fraud, but like all good frauds, it contains a grain of truth.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics does indeed amount to saying that in each energy conversion some small fraction must be irretrievably converted to heat. The environmentalists refer to this totally irrelevant law when they speak of nuclear and other power plants endangering aquatic life by using rivers to cool their condensers. Such argumentation would put the well being of fish above that of people; but it is faulty beyond that.

The heat involved raises the water temperature only by a few degrees, possibly displacing one species of aquatic life, but enabling another to find habitat—if indeed, it amounts to that much. When the British built a nuclear plant by the river Blackwater in Essex, there were the usual screams that the warm water would wipe out the oysters downstream. But it did no such thing; it did not even help the oysters when many of them died in the severe winter of 1962-3.

But nature is not without irony. What the warm water in British estuaries did show was that sole, plaice and other fish will undergo accelerated healthy growth, reaching maturity twice as fast, and an experimental fish farming station on the Isle of Man is now using "thermal pollution" (sans nuclear power plants) to breed healthy specimens faster.

With their half-baked theories and self-defeating cures, the environmentalists recruited a following of impressive extent. They were amply helped by power-hungry rabble-rousers who rightly saw in environmentalism a horse on which to crusade against business and the profit motive. They went almost totally unopposed, for who

wanted to be accused of supporting pollution? Politicians no longer campaigned for justice and motherhood, but for ecology and the environment, and Congress, sensing this mood, passed emotion-swayed environmental legislation, some of which may well one day become a laughing stock of history.

What all of this legislation has in common is that it puts the burden of proof on those who seek to change the status quo.

Whoever intends to build a power plant, for example, must supply an environmental impact statement describing in detail all the possible and impossible effects on everything from noise to disturbing the local vegetation, and this statement is then subjected to endless challenges. But no statement is required on the impact of failure to build the plant: How many women might die in childbirth for lack of electric power? How many tons of food might rot in refrigerators during blackouts and brownouts? How many working opportunities will, directly and indirectly, fail to materialize? The negative standards are set, rather arbitrarily, by the Environmental Protection Agency; the positive standards are set by nobody.

Among this environmental legislation, the 1970 Clean Air Act stands out as a major crumple; it will probably undergo drastic amendment before this year is out. It is technically unsound, its standards are based on erroneous data, and it is legally so nebulous that its latest interpretation by the Supreme Court will, in some parts of the country, make bad air worse while protecting air that does not need protection. In some instances it actually guarantees greater health hazards as its standards are progressively enforced.

AUTO EMISSION CONTROLS

The auto emission standards are unsound from several points of view; but perhaps the most ludicrous is their uniform enforcement throughout the country. The idea of enforcing the same standard in Los Angeles as in the countryside of Montana is something like forcing everybody to wear sterilized rubber gloves, no matter whether he is a surgeon or a stockbroker. Except that this glove idiocy would come cheaper: The total cost of the present pollution control will eventually come to \$60 billion. And for that money the auto industry is forced to produce cars that guzzle ever more gasoline, have ever less power, and are about to be equipped with emission controls that may produce new health hazards.

Yet \$60 billion, according to a study at Texas A&M, is more than enough to build coal-to-methanol refineries meeting the projected gasoline demand for 1985; methanol pollutes less than gasoline, and its pollution can be more easily controlled—for the small fraction of cars driving in heavily polluted areas such as Los Angeles and other metropolitan areas.

The 1970 Clean Air Act is also a landmark in that Congress has legislated a technology that does not yet exist. The Senate has now followed up this idea by passing a bill ordering the auto industry not only to meet the as yet unaccomplished 1976 emission standards, but to bring the gas mileage up to 20 miles per gallon as well. It has not yet legislated the production of cars running on fire-proof fuel.

Though the Clean Air Act forced power plants to switch to low-sulfur coal, then to gas, then to oil, and caused cars to lose power while guzzling more gasoline, it would be wrong to present it as a major cause of the energy crisis, which was in the making long before 1970. A much larger share of the blame must go to the anti-technology sentiment fomented by the ecocult and to its legalistic guerrilla tactics against the Alaskan pipeline, nuclear power plants, refineries, oil drilling, and, in fact, any type of energy conversion or accessing facility.

The "suddenness" of the energy crisis is

what has been used as alleged proof that the crisis was contrived by the oil companies. In fact, there was nothing sudden about it.

Fifteen years ago a presidential commission warned that demand would soon outpace supply unless countermeasures were taken, but the report was ignored, as were the increasingly frequent and increasingly urgent warnings by experts in industry and the universities. The present Administration is now being berated for not having foreseen the crisis, and while it is true that it could have done more, it has a better record in this respect than all of its predecessors. By April 1973, it had progressed from general warnings to submitting 18 specific proposals to Congress, including reevaluation of the price controls on gas and oil. But Congress ignored the proposals; by March 1974 it had acted on only one of them (the Alaska pipeline bill), and that only after the Arab oil embargo, watergating away precious months.

A look through the trade journals of the petroleum industry and of the electric utilities for the last few years will soon dispel any suspicions that the arrival of the energy crisis was sudden. The warnings from industry (but not its PR departments) and from the universities were frequent and urgent. But nobody listened.

There were other warnings, too. The long lines of cars now waiting their turn at the gas pumps in some metropolitan areas were commonplace in Denver, Colo., and Portland, Ore., in the summer of 1973.

To say that the energy crisis erupted suddenly is like looking at a man who has fallen to his death from a skyscraper and saying "How strange! The man was in perfectly good health when he fell past the fifth floor, and now all of a sudden he is dead."

But, of course, energy production in the United States is not dead, and that is another point that is overlooked in the "why so sudden" question placed at the door of the oil companies. Block-long lines at gas pumps do not start only when all the gas is gone; they start when the supply is down by as little as 10 percent. The cross-over point from enough to insufficient is indeed a "sudden" one. It so happened that the Arab embargo made that point appear dramatically in the fall of 1973; but without the embargo that point would have been reached a little later anyway.

The present shortage is more serious than was foreseen by government spokesmen immediately after the Arab embargo, when it was pointed out that direct imports of Arab crude amounted only to 5 percent of total U.S. consumption. When imports of refined products and other dislocations were considered, the forecast quickly rose to between 17 per cent and 21 per cent. Moreover, this represented only the immediate shortage for the present winter.

The real crunch will very likely appear as a gasoline shortage in the spring of this year, since refineries were ordered to produce 15 to 20 per cent more heating oil at the expense of gasoline during the winter. The usual latitude for changes in the fraction of gasoline production is only 5 per cent, and this disruption may show up as an additional factor in the shortage. When demand goes up this spring and summer, a refinery capacity shortage of some two million barrels per day (b/d) will probably show up as well.

On the other hand, the embargo proved far less effective than anticipated, partly thanks to the oil companies who switched deliveries from non-Arab countries to Holland and the United States and delivered Arab oil to "Arab-friendly" countries, often by radio message to tankers already bound for a different destination.

More important, the considerable waste of energy, engendered by its artificial cheapness through price controls, will cushion the increasing crunch as this waste is progressively eliminated. There is quite a way to go before

energy consumption in the U.S. is reduced to the more frugal level of Europe, where a gallon of gasoline costs \$1 up, and a kilowatt-hour of electric energy is double the U.S. price.

The present energy shortage has so far been an inconvenience, not a catastrophe. Yet it is fraught with dangers that could very well lead to disaster.

First, there is the danger of appeasement, of knuckling under to the Soviet-Arab blackmailers and aggressors. Several influential voices have already called for an "even-handed" approach to the Middle East situation—meaning evenhanded treatment of aggressor and victim alike—in order to end the energy crisis. One Ragai El Mallakh, adviser to the Energy Project in Washington, D.C., has gone so far as to lay the energy situation at the door of an Israeli lobby and to suggest that achieving independence in energy is a gimmick in self-image not worth the costs in money or pollution.

Such Chamberlainesque exhortations to trade security and integrity for oil are not merely immoral and short-sighted, they are also multiply fallacious and they rely on ignorance of recent history.

Arab lands—worthless deserts—have been handed back to Arab dictators before, only to be used as springboards for Soviet-inspired and Soviet-backed military adventures. The energy crisis has been approaching for the last 15 years, and the latest Soviet-Arab military and political adventure was merely a last straw that accelerated its arrival. But most important, of all blackmailers the Arab sheiks have the least motivation to honor any agreements they would like to extort.

They have not the slightest reason to squander the only resource of their medieval sheikdoms—certainly not for money or gold, which they receive in such quantities that they literally do not know what to do with it; and as they hike the price of crude oil, they will only have more of it for less production.

They are merely using Israel as an excuse for what is the only way for keeping their anachronistic sheikdoms alive as long as possible. (Iran, on the contrary, is making an effort to use its oil revenue for transforming its economy to a more viable one by the time oil loses its present importance, and it has not joined the embargo.)

The second big danger is that conservation of energy, which is the only immediate answer to the present bottleneck, will become a self-serving end; instead of forging ahead to harness the limitless supplies of solar, nuclear and geothermal energy, instead of unlocking America's vast reserves of untapped fossil fuels, this attitude rejoices in the "blessings of doing with less" and presents conservation as the only possibility henceforth and forever more. If this approach gains wide acceptance, the doomsday theory may well become the doomsday practice.

In this connection it should be pointed out that consuming 33 per cent of the world's presently harnessed energy is no cause for a guilt complex. Would anybody be ashamed of the fact that with only 6 per cent of the world's population, America has more institutions of higher learning than any other country? Fully 35 per cent of American youth enroll in college; in the USSR, the fraction is only 12 per cent, and in India it is quite minute. Americans are no more "depleting" the world's education than they are depleting the world's energy, for both are in potentially unlimited supply.

Moreover, the two are not unconnected, for the high level of education is one of the symptoms of a high standard of living; this has been brought about by high productivity, which, in turn, is due to large-scale and efficient harnessing of energy. Yes, efficient: With all the waste of energy in the United States, it still produces a higher GNP per unit

of consumed energy than any other country in the world. This is a point to remember the next time you hear Americans called "a nation of energy pigs."

The third danger is that the energy crisis will be used as a cloak for an unprecedented attack on the principles of private enterprise. Not merely for a fresh avalanche of regulatory laws and agencies (that also), but for an outright attack on the principle itself. Naturally, such attacks are not made against the corner drug store or the small stockholder. They are first made against the large industries "too important to be left in the hands of those who have only profit for a motive"; above all we hear that "natural resources belong to all of the people."

THE "THIN SLICE"

"The planet Earth is a seamless structure with a thin slice of sustaining air, water and soil that supports almost four billion people," writes Ralph Nader in an article called "The Profits in Pollution." "This thin slice belongs to all of us."

This thin slice belongs to all of us. The "thin slice" includes the totality of human civilization with a fat layer of earth and all of the sky thrown in, and what Nader wants to belong to everybody, and he makes amply clear in his corporation-baiting binges, is not so much the air and the water as it is the oil and the gas and the other corporate assets. By constant repetition, amply disseminated by the mass media, the word "profits" has been made as repugnant as "pollution"; one cannot exist without the other; therefore give "back" to the people what the corporate vampires are using to rape the consumer.

This line of thought is pursued by a number of eloquent demagogues. The more sophisticated among them are adept in drawing fallacious conclusions from arguments injected with heavy doses of truth (an ingredient which too seldom appears in Ralph Nader's tirades). It is a method used, for example, in many scholarly dissertations seeking to demonstrate that private ownership of natural resources is an 18th Century idea that no longer makes sense in a modern economy.

More interesting than the tactics of the demagogues is their strategy. The target is not the corner drugstore, but oil, coal, electric power and mass transportation. Why?

Because only a fool would want to see the corner drugstore run by the government; but oil—well, people muse, perhaps it would not be a bad idea to cut the "rapists" down to size.

This writer once talked to an older Russian who remembered the nationalization process in the USSR in the early '20s. He came from a very small town in the Ukraine, and the first thing to be confiscated there was a large forest nearby that belonged to a *kulak* (large landowner). This was announced at a public meeting with most of the inhabitants present, and apparently everybody agreed that a forest should belong to everybody to enjoy. Shortly afterward, a public meeting was called to nationalize the small factory in the town.

"Now comrades, you all know that I supported nationalization of the forest," said the factory owner, "but when it comes to a little factory like mine, I ask you . . ." but he aroused no sympathy. At the next meeting, the local druggist said, "Now, comrades, you all know that I supported nationalization of the factory, but when it comes to a little drugstore like mine, I ask you . . ." And so it went, until the people were left with the right to own fountain pens, except that he could not get any to buy.

Now only a paranoic would suggest that the various oil company baiters, from Adlai Stevenson III to the commentator of your local radio station, are engaged in a conspiracy to deprive you of your fountain pen. Presumably they want no more than some

form of "public ownership" of the oil industry, and possibly the railroads. But the motivation of the advocates of nationalization (or whatever less offensive word they use) is not what is of interest here. What matters is the first step along a road to disaster. Who cares what made that Ukrainian druggist support the confiscation of the forest? Whatever it was, he saw his error only when it was too late.

DELUDED PUBLIC

Fully 25 per cent of the American people, according to a recent Harris poll, now believe that the energy crisis was contrived by the oil companies—the very companies that had been sounding the alarm for many years (alas, only in their trade and professional journals, in congressional hearings and other public meetings—their own public relations departments joined the fashionable ecology fad and squandered millions on oozing out environmental drivel).

If a quarter of the U.S. population holds this demonstrably wrong opinion, it is worth while to take a closer look at the present onslaught against the oil industry.

A formidable hate campaign has been unleashed against the oil companies; politicians, the mass media, college professors, and almost everybody else active in political life has joined in the merry sport of kicking the scapegoat. You are not "with it" today if you don't spit your fair share of saliva at Exxon and Texaco.

The utter irrationality of this campaign is evident from the fact that its instigators are out for blood, not for oil. Even if the charges against the oil companies were true, which they are not, a thoughtful approach would look to increasing the oil supply first; but what we are witnessing is a grueling call for blood, and the punitive measures with which to hit the scapegoat, whether a rollback of oil prices, or increased taxes, or trust busting, or outright nationalization, will obviously only guarantee that the oil supply dries up even further.

The utter irrationality of this crusade is also evident from the charges hurled at the oil companies: They not only contradict the facts, they even contradict each other.

The same people who are willing to believe that the oil companies want to drive the independents out of business by keeping their prices indecently low are also quite willing to believe that the companies are raping the consumer by keeping their prices indecently high. They believe that the companies are purposely keeping the oil supply low so as to raise prices, yet they also believe that they want to destroy the Alaskan environment in their unbridled greed for more oil.

They see every ship anchored off the coast as fresh proof of the diabolical plot that they are allowed to pass on price increases of foreign oil anyway.

Yet the salient facts are simple. A substantial change in energy sources cannot be expected for some 15 or 20 years. Oil will have to continue to provide a significant share for at least this time. The investments needed to supply that part of the energy, according to all financial experts, will amount to about one trillion dollars over the next 15 years. There is no chance that the oil companies can get that kind of money out of their present earnings. They cannot even get half that amount, which they will be required to put up if they want to borrow the rest. The simple fact of the matter is that the oil companies' present profits are *insufficient* to ensure the needed energy supplies for the future.

Such a statement may sound very heretic in the face of orthodox wisdom which preaches that the oil companies are rolling in exorbitant profits, but a coolheaded examination of the figures will confirm the conclusion.

MISLEADING STATISTICS

The outraged reports of 50 per cent and 60 per cent increases in profits are always

based on lean years such as 1971 or 1972 (if the detractors could find a year with no profits at all for a base period, the percentage increase would be infinite). The percentage on invested capital is hardly ever quoted, because it is well below the average of production industries, or for that matter, below the average of any other group of industries. And most of the profits go into the vast investments to keep the oil industry alive.

The oil companies' profits have, in fact, been steadily declining since 1968; the trend was only stopped in 1973. And the reason is not hard to find. With prices controlled at an unrealistically low level, it became increasingly unprofitable to explore and to invest within the United States. In 1973, oil production increased by 20.5 per cent in the Asia-Pacific area, by 16.9 per cent in the Middle East, by 4.3 per cent in Africa, by 6.4 per cent in Latin America, by 9.3 per cent in the Communist world. There was only one major oil-producing area which recorded a decline: the United States of America, down by 2.8 per cent.

The depletion allowance and intangible drilling costs are another red herring waved by the rabble rousers. The original idea behind these tax breaks was to encourage exploration. The major companies with their gigantic floating rigs at \$250 million apiece can find other ways to write off their expenses, and several of them have offered to scrap this chicken feed for higher prices in a free market.

If these tax breaks are abolished, it won't be Exxon or Shell who will go out of business; it will be the little wildcatter who will no longer be able to risk drilling a dry hole. It is the little independent who will be ruined by the senators masquerading as his friends in their slimy game of clowning for political popularity.

It is also the little independent who finds most of the new oil at the present time. Fairy stories about monopolies, cartels and conspiracies to the contrary, there is now no oil company in the U.S. that has more than 9 per cent of the oil, gas or gasoline market.

However absurd the accusations against the oil companies, the charges have gained credibility since the Federal Trade Commission filed suit against them alleging "anti-competitive practices." If even a government agency says so, many think, there must be some truth to it.

What is the FTC? It is not just another bunch of bureaucrats. It is a collection of liberal lawyers who specialize in perverting semantics. They are the people who are supposed to prevent misleading advertising, but who have in fact helped to make it more misleading than ever.

They have, for example, ruled that a company must submit complicated and convincing proof before it can say "Our product is better," but no proof is required if the company says "Our product is best." They have no objections to half-truths and three-quarter lies like "Of all leading gums, Trident is sugar free" (in which the word *only* is missing before *Trident*, and with good reason), but they brought suit against Gillette when they found that the razor in a TV commercial was shaving the abrasive not off sandpaper, but off something else. They do not prevent misleading advertising, they merely give it the stamp of respectability. They protect the countless millions who yearn to dip a crystal chandelier in pancake batter.

The FTC's war against English grammar, as in "better" and "best," is but a small part of their activities in perverting semantics. The suit brought against the oil companies abounds in the type of half-truths and three-quarter lies which the FTC is encouraging on the TV screen.

"The ties between the oil companies and financial institutions are so strong," charges the FTC, "that, in a real sense, the banks and major oil companies enjoy an identity of interests." What the semantic perverts are

saying is that all voluntarily concluded business transactions are based on common interest. When you borrow money from a bank, the FTC has just discovered, this is because you want to borrow it and the bank wants to lend it. You enjoy an identity of interests. (And "in a real sense," too, whatever the unreal sense may be.)

But the oil companies and the banks are in cahoots in far bloodier crimes. The three major shareholders in Mobil are major New York City banks, charges the FTC, and it is therefore not in the interest of these banks to finance a competitor. But elsewhere the FTC charges that Chase Manhattan is the largest shareholder in Atlantic Richfield, and the second largest in Mobil; it is not in the interest of Chase Manhattan to promote competition between them.

What the semantic perverts are saying is that there are two kinds of banks in New York City: those that are criminal because they invest in one oil company, and those that are criminal because they invest in two or more oil companies.

"HUMOR" BY THE FTC

But the FTC is not without a sense of humor. It actually charges that the consumer is hurt because due to the companies' market power, "society's resources aren't allocated efficiently." This humorous statement appeared in an FTC report issued at a time when "society's" resources (this thin slice belongs to all of us!) were allocated not by the oil vampires, but the FEO; and the efficiency was such that in Colorado you could get all the gas you wanted, but in neighboring Arizona drivers stood in line for two hours in hopes of getting to the pump before the gas ran out. What the vampires in their boundless greed for profits would do, if the politicians got out of the way, would be to truck some gas from Colorado to Arizona; and what the raped consumers in their pitiful helplessness would do would be to gladly pay a few more cents per gallon rather than stand in block-long lines.

And so the suit rambles on. The gist of the argument might well be paraphrased in the FTC-approved Trident chewing gum slogan: "Of all major U.S. corporations, the oil companies are vertically integrated."

What price controls, allocations and other forms of interference have done to oil, they have done to coal, only more so.

They have, among other things, rendered the idiom "carrying coals to Newcastle" obsolete, for Newcastle doesn't have all that much coal. The United States, with trillions of tons of it underground, is the place to which coal (coke) is now being imported all the way across the big lake from Germany. The steel industry and the electric utilities are frantically competing to get what they can, while American coal is being exported overseas. Perhaps the crews of the freighters are waving in mid-Atlantic as they pass each other in opposite directions in this monumental lunacy second only to the distinguished feats of Soviet bureaucracy in its more idiotic moments.

Until last fall, both steam coal and metallurgical coal were price-controlled. Then the Cost of Living Council decontrolled part of the steam coal, but not metallurgical (higher grade) coal. There has never been a price control of imported and exported coal, and the coal, naturally, goes where it fetches most money.

The resulting long list of sordid details includes a price rise of \$9 per ton to as much as \$40 a ton, a cut in steel production (one million tons, or 8 per cent by Bethlehem Steel), power plants breaking down because low-grade coal (better than none, some utilities thought) accumulates slag in the boilers, coal mines running out of steel supports because the steel industry doesn't have enough coal, and all the other woes so well known to every controlled economy.

And sooner or later the advocates of nationalization will step in and say "You see? Private enterprise is no longer able to handle the thing. Society's resources belong to all of us. Coal is too important to be left in the hands of profiteers."

If coal is not next, the railroads are. In a recent article "Trains Into Flowers—An argument for the nationalization of American railroads," Barry Commoner injects a heavy dose of truth into his arguments to arrive at a fallacious conclusion.

The six-page article does not make a single mention of how government interference and union featherbedding have stifled the railroads. Instead, much space is devoted to the perfectly true points that railroads use much less fuel per ton-mile of freight than do trucks, that they pollute less, that they are run far below capacity, that land use, energy consumption and costs are smaller for railroads than for roads, and that the Penn Central bankruptcy was the largest in U.S. history. But by weird mental acrobatics he concludes from these points that railroads can no longer be run at a profit, and that they should be nationalized.

TIME LEADS NEEDED

The time leads for constructing conventional energy facilities are of the following orders: refinery, three years; surface coal mine, two to three years; underground mine, three to four years; coal gasification plant, four years; new oil and gas production, three to eight years; fossil-burning power plant, five years; nuclear power plant, eight years.

These figures do not take into account environmentalist sabotage or bureaucratic hurdles. (The Alaska pipeline was longer in the courts than it will take to build, and even now the 50-odd required federal and state permits are not yet in hand.)

Obviously, then, there are no quick ways of getting out of the bottleneck. Relaxing air pollution standards, for example, will save some power plants from closing down, but it will not have a decisive effect, for switching back to coal under the boilers is not as easy as in a bonfire; nor is the coal industry prepared to handle substantially increased demand immediately. Under the circumstances, conservation of energy is the only immediate major option.

Conservation does not increase the supply. It may soften the shortage, but there are several ways of doing this. The one advocated by many politicians is the one that got the country into the bottleneck in the first place: more bureaucratic regulation. Rationing is the way to spread the shortage fairly, we are told, and it is the only way to ensure gasoline for the poor.

But rationing is one of the ways that could help make the shortage permanent. It provides no incentives to tap new energy sources, it will not prevent gasoline prices from rising, it will cost \$1.4 billion a year to administer, and it would be a godsend to the Mafia.

On the contrary, if price controls were removed, the price of gasoline would move to the point where demand meets supply. Estimates vary between 60 and 80¢ a gallon for that point, which is still well below the \$1 gas. At that price, car pools and slow driving would arrive overnight and with such fervor as the government's advertisers appealing for sacrifices could never dream of. This, coupled with the enormous incentive for new oil production and new refinery capacity, would soon drive the price down again, and the poor would then be better off than with rationing coupons and nothing to stop the price spiraling up. (Incidentally, where but in America do the poor have cars?)

Bureaucratic allocation of fuels leads to cases like oil wells in Texas having to shut down because their pumps run out of diesel fuel. And if rationing is good for the Mafia, allocation is fabulous for the lobbyists, influence peddlers and string pullers ready to

demonstrate what allocation can do for the allocators.

A bureaucracy is also vulnerable to pressure groups like Nader's phony crusaders who demand that supplies be allocated to "consumers" rather than industry. In a free market consumers would be free to make their own decisions on how best to economize on the energy they have purchased, and they would not need Mr. Nader to be so good to them.

Here is a little item of what conservation by allocation and appeals instead of conservation by a free market can do: Some 630 million gallons of good gasoline are immediately available, here in the United States, but they are not being used. On the contrary, they use up energy, because their weight of many hundreds of tons is being pushed around the country without rhyme or reason from sea to shining sea.

This is the gas in the lower halves of the fuel tanks of 90 million passenger cars. It never flows into the carburetor, because motorists refill their tanks as soon as the fuel gauge shows the tank half-empty. They do this because of the 10 gallon per fill limit, because of gas pumps closed on Sundays, because of the general uncertainty whether gas will be available when the tank is near empty. Lifting price controls would soon start these 630 million gallons of gas flowing from the fuel tanks into the carburetors.

A SPECIAL GAS TAX?

Realizing the advantages of a free market and the pitfalls of rationing, some politicians have suggested a compromise: a government tax on gasoline to raise funds for alternative energy sources. Such a tax would indeed curb demand, but it would give no incentive to competing suppliers to produce more supplies. Like all taxes, it would merely creep up and up; most likely it would eventually be used for further wars on poverty that cure nobody's poverty except that of its administrators. But even in the unlikely case that the proceeds would be handed to industry as research funds, who needs such a middleman?

There is an abundance of energy sources that can be harnessed within the next five to eight years: coal, gas, synthetic fuels, oil, oil shale, and nuclear power. None of these need pollute, for pollution is a byproduct of poor technology, not of technology in general.

The domestic coal supplies of the United States suffice for between 300 and 500 years. No other area in the world has as rich deposits as the belt stretching from Montana and the Dakotas to Arizona and New Mexico, much of it low-sulfur coal. Coal need not be a "dirty" fuel; apart from pollution control in conventional furnaces, coal can be used as a feedstock for synthesizing natural gas, crude oil, gasoline, methanol and other synthetic fuels.

Germany ran a war without oil by synthesizing gasoline from coal, and coal refining technology has come a long way since then. Although investment costs for coal gasification and liquefaction are high (about \$300 million for a 100,000 b/d coal-to-methanol plant), large-scale production could make methanol competitive with gasoline even at present prices, and the advantage would widen in the future.

Natural crude oil and gas are not only available in the continental United States, where the removal of price controls on "new" oil has shown how production goes up with price increase, but above all in the continental shelves, where billions of barrels of oil await the governmental go-ahead. Oil spill prevention and clean-up have advanced beyond recognition since the Torrey Canyon and Santa Barbara spills, and oil spills no longer represent a significant risk for offshore drilling or supertankers.

There is more oil in the oil shale of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming than in all of the Middle East, and it is low-sulfur, too.

The rising price of natural crude oil is about to make retorting of oil shale competi-

tive; and the recently demonstrated feasibility of retorting it *in situ*, without use of water or even bringing the shale to the surface at all, is being consistently ignored by the environmentalist bogey of ruining the Rockies. A vicious campaign based on superstitious fantasies has also been unleashed against the demonstrated feasibility of freeing natural gas by underground nuclear explosions.

Nuclear power, in the presently used form relying on uranium and plutonium, cannot run out of fuel before other forms of nuclear energy production and other sources of energy become widely available. But in the case of nuclear power, environmentalist superstitions have been more successful in confusing the public than in any other area, perhaps because the anti-nuclear crusaders have been playing so cleverly on the psychological association between "atomic" and "bomb." That association makes as much sense as the association of "electric" and "chair."

Is nuclear energy dangerous?

Of course it is; harmless energy is as common as incombustible fuels. But it has proven to be the safest form of large-scale energy conversion yet discovered.

No industry is as closely regulated for safety as nuclear power; and indeed, none is easier to regulate, for none has its danger points so highly concentrated and so closely guarded. The precautions taken in waste disposal and preventing overheating of reactor cores border on the absurd, and the incredibly few mishaps that have occurred (in the weapons industry, virtually none in the power industry) have been blown up beyond all sanity.

For example, when some tritium found its way from a Colorado plutonium refinery into the water supply of a nearby town, the "disaster" made national headlines and it provided the environmental paranoids with a new bogey for years to come. What they did not say was that the radiation the citizens got from the contaminated water supply, during the few days before it was detected, was less than they receive from the luminescent dials of their watches.

ANTINUCLEAR PROPAGANDA

This type of anti-nuclear propaganda stunt has frightened many people who think nothing of getting behind the steering wheels of their automobiles, though 50,000 people are slaughtered annually on the nation's highways. And the comparison is an apt one, for fatalities per passenger mile are fewer for automobiles than they used to be for stage coaches. Advancing technology consistently raises overall safety, and the safety hazards increase only seemingly when the potential hazards are considered without weighing them against benefits.

In nuclear power generation, the greatest danger comes from the waste disposal system (not from overheating of the reactor core, which has a philosophically small probability), and here the situation is such that the average individual could be exposed to less than one-thousandth of the radiation received from natural sources. These, as the anti-nuclear crusaders invariably fail to point out, are the biggest source of radioactivity. The next highest dose received by the average individual comes from medical equipment such as X-rays, followed by that from other man-made equipment such as TV sets, and nuclear waste radiation is still one hundred times below that.

The records accumulated in the past 15 years show that nuclear power plants are safer than fossil-burning ones. They are not, of course, without potential danger; no energy conversion facility is. But has anyone ever considered the health hazards of not going nuclear?

Whoever wishes to attempt such a consideration will find that the AEC has spent more than \$1 billion on exploring health and environmental problems of nuclear en-

ergy, but that very little data are available on the health hazards of generating electricity by burning fossil fuels. However, here are some scraps of information:

Number of deaths from unrestricted coal burning (pre-1968) in power plants in New York alone: several thousand per year. Number of American miners currently disabled by black lung disease: 50,000. Compare this with the number of reactor-related fatalities in the power industry since nuclear plants went into operation: None.

There are no major technological problems in harnessing the conventional types of energy listed above. Their technical feasibility has been demonstrated and, with the possible exception of oil shale recovery, their economics are well known. The obstacles are entirely legal. Leases to explore the continental shelves and oil shale lands (almost all of which are owned by the federal government) can be granted by the federal government, in some cases without congressional approval. The price controls on gasoline can be lifted by Executive Order.

As for the lengthy environmental litigations, no one would suggest that even the most paranoid environmentalist should be deprived of his right to due process also implies hearing the other side. If environmental impact statements were required to be accompanied by impact statements on the consequences of failure to realize the proposed project, then judges and juries would have to rule on genuine dilemmas (which, after all, is their job), and not on esoteric questions of biology with the deck always stacked in favor of the status quo.

Looking ahead toward the '80s and '90s, the energy picture is shaping up in ways that belie the myth that the era of cheap energy is over. Not only can it be made cheap, but it can be made clean as well.

Among the many alternatives that need long-term research and development, two now appear particularly promising: nuclear fusion and solar energy. But whatever alternative is considered, there is a tendency common to all: If energy is to be clean and abundant, it must be converted centrally in large facilities for distribution to the individual consumers. Small-scale conversion is cumbersome, inefficient, and it tends to be dirty as well.

For example, solar energy harnessed by individual houses is cumbersome, wastes a lot of space (the roof and attic, the south wall, plus storage facilities), requires maintenance, and it will not provide all of the energy required by a family in an industrialized country; nor does it come cheap, since the house must be designed as a solar house from the outset.

Similarly, domestic windmills and other "low-impact" technology ("feudal" technology would perhaps be a better name) require much effort for very little power output, and they soon run into problems of space, and even pollution when storage facilities are considered.

Large-scale facilities to harness wind, tidal and sea wave power cannot, as simple calculations show, have a decisive effect as major energy sources on a national scale, though individual facilities can be quite impressive.

Geothermal power is not likely to be one of the early alternatives. The places where natural underground steam is available are relatively few, and utilizing the heat deep in the earth by injecting water and harnessing the existing steam now appears further away than other alternatives. However, there may always be surprises, and geothermal energy is an alternative which, unlike wind and tides, can eventually provide unlimited power.

SOLAR POWER INSUFFICIENT

The trouble with solar energy is one that is not always appreciated: Solar power is very dilute (about one kilowatt per square meter), and to harness appreciable amounts

of power, very large collecting areas are needed. Solar farms (which would generate steam in pipes distributed over many square miles), solar furnaces (which would use mirrors to concentrate sun rays in boilers), and satellite collectors (which would transmit power to earth by very short radio waves) all run into the problems of large collector areas, and while there is plenty of room for solar farms in the desert, they do not represent a general solution for areas where land is hard to come by.

There is, however, a vast area already collecting solar energy; namely, the earth's oceans. The temperature difference between the surface and the deep water in tropical oceans amounts to some 25°C, enough to run turbines using a working fluid with a low boiling point (ammonia, for example). The electric power thus generated could be used in several ways; one of them would be distillation and electrolysis to produce hydrogen for piping or shipping to the shore; hydrogen is a non-polluting fuel with high heating value.

The environmental impact of such offshore solar sea power plans would be minimal: If there were enough of them to meet the demand of the whole world at present U.S. consumption rates (a demand that will not be posed for a very long time), they would do no more than lower the surface temperature of tropical oceans by less than 1°C.

NUCLEAR FUSION

Probably even more attractive is the promise of nuclear fusion, which releases energy by fusing two nuclei of deuterium into a helium nucleus. Such a process runs on virtually unlimited fuel, for deuterium, an isotope of hydrogen, is amply available from sea water. Moreover, fusion produces vastly more power per unit amount of fuel, and it produces less radioactive wastes, in fact, a process involving the fusion of boron nuclei (also in plentiful supply), which will give rise to virtually no radioactivity at all, is now envisaged.

Thermonuclear fusion is the process by which the sun releases energy, but it has not yet been achieved in the laboratory. It requires neutrons at velocities corresponding to temperatures of 20 million degrees, a sufficient density of the neutrons, and maintaining both for a sufficiently long time to keep the reaction going.

It is this combined requirement which has not yet been achieved, though the individual conditions have been achieved separately. This is usually the sign of being close to a breakthrough, but an exact forecast cannot be made. The pessimists predict success for the end of this century, the optimists talk about five to 10 years. What can be said with certainty is that there will be no fusion at all if it is starved of funds.

About a quarter of the primary energy consumption in this country goes for transportation, but abundance of primary energy sources does not automatically guarantee satisfactory means of transportation. At present, most transportation is powered by the internal combustion engine, which has a low efficiency (20 per cent or less), is noisy, relies on fossil fuels, and pollutes. The obvious answer, on present evidence, is to power transportation by centrally generated electricity.

For mass transportation over intermediate distances, the problem will very likely be solved by magnetic levitation or electromagnetic flight in which trains float above an electromagnetic guide track, their speeds unrestricted by the mechanical limitations of wheels. The advances of superconductivity have made the powering of the train and track feasible, and several early versions of such trains are now on the test tracks in the United States, France, Britain, Germany and Japan.

But mass transportation denies a man the

basic virtue of a car: to go where he likes when he likes. Here, too, electric power is almost certainly the long-range answer.

Barring a major breakthrough, battery storage will not give a car the range, room, speed and acceleration which even contemporary drivers require; but recent advances in plastic materials will make it possible to store large amounts of energy in "superflywheels" spinning in vacuum canisters to drive an electric generator. Such a flywheel is revved up by electric power from the mains (at home, for example) and can power a car electrically for some 200 miles of driving; if not loaded, the flywheel will spin for many months. A bus using this principle (though still with a metal flywheel and a range of only six miles between recuperation points) will be tested in the streets of San Francisco within two years.

AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM

It is hoped that the foregoing discussion has made it amply clear that except for a temporary bottleneck, the problem of clean and abundant energy is not technological, or technological only to a minor degree. The real problem is economic and something like ideological: The basic option is whether to make the bottleneck permanent by the same methods that made it appear in the first place, or whether to go forward to more and better technology to assure abundant supplies of clean energy; and whether to take the fast road of free enterprise or the road into the swamp of bureaucratic regulation.

The choice is easy enough for those who have the technical background and the necessary information; but that includes only a small fraction of the population, and both points present a major stumbling block at the present crossroads.

LEAD TIME

It takes three years to build a refinery and five years to build a power plant; but it takes 15 years to become a competent and experienced engineer. Engineers and physicists will, in fact, be the ultimate bottleneck in the energy shortage. Yet what will be needed in vanquishing the energy crisis is not merely the engineer who is a competent specialist in a narrow field of energy conversion; to solve energy problems as they are now shaping up, he will have to understand economics and world politics as well. Perhaps more training of this kind would have seen fewer politicians who thought that technology and energy production could be legislated, and fewer engineers who were blind to the ideological raids on technology.

In the climate of widespread antitechnology sentiment, enrollment in engineering and the hard sciences has been steadily declining at most American universities for a number of years. Technology, like business, has become a dirty word in the eyes of a part of the younger generation.

Engineering schools, which even in the best of times had a freshman mortality of as much as 50 per cent, have an inescapable tendency to lower standards in the face of decreasing demand and mounting insufficiency of high school preparation.

It has always been easier to major in the memorization-oriented subjects demanding less exact thinking than the vertical structured sciences such as physics and engineering; but today some of the drift from the hard sciences is to the mysticism of the various Maharajah of Mumbo Jumbo, where the impressionable learn to relate, to find out about themselves, to be aware, and to freak out.

ENGINEER SHORTAGE

1984 will hopefully not be the year of Newspeak and the Memory Hole; but it will certainly be a year of an acute shortage of engineers and physicists.

Perhaps the greatest obstacle to the logical course of moving rapidly toward harnessing some of the unbounded energy around

us lies in the misconceptions dished out daily, weekly and monthly by the information industry, which appears to be dominated by men of identical ideological outlook. This manifests itself not only in the misinformed attacks on the oil companies, but above all in the constant harping on the theme of energy conservation as a self-serving end with little or no regard to the abundance of potentially harnessable energy.

This campaign takes many forms. The utterly erroneous postulate that more technology means more pollution is constantly repeated and pounded into the mind of the reader and TV viewer. The blessings of doing without the energy "obesity" are expounded. Every scrap of misinformation is used to bolster the anti-nuclear crusade. Economic growth is presented as a disease.

Guilt complexes for using too much energy are fostered, the implication being that the energy consumed in the United States is somehow stolen from less fortunate or less powerful countries. The country is reproached for not having listened to the doomsday prophets' triumphant we-told-you-so's are reported in all their sick absurdity.

A climate of helplessness and defeat is being created. ("Population is swelling," says an editorial by Norman Cousins. "The food supply is shrinking. Oxygen is being depleted. . . . The sky has become an open sewer. The conditions of life on this planet are running down.")

Above all, the conservation of energy, undoubtedly necessary in the present temporary bottleneck, is being presented as a new patriotic ethic to be instilled in all citizens forevermore, for allegedly we have reached the bottom of a once plentiful barrel, and there is no more when the remainder is gone.

Perhaps nowhere has this attitude of the information media been seen more clearly than in reporting the President's energy message. The items on conservation and waste were blown up to imply that this was the only way from now on for all times, but the parts referring to actions safeguarding the future were almost totally embargoed.

For example, you may not have read the following passage before:

"We can take heart from the fact that we in the United States have half the world's known coal reserves. We have huge untapped resources of natural gas. We have the most advanced nuclear technology known to man. We have oil in our continental shelves. We have oil shale out in the western parts of the United States, and we have some of the finest technical and scientific minds in the world. In short, we have all the resources we need to meet the great challenge before us. Now we must demonstrate the will to meet that challenge."

ECONOMY IN VOTER REGISTRATION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the National Municipal League has published under Library of Congress Catalog No. 73-85779, a short booklet entitled "The Cost of Administering American Elections," written by Prof. Richard G. Smolka of American University. The booklet provides an excellent review, in simplified form, of the costs of administering registration and election systems.

I commend it to all Members, particularly if the House should take up the post card registration bill, HR 8053.

Because the chapter on the costs of voter registration is particularly interesting, I have inserted the last few pages of that chapter entitled "Conclusions."

In addition, under the chapter headed "Comparative Costs of Elections," I am inserting a paragraph from page 74, entitled "Voter Registration."

The two sections noted above follow. I hope Members will find them interesting and will be encouraged to read the booklet in its entirety.

EXCERPTS FROM "THE COST OF ADMINISTERING AMERICAN ELECTIONS"

CONCLUSIONS

Registration costs are astronomically high because the methods are inefficient and ill suited to the requirements of the task. Typically, in large and medium-sized jurisdictions thousands of voters must be registered during periods just prior to the elections. This is also the time when election officials must devote the greatest amount of time to the preparation of the ballot and the polling places. From an administrative standpoint it is the least desirable time to register large numbers of voters. The process has become so cumbersome that most states must close registration a minimum of 30 days prior to an election, and some states require as much as 50 days. Even the Supreme Court of the United States in *Marston v. Lewis* has recognized the enormous burden of last-minute registration on the election process.

In addition to registration, most states provide for purges which are conducted after the general election either every two or four years. These are required by law to bring registration lists up to date as a fraud prevention device. It is presumed that persons who have not voted in at least one election during the prescribed period may have moved.

Courts have intervened in the process and prevented easy purges by mail. The Michigan supreme court in overturning a mail purge conducted in Detroit, ruled that the failure of the addressee to respond to the purge notice could not be construed as evidence that he no longer lived at the address indicated. Although purge practices vary widely, they have one thing in common—they are all expensive.

In some jurisdictions, there is a canvass of voters to verify the names on the list prior to the election. Such a process resulted in the deletion of names of many persons who should have been able to vote in 1972 in St. Louis.

Even with purges many jurisdictions find that the lists are still out of date and that the simplest way to keep them accurate is to initiate a statewide purge as Kentucky did in 1973. Such a practice is very expensive. The conversion of county lists to a statewide registration list in Virginia cost over \$500,000 without the requirement of reregistration.

Registration costs can be drastically reduced if the activity can be systematized. The most efficient way of achieving maximum registration with minimum effort at a low cost is by means of an annual personal canvass supplemented by deputy registrars.

There are employees of the election board in every precinct in the country. These precinct judges and clerks offer a pool of talent already familiar with the elections process and with the persons whose names are on the list with which they work. Many of these officials are now employed in systems such as the prohibitively expensive New York City registration process which lacks the efficiency of the canvass.

Utilization of precinct election judges as canvassing teams and deputy registrars

would provide a built-in protection against fraud. If such a canvass were conducted in January or February of each election year, it would permit several months for checks and challenges of the names not only by precinct officials of the political parties but also by party and public officials. Further, once the precinct canvass has been completed, if any unusually large increase of registration occurs, it will immediately draw suspicion and some explanation will be required. "Deadwood" would be effectively eliminated from registration lists.

A list compiled as early as January or February, however, will not be completely accurate by November. There must be an efficient method to supplement the roster, delete names of persons who have moved, and to make necessary changes. At the present time, notaries public are considered officers of the state for the purpose of verification of the signatures of individuals on legal documents. If precinct judges functioned in a similar manner and were permitted to enroll registrants at times other than the annual canvass, then the prospective voter would not need to go out of his neighborhood to register. Further, when a new resident offers to register, this is immediate notification to the precinct deputy registrar that the registrant at the former address may no longer live here.

Alternate methods of supplementing registration by canvass are also available. The Michigan secretary of state has suggested that the Department of Motor Vehicles serve as such an agency because of high proportion of persons reporting changes of address for drivers license or auto registration purposes would be able to utilize the service without making additional trips to other public offices. The system used in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, described above, is another alternative.

The least expensive system of voter registration is the North Dakota method which merely requires the voter to identify himself at the polls. There are no permanent lists, no changes of address, no purge and no list processing. The volunteer deputy registrar system is the next least expensive. If every community were able to recruit as high a proportion of civic-minded citizens as Multnomah County, Oregon, then there would be little cost to the voter registration effort. Because volunteers account for over 90 percent of all registrations in the county the cost per registrant is less than 5 cents.

The deputy registrar system with paid deputies may be the next least expensive provided that the deputies register voters in high volume, obtain accurate information, and process it in a timely manner. The deputy registrar system can operate effectively for about 25 cents per registrant but must be supplemented by a central registration office or decentralized offices to ensure that all citizens of the jurisdiction have an opportunity to register. The cost of the entire system depends on the proportion registered by the deputies and the costs of operating the supplementary system. The more usual costs per registrant for the deputy system would range between 35 cents and \$1.00 or more.

The post card system does not offer the registrar an opportunity to instruct the prospective voter in person. Hence, many cards are incorrectly completed and the registrar must seek out the voter either by telephone, in person or by mail to obtain the correct information. If either the name or address is not legible or if the address is incomplete, it may take considerable time to identify the applicant. Kentucky experience with mailed-in registration forms indicates that about one in four is incomplete or incorrect. A clerk can process about four such forms an hour. On this basis, the net cost of post card registration can be estimated to be about a minimum of 50 cents per

registrant. This estimate is based on very limited experience, however, and is subject to change depending on the simplicity of the form, the educational level of the prospective voter, and familiarity of the voters with the particular form.

Central office registration costs vary depending on the wage scales paid rather than the work to be performed. A minimum estimate for this type of registration is 25 cents and the costs may easily exceed \$1.00 per registrant. In addition it is the least convenient and the lowest volume system of registration.

Although the canvass method may appear at first sight to be extremely expensive, comparable to conducting a national census, nevertheless it does produce a relatively low-cost voter registration list because it operates at maximum efficiency for an extremely short period of time. There are no wasted motions, no haphazard efforts to seek out registrants, no difficult and time-consuming purge processes, and no repetitive processing of inactive registrants, all of which add to the cost of election administration. The voter enumeration conducted early in an election year also relieves the election office of a large volume of last minute registration, freeing its officers to devote full time and attention to the process of ballot construction, printing ballots and counting the vote.

There is no reason why the canvass method of voter registration should cost more in the United States than the 70 cents per voter reported by Canada, and there are several reasons why it should cost less.

VOTER REGISTRATION

Economy in voter registration can be achieved in the same manner as in political campaigns. Political campaign consultants sometimes advise candidates that time and energy can be used most efficiently if they "go where the ducks are." Likewise, it is readily apparent from illustrations in many parts of the country that the cost of voter registration is reduced greatly if the registrars go where the potential voters are. A systematic door-to-door canvass which combines voter registration and purge procedures provides an efficient, economical manner of producing an accurate voting list with maximum security.

Deputy registrars, mobile registrations and other easy opportunities for voters to register or to change registrations contribute to keeping lists current and lowering costs. Other techniques which require excessive processing or ineffective use of manpower, or produce inaccurate information, will be time consuming, produce inaccurate lists and contribute to expensive purge processes.

WHAT IS BUSINESS?

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. President, a brief but pointed editorial on the role of business in our Nation appeared in the March issue of *Nation's Business*.

The point made in the editorial—that business, after all, is people—is so basic that I think all of us need to be reminded of it from time to time.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "What Is Business?" be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

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

WHAT IS BUSINESS?

The energy problem has brought attacks not just on oil companies but on business as a whole. Critics demand that business somehow be punished.

We wonder what they mean by "business."

All the businesses we know are owned by people—whether by one guy, a few partners, or thousands of stockholders.

Businesses buy from people, too—some big ones buy from thousands of suppliers.

Businesses give people jobs—a total of 90.5 million.

And businesses serve people—providing the goods and services all 212 million of us need and want.

Whom would it hurt to punish business?

REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE OF WESTERN NEW YORK ON NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE REGULATION OF WATER LEVELS ON THE GREAT LAKES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the regulation of the water levels of the Great Lakes is a matter of great importance to the people of western New York. It is a goal to which, in their interest, I am totally committed.

Why is the water level on these lakes important?

Without an adequate water level, navigation is impeded through the lakes and the St. Lawrence River which ultimately empties these bodies to the sea, affecting such major industrial ports as Buffalo.

Without an adequate water level, power generated from falling water—to light and heat our homes and factories—is threatened.

Without an adequate water level, water quality diminishes as a stable level of pollutants is mixed with a diminishing quantity of water.

But, on the other hand, if there is too much water, serious flooding may occur along the shorelines and rivers which either empty into the lakes or serve as conduits between them.

If there is too much water, shoreline erosion damage—both gradual and storm created—also increases, destroying millions of dollars in real property and personal possessions.

If there is too much water, port and marine facilities—commercial, municipal, and private—are jeopardized, threatening commerce and jobs.

Against this background, one can understand more fully why this matter is of extreme concern to western New Yorkers and their elected and appointed officials. The vitality of the economy along the shore is directly affected by water levels on the lakes. In few places is this more true than in the counties of Erie, Niagara, and Chautauqua, N.Y., all bordering on Lake Erie or the Niagara River which empties it—over the falls—into Lake Ontario.

NEW STUDY FINDS REGULATION OF LAKE ERIE MAY BE ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House and to the people of western New York, a finding of the International Great Lakes Levels Board, that regulation of Lake Erie may be economically feasible.

The 300-page report, released on February 26 by the Board, under the aegis of its parent body, the International Joint Commission, embodies the findings and conclusions of several hundred engineers and scientists from both the United States and Canada. The report, under preparation since the Board's appointment in 1965, used the most up-to-date technology and all available information from both countries.

This report is also commendable because it reflects a well-reasoned balance between economic development on one hand and environmental protection on the other. The report shows that we can have technological progress, even involving substantial construction, and yet take into full account all reasonable, potentially adverse environmental impacts. I commend the Board and Commission for insuring this balance in the report.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS ON LAKE ERIE

This is truly one of those cases of, "First the good news; then the bad news."

First the good news: The study finds that "two preliminary plans for the combined regulation of Lakes Superior, Erie and Ontario exhibit favorable benefit-cost ratios." Now the bad news: The study also finds that "further study is needed of the alternatives for regulating Lake Erie."

I am a patient man. I know that adequate study is essential in order to insure the worth of projects to be built with the taxpayers' dollars. It is better to know all the facts than to construct a project on incomplete information, only to have its purpose frustrated when it fails to meet its objective.

But, how long must we wait?

The study just released has been underway since 1965—a full 9 years. I am not criticizing the Commission or the Board of their staffs—they have done fine jobs—but I am saying to all those in key leadership positions to effect authorizations and appropriations in the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada that every day, every month, every year of delay is costing the people of the Lakes' areas a share of our Nations' joint and several posterities.

It is hard to tell a port captain who sees his commerce declining, or a landowner who sees his property being gradually washed away, or a labor man about to be laid off, that we must have still yet another study. This is particularly true when the water level has been as high as it has in Lake Erie over the past few years. I think everyone can understand that.

What, then, has the Board recommended?

The Board has developed and evaluated plans for the coordinated regulations of the three lakes—Superior, Erie, and Ontario—under three alternative approaches. For the purpose of these

plans, Superior-Erie-Ontario have the acronym "SEO".

All of these alternative plans would employ the existing regulatory works for Lakes Superior and Ontario, preserving the existing criteria and other requirements governing the Commission's Orders of Approval governing the regulation of Lake Ontario.

These three alternative plans are as follows:

Plan SEO-33. This plan would regulate Lake Erie with channel enlargement and control works in the upper Niagara River, based upon the principle of balancing storage in all the lakes.

Plan SEO-901. This plan would permanently lower the mean level of Lake Erie by channel enlargement in the upper Niagara River and employ a related plan—SO-901—for the regulation of Lakes Superior and Ontario.

Plan SEO-42P. This plan would employ the Black Rock Canal to increase Lake Erie outflows during periods of above-average supply, regulate Lake Superior in accordance with plan SO-901, and use a modified Plan 1958-D rule curve for the regulation of Lake Ontario.

SEO-33 and SEO-42P are both trial plans; they have not been sufficiently refined. SEO-901, on the other hand, is essentially a refined plan in that one can estimate with some precision the effects of lowering the mean level of Lake Erie by a certain amount, and the amount of lowering was determined so that the minimum level of the lake would not be changed from natural conditions.

As to the economic feasibility of SEO-901, it would provide annual benefits of almost \$6.4 million at an annual cost of only \$169,000, giving thereby a benefit-cost ratio of a most healthy 37:6. The incremental benefit-cost ratio of this plan is even better—40:3.

The Board's principal concern in the use of these figures, it points out, is the concept of enduring shore property benefits from permanently lowering the lake levels; they think this to be "highly suspect." There could also be a detrimental effect on wetlands around the lake area. Plus, the future level of the lake might be permanently lowered. This is, understandably, why additional study is needed.

STABILIZATION OF LAKE LEVELS MUST BE A "MUST" PROJECT

Mr. Speaker, the stabilization of the water levels of the lakes is essential.

It must become even more of a priority project within both our Government and that of our Canadian neighbor.

It is a matter on which we must show movement toward construction at the earliest possible date.

CUBA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, Columnist Richard Wilson, in the

Washington Star-News of February 9, made a valuable contribution to the current debate about "normalizing" relations with the Castro regime in Cuba.

Mr. Wilson wrote that if there is to be movement toward more normal relations between the United States and Cuba, there must be assurances that the Castro government will not "offend the interests of the United States, nor the security of the hemisphere."

He also pointed out that the reported recent espousal of "normalization" by Soviet Premier Brezhnev no doubt reflects a reassessment of their own interest on the part of the Russian leaders. Communism, Wilson said, "has not prospered in the Western Hemisphere."

If we are to establish better relations with Castro's Cuba, let it be on a realistic basis, and let the United States keep its own interests paramount.

I ask unanimous consent that the column, "What Would Fidel Castro Promise?" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WHAT WOULD FIDEL CASTRO PROMISE?

(By Richard Wilson)

When Sen. Edward M. Kennedy espouses an international cause it can fairly be concluded to have an important domestic political content. This is certainly the case with Senator Kennedy's advocacy of "normalizing" U.S. relations with Fidel Castro.

The issue is a complex and serious one which cannot be settled on the basis of catch phrases that "surely an administration that is willing to travel 9,000 miles to improve relations with the People's Republic of China should be willing to span the 90 miles to the Republic of Cuba for the same purpose."

The issues involved are so different as to make any such comparison irrelevant. Furthermore a sharp division of opinion may be expected to take the place of the universal approval of President Nixon's initiative in China.

According to one version, why not embrace Fidel Castro, let bygones be bygones, promote the good will of Latin America and détente with Russia? But, according to an opposite version, why help a bearded buffoon who is hung around Moscow's neck as a living symbol of communism's failure in the Western Hemisphere?

Both versions are parodies of the available alternatives, but they serve to illustrate the heat that may enter into this argument before President Nixon and Secretary Kissinger respond to the open overtures of the Moscow and Havana governments.

The present phase began early in January when the Cuban ambassador in Mexico said for publication that "Guantanamo isn't important to us now" and that Havana is ready to discuss normalizing relations as soon as Washington lifts its 12-year economic blockade of Cuba. Previously Castro insisted the United States must give up the naval base at Guantanamo before relations could be normalized.

Concurrently, the Peron government in Argentina broke with American policy, resumed diplomatic relations and advanced a credit of \$200 million for the purchase of Argentine products, including automobiles manufactured by a subsidiary of Ford Motor Co.

Argentine Ford is reported negotiating for the sale of 1,500 cars and 1,000 heavy trucks but is caught in the middle between Peron's virtual orders to do so and American prohibitions against it unless the embargo is modified.

Pressure is on to open the car market in Cuba once again.

Now Soviet Chairman Leonid Brezhnev is reliably reported to have reasoned with Castro, and Foreign Secretary Andrei Gromyko came to Washington to open the way toward normalization with the President and Kissinger.

But this is no sentimental question, no worthy liberal cause in the terms stated by Senator Kennedy, and not really anything that will promote détente unless there are some hard practical reasons why the United States should help Moscow share a burden which has cost it \$5 billion. Not only that. Communism has not prospered in the Western Hemisphere and is a much poorer investment than when Nikita Khrushchev backed down from maintaining a nuclear base in Cuba.

What recompense will there be for the \$2 billion and more of American property seized by Castro? What guarantees of the personal liberty of Cubans and the right to return in safety of the thousands of refugees who wish to do so? What commitments against the export of revolution which, however farcical, is not an abandoned goal? What benefits from cultural exchange if they merely mask and condone the Havana repression? What sure sign that we are not closing the prison doors forever on those who pray for liberty in Cuba? These are questions which often occur to the liberal mind, as they must have to Senator Kennedy but he did not mention them when he advocated that we should abandon the boycott, restore commercial air service, and encourage the "free" exchange of ideas and people. Free? Like with Solzhenitsyn in Russia? And is the restored air service to carry Cubans both ways?

These are among the practical questions, but they are aside from the broader generality of Russia's motives. Russia would like to share the cost of a bad investment, cut its losses and maybe salvage a little profit. Russia's approach to the Western Hemisphere is being softened, as it was in Africa, and that is all to the good.

But if that is the case, in view of the drastic events of scarcely a decade ago, then firm assurances must be found that Russia's client, the hard-to-manage Castro, shall conduct a government which does not offend the interests of the United States, nor the security of the hemisphere.

WHO'S RUNNING DETROIT?

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, unionization of city employees has brought about some sad days for our Nation's once proud big cities. San Francisco was the most recent victim, and who can forget when all of New York City's bridges were locked open. Recently, the mayor of Detroit had to yield to the threat of a strike by the city garbage collectors, who are under the Teamsters, rather than assist in an area grape sales boycott by Cesar Chavez. I do not agree with what Mr. Chavez is trying to do, but the speed with which the threat of this strike made the mayor buckle under, raises the question: Who is running Detroit? The article, as printed in the Detroit Free Press, March 9, 1974, follows:

YOUNG YIELDS TO TEAMSTERS OF CHAVEZ

(By Peter Benjaminson)

Mayor Young yielded to Teamster pressure Friday and agreed to refuse aid to a Detroit area grape sales boycott backed by United Farm Workers leader Cesar Chavez.

Local Teamster representatives had indicated to Young that the men who drive Detroit's garbage trucks might walk off the job next month if the mayor aided Chavez by proclaiming a Grape Boycott Day.

Chavez' union is battling the Teamsters in California for the right to represent that state's farm workers.

The request for support from Chavez and the Teamsters' reaction to that request put Young in a political bind because both Chavez and the Teamsters supported him in his campaign for mayor last year.

A spokesman for Young said Friday the mayor feels he "can't subject the people of Detroit to the threat of a garbage strike."

The spokesman said that although Young sympathizes with Chavez' goals on behalf of the mostly Latino farm workers, the mayor doesn't want to take sides in a union battle and has political obligations to both sides in the dispute.

A walkout by garbage truck drivers next month would come at a particularly bad time for the city.

The weather is likely to be warmer and any garbage left uncollected would rot quickly. Also, the Teamsters labor contract with the city is expiring and a walkout might well exacerbate any attempts to negotiate a new contract without a strike.

Young's spokesman said that the mayor "appreciates his friendship with Chavez and if there was some way to work out an accommodation he would be glad to do it."

Reacting to Young's decision, a spokesman for Chavez' grape-boycott effort charged Friday that "the Teamsters are holding up for ransom the million and a half people who pay taxes in Detroit to have their garbage collected."

The spokesman, Sam Baca, went on to charge that "by succumbing to this type of coercion, the mayor is setting a dangerous precedent. Will the people of Detroit be threatened with the denial of a service for which they pay taxes every time the elected officials of this city make a decision the Teamsters do not approve?"

Young's spokesman, Bob Pops, said he did not consider the Teamsters strike talk a threat "because they were just offering the strike as a possibility. They weren't holding a gun to our heads."

But Baca said the Teamster action was "an example of the strong-arm manner which we have come to expect from the Teamsters Union," which he called "ruthless and brutal" in its California organizing effort.

NEW OIL DISCOVERIES DEPEND ON DOMESTIC FAIR PRICING

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America continues to ride on the borderline of an energy crisis. Even with Arab oil, we are slipping backwards in our energy economics. In the United States, we can find and produce oil for \$10 a barrel. The Arabs demand and get \$15 a barrel for their oil. The obvious solution is to produce more domestically so we can save money and save foreign exchange.

The Dallas Morning News on March 10 had an enlightening editorial on this subject. They quoted a prominent Dallas oil man, Cary M. Maguire, who told the Senate Committee 4 years ago about the impending shortage. Read the News editorial and let us provide oil incentives for more production.

NONPROGRESS REPORT

The only meaningful energy legislation that has so far moved from Capitol Hill to the President's desk was the emergency energy bill, no achievement of which to be proud. Mr. Nixon announced, even before the bill reached him, that he would veto it.

And very properly so, since the bill's distinguishing feature was its rollback of oil prices from the level that free market forces have carried them to—something like \$10 a barrel—to a level more popular with the voting public.

Plain evidence, here, of just how shallow runs Congress' concern with making the U.S. self-sufficient in energy.

How much oil would a price rollback produce? Nary a gallon. Given the \$110,000 cost of a 4,000- to 5,000-foot well that six months ago could have been drilled for \$75,000—this is thanks to shortages and inflation—the oilman needs higher prices if he is to drill for oil.

And yet Congress appears to believe that finding energy is as cheap and as automatic as flipping on a light switch.

To find oil, to produce nuclear energy, to harness the sun's rays requires not only huge sums of capital but a lot of what businessmen call "lead time." You do not snap your fingers and magically discover all the oil you need. You settle on a drilling program; you select sites, you budget the money, you plan refinery and transportation facilities.

It is as Dallas' Cary M. Maguire, an independent oilman, told Sen. Jackson's subcommittee on minerals, materials and fuels back in November, 1969, when testifying on gas supplies:

"Gentlemen," said Maguire, "although there is instant coffee, there is no instant supply of gas. We beg the committee to do something to correct the situation now—and I mean now, not three years from now."

Well, the three years passed, and not even by then had Congress acted. Yet as Maguire also told the committee, the average gas discovery takes a lead time of 6.4 years.

And so three years of that 6.4-year lead time have been wasted. Even if tomorrow we raised prices high enough to stimulate drilling, it would be half a dozen years, if then, before we had enough gas to go around.

BROWN HITS 50

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, about this time every spring in South Dakota, crises and other events that command world headlines are crowded off the front pages by State basketball competition. Even the "streaks" that are notorious throughout other parts of the Nation take a different form in South Dakota. There we pay more attention to scoring streaks on the basketball court, and, also contrary to the national norm in these things, we let the little guys have their go at these streaks, too.

Steve Brown, of Hamlin County, was this year's big streaker with 50 points in one game. I want to share with my colleagues a bit of his achievement.

The article follows:

BROWN HITS 50

(By Dave Jurgens)

By this time of the basketball season, the adjectives have been used and reused so much they become old hat.

So what do you do when a player like Steve Brown comes along? Dig up some new ones or rework the old ones.

In record-shattering fashion, Brown led Hamlin past Salem 80-68 in semifinal action at the Arena Friday night and sent the Chargers into Saturday's finals of the state Class B tournament against Parker.

Brown busted the tournament scoring record for a semifinal game with his 50-point outburst. The old mark of 40 was set by Stan Uhler of Kadoka in 1951.

The 5-10 sharpshooter, an 11-man all state quarterback pick last fall in football, also took a giant stride toward the tournament scoring mark of 103 set by Tripp's Mike Frier in 1967.

Brown has 83 in two games.

He helped Dick Baysinger's Chargers hold the lead at all stops Friday as he scored 10 points in the first frame, 12 in the second, 11 in the third and 17 in the last eight minutes.

He was true on 18 of 40 tries from the field and connected 14 of 16 times from the free throw line.

Four Cubs, Kevin Weber, Raulie Weber, Norm Peterson and Steve Norberg, had chances to try their own personal defensive tactics on him.

Peterson fouled out and Norberg had four fouls for the night.

Brown's second-half heroics included scoring all but nine of the Chargers' points in the last 16 minutes.

His fourth-quarter output matched that of Duane Knebel's Cubs.

Hamlin's 10-point halftime lead stretched to 14, 53-39, in the early going of the third period before the Region 5 champs battled back to within nine at the quarter's end.

Brown scored Hamlin's initial nine fourth-frame points while Salem was scoring four. Then Kevin Weber, Norberg and Raulie Weber, hit fielders for the Cubs, who meet Britton in the third-place game tonight at 7, and Norberg added a pair of charities to cut the score to 69-63.

Bruce Wadsworth hit a free toss and Brown added six straight from the free stripe to ice the game for the Chargers.

Harley Tetzlaff scored off a Brown assist late in the game and Brown closed out the Charger scoring with two more gifters.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XXXIII

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the two newspaper articles reproduced below from the March 13 edition of the New York Post and the March 12 edition of the Washington Post, respectively, demonstrate an extremely alarming pattern. In each instance, a gunman, caught in the act by policemen, has chosen to shoot it out rather than surrender peacefully. Cornered criminals, armed with deadly handguns, pose a tragic menace to our Nation's peace officers. How many more

policemen must be shot in the line of duty before the Congress finally enacts meaningful gun control legislation?

The articles follow:

SECOND MAN SOUGHT IN COP'S SLAYING

A nationwide alarm was out today for a man sought for questioning in the murder of a policeman during a Queens holdup Saturday.

Police issued the alert yesterday for Martin Settles, 22.

Officer Timothy Hurley, 32, was shot outside a Jamaica bar when he tried to halt fleeing robbers. He was the first policeman killed in the line of duty this year.

Osborne (Sonny) Boalds, 36, was arrested four hours later in an apartment near the bar in connection with the shooting.

Boalds had bullet wounds in the thigh and shoulder which police said were received in the exchange of shots with Hurley and his partner, William Cutter.

POLICE ASSAULTED, MAN WOUNDED

A 26-year-old Washington man was listed in fair condition at D.C. General Hospital yesterday after being shot by police officers who he allegedly threatened with a pool cue and fired at with a gun, D.C. police reported.

According to the report, the exchange of gunfire occurred after the man, who was identified as Terry L. Burbin of 1246 Wiley St. NE, threatened customers in Dixie's Pool Hall, 1342 H St. NE, with a gun. Police responding to the call chased the suspect down an alley, where he hid behind a parked car, pulled a gun, and opened fire, police said. Four police officers were in pursuit and those who actually hit the suspect could not be determined, according to police.

Burbin, shot in both legs and in his left side, has been charged with assault with a deadly weapon.

YANKEE INGENUITY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is still stumbling along in an attempt to work out energy legislation. Some practical grassroots thinking might be in order.

I believe that the editorial from the March 9 edition of the Press Publications, serving West Cook County and DuPage County, Ill., which I will insert following my remarks, is the kind of practical grassroots thinking that should be more evident in the Congress.

The editorial follows:

YANKEE INGENUITY

The United States Government with its constant meddling in the mercantile affairs of the country is ignoring and degrading one of the greatest traits of the people. This trait is commonly called "Yankee Ingenuity."

The American citizen has always survived. Through thick and thin, good times and bad the American Citizen has always managed to cope with the problem and make the necessary adjustments without the interference of a benevolent government bureaucracy.

So what if food is scarce and costly—we are all too fat anyway. So what if gas is short and expensive—we have always found a way before and we will again.

Everyone knows that the more you tax business the higher go the prices and the

average citizen winds up paying the bill anyway.

Allocation (which is rationing spelled in Washingtonian) is unfair and administratively impossible.

Instead of using Yankee Ingenuity to find ways to get the job done with less of the scarce commodities the citizens are using the ingenuity to find ways around the bureaucratic rules. What a waste of effort.

If the government was to take its fingers out of the gasoline stew and gasoline soared to \$1 a gallon, how long would it take an Ingenious Yankee to create a gasless carriage?

Major oil companies do not want gasoline to sell at \$1 a gallon because they know that as soon as they price themselves above what the market will bear the citizens will find a substitute and put them slam out of business.

It is only by a combined effort on the part of oil and government to keep the price as high as possible within reason and at the same time keep the people's attention focused on this one problem that they can keep Yankee ingenuity from making their very existence unessential.

It would do us all well to remember that there was a lot of bureaucratic hot air over protecting the whale herds to conserve the source of supply of whale oil and blubber and that a lot more bureaucratic hot air was spilled over the shortage of hay to feed the ever growing number of horses in the nation at the turn of the century.

MARCONI COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, last October I introduced House Joint Resolution 781 to require the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the great Italian-American inventor, Guglielmo Marconi. Marconi's contribution to the art and science of communication made possible the great advances of the 20th century in this field, and indeed our lives would be quite different had it not been for his work.

Not only Italian-Americans, but all Americans, have forebears from distant shores. A stamp commemorating Marconi's life work is a fitting tribute to the ethnic diversity that so enriches our country. I hope that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will move without delay to bring House Joint Resolution 781 to the floor for a vote.

I was recently delighted to receive a resolution from the county legislature of Suffolk County, N.Y., urging prompt congressional action. I insert it at this point in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION No. 38

Whereas, H.J.R. 781 of October 18, 1973, calls for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the late Guglielmo Marconi, said stamp to be first placed on sale on April 25, 1974, and be sold thereafter as the Postmaster General shall determine, and

Whereas, the late Guglielmo Marconi, who was born in Italy in 1874, discovered and implemented the first practical wireless telegraphy, and

Whereas, Guglielmo Marconi was awarded the 1909 Nobel Prize in Physics in recognition of his discovery, and

Whereas, Guglielmo Marconi's discovery was the forerunner of most of the revolutionary twentieth century innovations in communications, benefiting people in America and all over the world, and

Whereas, the site of the birth of the American Wireless is located on Fire Island Avenue Extension and Virginia Road in the Village of Babylon, Suffolk County, and

Whereas, there are many people in Suffolk County of Italian heritage including some on this legislature who would appreciate this honor being bestowed on one of their own; now, therefore, be it

Resolved that this legislature supports in total and hereby urges the Congress of the United States through the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to entertain favorably and to enact proposed H.J.R. 781, and be it further

Resolved that the Clerk of this Legislature forward copies of this Resolution to the Chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and to Senators Javits and Buckley and to Congressmen Roncallo, Grover and Pike and to the Mayor of the Village of Babylon, Gilbert Hanse.

DOUBLE STANDARD

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest complaints we hear from the people is that people in the Government are not willing to abide by the same standards that they impose on others. If we are so anxious to modify people's behavior, it is incumbent upon us to lead by example, especially in these days when public opinion polls show a declining confidence by the people in their Government and those who run it.

A recent disturbing example of this double standard is the case of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. In the past, Justice Douglas has fairly earned the admiration of civil libertarians who would see the Government shackles removed from as many personal freedoms as possible. The Justice has prided himself on his record of defense of such basic constitutional rights as freedom of the press.

How hypocritical of him it was, then, to refuse to have his public remarks taped during a recent appearance in my congressional district. Justice Douglas, by banning this legitimate form of news coverage, has done more violence to the civil liberties of those newsmen than he has effected during decades of opinion-writing on the bench. He has seriously damaged his own credibility and may have undermined the integrity of the Supreme Court.

I enclose at this point in the RECORD, a resolution unanimously passed by the Wisconsin Broadcasters' Association, condemning Justice Douglas' ban on taping of his remarks. It is a worthwhile reminder to all of us of the public trust to which we have been elected.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Honorable William O. Douglas, Justice of the United States Supreme Court, did prohibit all taping and filming, by broadcast news representatives, of his public address delivered at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville on January 23, 1974, and

Whereas, Justice Douglas further stated in a local radio news interview with a member of the news staff of Radio Station WSWW, Platteville, Wisconsin, that he banned the taping and filming of his speech because, in the words of Justice Douglas, "The people who have the tapes are not very ethical . . .", implying that broadcast news representatives in the past have deliberately taken his remarks out of context, and

Whereas, the aforementioned reasons given for the ban by Justice Douglas tend to impugn the integrity and professional ethics practiced by the vast majority of broadcast journalists, and

Whereas, such an unwarranted indictment of responsible broadcast news persons by so distinguished a national personage as a Justice of the United States Supreme Court may tend to discredit all news media representatives, in the minds of the listening and viewing public, and

Whereas, the banning of any legitimate form of news coverage of a public official at an open meeting held on the campus of a public, tax-supported university constitutes a blatant violation of First Amendment guarantees—with the imposition of restrictions on the public's right to know,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Wisconsin Broadcasters' Association, assembled in annual mid-winter session at Madison, Wisconsin, this February 12, 1974, be officially recorded as opposed to the banning of tape and film coverage of the public address by Supreme Court Justice Douglas at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville on January 23, 1974, on the grounds that such prohibition is not only unconstitutional, but also discriminates against one segment of the news media, in that broadcast news personnel were denied the right to utilize the technology of their profession to gather information essential to the presentation of such a broadcast news account.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this Resolution be sent to Justice Douglas; to the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court; to each of the other Justices of the United States Supreme Court; to the President of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. John Weaver; to Frank Pellsek, president, and members of the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents; to each member of the Wisconsin Congressional Delegation; and to the principal representatives of the National Association of Broadcasters; to the Radio-Television News Association; Northwest Broadcast News Association; the Associated Press; United Press International; ABC News; CBS News; Mutual News; NBC News; Public Broadcast Corporation; and the Mutual Black News Network.

Motion proposed by WBA Past President Robert Bodden, President-General Manager, WSWW, Platteville, Wisconsin. Unanimously approved at the business meeting of the Wisconsin Broadcasters' Association, February 12, 1974.

PERSONAL FINANCES

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for publication the following personal financial information of Mrs. Eshleman and myself:

Total worth	
Bank accounts (time and demand) -	\$14,000
Retirement equity -	21,000
Old books and coins -	8,000
Automobiles, two -	5,000
Life insurance (cash value) -	7,000
Home real estate -	60,000
Personal property -	20,000
Stock holdings (Armstrong, Delaware Fund, Duquesne Light, Fulton Bank) -	50,000
Total -	185,000

The above includes the inheritance from my father. (No outstanding liabilities.)

1973 Federal income tax summary

Adjusted gross income -	\$47,152.60
Tax paid -	11,127.50
Total deductions -	7,153.00

This amount includes a total contribution to church and charity of \$4,025 which, in turn, includes the untaxable portion of my State retirement.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR HIGH FOOD PRICES?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the March issue of *Successful Farming* contained an editorial which I wish every adult in America could read. It is one of the best expositions of the reasons for high food prices that I have ever read and to share it with my colleagues, I ask your permission to include it in the RECORD:

EDITORIAL VIEWPOINT

(Here is a story that, until now, no one in agriculture has had the backbone to write. It is written by Fred Bailey, Jr., *Successful Farming's* Washington correspondent, and bears reading closely . . . and pondering. If anyone cares to respond, we are always glad to give space to responsible viewpoints.—The Editors.)

As you read this, a lot of people are getting set to spend a lot of money to tell the consumers of this country—as though they hadn't heard it over and over again like a broken record—what a great buy food is. The argument has mainly been that "you can afford it, so quit griping!" This has been the traditional party line of the entire food industry and as farmers we've faithfully followed it like a hound behind a jackrabbit. In the opinion of this writer, it's high time we began leveling with consumers and telling them we couldn't agree with them more: Food prices are too high. Because they are.

Who's responsible. And in the same breath we ought to tell them *why* food prices are too high, so if they want to yell at someone they'll know who to yell at—namely those segments of our food system that are really responsible for soaring grocery costs: Labor unions whose featherbedding and excessive wage demands have been a major factor in higher-cost food; a rail system that is often just slightly more efficient than a mule train; a maze of ridiculous laws and regulations by state and local governments; an almost total lack of uniformity in grades and standards; and a long list of other obstacles which stand in the way of consumers getting more for their food dollars.

As the most efficient sector of our food system (and the most efficient sector of the entire U.S. economy, for that matter), we've been apologists for shortcomings in the rest of the system for much too long. And with

each new bump in the cost of living curve, these shortcomings become that much more difficult to apologize for, that much harder to justify with silly statistics. The fact is, we have nothing to apologize for, nothing that needs to be justified. Agriculture's accomplishments are a matter of record and most consumers are aware of them.

Time to be honest. Yet we continue to be a party to the big lie that everything's just dandy at the checkout counter. The longer we participate in this deception, the more we risk incurring the distrust and hostility of our best friends: The American consumers who enjoy and pay for the things we produce.

The time has thus arrived to assert that we don't like overpriced food one bit more than they do. After all, we have to buy back most of our groceries at the same inflated prices they have to pay. But it's not just that. Much more worrisome is the fact that when consumers finally tire of being gouged at the grocery store, they'll start buying fewer groceries.

So first thing we need to do is stop parroting the party line about how cheap food is. Our customers know better. Instead, we need to lay out the kind of hard facts a National Commission on Productivity came up with, but in some cases decided not to talk about, when it took a close look at productivity in the food industry. The report of the Commission clearly points a finger at causes of higher food prices. From this and other sources, consider the following:

Of the roughly \$750 the average American will spend for food at and away from home this year, farmers will get only about \$300. Fully half of the remainder—about \$225—will go to pay the tab for labor. During the past 10 years, labor costs in the food industry have soared a staggering 80%, four times faster than productivity.

Or let them look at specifics: Substantial money could be saved by butchering meat into retail cuts at a packing plant but local butchers' unions won't allow it. Costs could be cut if bread and milk could be stacked on the grocery shelf by store clerks instead of by highly paid delivery truck drivers. Fish would be cheaper if they didn't have to be caught in boats built in union boatyards. And supermarket expenses could be reduced if retail clerks weren't so obstinately opposed to automated checkout counters.

Much of our rail transportation makes molasses seem speedy. It takes half again longer, and in some cases twice as long, to move perishable food from the West to the East Coast as it did 20 years ago. Instead of more refrigerated cars to haul food, the railroads today own less than one-third as many as in 1968. At any given time, an average of nearly 90% of the railroad cars in the U.S. are standing still, empty. One result: More food must be carried by trucks, driven by drivers who may earn \$25,000 annually.

One more fact for meditation: Mainly because of anti-backhaul laws, up to 40% of the trucks on the road run without a load. Cost: \$250 million.

A simple item like an orange is handled 17 separate times from tree to table. Apples are packed in containers of 40 different sizes and shapes, none of which fit a standard grocery shipping pallet. The 8,000 most common items in a food warehouse are packaged in 2,650 different sizes, reducing automated handling.

Federal, state and local regulations add unnecessarily millions of dollars to the cost of food. A single change by a single state in the ingredients required to be listed on sausage labels added \$75,000 a year to consumer costs. Absurdly confusing packaging and inspection requirements further boost grocery prices.

This is by no means a complete list. It is barely a beginning. But it's at least a sample of the sort of things someone should be telling consumers about who is really respon-

sible for the exorbitant cost of food. Let's stop trying to kid our customers.

RUSSIAN CARS AND ADDITIONAL U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people have become so conditioned to accept change that many times it seems they cannot be shocked into any reaction. But the proposed sale of Soviet automobiles to the American market may stimulate public reaction.

American industrialists, using American capital and know-how, are building the world's largest truck factory in the Soviet Union on the Kama River. It seems unlikely that Soviet technology can offer the American consumer an automobile competitive in engineering standards and efficiency with the U.S. and foreign makes now available. It also does not seem likely that there are enough Communists in the United States who would buy Russian hardware out of ideological loyalty to deliver windfall profits to Russian workers.

Some American workers may wonder who gave the Soviets this invitation to compete in our marketplace against U.S. wage scales and our free enterprise economy. Perhaps our chiefs of state feel it is necessary to aid the Russians in improving their balance of payments to offset all that wheat that they generously took off our hands. Admission of the Soviets to our marketplace may be one of the price tags of the historic East-West détente.

Americans have always seen something good in "free" trade—new competition, new jobs, and new sources of credit. After all, if the cheaper and less sophisticated Russian cars prove too successful, we could always follow the pattern set by our friends in other nations—including the Soviet Union—and simply nationalize their holdings and investments in our country.

I insert a related news clipping:

THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING—MAYBE

(By Charles Yarbrough)

Confirming rumors of the last year or so, a recent dispatch from Dow-Jones says the Russians are indeed thinking of putting one of their subcompacts into the American market.

The story says the Soviets will take about six months to decide "after taking into consideration such problems as U.S. tariffs, safety and emission standards."

Covering that course in a mere half a year would be an achievement itself.

Even United States auto builders are still bewildered.

What the Russians are being called upon to consider—and anticipate—are such governmental dictates as the environmental plumbing system and what's coming (or disappearing); interlock ignition systems; airbags-or-something-better; bumper standards and how to make fuel out of wheat.

Most likely Russian automotive candidate for the U.S. market appears to be the Lada, which Dow Jones compared loosely with the Fiat 124.

It could be expected that performance figures for the trim little car as it is currently operating in Russia will be deflated when American gadgetry is applied.

Examples: Claims of 27.7 miles per gallon and a top speed of 87 miles an hour.

The Lada has a four-cylinder, in-line engine with 73.1 cubic inches and 65 horsepower; a five-bearing crankshaft and overhead cam; a two-barrel Weber carburetor. Four-speed transmission is manual.

Its dry weight of 1,962 pounds is on a 95-inch wheel base.

It comes, at least in the Russian version, only as a saloon-sedan four-door for five passengers; bucket seats in front. Price was not available at this writing.

Were it not for U.S. standards—toughest in the world—this country could be deluged with imports most motorists here have never seen, including more from Russia. Almost comparable are the Zaz 968, the Moskvich and the Volga.

(A contrast would be the Zil 114 limousine of 7,000 pounds and eight cylinders and a top speed of 118 miles an hour).

Rough comparisons could be made of the Lada and the British Ford Cortina 1300; the French Citroen GS Berline and the Peugeot 204, plus a half dozen small cars from the Japanese.

No comparison at all could be made with the Ford Pinto, Chevrolet Vega, AMC Gremlin.

Nearest thing to a comparison even in names, diligent auto historians might be able to ferret out, might be "Lad's Car," a juvenile "auto" for two small passengers, which was produced in kit form at Niagara Falls, N.Y., from 1912 to 1914.

Or, the "Lady," a 2½ horsepower creation which flitted into history from Coventry, England, in 1899.

Its distinction, other than brevity, was a two-seater body.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11500, the bill to blast surface coal mining, provides that the mine operator must provide advance notice of blasting. That is a sound idea. However, as in most of the rest of this bill, the whole thing runs backward.

The operator would have to provide advance written notice to local governments "and residents who would be affected." That puts the burden on the operator to determine who would be affected, and then, presumably, make sure that each person gets a registered letter.

The bill sheds no light on how to find out who would be affected. Does he survey people for miles around, asking, "Do sudden noises make you jumpy?" If he misses one person on the mailing list, is he violating the law?

It would be logical to allow the operator to run a public notice in a local newspaper of general circulation. But H.R. 11500 was written by environmentalists to stop strip mining, not to regulate it. It is not a logical bill, it is a punitive measure. It is as illogical as starting a banana farm on Pike's Peak.

THE ALL-AMERICAN ROUTE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to understand the continued indecision of the Nixon administration over the feasibility of an "All-American" transportation system for Alaskan natural gas versus a pipeline through Canada.

Surely, we should have learned by now that our energy needs are something which are of concern to us alone and on which, when crunches come, we can depend little on others, including those who profess to be our "good allies."

Still, despite these recent lessons, the White House, according to the United Press International, goes on "considering" a new Canadian route for Alaskan gas and talking note of that country's proposal for our participation in the \$6 billion MacKenzie Valley pipeline.

As for me, I favor the all-American project being urged by the El Paso Natural Gas Co., and others, even though, on the surface, it appears to the benefit of the west coast markets. This route would move the gas by pipeline across Alaska and then bring it down to the mainland by tanker fleet. Present west coast supplies then would be freed to the rest of the country.

The issue, it seems to me, is the one which the President keeps stating—that of making this Nation self-sufficient in the energy field and independent of others. How this could be accomplished by participating in a Canadian pipeline project for the transmission of Alaskan gas through Canada is beyond my powers to understand.

Should we trust Canada? Perhaps, at one time, the question would have brought an affirmative reply from most people in this country. But times certainly have changed and Canadian-United States relationships have changed with them. In the current oil crisis, Canada has played its position as a U.S. supplier to its own profits gain and advantage.

I cite the message given our energy officials by Donald MacDonald, Canada's energy minister, in his recent trip to this city. A report by Robert D. Bott, as published in the Pittsburgh Press of February 3, said:

Two conclusions emerged from MacDonald's 5-hour meeting with William E. Simon, head of the Federal Energy Office. Canada will not lower its oil export tax unless international market prices come down and it will not enter into a continental energy sharing with the United States.

Mr. Bott added, in his dispatch, that Canada will continue to charge us the inflated international oil price "indefinitely" and that Mr. MacDonald flatly rejected the argument of Mr. Simon that we should get a lower price as a "good trading partner." In other words, the United States-Canadian "partnership" has gone the way of so many other of our vaunted alliances with the chips down and Uncle Sam in the middle.

Canada, of course, has a right to charge us any amount we are willing to pay for her oil and gas. There is nothing we can do about such a decision except to examine our business relationships in other fields and make any adjustments which might be advisable under the altered circumstances. But most important, this Canadian stand must be accepted as notice enough that Canada cannot be counted upon any more than an Arab shiekdom in a time of an U.S. energy crisis.

For this reason alone, the decision should be made in favor of the all-American pipeline route through Alaska and they by tanker to our west coast ports. We know now that we cannot depend, with the totality which our energy needs demand, on a transportation system running across Canadian soil, and thus subject to Canadian regulation and control.

PROTESTING THE REMOVAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that last year the United States and Canada received visits from Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty of Hungary although his visit to the United States, unfortunately, covered only several days. It was anticipated that the cardinal would visit Washington, but last-minute plans ruled this possibility out also. It is my understanding that the cardinal will again visit the United States this year and that his visit will be for a longer period of time.

On February 5, 1974, the cardinal was removed from his jurisdiction as Archbishop Esztergom in Hungary and as the spiritual leader of Hungarian Catholics. This action caused protests from many sources as the cardinal has become a symbol of freedom among freedom-loving peoples all over the world.

The Washington representative of the Government of the Commonwealth of Poland-in-Exile, the direct successor to the London Polish exile government during World War II, was numbered among those protesting in a letter to the Pope emphasizing the freedom-loving spirit of the peoples of east-central Europe and the absence of religious freedom.

I insert at this point the above-mentioned letter from Ambassador Ostoja-Starzewski:

FEBRUARY 14, 1974.

His Holiness, POPE PAUL VI,
Vatican City, Vatican.

YOUR HOLINESS: We urge Your Holiness most respectfully to reconsider the order for the retirement of Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop of Esztergom and Primate of Hungary.

It is our opinion that the Holy Roman Catholic Church should not compromise with the Communist usurpers in Hungary, or with the Red Czars in the Soviet Union and the usurping Communist regimes in East Central Europe which region has been enslaved by Russian imperialism.

Poles, Hungarians, Czechoslovaks and other East Central Europe who are Christians will never accept the Communist usurpation of power in their countries no matter how many Western Heads of State are trying to whitewash Soviet Russian policy and their crimes committed against persons and humanity in East Central Europe and the Soviet Union.

We consider it as our sacred duty to free our countries from Communist killers, by force if necessary.

It is only a matter of time that our children will follow the path of our ancestors who have written our history with their blood, fighting the Russian and Soviet imperialists trying to take over Europe.

The hands of the bestially murdered people from the forest of Katyn, the graves of Vinica, Budapest, the Baltic countries, Yugoslavia and East Germany point accusingly to Moscow and demand justice.

The Free World paid a heavy price fighting the usurpation of power by Adolf Hitler and after World War II the West successfully demanded trials against those people who had committed crimes against humanity by killing innocent people and torturing them in jails and concentration camps.

We do not believe that anybody of the world has the right to force us to accept a theory of coexistence with the Red killers, that they should be accepted as full members of world society and that the bestial crimes against humanity should remain unpunished.

Nothing in the world is so important as to justify such a compromise, neither the artificial detente policy nor the creation of so-called peace.

Please accept this letter personally also as coming from a man whose whole family has been erased by the dictators of the Third Reich and the Soviet Russia.

With the expression of our highest regards, we are,

Respectfully yours,

ALEX OSTOJA-STARZEWSKI,

Ambassador and Special Adviser to the President of the Commonwealth of Poland-in-Exile.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME TO HOLD HEARING ON THE BUREAUCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1973, H.R. 6223, H.R. 6224, AND H.R. 6667

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Judiciary Committee has scheduled a hearing on the Bureaucratic Accountability Act of 1973, H.R. 6223, H.R. 6224, and H.R. 6667. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, March 27, 1974, at 10 a.m. in 2141 Rayburn House Office Building.

This legislation was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, PETER W. RODINO, JR., and Representative RONALD V. DELLUMS. It would amend the administrative procedure provisions of title 5 of the United States Code to make rulemaking provisions applicable to matters relating to public property, loans, grants, benefits, and contracts. Further, it would provide for payment of expenses incurred in connection with proceedings before agencies; waiver of sovereign im-

munity; the enforcement of standards in grant programs; and other purposes.

Witnesses scheduled to testify on the bureaucratic accountability bill are Representative RONALD V. DELLUMS, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Antonin Scalia, chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, and the Department of Justice.

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

NIXON'S CHINA INITIATIVE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there have been dramatic shifts in American foreign policy in recent years. These have included the rhetoric of "detente" which has led to such unilateral concessions as those implicit in the SALT agreements and the wheat deal and the change in our relationship with the Communist Chinese Government in Peking.

Many Americans have hailed our altered policies toward the Soviet Union and Communist China as an important "breakthrough" in American diplomacy. All of us hope that this is true. Many of us, however, fear that it is not, and that it is now time to ask the very serious questions which too many Americans tended to overlook at the time of the dramatic policy changes.

The whole question of our altered relationship with Communist China is placed in perspective by Prof. James Dornan of the Catholic University of America in an article appearing in the February, 1974 issue of *The Alternative*.

Professor Dornan notes that:

There has been . . . virtually no cogent examination of the political assumptions and purposes of the Nixon-Kissinger grand design for the reorientation of American foreign policy, or of the place of the Peking initiative in that design. Such analysis as has appeared . . . has consisted principally of superficial remarks about an allegedly emerging 'tripolarity,' with little attempt either to define the political, military and economic conditions under which true tripolarity could occur, or to demonstrate that such a state of affairs is or should be the primary objective of American foreign policy.

Discussing what appears to be a growing euphoria in Washington concerning our relationship with Peking, Professor Dornan writes that:

The danger is obviously real that the Administration will allow its fascination with certain features of the new China relationship to obscure our differences with Peking over the future course of Asian and for that matter global international politics. Moreover, prudence alone would dictate that the possibility of a Moscow-Peking rapprochement, particularly in the post-Mao leadership era, not be totally discounted; any attempt to use Peking as a permanent make-weight in the balance of power on the American side . . . could prove to be dangerous in the extreme.

Professor Dornan also discusses the alleged "detente" with the Soviet Union. He points out that—

The unchecked build-up of Soviet strategic and conventional military power, the continued attempts by the Soviets to project political influence in the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America, the uncompromising position the USSR has assumed in the various East-West negotiations now in progress all constitute challenges to Administration logic. . . .

The Communists, both in Moscow and Peking, appear to be as committed to their traditional goal of world domination as ever before. The brutal repression within both the Soviet and Communist Chinese societies continues, as the renewed cultural revolution and the Solzhenitsyn case so clearly indicate. The only change appears to be in our own policy, and it is something which we should carefully rethink at this time.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article, "Nixon's China Initiative," by Prof. James Dornan as it appeared in the February 1974 issue of *The Alternative* and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

NIXON'S CHINA INITIATIVE

(By James Dornan)

"The biggest story I have ever covered," Joseph Alsop wrote with characteristic hyperbole: indeed, although nearly two years have elapsed since the event, it remains plausible to assert that the President's visit to Peking ranks among the most brilliantly-staged foreign policy operations of the postwar period. Few such events have attracted the support and aroused the enthusiasm of such a wide spectrum of professional opinion; fewer still have so promiscuously stimulated the imagination of the American populace.

To be sure, what has often been called "the mystique of the East" has long had a singular impact upon the American—not to say the western—political mind. The sheer vastness of the Orient, with its countless millions of people, its unfathomably nonwestern values, its ancient and proud yet curiously primitive civilizations, has fascinated westerners for centuries. China in particular has been the focus of American attention since the late eighteenth century, in considerable measure for economic reasons.

Beyond such underlying factors, several additional circumstances helped create a climate of opinion favorable to the President's initiative. The sheer audacity of the undertaking itself was obviously crucial. The sudden turnabout of relations with a nation toward which the United States had been unremittingly antagonistic for more than two decades was striking in itself; that it was accomplished through super-secret diplomacy followed by a week-long presidential sojourn in a land never before visited by a ranking American elected official was truly astonishing.

The media obviously had an enormous impact as well. Every public moment of the trip, appropriately embellished by rhapsodic commentary, was beamed home to enthralled television audiences. Respected reporters such as Alsop and W. H. Hornby of the *Denver Post*, not to mention members of the congressional delegations which quickly followed the President across the Pacific, were lavish in their praise of the "New China." Alsop was writing for most of them when he enthused that "everything in China has changed, in truth, except the endlessly resilient, hardworking and clever Chinese people. The quality of life has changed, vastly for the worse for the ancient ruling class but for the better for everyone else . . . The right way to see the New China, in truth, is to

forget the Communist label and to consider the revolution as a specifically Chinese event"; he went so far as to suggest that "the period of harshness, of dogmatism, of extreme heavy-handedness" in the Communist rule over China is drawing to a close. Steffens and the Shaws went only a little further in their praise of the Soviet system after their visits during the 1920s and 1930s. (See Alsop, "In China, Everything is Changing" and "Conclusions After a Visit to China," December 16, 1972, and January 15, 1973, *Boston Globe*. For Hornby's articles, see *Congressional Record*, January 29, 1973, pp. S1474-82. Alan Reynolds has written an excellent critique of these and similar analyses of the "New China"; see "A Reader's Guide to the Visitors' Reports," *National Review*, March 3, 1972.)

Finally, general public discontent with recent American foreign policy was a significant factor. The deepening war-weariness of the American population, a reaction both against Vietnam and against the seemingly endless Cold War, had molded a ready constituency for policies of conciliation with our postwar adversaries. Long before the specifics of his new foreign policy became known, Nixon's promise of "an era of negotiation, not confrontation" had struck a responsive popular cord.

That the average American found the China trip of compelling interest, and in the main viewed it favorably, is therefore not surprising. But there was a broad spectrum of American intellectual opinion equally receptive to the new policy. Few of the nation's so-called Sinologists, for example, had accepted the analysis of Chinese aims which culminated in the extension of the containment policy to Asia; virtually all rejected the thesis that China was the principal enemy in Vietnam, as the Johnson Administration had so often argued. Hence, most of the "old China hands" greeted the Nixon visit with unrestrained enthusiasm.

Moreover, by the time the Nixon-Kissinger team assumed office a consensus was rapidly forming among opinion leaders around the "limitationist" position concerning the goals and activities appropriate for American foreign policy in the seventies. That consensus attracted many conservatives as well as liberals, although for fundamentally quite different reasons. Both camps agreed that the United States was "overextended" in its international commitments and hence needed to scale down considerably its operations and activities abroad. Orthodox liberals apparently believed as well that a reduced international role for the United States and a concentration upon domestic reform would enable America to better fulfill her historic mission of propagating American ideals; in this view, moral example rather than military force was to be the means for changing the world. (For a discussion of this point, see author's "The Search for Purpose in American Foreign Policy," *Intercollegiate Review*, Winter 1970-71.) Many conservatives, on the other hand, were persuaded that the Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy bespoke a new "realism" in American diplomacy. Nixon's policy, it was argued, represented the abandonment of the crusading internationalism of Woodrow Wilson and his liberal successors, and the adoption in its stead of the "national interest" as the standard guiding our international behavior. Kissinger's theory of international politics, as articulated in the hard-headed logic of *A World Restored* and *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*, was believed to rest on precisely such a foundation; more disquieting features of his approach, particularly as revealed in the position papers which he wrote for Nelson Rockefeller during the 1968 pre-convention campaign, went unnoticed.

Thus many conservatives expected that Nixon's China policy would attempt to exploit the Sino-Soviet dispute in order to

improve America's position in the global conflict with the USSR. Barry Goldwater, on the other hand, in his first full comment on the China initiative, urged conservatives to accept the fact that "this is not 1960; it is 1972, and the world situation which we now confront is an entirely new ball game." "I am satisfied that we have not given away one single thing to the Red Chinese," he stated, and he asked that "all Americans join in supporting the President of the United States in his efforts to establish world peace in the most direct and effective way possible." Some on the Right—William Buckley most prominently—were far more dubious; but even these commentators did little more than denounce the euphoria and the atmospherics which accompanied the Nixon trip. Buckley himself was largely content to reiterate his moral objections to the Peking regime.

There has been, in sum, virtually no cogent examination of the political assumptions and purposes of the Nixon-Kissinger grand design for the reorientation of American foreign policy, or of the place of the Peking initiative in that design. Such analysis as has appeared in the press and professional literature has consisted principally of superficial remarks about an allegedly-emerging "tripolarity," with little attempt either to define the political, military, and economic conditions under which true tripolarity could occur, or to demonstrate that such a state of affairs is or should be the primary objective of American foreign policy. But that aside, virtually all commentators have missed the real point: the China gambit, electrifying though it may have been an international theater, and whatever its long-run importance, was actually only a sideshow in what Nixon clearly regards as the principal scenario of his foreign policy, the effort to establish an effective détente with the Soviet Union.

Those who attribute to Henry Kissinger the paramount role in the formulation of the Nixon Administration's foreign policy should reread the now-famous article, "Asia after Vietnam," written by Nixon himself for *Foreign Affairs* in October 1967. Although principally concerned with recommendations for America's post-Vietnam Asian policy, the article adumbrates in more-or-less complete form most of the themes of what was later to be called the "Nixon Doctrine," and lays the foundation for the unusually coherent global strategy articulated by the Nixon Administration after it assumed office. (Kissinger's thinking had been developing along lines remarkably parallel to Nixon's, especially between 1965 and 1968; see the analysis in Stephen R. Graubard's *Kissinger: Portrait of a Mind*, pp. 223-69.) In general, that strategy rests on the belief that virtually all of the forces and factors which determined the structure of world politics during the first two postwar decades have changed.

The principal changes are said to be six in number. Japan and the nations of Western Europe, the latter gradually drawing closer together economically and politically, have recovered from the ravages of World War II, and are capable once again of assuming major roles in the world political system. The new nations of Africa and Asia have substantially matured since the early post-independence period; they now appear able to resist external aggression and to hold their own in relations with the bigger powers. The one-time communist monolith has been shattered, replaced by a loosely organized bloc whose members quarrel as often as they cooperate. U.S. military preeminence has given way to a condition of strategic parity between the USSR and the United States, substantially reducing American freedom of maneuver in crisis situations. The old "isms"—the once-vibrant ideologies which for twenty years animated the foreign policies of the great powers—have lost their vitality, and

more traditional goals such as security and economic progress have become the primary concerns of the superpowers. Finally—most important of all in the Nixon view—United States foreign policy is now inhibited by serious internal constraints. Our citizens' "psychological resources" have been exhausted and their "moral strength" has been undermined; the nation's ability to play a major role in world politics is thus severely diminished. (For a characteristic discussion of these points, see *U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's: A New Strategy for Peace* [February 18, 1970 pp. 1-3] and *U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's: Shaping a Durable Peace* [May 3, 1973, pp. 1-9], Reports to the Congress by Richard M. Nixon.)

The American response to these transformations in international politics, according to the Administration, must be commensurately far-reaching. First, our foreign policy objectives and interests must be restructured. The universalization of American principles and values can no longer constitute an important purpose of American policy; the day is past when we can look forward confidently to a democratic world emerging under American auspices and leadership. "Two centuries ago," Nixon wrote in his 1971 Annual Report, "our mission was to be a unique exemplar of free government. Two decades ago it was to take up worldwide burdens of securing the common defense, economic recovery, and political stability. Today we must work with other nations to build an enduring structure of peace." Stability and order, not the "expansion of the domain of freedom," must become the goals of our foreign policy. (For a more complete analysis of the main themes of the Nixon Administration's foreign policy, see the author's "The Nixon Doctrine, Strategy, and Tripolarity," available from the Intercollegiate Studies Institute.)

Not only must American expectations be scaled down, but our role in world politics must be substantially diminished as well. The day is past when global security can depend solely on American power or American will. But since other nations are now capable of doing more for themselves, this need not mean a rising level of insecurity around the world. It is only necessary that our determination to reduce our efforts be clearly understood, so that others will realize that they must assume responsibility for their own defense.

The effort to call forth a greater effort by others in maintaining their own—and world—security has constituted one of the Administration's major purposes from the outset. The Nixon Doctrine in its original formulation, while reiterating America's commitment to aid both those nations which we consider vital to our security and others which are threatened by nuclear attack, was in considerable measure a hortatory device aimed at erstwhile friends and allies; the new distance which we have introduced into our relations with Europe and Japan, best symbolized by the "shocks" administered to the latter in 1971, appears similarly motivated. In the future, Nixon has announced, "our interests must shape our commitments, rather than the other way around." Kissinger has made it even more clear that far-reaching changes in the structure of American alliances may be in the offing: "If the only argument for American military participation in an area," he has said, "is the fact that the United States happens to have made a treaty some fifteen years ago, that would be a very precarious position for that area and for us. . . . So there has to be a periodic review of our commitments and there has to be a very systematic attempt to define our interests." (*Background Briefing [United States Foreign Policy]*, June 26, 1970, mimeo.) This statement, made to the press in mid-1970, deserved far more attention than it received.

It is thus clearly the Administration's view that other nations should no longer rely upon their alliances with the United States as the sole or even the primary instrument of their security. At the same time, the United States has arrived at a new definition of its primary interests and a new estimate of the means appropriate to safeguard them. Those interests concern especially the emerging new relationship with the USSR. Kissinger has believed at least since 1968 that the Soviet Union—and for that matter the CPR—is no longer a revolutionary power, although still anxious for a large role in world politics. Nixon, in turn, has made it plain that we fully recognize the right of the USSR to great power status, with the appropriate territorial and other prerequisites; indeed, even the "natural expansion of Soviet influence in the world" will not arouse American hostility unless the Soviets seek "exclusive or predominant positions" in areas where the United States retains vestigial interests.

Nixon and Kissinger manifestly hope that already-tempered Soviet designs can be further modified by American acceptance of the USSR's recently acquired global status and by American policies aimed at cooperation and interdependence. The Soviets have doubtless already taken note of the scaling down of American purposes represented by the Nixon Doctrine itself; in addition, the Administration has explicitly renounced any American interest in altering the domestic political order of the Soviet Union, both by public statements to that effect and more recently by its vigorous opposition to the Mills-Vanik legislation aimed at forcing a liberalization of Soviet emigration policies. Beyond that, Nixon and Kissinger have sought to create a "momentum toward progress" in our relations with the Soviets by means of negotiations on a broad range of issues; the economic arrangements discussed at the Moscow and Washington summits in particular, they believe, have established "an interdependence between our economies which provides a continuing incentive to maintain a constructive relationship."

It is only in the context of their convictions about the future of the Soviet-American relationship, therefore, that many otherwise inexplicable features of the Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy can be understood. If our conflict with the Soviets has been mitigated by events—especially by a change in Soviet ambitions—and can be expected to further diminish in the future, then America's fundamental security position is markedly improved. Not only is the danger of a military confrontation with the USSR reduced, but the need to "contain communism" through a vast complex of alliance systems is largely eliminated. Similarly affected is the whole range of American political interests abroad. In the past these interests have been in no small measure determined by the exigencies, real or perceived, of the Soviet-American conflict. With that conflict abated, they will of necessity be reduced in number and importance; so too will the need for military power and political influence to protect them. Herein may lie the explanation for the Administration's apparent lack of concern over both the relative decline of American military power and the political significance of that decline. In the Nixon-Kissinger design, our security in the future will be guaranteed above all through the new association with the USSR. To be sure, we must avoid an overly abrupt break with the patterns of the past to avoid upsetting the always-delicate equilibrium of the international system. We must also maintain strength sufficient to convince the Soviets that there is no alternative to détente and to deter direct threats to our physical survival from whatever source. Such considerations as these explain the Administration's vigorous support for the Trident

and the B-1 weapons programs. It cannot be too strongly emphasized, however, that the purposes of Nixon's defense program are quite limited, a point grasped by neither his opponents nor his supporters in Congress; indeed, his annual calls for an "American military capability second to none" represent mostly a bone tossed to the defense conservatives there and elsewhere.

II

Doubtless because of the peculiar difficulties and delicate negotiations involved in establishing relations with the CPR, the Administration has been considerably more reticent in articulating its expectations for the Chinese relationship than it has for that with the USSR. Nixon has stated that he undertook initial steps to establish contacts with the Peking regime shortly after assuming office, implementing a design he had first set forth in the 1967 *Foreign Affairs* article. Rumors of new tensions in the Sino-Soviet relationship and of possible Soviet intent to launch a preemptive attack on Chinese nuclear installations may have influenced the pace of his actions as well. (Alsop has asserted that the Soviets informally sought tacit American support for such an attack early in 1969, and John Newhouse alleges that the USSR during the SALT talks in 1970 proposed a plan for joint retaliatory action against China in the event of a nuclear war initiated by Peking against the USSR or the United States. See Alsop, "Thoughts Out of China, I: Go Versus No-go," *New York Times Magazine*, March 11, 1973, and Newhouse, *Cold Dawn: The Story of SALT*, pp. 188-89.) But beyond the now-repetitious salutes of the Chinese as a "great and vital people" without whose cooperation "no stable and enduring international order is conceivable" plus occasional references to China's future economic and military potential, he and Kissinger have said little concerning the assumptions and purposes of the new China policy. The contrast with the excesses which have often characterized Administration rhetoric on the future of U.S.-Soviet relations is striking. (Compare the section of the 1973 State of the World message dealing with the CPR with that discussing relations with the USSR; 1973 *Annual Report*, pp. 16-25 and 26-39.) If the hopes and expectations of the American people have been overly aroused by the China visit—and it is by no means certain that such is the case—blame must be placed primarily on the media and not on the President.

In any event, while the Administration's restraint in discussing its China policy complicates the task of analysis, its general purposes are quite clear. No "grand alliance" between the United States and the CPR against the Soviets is intended, nor is any effort to be made to use the Chinese connection to alter a military and political balance of power which is rapidly worsening from the American standpoint. Neither is an improvement in Sino-American relations being sought by the Administration as an end in itself. (It has been suggested that the pro-Pakistan "tilt" of American policy during that nation's war with India was designed to earn plaudits from Pakistan's principal ally as well as to repay Pakistan from her aid in opening Washington-Peking communications. But the Administration, it should be noted, perhaps not without disingenuousness has defended its pro-Pakistan policy as an effort to forestall total domination of the subcontinent by an Indian regime increasingly disposed to act as Russia's agent. See the 1972 *Annual Report*, pp. 141-52). The principal purpose of the Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy is the achievement of a permanent improvement in relations with the USSR, and the opening to Peking must be understood primarily in terms of its contribution to that

end. The Administration believes that Moscow's fear of China's military potential and territorial irredentism will further strengthen the Soviet interest in a détente with the United States. While the role of China in world politics is not without significance for the Administration, Nixon and Kissinger continue to view the world in bipolar terms; the "age of tripolarity," if it is to come at all, is in their view still some time in the future.

To be sure, it is doubtless true that there exist significant ancillary motives behind the Administration's Asian policy as well. There has been widespread speculation, for example, that the Administration hoped to obtain Peking's support for a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam war. There is little firm evidence on this issue, however, and it may be that most commentators have in any event missed the central point. Nixon certainly was convinced even before the onset of his administration that the American public would not support a foreign policy which did not result in an American military departure from Southeast Asia. At the same time, he repeatedly expressed concern about the possible impact of an overly precipitous withdrawal upon Soviet perceptions of our will and constancy.

The China policy thus served his purposes nicely. It made possible a withdrawal from Vietnam under terms which earlier Nixon had considered unsatisfactory, but which placated the American public to the greatest extent feasible without doing severe damage to America's global position. Since it had often been officially stated that the containment of China was one of the foremost reasons for our involvement in Vietnam, once Chinese hostility had at least somewhat abated it was not as important to American credibility abroad that we stand firm in Indochina. On the domestic scene, the key factor was popular ambivalence: a majority of Americans appeared to desire an end to the U.S. presence in Southeast Asia, but also were plainly apprehensive about expanding communist influence in Asia and elsewhere. The public thus might be largely satisfied with a political settlement which, though far from perfect, did not seem likely to set in motion a general communist advance throughout the Orient. Détente with China would reduce fears that the latter might be the result of a "compromise" in Vietnam. In any case, there can be no doubt that the China policy had important political roots, related to the 1972 campaign as well as to the broader purpose of attracting popular support for the Administration's foreign policy generally.

Over the longer term, Nixon may hope that China's own objectives will serve to check North Vietnam's more extended ambitions. From the perspective of overall policy priorities, however, his views on the importance of Southeast Asia to the United States have been unclear for some time. As many commentators have observed, the Nixon Doctrine is notably vague as to precisely what "interests" are sufficiently vital to justify American intervention in Third World conflicts under the perceived changed conditions of world politics. Given the new relationship with Peking, not to mention present public aversion to interventionist policies, Nixon appears to have concluded that Vietnam is of substantially less significance for American purposes than was the case earlier, and so was willing to accept a negotiated settlement whose terms made the ultimate survival of a noncommunist government in Saigon doubtful.

Considered even within Nixon's own perspective, of course, the China policy has incurred substantial costs. The loss of "face" for the United States implicit in the spectacle of an American president appearing as a supplicant in the court of the new Chinese mandarins had an immediate impact throughout Asia; indeed, evidence

indicates that uncertainty concerning America's future intentions is now widespread in the region. (See the summary of Asian reactions in William R. Kintner's *The Impact of President Nixon's Visit to Peking on International Politics*, pp. 23-56.) Equally damaging to America's prestige were the terms of the agreements announced at the conclusion of the Nixon visit. The CPR conceded virtually nothing, suffering at most a slight blow to its stature as leader of the world's revolutionary forces. Peking agreed to facilitate scientific and other "people-to-people" exchanges, but the Chinese stand to profit as much from these as the United States. Peking made no pledge to diminish her support for insurrectionary movements along her southern border, indeed, such activities continue unabated. The United States publicly conceded that Taiwan is part of China; and while not yet renouncing our defense pact with Taipei, we have agreed ultimately to eliminate the American military presence from the island. (A substantial reduction in the American force on Taiwan, Secretary Schlesinger recently disclosed, is scheduled for this fall.) Given Administration's announced intention, referred to earlier, to review all American treaty commitments in the light of our "interests," the demise of the Taipei regime at some not-distant point appears probable. Finally, Nixon's public utterances in Peking came perilously close to an admission that the United States bears primary responsibility for the Asian cold war itself. One Chinese leader summed up rather effectively the impression gained from the visit when he told *Washington Post* reporter Stanley Karnow that "we don't owe the Americans anything, but the Americans owe us much. Now they are redressing the balance."

III

There can be no doubt that the Nixon China policy, and the more basic global strategy of which it is a part, reflects and reinforces some of the worst features of the American political character. As many commentators on international politics have pointed out, the danger that summitry and its accompanying atmospherics will create among the populace an illusion of international harmony is an ever-present one in a democracy. Even more worrisome is the apparently irresistible inclination of every American president to believe that he can succeed where his predecessors have failed by bringing peace to the world. It is a commentary on the depth of the utopian strain in the American political tradition that an Administration which prides itself on its tough-mindedness and whose principal foreign policy architect is widely—if somewhat inaccurately—celebrated for his "realism" has proved to be little more immune than its predecessors from such temptations. To be sure, the current utopianism is of a sharply different variety than that of Wilson, FDR, et al. It is surely to Nixon's credit that his administration has explicitly renounced the ancient American conviction that the world should be remade in the American image, and that policy making during his presidency has exhibited an awareness of the realities of power at home and abroad. Nevertheless, he and Kissinger both have grossly underestimated the power drive of the Soviet state, and have drastically exaggerated the stabilizing effects of nuclear weapons in the international system. In the last analysis they appear unable to accept the permanence of conflict as the fundamental reality of world politics. The distance between contemporary American foreign policy and the moralistic-legalistic tradition whose apotheosis was Wilson is thus not as great as it appears.

The danger is obviously real that the Administration will allow its fascination with certain features of the new China relationship to obscure our differences with Peking

over the future course of Asian and for that matter global international politics. Moreover, prudence alone would dictate that the possibility of a Moscow-Peking rapprochement, particularly in the post-Mao leadership era, not be totally discounted; any attempt to use Peking as a permanent make-weight in the balance of power on the American side—a policy which the Administration has rejected, albeit for the wrong reasons—could prove to be dangerous in the extreme.

Nevertheless, the conclusion remains inescapable that the dangers inherent in the Nixon China policy are limited when compared with those created by Administration assumptions about the possibilities for a détente with the USSR. The unchecked build-up of Soviet strategic and conventional military power, the continued attempts by the Soviets to project political influence in the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America, the uncompromising position the USSR has assumed in the various East-West negotiations now in progress all constitute challenges to Administration logic as yet unanswered. Indeed, the argument that Soviet foreign policy objectives in their broadcast definition have decisively changed is only slightly more compelling now than when it was first raised not long after the Revolution of 1917. It would not be the least of the ironies associated with this Administration if the attention lavished on the Peking initiative caused the nation to misperceive the ultimate purposes and attendant dangers of the Nixon-Kissinger global strategy generally. Is it too cynical to suggest that this may have been among the purposes of the China gambit from the outset? Perhaps; but at the very least it is probable that the Administration would regard this as a not-unwelcome consequence.

VETERANS AFFAIRS DIRECTORS HONOR CONGRESSMAN RODINO

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1974, the Man of the Year award was presented to our distinguished colleague, PETER W. RODINO, by the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs. As many of us in the House already know, PETER earned a most distinguished record in World War II, winning a commission in the Army after service in an armored division in North Africa. He left his greatest mark in Italy where he was assigned to a military mission to the Italian Army in the late stages of the war. There, he organized a campaign in which families of American soldiers sent packages of food and clothing to impoverished families in Italy. When PETER returned to this country, he was designated by the Red Cross to continue the drive which eventually involved thousands of packages.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I know that whenever veterans' problems are involved, I can count on PETE RODINO's vote. The first year he came to this Chamber, he served on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. And since that time, he has been unwavering in his commitment to the needs and hopes of all our servicemen. During the opening days of this 93d Congress, PETER RODINO introduced House Resolution 100, to establish a national commission to

evaluate and study all veterans benefits programs. He has continually fought to prevent the loss of reduction of veterans pensions when social security benefits were raised. And, he has long been an advocate of all measures to provide fair and realistic benefits to our disabled and their families. Over the past few years, PETER has been particularly concerned with providing education, training, and job opportunities to our Vietnam veterans. We all recognize that the unemployment rate for veterans aged 20 to 24 stands at 10.6 percent. PETER RODINO has not ceased in his efforts to support all legislation to reduce so disturbing a figure.

PETER RODINO was honored at a luncheon ceremony in Washington, attended by high Government officials and national leaders of the major veterans organization. On the silver loving cup which was presented to him were engraved the words:

For his diligent and persistent efforts to reform and upgrade the federal judiciary system and to strengthen its proper historic constitutional role in the American tripartite unique system of government.

I would like to join the many who came to congratulate my colleague last Monday for his strong and continued support for all the men who so ably served this Nation.

SERIOUS CONFLICT OF INTEREST

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been brought to my attention that Mr. John J. Gilhooley, who is a director of the National Rail Passenger Corporation—Amtrak—is also president of an interstate bus company, Transport of New Jersey, which competes for passengers with Amtrak in the New York-Philadelphia corridor.

I believe that this is a serious conflict of interest. The Amtrak Improvement Act of 1973—Public Law 93-146—specifically outlaws a director from having financial interests in competition with the corporation:

No member appointed by the President may have any significant direct or indirect relationship, with any person engaged in the transportation of passengers in competition with the corporation, during the time he serves on the board. (Section 303a7)

In a time of acute fuel shortages when our rail transit system needs the best management possible, Amtrak has a director who would personally gain from the limitation of intercity rail service.

I have written to President Nixon and requested him to ask for Mr. Gilhooley's resignation from the Amtrak board so that a more impartial director can be found to replace him. I cannot imagine that Mr. Gilhooley can contribute sound guidance and advice to the National Rail Passenger Corporation when it may result in a loss for his bus company.

To further compound this unfortunate situation it turns out that Transport of New Jersey is also an active member of

the National Association of Motor Bus Owners—NAMBO—a Washington-based lobbying group that has consistently opposed Amtrak and has waged an expensive public relations campaign against the rail corporation.

I have here a brochure that was recently sent to me by NAMBO entitled "Amtrak, Should It Survive?" that includes the following passage:

The long distance train is in the same position now as the stage coach was to railroading: it is time to let it die an honorable death.

If Mr. Gilhooley subscribes to this view held by NAMBO—and he is an active member of the organization and his company contributes funds for its lobbying activities—it is utter stupidity to have him on the Amtrak board.

All of my colleagues here know that the Board of Directors of Amtrak are appointed by President Nixon with the advice and consent of the Senate.

AID FOR CHILEAN NONIMMIGRANT RESIDENTS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in the past months I have become increasingly aware of the plight of our nonimmigrant Chilean residents, and have found it difficult to answer such residents' pleading letters with the usual noncommittal phrases.

A nonimmigrant resident has a defined time period to his visa. At the end of this period, he may apply for an extension, which is usually given if he can demonstrate that his present pursuits are those he was admitted upon. Thus, a student may apply for an extension if he proves that additional study is necessary; he cannot transfer his choice of occupation.

Under the usual course of events, this practice is totally justified and supportable. But when such a nonimmigrant resident must be forced to return to a home that offers only danger and possible arrest upon arrival, a home that is in chaos due to a military coup while the resident was away is another matter entirely. I found it no longer possible to turn away from these people, and am, therefore, introducing legislation today that will alleviate the situation. My bill will allow an extension of 5 years for all temporary Chilean residents who are in this country at the time of enactment.

In 1973, the number of temporary Chilean residents who reported under the alien address program was 4,921. I estimate that this is the number we are and will be dealing with if this legislation becomes public law. There are additional Chileans in the country, in pursuit of a pleasant tour of our great land, but they are not the ones that will choose to remain on this 5-year visa program.

This bill's sole purpose is to aid those temporary Chilean residents that are in

fear of returning to their home at the present time due to harassment they are receiving from Chileans at home. I hope my colleagues will face this issue and the facts concerning the present deprivation of human rights in Chile that pour into our offices daily. These temporary residents should not be labeled, they are merely people in fear of their lives, and the instinct that reaches for survival has no connection with any political philosophy. It exists in all of us, and in similar circumstances we, too, would be pursuing similar courses of action.

This bill merely extends the visas of these aliens for 5 years; it grants no additional privileges, and they can still be deported if a crime is committed. But at least it gives them time to pursue other courses, time to find other means to attain immigrant standing, and time for the situation in Chile to regain order.

I ask my fellow Representatives to think of the position of these temporary Chilean residents, to put yourselves in their place, and then to join me in this endeavor.

MICHEL AMENDMENT NO. 1

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 963, providing for the consideration of H.R. 69, I am today submitting for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of what may be proposed as an amendment to that bill when the House resumes consideration of it.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

(MICHEL AMENDMENT NO. 1)

Page 29, beginning with line 18, strike out everything after "be" down through the period in line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(A) from two-thirds of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 134(a) (other than payments under such section to jurisdictions excluded from the term 'State' by this subsection), but not more than \$2,000,000,000, the product obtained by multiplying the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the school district of such agency by 40 per centum of the amount determined under the next sentence, and (B) from the remaining one-third of such amount so appropriated, but not more than \$1,000,000,000, the product obtained by multiplying the number of children counted under subsection (c) by 40 per centum of the amount determined under the next sentence."

Page 31, line 17, insert after "be" the following: "(A) from two-thirds of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 134(a) (other than payments under such section to jurisdictions excluded from the term 'State' by this subsection), but not more than \$2,000,000,000, the product obtained by multiplying the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in Puerto Rico by 40 per centum of (i) the average per pupil expenditure in Puerto Rico or (ii) in the case where such average per pupil expenditure is more than 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 120 per cen-

tum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, and, from the remaining one-third of such amount so appropriated but not more than \$1,000,000,000."

Page 32, line 19, strike out "two-thirds of".

Page 33, line 15, strike out "used by the Bureau of the Census in compiling the 1970 decennial census.", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of families receiving an annual income of less than \$3500."

Page 33, line 25, strike out the comma.

Page 34, line 1, strike out "the current criteria of poverty", and insert in lieu thereof "\$3500".

Page 34, beginning with line 4, strike out everything after "Act" through "index" in line 8.

Page 48, line 10, strike out "85" and insert in lieu thereof "90".

FOREIGN AID AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, our respected colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) has written an excellent article on the origins, development, and continuing need for a U.S. program of technical assistance to the less developed nations.

Mr. BINGHAM was an acting administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration in the early 1950's. He was deeply involved in giving life to the concept of technical assistance that President Truman announced as point 4 of his 1949 inaugural address.

Congressman BINGHAM has watched our technical assistance program closely ever since. I am certain his observations, published separately by the U.S. Agency for International Development and Global Dialogue Publications and reprinted below, will be of interest to many readers of the RECORD.

POINT IV ALIVE AND WELL

(By Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM)

"Fourth we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."—President Harry S. Truman, January 1949.

In January 1949, President Harry S. Truman wanted a new idea for the foreign part of his Inaugural Address and his staff came up with one. Over the objections of the State Department, the idea went into the speech. It was an idea that had "found its time", and it caught hold. Today, 25 years later, the idea has as much vitality as ever, and a vast array of activities are based upon it—activities carried on by tens of thousands of people around the world—Americans, foreign nationals, international civil servants—white collar, blue collar—young and old—teachers and students.

The essence of the idea, as Mr. Truman put it, was that, "for the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering" of the "more than half the people of the world . . . living in conditions approaching misery." The problem was essentially one of communication, to convey the knowledge to those who needed it. While resources were essential to effect the needed communication, the transfer of "knowledge and skill" was at the heart of the process, rather than the transfer of material resources from rich to poor.

Mr. Truman said "we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas," and he invited "other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking through the United Nations and otherwise."

At first, the U.S. Congress was dubious. The late Secretary Robert A. Taft saw the proposal as "opening up a kind of wide-open distribution of all kinds of aid to all kinds of people anywhere in the world whom the President might desire to help" and said he had heard "no substantial or persuasive argument made in favor of any such program." At one point, the Senate came within one vote of killing the proposed Act for International Development, but the Act was eventually passed, almost 18 months after Mr. Truman's address.

Over the years since then, the U.S. "technical assistance" has not only survived all the shifts of organization and substance in the overall foreign aid program, it has grown and has acquired a solid base of support in the Congress. The increasing legislative difficulties which the foreign aid program has faced in the Congress are not traceable to the technical assistance program, but rather to aspects of the military and budgetary assistance programs with which it is unfortunately linked in the annual or biennial legislative package. If it were possible for a bill to be brought to the floor of the Senate and the House which would be limited to a modern version of the Point IV program, such a bill in my judgment would have the enthusiastic support of a widespread constituency in the United States—a constituency which the overall foreign aid program presently does not have—and the Congress would, I believe, respond accordingly.

Twenty years ago, the main emphasis of the program of the Technical Cooperation Administration (TCA) was on agriculture, health, and education. Today, after intervals of special interest in other areas, the concentration of AID's development aid is still on these three areas.

The most dramatic new development in program emphasis is the current major effort in the field of popular planning. I am somewhat embarrassed to note that in 1954, when I wrote "Shirt-Sleeve Diplomacy," I took it for granted that the Congress would reject the idea that "methods of birth control" might be included in U.S. educational programs. Actually, the Congress has taken the lead in pressing for a substantial proportion of our aid to be for the purpose of encouraging and assisting in the development of population planning programs. It is the only substantive area in which a dollar figure (\$125 million) was specified in the legislation for the past two fiscal years.

In the early days of Point IV and especially in the technical cooperation programs which preceded it, as in Latin America and Liberia, a good deal of the activity was retail in character, meaning that techniques were being communicated to the users of these techniques. Such pioneer and deservedly famous shirt-sleeve diplomats as Horace Holmes in India and Frank Pinder in Liberia were, in fact, working directly with village people. Their achievement was to demonstrate that even desperately poor and ignorant people could be persuaded to try new methods.

Since those early years the effort in the U.S. technical assistance program has been to stress the multiplication factor—to train the teachers, to establish and strengthen extension services, to build institutions capable of carrying on the essential work of communication and education. For its part, the Peace Corps, founded in 1961, has turned increasingly to technical assistance, but its emphasis has remained at the retail or consumer level.

Geographically, there also have been interesting shifts in the technical assistance program. As of 1952, two of the largest U.S. programs were in Taiwan and Iran; both of these have since been phased out completely as the local governments demonstrated a capacity to carry on the work of Point IV on their own. Similarly major programs in Korea and Brazil have been phased down as these countries have achieved impressive economic development. Sizeable programs of aid to Egypt and Burma have been closed down for political reasons. While India has required and received large amounts of developmental aid over the years, the technical assistance component has been of decreasing importance in this country of tremendous human resources at all levels of professional and technical training.

NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

During these same two decades, the emergence of more than 30 independent African states has created a vast area of need for technical assistance of many kinds. Initial progress, although often limited, has brought these countries to a level where they are now ripe to absorb more assistance. Compared to the programs of France and the United Kingdom, the U.S. contributions have been modest, but nevertheless substantial by the standards of 1952.

Starting with President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, there has been a sharp increase in the relative emphasis on Latin America in the U.S. development programs. In 1952, the programs in Latin America totalled less than \$20 million, as against a world-wide total of some \$250 million. As of 1972, Latin America accounted for almost one third of a world wide total (for development loans, population programs and technical assistance) of about \$1 billion.

Of course, it is not only in the United States that the Point IV concept has burgeoned since 1949. Mr. Truman's initiative led directly to the United Nations' Expanded Technical Assistance Program (a total for the U.N. and its specialized agencies of about \$20 million in 1952), and ultimately to the U.N. Development Program (currently running at about \$300 million annually). Many countries, large and small have undertaken technical assistance programs of their own. Israel, once on the receiving end, developed a small but fast moving, efficient and highly successful program. The Soviet Union was initially slow to respond to the Point IV challenge, but in the 1960's embarked on ambitious development aid programs, often stressing the conspicuous, rather than the basic.

QUESTION OF PROGRAM SIZE

What has been the effect of all this? If the various national and international programs are today much larger than 20 or even 10 years ago, does this mean that the Point IV idea was a delusion?

On the contrary, the very spread and increase of development programs has been a mark of the validity of the idea. There have been dramatic instances of material progress—like the virtual elimination or control of malaria and smallpox in much of the world and the fantastic success of newly developed high yielding strains of wheat and rice—but even more important has been a vastly increased recognition of the importance of the concepts of communication and institution building as basic to growth. The Green Revolution would not have occurred otherwise. The underlying research, no matter how basic, imaginative and successful, could not by itself have been translated into food production.

It seems inconceivable that the United States which was more than any other nation responsible for the Point IV explosion, could not turn its back on the idea and retreat into a shell of economic isolationism. But if by

any chance we were to attempt to do so, the war against world wide stagnation and poverty would go on. The difference would be that, without our contribution, the struggle would be that much the more difficult and the developing world, and we ourselves, would be the poorer.

DIESEL TAX SUSPENSION

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased last week to reintroduce H.R. 12724, the Emergency Diesel Fuel Tax Suspension Act, with additional cosponsors.

At the same time, because of the continued interest in this proposal, I invite still additional cosponsors.

The bill reintroduced, I am pleased to report, carries the names of 13 new cosponsors.

They include Congressmen JIM BURKE, of Massachusetts, a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House to which this legislation has been referred; Mr. TIERNAN, of Rhode Island; Ms. ABZUG, of New York; Mr. BROWN, of California; Mr. EDWARDS, of California; Mr. MILLER, of Ohio; Mr. PEPPER, of Florida; Mr. RIEGLE, of Michigan; Mr. SEIBERLING, of Ohio; Ms. SCHROEDER, of Colorado; Mr. THOMPSON, of New Jersey; Mr. WALDIE, of California; and Mr. WHITEHURST, of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, the dilemma still facing sectors of the economy dependent upon the capability of the Nation's truckers to purchase diesel fuel at prices which will allow them to stay in business and move the Nation's food supplies and other commodities has not disappeared simply because that dilemma is temporarily off the front pages of the newspapers.

Since the settlement of the nationwide strike by independent owner-operators and the return to work, news of the predicament they face in the cost of fuel has faded. But the problem remains all too real.

It is reassuring in this regard that a number of colleagues have indicated their continued concern with this problem by asking to cosponsor the legislation which I introduced initially more than a month ago, on February 7, 1974, to suspend collection of the Federal tax on diesel fuel for 6 months tied to a freeze at January 15, 1974, price levels. I believe this interest shows the responsiveness of Congress even where the problem has become subsurface and no longer commands immediate public attention.

The fact remains that roughly half the truckers in the country received no benefit from the passthrough provision Congress permitted the Interstate Commerce Committee to implement without the delay ordinarily required, and that such a passthrough provision is itself inherently inequitable and further damaging to the economy.

In addition, the fact remains that the

problem—spiraling diesel fuel costs—has not and will not go away at any early date.

Therefore, I am again urging suspension of the diesel fuel tax for 6 months, at a figure estimated at \$185 million, and at a time when the highway trust fund enjoys a \$2 billion surplus.

I will reintroduce the original bill again shortly and invite additional co-sponsorship.

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETIC ACT

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, last October the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on proposed legislation regarding vitamin, mineral and other dietary supplements. One of those bills was H.R. 6170, which I introduced to prevent the Food and Drug Administration from interfering in the sale of truthfully labeled dietary supplements for reasons other than safety or fraud.

In the 5 months since those hearings were held, no further action has been taken and none is scheduled. I would like to take this opportunity to insert for the RECORD my testimony at the hearings and urge the committee to take action as soon as possible on this urgently needed legislation:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present to the subcommittee my views on the recently issued regulations of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration affecting food supplements. I strongly object to these regulations and respectfully urge this subcommittee to report favorably my bill, H.R. 6170, which would prevent the FDA from interfering in the sale of truthfully labeled vitamin and mineral food supplements for reasons other than safety or fraud.

Because the FDA's deadline for the implementation of these regulations is set for the end of this year this legislation assumes a new urgency and I am most grateful to the subcommittee for scheduling hearings on this matter.

My bill, H.R. 6107, introduced on March 26, is identical to H.R. 643, introduced by Congressman Hosmer of California. It defines food supplements and special dietary uses of food. It also prohibits FDA limitations on the potency, number, combination, amount, variety, or use of food supplements unless intrinsically injurious to health in the recommended dosage and limits the FDA's authority to require warning labels on food supplements to instances where the recommended dosage is intrinsically injurious to health.

My remarks will be brief. I do not pretend to be an expert on the subject of nutrition. Nor do I wish to act as final arbiter in the lengthy and interminable disputes between the proponents and opponents of natural foods and food supplements.

I do regard myself as something of an expert on the views and needs of the people of the 17th Illinois Congressional District.

I have heard from a great many of them on the subject of food supplements and their opinion has been unanimous. The new FDA regulations are bad news.

One does not need to be an expert on nutrition to understand why. The people of my home district believe in freedom of choice. They have confidence in their own and in their fellow man's ability to weigh evidence and to come to a rational conclusion. They resent the effort on the part of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to make "fact" of opinion and to impede free choice. They are repelled by the idea that a Washington bureaucrat can decree as "fact" that the vitamin content of a food is not significantly affected by its storage, transportation, processing or cooking or by the soil in which it is grown. They are disturbed by the fact that the FDA can give its opinion the force of law and compel adherence to these "facts" under pain of criminal sanction. In their opinion the FDA's new regulations amount to a censorship of ideas and to an unnecessary restriction on the individual's right to eat as he chooses even at the risk of making a mistake.

Research in nutrition is only beginning. Conclusions as to the validity of various nutritional propositions are at best educated guesses. Two hundred years ago bleeding by leeches represented the last word in medical treatment. One can only wonder what the state of medicine would be today if opinions to the contrary had been banned as "mis-labeling."

No one questions the right and obligation of the Food and Drug Administration to protect the public from mislabeled goods or from food supplements proven hazardous to one's health. But the FDA's new regulations go far beyond these legitimate ends. They run counter to the concepts of freedom of choice and of free interchange of ideas which are essential to a democratic society.

TRIBUTE TO VERSAILLES, PA., VOL- UNTEER FIRE COMPANY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, long ago the volunteer fireman carved himself a special niche in the hearts of Americans who live in suburban or rural areas. They have turned to him many times for help and he has never failed to respond. His dedication and courage have won him the admiration and respect of his friends and neighbors.

It is for that reason I rise today: to pay tribute to a volunteer fire company which has provided the residents of a community within my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania with fire protection and other related services for 60 years. The Versailles Volunteer Fire Company will reach this milestone on April 13.

That alone is worthy of public recognition, but there is another reason that I bring it to the attention of my colleagues. At this anniversary observance, the members of the volunteer fire company will honor one of their own; a man who has adopted this great Nation as his own and who, by his life, has set an example for all native born Americans.

This fine, elderly gentleman is Mr. Sabata "Sam" Dimieri, who came to the

United States at the turn of the century, opened a shoemaker shop and became a charter member of the Versailles Volunteer Fire Company. He has been active in its affairs from the beginning, serving as an officer for 49 years, including 46 consecutive years as its treasurer. This, too, is a noteworthy accomplishment in its own light but it is made more startling because Sam is looking forward to an anniversary of his own. Sam will be 92 years old on May 5.

Sam has been a part of the transition of the Versailles Volunteer Fire Company from a bucket brigade operation to the modern, self-sustaining organization it is today; one which offers the community fire protection as well as ambulance and rescue services and which has assets valued at a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the Versailles Volunteer Fire Company. I commend its officers and members for their dedicated service of the past and wish them continued success. As for Sabata "Sam" Dimieri, what can one say to one who has given so much except "Salute and God bless you."

QUINCY GOLDEN EAGLE COLOR GUARD

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Golden Eagle Color Guard of Quincy, Ill., will be in Washington during the annual National Cherry Blossom Festival representing the strength and vitality of Illinois and the Nation's youth.

The Golden Eagles are composed of 24 young ladies who are students at Notre Dame High School in Quincy. The unit is sponsored by the Quincy CYO as a part of a program involving many hundreds of Quincy area youth.

Under the leadership of Sister Karl Mary; CYO Director Joe Weise; and Herb Wellman, the director of the Golden Eagles; these young ladies have developed themselves into a finely tuned precision marching unit.

The members of the Golden Eagles are: Linda Harcharick, Kathy Koch, Kay Kuhlmeier, Sally Schlipman, Theresa Schonoff, Mary Lou Schutte, Sue Buckner, Geri Heinze, Chris Herman, Nancy Kinney, Debbie Swartz, Kathy DeVries, Karen Ennis, Lisa Harcharick, Maggie O'Brien, Sherri Stegeman, Lou Wensing, Donnette Bockenfeld, Candy Britton, Donna Cramsey, Lisa Musolino, Karen Quinn, Dori Scharnhorst, and Debbie Wellman. Accompanying the Eagles to Washington is Mrs. Wellman, wife of the director; Mr. and Mrs. William Kinney; Mrs. Melvin Koch; and Mrs. Charles Heinze; and Mrs. Wayne Harcharick.

These young ladies have carried their banners from the eastern seaboard of the United States to Texas during the past 6 years, showing the American people a fine example of young womanhood on and off the field.

Previously, the Golden Eagles have

been to Washington as part of the annual Cherry Blossom Festival. Now they are returning for this year's Parade of Princesses. In addition, the Golden Eagles will perform at the new Capital Arena on March 28 when All-American Jim Wisman, Quincy's basketball star, plays in the All-American High School Basketball Championship.

I am proud that these young ladies and Jim Wisman will be here from the 20th Congressional District in western Illinois.

SAVE A DUCK SLOUGH

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to my colleagues today on action taken this morning by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, on which I am privileged to serve.

The Commission gave reapproval for the acquisition of 875 acres of land for the Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge in Sherburne County, Minn. This completes acquisition at this 30,124-acre refuge located 40 miles northwest of the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

The Sherburne Refuge is designed primarily as a production refuge, but when developed will also attract large concentrations of migrating ducks and geese that use the western portion of the Mississippi flyway.

Acquisition of this land is made possible, as my colleagues are aware, through revenues realized from the sale of migratory bird hunting stamps, popularly known as duck stamps.

In the April issue of Field and Stream magazine, writer Don Grussing, coincidentally from Minnesota, tells of his suggestion for increasing duck stamp income, and that is simply for sportsmen and conservationists to purchase an extra duck stamp or two.

At this time, I insert the article into the RECORD:

SAVE A DUCK SLOUGH

(By Don Grussing)

How? Buy two duck stamps next year—unless you already buy two; then buy three or four. It's one of several quick and easy steps a hunter can take to help preserve and protect wildlife habitat.

As a hunter you're faced with a big problem. Habitat—places to hunt and places that birds and animals you do hunt must live and reproduce in—is disappearing. It's a fact of life that's been well documented. You've read about it in Field & Stream, newspapers, government publications, and periodicals put out by conservation organizations. You've got to do something about it.

You've got to do your part to protect our disappearing duck-producing marshlands (which, incidentally, provide much habitat for other game and nongame species). You've got to try to save patches of cover and fence-rows for pheasants, quail, and doves, and the old orchards where ruffed grouse hang out.

The key thing that you, as a sportsman, must understand, is that you can do a great deal to put away what's left for your use, and the use of future generations. It's as easy as buying a fifth of whiskey, or a sack of lawn food.

Many sportsmen, seeking to help, have banded to form clubs, working en masse as a political and environmental force. In fact, private sportsmen's clubs have performed some very important conservation deeds. Among them are construction of thousands of wood duck houses, preservation of trout streams and hunting habitat through club acquisition, spreading the gospel of conservation education, and much more. Some of the most important waterfowl wintering grounds in the U.S. are owned by hunting clubs. But, not everyone has the time or inclination to belong to a club. Your job may make it impossible. Or, you might not be a joiner.

But there is still something each and every hunter in the United States and Canada can do to protect and preserve wildlife habitat. One simple way is to buy an extra duck stamp this fall. Prairie potholes are still disappearing to the drag line and drainage ditch in this country. In the pothole country of the three most important duck-producing states in the U.S., Minnesota, and South and North Dakota (plus a corner of Iowa), it's estimated that 60 percent of the potholes have already been drained. And friends, it's continuing right now.

To fight this trend, Federal and state governments have been getting long-term easements on the prime duck-producing wetlands or buying them outright as fast as money allows. But that's not quite fast enough in the face of pressure applied by drainage interests.

As fast as money allows—that's the key! And that's where you can help. Federal funds for habitat acquisition come primarily from duck-stamp revenues. All you have to do to speed up wetlands acquisition is buy an extra duck stamp or two.

Can it help? Of course. For every twenty hunters purchasing an extra duck stamp this fall, enough revenue will be produced to acquire one acre of duck-producing wetlands in key areas of the U.S. (That's based on a cost estimate of about \$100 per acre for wetland acquisition. This figure varies, according to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. The Bureau's realty office gives a per acre average of \$100 to \$150.)

So you can see, it only takes a little effort per hunter to lay away literally thousands of acres of wetlands each year.

It's not for duck hunters only, either. Every species of game benefits from wetlands. Pheasants, doves, rabbits, deer, quail—virtually every wild creature utilizes wetlands in its life routine.

But look at what can be done if duck hunters alone participate.

If only 10 percent of the 2 million duck hunters in the U.S. buy an extra duck stamp this fall, we'll be stocking away about 10,000 additional acres of wetlands annually. In ten years, we'll have stashed away 100,000 acres.

On the other hand, if half of the duck hunters could be persuaded to buy an extra stamp, we could acquire about 50,000 acres of wetlands in one year. In ten years, we'll have acquired 500,000 acres of wetlands on top of the present programs.

You don't even have to buy a duck stamp to give money for Federal acquisition of wetlands. If you wish, you can simply send a contribution, any size, to: Director, Division of Wildlife Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Washington, D.C. 20240. Include a brief note concerning the purpose for which your donation is intended, and it'll get into the right account.

What's that? You say you'd rather have the money to go to a certain state! Well, a lot of states will let you do that, too. In fact, that's how I got turned on to this whole idea.

I live in Minnesota. Last year I raised a group of wild mallard ducklings for release in a couple of ponds in my neighborhood. One of my neighbors let his Siberian husky

run loose one day and the dog broke into my pen, killing four of fifteen ducks and permanently crippling one. The neighbor wouldn't pay me, so I took him to small claims court. I figured the value of the five ducks at about \$6 each. I won. But there was no sense for me to keep the money. I was raising the ducks for a conservation project. Let the money be used for conservation purposes!

My first idea was to give the money to Ducks Unlimited, a very fine organization, and one that I am proud to belong to. But I thought, Why not buy some wetlands in my own state, where I do much of my hunting. I'll still give my annual contribution to Ducks Unlimited in a couple of months.

I found out that Minnesota, one of the most important duck-producing states, does have a special fund to which you can donate money expressly for wetlands acquisition. And though my money wasn't much, they were glad to get it. And it's tax deductible.

I sent my contribution to Milo Casey, Director of the Division of Game & Fish, 301 Centennial Building, 658 Cedar St., St. Paul, Minnesota 55155.

It turns out that another prime pothole state also has a special fund for wetlands acquisition. South Dakota's Harvey H. Pietz, Executive Assistant with the Division of Game and Fish, told me donations designated for the specific use of wetlands acquisition have helped the state buy at least two tracts of wetlands. Contributions for South Dakota can be sent to the Department of Game, Fish and Parks, State Office Bldg., Pierre, South Dakota 57501.

North Dakota does not earmark donations specifically for wetlands acquisition. But the North Dakota Game and Fish Department at Bismarck does take donations specifically for prairie chicken production areas.

If you're interested in donating money to your state for wetlands or other habitat acquisition, check with your state department of game and fish. They'll be able to give you details on state programs in a few minutes.

Of course, there are other places where your money can be effectively and efficiently used for wildlife habitat acquisition.

One is The Nature Conservancy headquarters at 1800 North Kent Street, Suite 800, Arlington, Virginia 22209. Money from duck hunters or upland game hunters specified for wetland acquisition would be welcomed by The Nature Conservancy. This agency is currently involved in a very active program to acquire wetlands across the entire U.S. The agency would appreciate support of hunters who share an interest in preserving our fast-vanishing swamps and wetlands.

Involvement in acquisition of all sorts of ecologically important lands has led The Nature Conservancy to setting aside almost 268,500 acres of ecologically vital land across forty-five states and among the Virgin Islands. A significant proportion of these acres are wetlands.

Another helpful conservation organization is the Audubon Society, 1130 5th Avenue, New York, New York 10028. Money donated to its refuge fund will be used for acquisition and management of some of the finest refuges in the world. Many are in the U.S. and are most helpful to waterfowl and other game.

I dare not forget Ducks Unlimited, one of the pioneer organizations devoted to waterfowl production and preservation. This is a most deserving place for your contribution, because funds go to preserve and protect waterfowl habitat on the great Canadian breeding grounds. And it operates entirely on contributions of duck hunters. You can write for information to the national headquarters, P.O. Box 66300, Chicago, Illinois 60666.

Even if you don't hunt ducks, you should know that most other wildlife benefits from

your wetlands contribution. But if you're a grouse hunter, you can join the Ruffed Grouse Society of America. This organization, headquartered at 4515 Culver Road, Rochester, New York 14622, is studying methods of improving grouse habitat, methods of maintaining peak cover, and generally improving grouse hunting throughout the U.S.

Ideally, you'd send money to more than one organization. Personally, I feel strongly about Ducks Unlimited projects in Canada. I'm also going to see to it that Minnesota gets some more money, and I'm going to buy an extra duck stamp next year, and just put it away.

But can I afford that? It's easy. I quit smoking not too long ago, and now I've got an extra \$150 a year to fool around with.

But you don't have to spend that much money. It'll only cost you about 42 cents a month to buy an extra duck stamp each year. Certainly protecting your favorite outdoor recreation is worth that! Wouldn't you agree with that?

Won't you please give some of your extra change to protect our dwindling wildlife resource? Remember, if we all do a little bit, collectively we're doing a lot.

FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the numerous programs administered by the Office of Education received appropriations totaling almost \$6,000,000,000 for fiscal 1974. A table that I am inserting in the RECORD shows how most of these funds were allocated. The activities have been broken down by categories, but there is considerable overlapping between categories.

As my colleagues and other interested persons go over these programs and their costs, I am sure they will ask many questions. Some that occurred to me are:

Why should the taxpayers of the entire Nation have to pay for the education of migratory children? Should not the States that profit from their parents' labor pay for the children's schooling?

Why should children with limited English-speaking ability be helped from the time they are 3 until they become 18? Can they not learn to speak English fluently in less than 15 years?

When there is an obvious oversupply of teachers, why spend millions of dollars to train more, thus adding to unemployment among educators and possibly depressing their salaries?

Mr. Speaker, we will soon be asked to appropriate money for fiscal 1975. Here is a fertile field for effecting the economies that will be necessary if the budget is to be balanced.

The table follows:

Funds for Fiscal 1974

EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED	
[in thousands of dollars]	
Programs for disadvantaged children to meet educational needs of deprived children.....	1,446,338
College work-study, to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of postsecondary students of great financial need....	270,200

Educational opportunity grants, to assist students of exceptional financial need to pursue a postsecondary education.....	210,300
Programs for migratory children, to meet educational needs of children of migratory farm workers.....	98,331
Bilingual education, to develop and operate programs for children aged 3-18 who have limited English-speaking ability.....	50,350
Special grants to urban and rural school districts with high concentrations of poor children, to improve education of disadvantaged children.....	47,701
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas, to train or retrain persons for career ladder positions or for staff positions in urban and rural poverty schools and to introduce change in the ways in which teachers are trained and utilized.....	46,229
Follow Through, to extend into primary grades the educational gains made by deprived children in Head Start or similar preschool programs.....	41,000
Upward Bound, to generate skills and motivation for young people with low-income backgrounds and inadequate high school preparation.....	38,331
Programs for children in State institutions for the neglected and delinquent, to improve the education of such children.....	25,449
Student special services, to assist low-income and handicapped students to complete postsecondary education.....	23,000
State student incentive grants, to encourage States to increase their appropriations for grants to needy students or to develop such grant programs where they do not exist.....	19,000
To strengthen State administration of Elementary and Secondary Education Act title I programs (financial assistance to local education agencies in schools where there are concentrations of children from low-income families).....	18,048
Total.....	2,334,277

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

Programs for the handicapped in State-supported schools, to strengthen programs for children in such schools.....	85,778
Programs for the handicapped (aid to States), to strengthen educational and related services for handicapped children.....	47,500
Personnel training for the education of the handicapped to prepare and inform teachers and others who educate handicapped children.....	39,615
Training of physical education and recreation personnel for handicapped children (funds included in previous item).....	
Deaf-blind centers, to develop centers and services for deaf-blind children and their parents.....	14,055
Media services and captioned film loan program, to advance the handicapped through film and other media, including a captioned film loan service for cultural and educational enrichment of the deaf; to establish and operate a national center on	

Funds for Fiscal 1974—Continued

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED—continued	
[in thousands of dollars]	
educational media for the handicapped; to contract for research in the use of educational and training films and other educational media for the handicapped and for their production and distribution; and to contract for training persons in the use of educational media for the handicapped.....	13,000
Early education for handicapped children—to develop model preschool and early education programs for such children.....	12,000
Handicapped research and related activities—to promote new knowledge and teaching techniques applicable to the education of the handicapped.....	9,566
Programs for children with specific learning disabilities—to provide for research, training of personnel, and to establish model centers for the improvement of education of such children.....	3,250
Information and recruitment for handicapped—to improve the recruitment of educational personnel and the dissemination of information on educational opportunities for the handicapped.....	500
Physical education and recreation for handicapped children—to perform research in such areas....	350
Total.....	225,614
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION	
Vocational programs, to maintain, extend, and improve vocational education programs and to develop programs in new occupations.....	494,227
Occupational training and retraining, to train persons for work in fields where personnel shortages exist.....	145,000
Adult education, to provide literacy programs for adults.....	63,485
Vocational facilities, to construct such facilities in the Appalachian region.....	24,000
Vocational education research (developing new careers and occupations), to develop new vocational education careers and to disseminate information about them.....	9,000
Vocational education research, to develop programs that meet the special vocational needs of youths with academic and socioeconomic handicaps.....	9,000
Vocational education research, to develop, establish, and operate exemplary and innovative projects to serve as models for vocational education programs.....	8,000
Vocational education research (relating school curricula to careers), to stimulate the development of new methods for relating school work to occupational fields and public education to manpower agencies.....	8,000
Vocational education curriculum development, to develop standards for curriculum development in all occupational fields and promote the development and dissemination of materials for use in teaching occupational subjects.....	4,000
Total.....	764,712

LOANS AND INTEREST

Interest benefits for higher education loans, to provide such benefits through commercial lenders	310,000
National Direct Student Loan program, to assist in setting up funds at institutions of higher education for the purpose of making low-interest loans to graduate and undergraduate students attending at least half-time	293,000
Instruction in nonpublic schools, to provide interest bearing loans to private schools to improve instruction of academic subjects	250
Total	603,250

IMPACT AID

School maintenance and operation, to aid school districts on which federally activities or major disasters have placed a financial burden	225,820
Public schools construction, to aid school districts in providing minimum school facilities in federally impacted and disaster areas	19,000
Total	244,820

DESEGREGATION ASSISTANCE

Basic grants, to aid school districts to eliminate or reduce minority group isolation	146,875
Pilot projects, to help school districts provide special educational assistance in minority group isolated schools	37,341
To local education agencies, to aid school districts in hiring advisory specialists to train employees and provide technical assistance in matters related to desegregation; to teacher institutes—to improve ability of school personnel to deal with school desegregation problems; and to general assistance centers and state education agencies—to provide technical assistance for school desegregation activities	21,700
Nonprofit organizations, to give aid to community based efforts in support of school district Emergency School Aid Act programs	19,915
Special programs, to support efforts serving Emergency School Aid Act aims in areas not included in specified programs	12,447
Bilingual-bicultural programs, to help school districts provide such programs to reduce isolation of minority language groups	9,958
Educational television, to develop and produce multi-ethnic television presentations supporting educational improvements	7,468
Total	255,704

LIBRARIES

School library resources and instructional materials, to help provide school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials	90,250
Library services, to extend and improve public and institutional library services and library services to physically handicapped persons	44,019

College library resources, to strengthen library resources of junior colleges, colleges, universities, and postsecondary vocational schools	9,975
Librarian training, to increase opportunities for training in librarianship	2,850
Interlibrary cooperation, to establish and operate cooperative networks of libraries	2,730
Library demonstrations, to promote library and information science research and demonstrations	1,425
Total	151,249

TRAINING OF TEACHERS, ETC.

Teacher Corps, to improve educational opportunities for children of low income families and to improve the quality of programs of teacher education for both certified and noncertified and inexperienced teacher interns	37,500
Educational personnel training and development, to support, broaden, and strengthen training of teachers and other educational personnel	26,179
College teacher fellowships, to increase the number of well qualified college teachers	5,806
Fellowships for higher education personnel, to train persons to serve as teachers, administrators, or education specialists in higher education	2,100
Educational development for educators from other countries, to provide opportunity for such educators to observe U.S. methods, curricula, and organization on elementary, secondary, and higher education levels	350
Total	71,935

STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Strengthening state education agencies, to improve leadership resources of such agencies	34,675
To improve state and local comprehensive planning and evaluation of education programs	4,750
To help states administer programs under titles VI and VII of Higher Education Act	3,000
State administration of National Defense Education Act programs, to strengthen administration in state education agencies for supervisory and related services to elementary and secondary schools	2,000
Total	44,425

INDIAN EDUCATION

Indian education—to aid local education agencies Indian controlled schools on or near reservations meet the special educational needs of Indian children	25,000
Programs to provide additional educational assistance to Indian children in federally operated schools	15,810
Special projects in Indian education—to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects for the improvement of educational opportunities for Indian children and to develop training programs for educational personnel	15,000
Total	55,810

CUBAN REFUGEE EDUCATION

To help school systems meet the financial impact of Cuban refugee education	10,000
---	--------

Cuban student loans—to provide a loan fund to aid Cuban refugee students	2,600
Total	12,600

FOREIGN LANGUAGES, ETC.

Group projects abroad for language and area studies in non-Western areas, to promote development of international studies and research and to promote research on educational problems of mutual concern to American and foreign educators	2,300
Teacher exchange, to promote international understanding and professional competence by exchange of teachers between the United States and foreign nations	1,320
Fellowships abroad for doctoral dissertation research in foreign language and area studies, to promote instruction in international studies through commercial lenders	750
Consultant services of foreign curriculum specialists, to support visits by foreign consultants to improve and develop resources for foreign language and area studies	160
Fellowship opportunities abroad, to promote instruction in international studies through grants for graduate and faculty projects (funds included in previous item)	-----
Total	4,530

OTHER PROGRAMS

Basic educational opportunity grants, to provide financial assistance to postsecondary students at the undergraduate level	475,000
Supplementary centers, to support innovative and exemplary projects	146,168
Advanced institutional development, to assist selected developing institutions to enter the mainstream of higher education	99,992
National teaching fellowships and professors emeriti, to strengthen the teaching resources of developing institutions (funds included in previous items)	-----
Strengthening developing institutions, to provide partial support for cooperative arrangements between developing and established institutions (funds included in previous item)	-----
Instruction in public schools, to strengthen instruction of academic subjects	26,250
Veterans cost-of-instruction, to encourage recruitment and counseling of veterans by post-secondary education institutions	23,750
Incentive grants, to encourage greater state and local expenditures for education	17,855
Educational broadcasting facilities, to aid in the acquisition and installation of broadcast equipment for educational radio and television	15,675
University community service programs, to strengthen higher education capabilities in helping communities solve their problems	14,250
Endowments to agriculture and mechanic arts colleges to support instruction in such programs in land-grant colleges	12,200
Undergraduate instructional equipment, to improve undergraduate instruction	11,875

Cooperative education programs, to support the planning and implementation of such programs at higher education institutions	10,750
Higher education innovation and reform, to aid higher education in generating reforms in curriculum development, teaching, and administration	10,000
Talent search, to assist in identifying and encouraging promising students to complete high school and pursue postsecondary education	6,000
Drug abuse education and related programs and activities, to organize and train drug education leadership teams at state and local levels, to provide technical assistance to these teams, and to develop programs and leadership to combat causes of drug abuse	5,700
Sesame Street-Electric Company—to fund children's public television programs	3,000
Projects in environmental education, to develop environmental and ecological awareness and problem-solving skills through education programs conducted by formal and nonformal educational organizations and institutions	1,900
To assist the Close Up Foundation, Washington, D.C., to carry out its program of increasing the understanding of the federal government among secondary school students and the communities they represent	500
Total	880,865
Grand total	5,649,791

WABC RADIO BACKS VOTER REGISTRATION BY MAIL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, voter participation in elections in the United States is dismally low. It is urgent that the House of Representatives quickly completes action on legislation, already passed by the Senate, to establish a mail voter registration system. As I told the Subcommittee on Elections of the House Administration Committee in my testimony, the present method of registering voters has the tragic effect of disenfranchising millions of citizens.

The following WABC radio editorial, directed at the need for comparable legislation at the State and city levels, presents strong arguments in favor of opening our electoral system to those who are left out because of archaic and inequitable voter registration laws:

TAXES ARE COLLECTED BY MAIL, WHY NOT VOTER REGISTRATION BY MAIL

City Council President Paul O'Dwyer has introduced a resolution to the City Council supporting voter registration by mail.

Aside from being more convenient, mail registration would be economically sound. To register a new voter, it now costs from \$5 to \$8. Registration by mail would cost the taxpayer less than \$2 per new voter.

It is estimated that over one million new voters could be registered to vote by the mail system. In these apathetic times, only 50

percent of New Yorkers register and only 60 percent of those registered actually vote.

We feel that voter registration by mail would be financially feasible and would greatly assist the elderly and handicapped resident. We urge prompt action by the City Council and the State Legislature.

ON A NATIONAL ECONOMIC PLANNING BOARD

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial by Wassily Leontief, entitled, "For a National Economic Planning Board," appeared in the March 14 New York Times. Mr. Leontief's article pointing out the ineffectiveness of the Council of Economic Advisers and the need for the reinstatement of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's National Resources Planning Board, is timely indeed in face of an impending recession and an insensitive Federal Government.

It seems to me that Dr. Leontief's recommendations would create a vehicle to help curb inflation and prevent a damaging recession, and provide a continued degree of unity in setting national economic policy.

Dr. Leontief's words should be heeded and deserve the attention of each Member of this body. Therefore, I insert them in the RECORD at this time.

The text follows:

FOR A NATIONAL ECONOMIC PLANNING BOARD (By Wassily Leontief)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—"Maybe we need an economic planning agency." Coming from Herbert Stein, this statement might reflect momentary frustration with the inability of the "invisible hand" of the automatic market mechanism to arrest galloping inflation, rising unemployment and mounting shortages of prime necessities.

Four months have passed since Mr. Stein, chairman of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers, uttered these words, at the last annual meeting of the American Economic Association, and things in the meantime have gone from bad to worse.

Some optimists will argue that had George P. Shultz, Secretary of the Treasury; Roy L. Ash, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and William E. Simon, Administrator of the Federal Energy Office, not interfered with the operation of the free-market mechanism by their contradictory pronouncements and haphazard edicts, all would be on the mend by now.

I disagree, and am prepared to argue that if in place of the powerless and understaffed Council of Economic Advisers we had had a well-staffed, well-informed and intelligently guided planning board, the mess in which the country finds itself today could have been avoided.

The American economy is a gigantic, intricate machine. A serious malfunction of any one of its component parts affects, sometimes with a long delay, the workings of all the other parts. Decisions that are made and actions taken today will affect the life of everyone. Some of these changes might be felt only five, perhaps ten years, and even twenty years from now. Decisions made by the large oil companies several years ago to restrict construction of new refineries in the United States have idled tens of thousands of workers in the automotive, plastics and many other industries today.

The decision made today by a large company to build or not to build a new steel mill or a chemical plant, or to start a mining operation, can have major repercussions in the future.

For the managers, this means taking normal business risks, but it should not be forgotten that the outcome of such necessary gambles will affect not only the stockholders of that particular corporation and the careers of those in charge but also many businesses in other sectors of the economy as well. For example, the present shortage of raw materials in the petrochemical industry has stalled the phonograph-record-making business.

True, nearly every self-respecting corporation has a vice president in charge of planning. He is responsible for assessing the available options by predicting the probable consequences of alternative courses of action; top management, of course, has the duty to make the final choice. But how can the corporate planner of Republic Steel know what the demand for the future output of a proposed new mill might be if he does not know whether Bethlehem Steel is planning to expand its steelmaking capacity, too?

Moreover, even if he finds out, how can he anticipate the decision of a railroad czar in Washington to finance large-scale purchases of new equipment, or of some oil company to authorize or possibly to cancel the construction of a new pipeline?

Miscalculations resulting from such ignorance are bound to lead to over-investment, which is bad for the stockholders, or under-investment, which, as recent experience has shown, can be very good for some stockholders but bad for others and the public at large.

There are, of course, Government agencies in Washington that monitor the situation or even control the planning decisions made in some key industries.

For instance, the Federal Power Commission is supposed to control electric utilities (or is it vice versa?), the Interstate Commerce Commission the railroads, and so on.

Whenever trouble crops up somewhere, a new Government agency or commission is set up to investigate, and if things get really bad, to regulate.

In some instances two or three different agencies with overlapping responsibilities arrive at contradictory appraisals of the present state and future prospects of the same industry. This is not at all surprising. The heads of these agencies, more often than not corporate vice presidents in mufti, have as much difficulty finding out what the situation actually is as they did when they sat in their own company offices, since the real cause of trouble in most cases lies outside their narrow field of vision.

The resulting scene reminds one of a Ringling Brothers act with four frantic characters in a car, one pressing on the gas, another on the brake, the third clutching the steering wheel, and the fourth blowing the horn.

Isn't it high time to revive President Franklin D. Roosevelt's National Resources Planning Board? Our technical capabilities for monitoring the state of all the branches of the economy in their mutual interrelationships and for analyzing in great detail the available options—not from the point of view of an individual company or sector but of the system as a whole—are much greater today than they were forty years ago. Most of the necessary factual information is available, and what is missing can be readily obtained.

The establishment of a national planning board would obviously require major efforts and much time. Steps taken now in this direction could not possibly lead to the solution of the present crisis. They might, however, keep the country from stumbling into the next crisis, and the next, each contributing one more turn to the inflationary spiral in which we have been caught.

THE SPACE SHUTTLE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, only a few opportunities occur in a generation to support or advocate truly innovative change benefiting all the people of this Nation. Our national space program has been an innovative stimulant to education, industry, and economic progress. The gains accrued from the Apollo program are still being realized in our daily lives, and foreshadowed what will likely be an even more significant direct contribution to our Nation—the Space Shuttle. H. Allen Perry, in a definitive article from the American Legion magazine, points out in detail the importance and value of the U.S. space effort and the need for a low-cost space transportation system. I urge the reading of this important article to my colleagues and general public:

THE SPACE SHUTTLE—THE SPACE AGE WILL PROBABLY REALLY BEGIN ABOUT 1980, WHEN SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS MAY START
(By H. Allen Perry)

If we tend to think that we have been living in the Space Age for about 15 years, ever since NASA started operations in October 1958, I doubt that history will agree.

It will probably be viewed in the future as the start of the Space Age.

The space shuttle will mark our first effort to use the same vehicle for transit back and forth between earth and space, time after time.

From this so many other things must flow that the shuttle is the key to getting into space on a working basis.

Although the United States had made 666 civilian and military space launchings by the end of 1972, I rather think that they will all be seen as the log rafts, and the shuttle will be Numero Uno of the new age. It will provide the first foundation for regular space operations for all the things our descendants will do in space.

The use of space by man stretches ahead forever. Fifty years, a hundred, a thousand. We cannot even start to guess what we will do there eventually.

Our descendants will almost surely have factories in space, while huge mirror lenses may be parked in close orbit to the earth, reflecting the perpetual sunshine in space down to solar furnaces on earth to supply us with power.

Before such things and countless unimaginables can even begin, the aims of the space shuttle must be realized.

The size of the payloads we orbit must be increased and the cost of putting them up decreased. A routine way to repair and re-supply satellites in orbit—or to add improvements to them—must be worked out. The wasteful habit of throwing away millions of dollars worth of launch vehicle and satellite after one use must end. Taxi and tugboat services must exist in space to avoid the costly launches against earth's gravity for every little thing that we may want to do out there.

The space shuttle represents our first crack at converting the space around the earth from the proving ground it now is to a busy harbor. To see it as a whole, let's jump ahead to an imaginary look at perhaps the 150th launching of the space shuttle program from Cape Kennedy. Maybe the years is 1983 or so.

Earlier shuttle trips have modestly tried

to do only one or two things at a time to test them out in practice. This 150th trip has multiple missions and its crew are old hands at shuttling. The first launchings have parked various things out in space, in orbit around the earth. Craft like the one we are looking at on the pad took them all out and returned. They have already revisited many of them, ferried repair crews up and back to some of them, and several times relieved crews stationed on others. Each was ready for turnabout only two weeks after gliding back home.

Even at this stage of the space game we are still experimenting and exploring. Many of the satellites that this mission will revisit are still collecting scientific data. One day we will know most of what we can readily learn in earth orbits, and more of the satellites will be doing jobs that are more immediately practical than long-range scientific research.

The craft we see on the pad is called an orbiter. "Space shuttle" refers to the whole project, not any one element.

The orbiter has carried dozens of payloads up, and it may carry hundreds more before we replace it. It doesn't look like the earlier rockets, but like a big jet transport standing on its tail. It has delta wings for moving about in the earth's atmosphere and for gliding to a landing on return trips from space.

Though it is like nothing else in the past in detail, it is plainly a flying cargo vessel and not a three-staged space package whose parts will be separated, never to be reused when the mission is complete. Like a jet transport or a bomber, the payload is inside its main body.

Except for the Apollo moon rocket the payload is much bigger than anything we ever blasted off in the days before the shuttle. One reason is that the orbiter does not carry the weight of a third-stage rocket, and can use the saving to carry useful load. It is only going to a low orbit. There is a tug orbiting in space that will haul any of the payload that is destined for a distant orbit the rest of the way.

The tug was sent up just one time and parked in orbit, to sort of take the place of all future third-stage rockets. The orbiter need only bring it fresh fuel supplies to keep the tug operable, instead of blasting the weight of a third-stage launch vehicle off the earth each time we put something in a distant orbit.

For this and other reasons, the useful load of the orbiter is much larger than useful loads were before 1978. For instance, one thing in the orbiter as it stands on the pad is a new sort of Skylab, an advanced version of the first one up that got in trouble in May 1973. Yet it is simpler and cheaper as it is not an independent vehicle. It is called a Space Lab. Several scientists working in a shirtsleeve atmosphere can conduct space experiments in it for anywhere from seven to 30 days. On this trip four scientists have been allotted 20 days. The Space Lab is not a part of the orbiter, but is just part of the payload—a sort of workshop in an enclosed cylinder that's going along this time. This one will be carried inside the fuselage on the whole trip, though it can be exposed to the space environment.

We can pretend that the scientists in the Lab for Trip 150 are going to try to manufacture several useful things for mankind in space that cannot be manufactured on earth, and were never known before, because they can't be made except in no-gravity, or in a perfect vacuum. It is felt that their work on this trip will result in a permanently orbiting space factory to produce unheard of drugs and other chemical compounds within a few years, as well as some more familiar products that will be of a purity unknown on earth, where trace contaminants and uneven reactions are unavoidable. A rather

conservative professor has predicted that as a result of this trip, crystals will be made in space of such purity that they will revolutionize electronics.

If it weren't carrying a Space Lab on this trip, the orbiter could take up a number of free-flying satellites (as it has often done) and park them in orbit by pushing them overboard.

Right now, it's close to launch time. The orbiter has a huge fuel tank strapped to its belly and two slightly smaller rockets on either side of the tank. All three are so big that, to the eye, the orbiter looks something like a DC-9 piggybacked onto the larger tank and rockets. This impression isn't all that inaccurate. The orbiter has its own high pressure engines for takeoff, smaller ones for maneuvering in space, and other jet engines can be added for flying around like a plane in the atmosphere. But on the launch pad, the blast-off rockets and fuel tank combined seem to be bigger than the orbiter is.

It takes off gently and slowly, though with the usual thunder and flame of a big-rocket launching. The two rockets are blasting with their own solid fuel supply, the orbiter's engines are burning liquid hydrogen drawn from the big accessory tank. The package accelerates slowly, avoiding the high G's of earlier rocketry.

At 25 miles up, over the Atlantic, the two booster rockets drop off. They are parachuted over the Atlantic to be picked up at sea, and will be refueled and ready for reuse with a later shuttle trip.

The orbiter continues toward space. In the fringes of the earth's atmosphere, it lets go of the huge fuel tank. This burns up on reentry, and it is the only major equipment that is expendable, outside of the fuel itself.

Having shed the tank and rockets, the orbiter now looks just like an airplane flying in space.

Soon, it goes into low orbit—100 miles above the earth's surface, at about 18,000 mph. At this point, the scientists in the Lab begin their in-orbit experiments, dressed in ordinary clothing. Up front in the cockpit, orbiter crew-members open the cargo bay doors and place a package of materials outside to test what effect the vacuum of space has on them.

Then the orbiter fires its maneuvering rockets and changes orbit somewhat. The scientists in the Lab work on. They are heating a complex liquid chemical in a way that's familiar on earth, but the results are different because no turbulence occurs in it when heated. In the absence of gravity there is no up or down, hence no mixing, boiling action in the liquid. The Lab scientists conceal their excitement as they take notes and draw tentative conclusions about a phenomenon never before observed. The chemical reaction is occurring in a brand new way.

Next stop, on this mission, is the unmanned Large Space Telescope. It has been observing the universe without any intervening atmosphere, taking pictures of a clarity that no earthbound telescope can record. Some exposed film is ready to be picked up and some batteries are scheduled for replacement. An orbiter crewman leaves the ship and takes care of these tasks, returning with the film and a report on the state of the telescope.

The allotted 20 days are up. At a specified moment, the pilot fires maneuvering rockets and descent begins. At an altitude of about 400,000 feet the orbiter enters the fringes of the earth's atmosphere. From here on in the landing will be completely unpowered. Control is provided only by the orbiter's wings and tail surfaces. The ceramic thermal protection system can stand the heat of this reentry and a hundred more.

At about 39,000 feet, the pilot engages an automatic landing system and the orbiter begins a curving descent to a predetermined point at about 20,000 feet, some 20 to 30 miles from the shuttle port. There, the

orbiter steadies into a steep, 6,000-foot-per-minute descent in a 300-knot glide. It's the world's largest glider now. About 45 seconds before landing, the craft's nose comes up. Finally, it settles down for a smooth, 160-knot landing, belly down, on retractable wheels that are now in landing position. The runway is more or less similar to that used for today's jetliners, only about twice as long, at 15,000 feet.

Two weeks later, the orbiter will be off on Trip 151, this time carrying several small satellites, perhaps, or a large observatory, or another Space Lab with several scientists.

The Trip 150 Lab scientists have headed back home, certain that they have a sample of a drug and of an electronic crystal of the greatest purity ever known, as well as a dozen other samples about which they are willing to say nothing, pending analysis. The conservative professor, after only a brief inspection of the electronic crystal his friends brought back, is already designing in his mind an unmanned capsule to grind out silicon and germanium crystals in space and deliver them in quantity to the orbiter.

The films from the telescope have been processed and a host of astronomers have convened to consider the results. They make no statements at all, and when reporters press them, a spokesman finally says: "These pictures are an improvement over large telescope photos taken through the atmosphere by an order of 100 or more. Many of the results seem astonishing. I am afraid we can say nothing more until after a great deal of analysis, and we await further photos of other sections of the heavens taken by this instrument."

An Arizona scientist puts a sour note on things in an open letter to the President complaining about delay in sending up the first experimental Solar Power Reflector. He hints that oil and coal interests are responsible "while the energy crisis is upon us." A swift denial comes from power interests, and for three days the news media play up the quarrel. A NASA scientist releases a list of technical problems still facing the Reflector. Hardly anyone read it because they can't understand it as well as they can the exchange between the Arizona scientist and the fuel producers.

Though this has been only an imaginary trip, it should give a general idea of what the space shuttle is all about. It seems obvious that it will be the true start, for all start, for all future centuries, of getting into space on a working basis.

Development of the shuttle began in earnest in August 1972, with the awarding of major contracts. By 1976, it's expected, the reusable vehicle will be undergoing horizontal test flights within the earth's atmosphere. By late 1978, space tests will begin. And, according to the current schedule, the shuttle will be fully operational by 1980.

The present program envisions five orbiters (two by 1978) to take care of our needs through 1990, each with a life of 500 missions or more.

But we are not going to foot the whole bill. Several European nations have already agreed to produce the Space Lab, and they are working on it now.

We expect that the shuttle may bring the launch cost down to about \$160 a pound at the same time that it permits retrieving or repairing gadgets in orbit. We envision that many nations will be coming to us for launching and in-space services for satellites of their own. Whatever arrangements are made, NASA believes that we'll recoup a good part of space shuttle costs by operating it as a satellite taxi and road-service truck for paying customers.

In the first 12 years of the shuttle, as many as 780 trips are envisioned. About 26% would be manned or man-tended. Almost an equal number would involve further earth study or

render services to earth, such as communications, navigation, weather and others that may be developed. About 25% are expected to involve physics, astronomy or interplanetary exploration. Unquestionably, the final pattern of later missions will evolve more definitely from the results of the earlier trips.

About 22% are expected to be allocated to the military. One of the early missions is expected to put a north-south military observation satellite in orbit, a tricky bit of business from a shuttle launched in an east-west orbit. The military is planning to have its own space shuttle station in California.

Present estimates are that without the shuttle the planned launches to 1990 would cost about \$42 billion and be neither redeemable nor repairable in space. With the shuttle they would cost about \$35 billion, and enjoy the greater versatility in operations that it will allow.

The preparations for flights will be shorter, less tedious and less expensive. The deployment of ships to attend the splashdowns of manned satellites in mid ocean can be abandoned, to make landings cheaper.

The wedding of an airplane with a space vehicle was seen when Congress first created NASA. The initials stand for National Aeronautics and Space Administration, with "aeronautics" ahead of "space." Though it has attracted fewer headlines, a great deal of NASA's work has been concerned with the development of novel airplane design and testing. In 1958, virtually all advanced development of planes and space vehicles being conducted by many government agencies was pulled together and put under NASA. This was ten months after our first satellite in space, Explorer 1, was launched by an earlier agency in March 1958.

During the middle and late 1960's, when the Apollo program was at its peak, when NASA was growing by the minute and when our desire to undertake space adventures seemed unlimited by such earthly considerations as budgets and technical difficulties, the space shuttle was revived as part of a broad, almost grandiose plan. It included a low-earth orbit space station, a space base on earth, a space shuttle, a high-orbit space station, a nuclear shuttle, a space tug, a manned lunar orbiting station, a manned moon base and manned trips to Mars.

The space shuttle and the space tug are the only items left from that shopping list. Even the space shuttle isn't very close to the original design. It's far simpler, less luxurious.

Today, about the only aspect of the original luxury design that's left is the rationale: a device that can offer economic space transportation to all customers. Which seems to be the real meat of all the earlier proposals.

CAREY DENOUNCES DESECRATION OF JEWISH CEMETERIES

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have brought to the attention of the House on many occasions the plight of Soviet Jewry and the persecution these people have experienced in trying to exert their right to emigrate to another country.

Today, however, I wish to speak about another facet of discrimination that these people have experienced—the desecration of their cemeteries.

I have been informed that the Soviet

administration in several cities in Eastern Europe has been destroying sites of Jewish cemeteries to make way for buildings. In some instances, moreover, the removal of these burial sites has also meant the destruction of historical sites such as the graves of the great Yiddish writers Mendel Mocher Sesorim and Simon Frug.

In Odessa, in Kishinev, in Warsaw and Moscow, the story has been the same—progress has been used as an excuse for persecution. It is a subtle approach, but an appalling policy, nevertheless.

I feel strongly that we must protest this action and urge the United Nations to issue its own objections to such behavior.

The dignity of the living is either enhanced or diminished by the manner in which those who have gone before are treated.

The assault on the resting places of Eastern European Jews is an affront to all men. Let us go on record as protesting such behavior and having been able to end such practices through the united efforts of the Congress and the U.N.

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1974

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1974, I received a copy of S.F. No. 720, resolution No. 1, as adopted by the Minnesota Legislature. The resolution memorializes Congress and the President to stop railroad abandonment.

With the new administration proposal called the "Transportation Improvement Act of 1974," which includes liberalizing railroad abandonment procedures, it is imperative that Congress hear from the separate States in this regard.

I share the concern of the Minnesota Legislature, and wish to share this concern with the other Members of this body. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, maintaining adequate, competitive transportation facilities is equally vital to industry, business and all consumers; and

Whereas, railroad service is particularly vital to hundreds of Minnesota communities; and

Whereas, Minnesota's biggest industry, agriculture, is heavily dependent upon the railroads to move its production equipment and supplies, and its millions of tons of farm grains to market; and

Whereas, the loss of rail freight service that has already occurred and the continued loss of freight service that is programmed by the railroads for abandonment of most branch lines and some sections of primary rail arteries has had and will increasingly have a disastrous economic impact upon the State of Minnesota and its citizens; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, that the appropriate federal agencies declare a moratorium on all further railroad abandonments immediately until a study is completed and it is determined if reasonable transportation alternatives are available to the public.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Congressional Delegation of this State, to the President of the United States, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the Secretary of Transportation, to the Chairmen of the United States House and Senate Committees on Transportation and Commerce, and to the major farm organizations requesting their support for the enactment of this program.

CLIENT REPRESENTATION OR POLITICAL ACTION?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Senate version of the Legal Services Corporation Act, although containing apparent restrictions on political activity, has an escape clause built into every restriction. This escape hatch is the language "necessary to the provision of legal advice and representation." Thus Legal Services attorneys may not engage in political activities "except where necessary to provide necessary legal advice and representation to eligible clients." Nor may they make personnel or funds available for advocating or opposing ballot measures "except as necessary to provide legal advice." Nor may they lobby for legislation "except where necessary to the provision of legal advice."

As an attorney, I find it difficult to believe that lobbying, working on a referendum, or any other form of political activity is necessary to the provision of legal advice or client representation. Why should political activity be an integral part of an attorney's services? I do not think there is anything extraordinarily political about the clients of Legal Services attorneys. I do believe, however, that the drafters of this legislation are paving the way for the Legal Services attorneys to get as politicized as they want, and to politicize their clients if that suits them too.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an example of what I mean. One of OEO's Legal Services grantees is the National Clients Council. A notable feature of this organization is its political involvement and its lobbying efforts. I have a confidential memo from OEO, dated September 20, 1972, which describes some of the council's activities. As I read over the memo, I am struck by the fact that most of the council's political activities could be justified by invoking "necessity for client representation," if you are willing to stretch the point somewhat. That, of course, is what will be done if we allow these escape clauses to be written into the law.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this memorandum from OEO for the consideration of my colleagues:

(Confidential)

SEPTEMBER 20, 1972.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR
From (deleted).

Subject: National Clients Council.

I recommend that appropriate steps be

taken, over the long run to discontinue the funding of this grantee, which is up for renewal at the end of September, for the following reasons:

1. The underlying concept of the grant, namely the presupposition that the poor should be governmentally regarded as a group, is inimical to the position taken by President Nixon in opposing quotas. Opposition to quotas is based on the view that it is wrong to deal with people in consequence of their collective identity, rather than their individual identities. In the "one America" which the President seeks, discrimination, either favorable or adverse, on the basis of one's group characteristics, would be prohibited.

2. Included on the Board of Directors of the National Clients Council are two organizations which have been politically active against President Nixon and his policies: the National Welfare Rights Organization and the National Tenants Organization. NTO is regularly in the news for its activities in organizing rent strikes.

3. The August 1972 newsletter of the National Clients Council included the following paragraph:

"The new Legal Services Corporation bill is still in a state of limbo. You will remember that President Nixon vetoed the Bill that included the provision for establishment of an independent non-profit corporation to house the present programs administered by the Office of Legal Services. That was last December. Since that time, friends of Legal Services have sought to arrive at a compromise bill which would adequately serve the needs of the poor and would stand a chance of being signed into law. Last month the OEO program, including the Office of Legal Services, was extended in the same form and at the same dollar level for another two years.

"This was only after a commitment could not be obtained from the Nixon administration in support of the new compromise bill. Now that same compromise bill has been returned to the House-Senate conference committee for further adjustment and compromise. If you would like to voice your support for a strong Legal Services Corporation, now is the time. Write your Senator or Congressman and voice your opinion."

It seems to me most improper for us to fund an organization which has been actively lobbying in this manner.

4. It also seems wrong that government funding should be used for a grantee to lobby for more government funds. Yet the following quote from the August newsletter gives evidence that the National Clients Council is doing precisely that.

"Well, it's refunding time once again and NCC has been busily preparing budgets and proposals for refunding by the Office of Legal Services since the time of the Annual Conference. We had hoped to be able to secure funds to greatly expand and improve NCC's work program this year. However, with the uncertain fate of the new Legal Services Corporation Bill, all programs are being refunded at the same level. We must then strive to improve the services offered by NCC and continually work towards expansion even within limited budgets. Your support of NCC and its goals and work programs can be of great help. Write: Mr. Robert Bellrune, Office of Legal Services, 1200 19th St. N.W., Room L-514, Washington, D.C. 20036."

5. The work program mentions that "NCC is presently very deeply involved in formulating an innovative method of training for Boards of Legal Services Programs." In view of what seems to me to be an improper use of the newsletter, I am concerned as well about the possible content of the proposed training activities.

I appreciate your consideration of this recommendation.

FUEL CONSERVATION

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, recently I asked high school students in my district to express themselves on how we can each conserve fuel and what the Government should do about the fuel shortage. Some of the ideas were ingenious and farseeing, and I would like to share the following examples with my colleagues:

CARING IS THE ANSWER

(By Carlene Ness, Huntington Catholic High School)

Did you ever think about what this world would be like if people did not care about other people? There would be even more mass confusion, crime, and selfish people in our world than there are today. Sure we do not have a perfect world now, because people are not perfect. But the majority of the people "care," that is why I believe we can pull through this energy crisis, a problem that we ourselves brought about. We took the abundant supply of fuel that God gave us and misused it, took it for granted. Now we have to suffer the consequences.

One person did not use up our entire supply of fuel, nor can one person solve the shortage problem. We must all do our part to save fuel because we all helped bring about the crisis. This may mean we cannot drive three hundred miles to see Grandma over the holidays, or our house may be a little colder but it will be worth it in the future.

Some of us say, "It does not do me any good for me to turn down my heat if everyone else on my block has their furnace going full blast."

This is true, but that is where the "caring" part comes in. We have to do our part in conserving fuel so the next generation does not have to suffer for our mistakes.

HYDROGEN: THE ANSWER TO THE FUEL
SHORTAGE

(By Terri Scher, Huntington Catholic High School)

Gasoline consumption has dropped fifteen per cent over the last three weeks. Highway lighting has been cut by half except for ramps and freeways. Thermostats are being turned down all over the country.

These are only a few of the drastic measures being taken by President Nixon to halt the energy crisis. Will they work? It is hard to say.

Personally, I think the whole answer to the fuel shortage is very simple. Hydrogen. What is it? Hydrogen is a colorless, gaseous, odorless, nonpoisonous inflammable substance. It is also the lightest element yet known to scientists. It is fourteen times lighter than air. When hydrogen is combined with oxygen, it produces water.

What can be done with it? Hydrogen can be used to replace gasoline as a fuel.

The idea makes a lot of sense when you think about it. Hydrogen is the most abundant element in the universe. Why not turn it into something as essential as fuel?

Unlike electricity, hydrogen can be stored. It is pollution-free. When burned, it produces only energy and water vapor. Even today hydrogen is being used to blast huge rockets off the launching pad. It has been used for a quarter century in America's atomic and space programs. Hydrogen could be substituted for the fuels that now fire steam-generator power plants. But it will be far more efficient to use it in a fuel big enough to supply a neighborhood, or a smaller one about the size of a dishwasher to make on-the-spot electricity for homes,

hospitals, farms, apartments, stores and small factories.

As an engine fuel, hydrogen is in many ways superior to gasoline and diesel fuel oil. In this day and age everybody is always screaming about pollution. Hydrogen's biggest selling point is this: Only four per cent as much pollution as gasoline-powered vehicles.

By now you are probably thinking, "OK, what is the drawback?" Here it is: Right now, made from nuclear energy, it would cost three times as much as gasoline. It takes electricity to separate the H from H₂O. Big money is needed to launch a hydrogen era. To build just one atomic plant on an artificial island in the sea will cost at least \$600 million, and many of them will be necessary.

The United States already uses one third of the world's energy, and by 1990 our consumption of energy will probably be twice what it is today.

Fossil fuels, with the problems of depletion and pollution, can no longer be the only option to fight this energy crisis.

For relief, hydrogen offers more than a glimmer of hope as the big payoff.

THE FUEL SHORTAGE

(By Mary Farquhar, Bishop Luers High School)

Hon. J. Edward Roush poses one loaded question. First, let me say that I am very glad that someone realizes that we are facing a fuel shortage and not an energy crisis. Energy as defined by my most detested physics book is "the ability to do work." America has never suffered from a lack of the ability to do work. It is suffering from a fuel shortage which if allowed to go unchecked and unexplained could result in a much dreaded energy crisis.

People turn to Washington for leadership. But, how can anyone lead; if no one knows what is going on?

The Administration has so far not put forth a concrete plan of action. The voluntary measures they have set come as more or less predicted surprises and are based on the oil companies' statistics. I find that slightly frightening to say nothing of ironic. During the fuel shortage, the large oil companies are profiting (e.g. Exxon has increased their profits by 80%). This does not help a confused public at all. I think it would be right in forming a fact finding committee, independent from the oil companies. Or a statement I found inserted in the Congressional Record (Dec. 3) can only become more prevalent. It was in an article written by Michael O'Hearn. And the article was submitted by Hon. Edward J. Derwinski who found it "one of the more imaginative, inquisitive, and interesting articles" he has read on the crisis.

The statement which caught my eye was one where Mr. O'Hearn said, "No one has proved to me that there is a shortage."

In my opinion it is the duty of the Congress as our elected officials to set the record straight. If there is a fuel shortage we should know it and how much, or if this is another one of these schemes on the level of the Russian Wheat Deals we should know that too.

The average American is being hurt by this shortage while the bank rolls of the big oil companies soar. How can the administration expect Joe Citizen to limit his driving when oil companies are making unlimited profits? Therefore, I think Congress should pass the windfall profit legislation. If the oil companies need the huge profits for taking risky gambles searching for new oil fields as they claim, then they should be able to prove it.

Else, how are we to know that the fuel shortage is not some concoction of the oil company to pass the Alaskan Pipe Bill?

As cigarette smoking is dangerous to your health, using fuel wastefully is dangerous to your pocketbook. I think in advertising a

product; if the product is a motor vehicle (car, truck, etc.) the miles that it gets per gallon of gas should be posted and machines using electricity (refrigerators, washing machines, etc.) should post the number of BTU's it uses per hour.

This would help consumers be more comparative and it make for more interesting commercials. Picture a luxurious sedan with a beautiful woman spouting out features (the car's not her own) in a sexy voice. Flashing across the screen would be a sign showing that this epitome of comfort is a hopeless gas guzzler.

At present everyone is supposed to use ten gallons of gas per week. Since this is the case I think more of the highway funds should be used to expand mass transit systems. Ten gallons of gas does not get a person from one state to another in most circumstances.

Plus, it is now obvious that the Interstate Highway System is costly, both economically and environmentally.* The \$68-billion price tag for some 42,500 miles of highway is indeed staggering, but even more overwhelming are the environmental costs. To build just the Interstate System:

1. Total excavations will move enough materials to bury Connecticut knee-deep in dirt.
2. New rights-of-way needed amount to 1.5 million acres.
3. The sand, gravel and crushed stone needed for construction would build a wall 50 feet wide and nine feet high around the earth.
4. The steel used will take 30 million tons of iron ore, 18 million tons of coal and 6.5 million tons of limestone.
5. Lumber and timber requirements would take all the trees from a 400-square-mile forest.
6. The culvert and drain pipes used will equal the combined water and sewage system in six cities the size of Chicago.

By contrast, the railroads are a very economical and environmentally sound means of transportation. For example:

1. Railroads require far less land than highways. One track can handle as many people as 10 to 20 lanes of expressway.
2. Diesel locomotives create less pollution and noise than other forms of transportation.
3. Even if they were financed with tax money, railroads are much cheaper than highways. For example, new expressways cost \$1 million a mile in rural areas and \$10 million and up in urban areas. By contrast, upgrading existing railroad rights-of-way costs about \$200,000 per mile.

Tearing up the land bothers a lot of people including those that want something left in 40 years. This brings in strip mining. It can last only for 40 years and it will leave unrepairable scars on the Earth. Strip mining should only be used as a last desperate resort especially if full oil tankers are resting in docks waiting for the prices to go up.

Congress has been acting on the fuel shortage. They should continue to do so in a calculating manner not only to keep our houses warm this year or next but in the future and in a safe manner. The fuel problem will remain but Congress can deal with it now. It should be kept in dimensions that we can end in the future.

HOW WE CAN CONSERVE FUEL

(By Catherine G. Wall, Huntington Catholic High School)

Sooner or later the people in the United States are going to realize that there is a fuel shortage. They know that they must cut down a little but to me, they are not going to realize it until it is all gone and they are freezing in their houses and there is no gas

to go anywhere. Then they will wish they would have cut down when they were told to.

There are many ways we can conserve fuel. The problem is getting the people to conserve it. First with the gas, I think it is a good idea to have all gas stations closed on Sunday. This should be a day where everyone stays home instead of going to visit friends or relatives or just out for a Sunday drive. These things are not really necessary. There is a lot of gas wasted on just people going places just to be going. Of course then, there are some people that must be on the road all the time, like the business man. Therefore let him on the road, but if gas is needed it should be up to the company where he is employed to supply it for him.

Lowering the speed limit is going to be one of the hardest jobs for the Government to get the people to cooperate with. The Government can ask the public to reduce the speed, but it is still going to have to be reminded of them. You can not really arrest someone if they are speeding because if they are a normal person, the next time they get on the road they will speed up again. I do not think that not having buses for away basketball games is solving any gas shortage because if there are not any buses the fans are going to drive to the game and when you get about six people driving that is all the more gas you could be saving by just getting a bus. A bus does not use up as much gas as a whole school full of fans would going in separate cars.

The heat shortage can only be solved by the people themselves. Asking the people to turn down their thermostats is only a small part of it. The biggest part is the people actually turning them down. You can not set a certain temperature because some houses are bigger than others and if there is a baby, they need to be kept warmer than a person of average age. I myself can tell what it is like to freeze in a house. With a five floor house heating the whole thing would be a little expensive. Our thermostat has always been set at 68 degrees and now it's even lower. I guess my family is just conserving for those people who do not. A question that runs through my mind is, Are the men in politics themselves turning down their thermostats. Remember the famous saying "Practice what you preach."

THE FUEL SHORTAGE

(By Debbie Young, Huntington Catholic High School)

The problem of how to conserve fuel is not something that can be put off. It is a problem that we have to deal with today. I think that before we can find a solution to it we have to realize the seriousness of the shortage. Many people do not think that it will affect them personally. Others do not even believe that there is a shortage.

The fuel shortage will affect the life of every American. It is possible that everyone's life style may be changed. Americans are going to have to unite and do their part in saving fuel. They are going to have to be a lot less wasteful. They have to decide whether the ways they are using fuel are necessary and cut out some of the luxuries that they have become accustomed to.

People should lower the thermostats in their homes, use less electricity and water, cut down traveling, and lower their speed when traveling. They should try to cut down on Christmas lights too.

Mass transit in large cities would cut down a lot on personal transportation to shopping centers, places of employment, libraries, doctors offices, and other centers of activity. This would save a lot of fuel and would not cause too much change or discomfort in anyone's life style. Although this could be successful in the cities it would not be possible in rural areas. Therefore all personal transportation could not be cut out. Car pools

*Information obtained from Rodale's Environment Action Bulletin, April 28, 1973.

should be organized whenever possible and people should walk to places that are nearby instead of taking their car. One measure that the government might have to take is driving restrictions on public school pupils and on students of state universities.

Fan buses to basketball games and other activities may be banned if the shortage gets more serious because they are not really necessary. This may cut fuel but if people drive their own cars to the activities more gas may be used than that the bus would use.

The government may have to put limitations on aviation fuel. I think that they should also stop space flights for a time being until some solutions to the fuel shortage are made because of the huge amount of fuel they consume. Race driving is also an unnecessary use of fuel.

The President has asked gasoline station owners to voluntarily close their stations from nine p.m. each Saturday until midnight Sunday. He feels that this should cut down on unnecessary Sunday driving, even though people can fill up on Saturday night. He has also asked Americans to reduce their speed to fifty miles per hour because an automobile uses much less gas comparatively at this speed. The fifty mile an hour speed limit could possibly become a law throughout the United States.

The higher gas prices that are being charged today are hoped to cut the amount of gas purchased. People are more likely to buy only the gas they need.

Small economic cars are much better on gas mileage. Cars with anti-pollution devices burn more gas. It has been suggested that these devices be removed, but we should not pollute the air in order to conserve fuel, just as we should not do much strip mining because it defaces the land.

We should not sell our fuel to other countries. Our scientists can reach and find new methods of making fuel. And if worse comes to worse, gas will have to be rationed.

These are suggestions on how to conserve fuel. But before the country can act as a whole to fight the shortage they have to realize that it is going to affect them sooner or later. They have to understand that it is a serious problem that must be solved now through cooperation, or it may result in a severe economic upset for our country.

KEEPING OUR NATION ON AN ACCURATE COURSE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, surveyors know that the mistake of the smallest fraction of an inch at the eye of the transit operator will make a dangerous error yards wide, a few miles down the road. The following article reminds us of the importance of keeping our Nation on an accurate course:

SOMETHING NOT QUITE STRAIGHT TODAY CAN BECOME FATALLY CROOKED TOMORROW

Bowing and scraping to greedy groups abroad because it might get you votes at home can lose allies for America, and be the difference between life or death for your country some day.

We feed our enemies, because "it's the decent thing to do". Today's tiger cub, well fed, can tear you apart tomorrow.

Your ear to the ground for the whisper of

security might mean you wouldn't hear the rumble of a coming nuclear blast which could kill you and your nation.

No future worth living can be reached by compromising today with the truth, with honor.

Either we go back to the principles of courage, decency, self-respect—the principles which built this nation—or we accept the slightly dishonest, the expedient, the compromise, the "practical"—which so many seem to want, and which can not help but seal the death of this nation, and of all who accept it.

There is no middle ground. Either we believe in this country, the principles which built it, or we do not. And if we do not, if we are not willing to sacrifice self for principle, then—God Save America.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 69

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that I am preparing a series of amendments which I intend to offer to title VII of H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1974.

Title VII of H.R. 69 amends and extends the Bilingual Education Act, and it is my view that the limited scope of the committee amendments fails to reflect the importance we should attach to this program.

The Bilingual Education Act authorizes funds for special instruction for children from other than English-speaking families. The current USOE estimate is that there are 5 million such children throughout the country, including Spanish speaking, Chinese, American Indian and Eskimo, Italian, Greek, and a variety of other ethnic backgrounds. These are among the most educationally disadvantaged youngsters in America, since their educational progress is hampered or permanently impeded by their inability to understand the instruction offered in English in the standard classroom and curriculum.

Federal bilingual education programs are intended to allow these children to be taught in their mother tongue at the same time they are learning English.

Also incorporated into the program are studies in the history and cultural heritage of the ethnic groups from which their families come, to instill a sense of pride and identity in place of the social isolation that is so often the lot of non-English-speaking children in the classroom today.

Bilingual education has received only nominal support from the Federal Government, from the first appropriation of \$7.5 million in 1966 to \$53 million in fiscal 1974—far below the level authorized by Congress. The President has requested a cutback in the budget to \$35 million next year, a disastrous setback for an urgently required program already reaching far too few of the children in need of its benefits.

In New York City, only 7,300 or 250,-

000 Spanish-speaking students are enrolled in bilingual programs. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission recently found that less than 4 percent of the Mexican American children in the public schools of the Southwest are receiving bilingual instruction. Nationwide, 111,000 children participated in the 217 projects funded in 1973, the last year for which data are available, only 2 percent of those in need of such aid.

The U.S. Supreme Court has recently ruled that Chinese-speaking children in the San Francisco public schools are being denied their right to equal educational opportunity under title VI of the Civil Rights Act through the failure of the schools to provide them with bilingual instruction.

The court stated that to require children to acquire basic skills before they enter school is to make a mockery of public education.

Clearly, we need to do more for these children unless we are willing to allow their special needs to go unmet, with the all too predictable consequences of educational retardation, increasing truancy, and the high dropout rate characteristic of students of limited English-speaking ability. We must stimulate meaningful nationwide activity at all levels of government to overcome the neglect shown these youngsters till now.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments I will offer to H.R. 69 will be similar to provisions in the Senate amendments to ESEA. I will offer an amendment to establish a Bureau of Bilingual Education within the Office of Education, to be headed by a Director with the rank of Deputy Commissioner of Education with the responsibility to report to Congress every year on the activities of the Bureau. Present administration is in a Division of Bilingual Education within the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, but I feel that the low levels of the President's budget requests over the years indicates that we must upgrade the status of the office to generate the kind of thrust this program needs.

Another amendment will authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants for preservice and inservice bilingual teacher training and for short-term training institutes. It will also authorize fellowships for advanced degrees in bilingual education and will allow the Commissioner to pay stipends and expenses for participation in these programs in accord with prevailing practice. Though there is already provision in the Bilingual Education Act for funds for teacher training, I believe that this aspect of the program needs greater emphasis. The teacher is the key to what happens in a bilingual program as in any classroom. Fluency in two languages is required, as well as an ability to teach about the cultural heritage of the specific ethnic group being instructed. USOE has found that many of the teachers in its programs are not qualified to handle this kind of assignment, and I am convinced that we should add stronger incentives in the law to prospective bilingual teachers.

I will also offer an amendment to extend the availability of other educa-

tional programs to individuals of limited English-speaking ability, particularly vocational education, library services, and adult education. Besides providing formal classroom instruction in basic skills that pupils will need to get ahead in society, we should give the opportunity to youngsters and older people alike from non-English-speaking backgrounds to participate in all federally supported education programs.

Finally, I will offer an amendment to the act to describe what the content of a bilingual educational program should be. Where bilingual programs have been instituted, they are often rudimentary, sometimes no more than 1 hour a day of separate instruction in English as a second language. A comprehensive bilingual program must include instruction in all subjects at preschool, elementary, and secondary levels; the study of the history, nation, and geographical area of the student's background; provision for the enrollment of children whose language is English to avoid social isolation and to enrich the studies of the English-speaking children; and the establishment of standards regarding pupil/teacher ratios, teacher qualifications, and other factors in the enhancement of bilingual instruction.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer ignore the needs of half a million children in our schools who, without our commitment, may be denied forever the right to play productive roles in our society. Equal educational opportunity will never be a reality so long as we deny to one child the chance to advance to the full limit of his ability and capacities. Expanded bilingual education programs are essential if we are to make that goal attainable.

NUCLEAR WARSHIPS AND THE NAVY'S FUTURE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Seapower Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, I am intimately aware of the rapidly expanding Soviet naval threat and the declining posture of the U.S. Navy. My colleagues and I are alarmed over the tremendous change in the balance of naval power which has taken place in recent years.

We all remember the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 where the United States displayed its overwhelming superiority of naval power and the Soviets were forced to back down. But, last year during the Arab-Israeli October war the United States found itself in an entirely different position with the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean greatly outnumbering the U.S. 6th Fleet. If they had challenged us would we have won? I am not sure of the answer, but I think all of us should ponder the question. I, personally, have my doubts as to what the outcome would have been and I don't like to find the United States in such a position. We are a

maritime power and we must have a Navy second to none.

There is just no doubt in my mind that the United States must embark on building a modern Navy for the future capable of defending our national interests against the naval threat being developed by the Soviets. I am also convinced that the new warships we build for our striking forces—submarine and surface—must have nuclear propulsion. If we are to learn any lessons from the expanding Soviet naval capability and the current oil crisis, we must provide nuclear propulsion in our new warships being built for our first line striking forces which must be capable of defending us in areas of highest threat.

Frankly, after the debate that has been going on for a quarter of a century concerning the need for nuclear propulsion for striking force ships; after the present fuel crisis has demonstrated the tremendous vulnerability of our oil supply lines; after the Soviets have put to sea in a period of 10 years far more new classes and more new warships of modern design than ever put forth by any world power in the equivalent period of time in peacetime—I don't see how the Navy could even be considering the design of new ships for our aircraft carrier striking forces which do not have nuclear propulsion.

Can you imagine this House of Representatives ever again approving the construction of a major aircraft carrier that depends on fuel oil for its propulsion? I can't, but let me tell you: The Navy can and does. The Navy not only can imagine it but they are currently working on the design of a new class of conventionally powered aircraft carriers and missile ships for our carrier task forces. They are wasting the taxpayers' money even to be looking at such designs. I am sure that our committee will not approve future attack aircraft carriers that are not nuclear powered, and I am sure that we will continue to insist that sufficient nuclear escorts be built to provide our Navy with all-nuclear carrier task forces.

It is time for our Navy to stop living in the past and to start recognizing the needs of the future. We must get about the task of building the ships needed to defend our national interests in the areas of highest threat. Not to do so could be fatal. I think it is essential that our citizens understand these issues.

I know of no one who has demonstrated more vision in foreseeing the needs of our Navy than Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy. Nor do I know of a more eloquent spokesman for our Navy's needs. Therefore, I asked Admiral Rickover to prepare a speech on "Nuclear Warships and the Navy's Future" and invited him to present it to the San Diego Press Club on March 8, 1974. I will insert my introductory remarks and Admiral Rickover's speech in the Record at this point. His speech was received with enthusiasm by a large audience. The thrust of the reaction was amazement over the reluctance of the Navy to accept nuclear propulsion for our new warships built for our striking forces.

Mr. Speaker, I consider Admiral Rickover's speech addresses an issue of great

national importance and I recommend it be read by all Americans:

NUCLEAR WARSHIPS AND THE NAVY'S FUTURE (By Admiral H. G. Rickover)

Congressman Wilson has asked me to give you my views on nuclear propulsion in the Navy.

Much has been said in recent months about the importance of naval power as it relates to contemporary international relations. For a country that is essentially an island nation, whose economic life is increasingly dependent on foreign resources, and the majority of whose allies are oceans away, the emergence of widespread national interest in our naval posture is long overdue.

Several important events are making clear the inescapable reality of our dependence on naval power. Among these are the national retrenchment following the long war in Southeast Asia, the development of a strong Soviet Navy, with warships particularly designed to destroy U.S. naval forces, and most recently, the Arab-Israeli conflict, with the resultant loss of oil supplies from the Middle East.

The current lack of foreign oil has reminded us of our vulnerability to outside pressures. It has not been easy for our citizens to accept the fact that this country is dependent on anyone or anything. Americans are proud of their self-reliance and self-sufficiency. That something as simple as heating a house or driving a car can be governed by conditions beyond national or individual control is for most of us a painful revelation. The smoothest generalizations are breaking up against the rough edges of recent events.

So far, the oil shortage has only been an inconvenience to the majority of our people. But a shortage of petroleum could have disastrous results on the ability of our oil-fired naval forces to fight in areas where fuel supplies are unavailable to us. This does not have to continue to be the case for future major U.S. naval combatants, because we can build them with nuclear propulsion, if we exercise the foresight to do so.

With existing designs of naval nuclear propulsion plants it is possible to provide enough energy for ten to 13 years of ship operation without the need to refuel. And new reactor designs now under development will last 15 years. In contrast, oil-fired naval warships must be refueled every few days. The initial nuclear fuel for a NIMITZ Class aircraft carrier contains the energy equivalent of 11 million barrels of Navy distillate fuel oil, or enough oil to fill a train of railway tank cars, stretching from San Francisco to Los Angeles.

It was the concern for fuel for naval ships in time of war that led to establishment of the Naval Oil Reserves, which are now being considered as a quick source of additional oil during the present shortage. But even if this reserve is still available during a future war it will also be necessary to have the oil at hand where it is needed, before it can be used. Of what value is an oil-fired warship if it is unable to get oil? It is the need for a reliable worldwide fuel distribution system, that is the Achilles' heel of our oil-fired Navy. The difficulty in obtaining foreign oil supplies to support recent operations in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean shows this vulnerability.

But from the very beginning of the nuclear power program there has been strong opposition in the Navy. Were it not for the Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission we would not have nuclear submarines. In 1948 when the Navy opposed nuclear submarines, the Navy's systems analysts made a study. This study showed that a nuclear submarine would be worth 1.41 times as much as a conventional submarine, but would cost about twice as much. The analysts therefore concluded that nuclear power was not worthwhile. The Navy argued that if

they built nuclear submarines they would only get half as many submarines each year. This argument was similar to a view held by the Navy at the end of the nineteenth century. President Theodore Roosevelt said that the Navy feared to push submarines lest Congress withhold appropriations for building battleships. Fortunately, in the case of nuclear power, Congress prevailed and the *Nautilus* was built. In fact, the Atomic Energy Commission paid for the propulsion plants of the first two nuclear submarines. The *Nautilus* ushered in a revolution in submarine and naval warfare.

Although nuclear submarines have now been recognized as among the most vital warships we have, opposition to them has nevertheless continued for over a quarter of a century. For example, the Department of Defense at one point decided to stop building any more nuclear submarines after 1970, but they were overruled by Congress.

In another case, just a few years ago, the systems analysts in the Defense Department suggested sinking ten of our Polaris submarines to save money. And more recently it had to be Congressional action that increased the number of high speed *Los Angeles* Class nuclear attack submarines in the shipbuilding program over what the Defense Department had requested. Such a reluctance to build submarines has continued even though the Soviets have surpassed us in numbers of nuclear submarines since 1971 and are outbuilding us by three to one; and even though they now possess three times our submarine building capacity and are still increasing that capacity; and even though they have introduced nine new designs in the past seven years as compared to two for us.

In nuclear powered surface warships the opposition has been even more persistent. The five nuclear surface ships in service today came into being only after much pushing and shoving by Congress. The aircraft carrier *Kennedy* was built with conventional power over the strong objection of Congress. One of the two nuclear powered frigates which were authorized by Congress in fiscal year 1968 was not permitted to be built by the Defense Department, and the other was delayed for nearly two years. In 1971 the Navy scrapped a previously planned program to provide each nuclear powered carrier with its required four nuclear frigates, and suspended indefinitely the nuclear frigate construction program. Yet this was the only type of new combatant ship having a fleet air defense capability.

Central to the opposition to nuclear powered ships has been the precept that we should not go to nuclear power until we can show it is no more expensive than conventional power. But why should we expect to get all the advantages of nuclear power at no additional cost? The cost of all other weapons has gone up as their capabilities have improved. For example, the M-16 rifle costs three times as much as the World War II M-1 cost; a modern machine gun costs nine times more than one from World War II; a C-5 transport plane is over 300 times as expensive as the World War II C-47; the airplanes the Navy flies today cost 20 to 25 times as much as World War II aircraft. Does that mean we should have only four or five planes on our carriers instead of 100?

Even so, the additional cost of nuclear powered warships is minimal when all factors are considered. First, nuclear powered ships are built to higher standards than conventional ships and have proved to be more reliable in the operation of their propulsion plants. These first line ships carry the most modern and complex weapons systems and have increased operational capabilities over their conventional counterparts—all of which naturally contribute to their higher initial cost. In addition, the construction cost of

nuclear ships includes nuclear fuel for over ten to thirteen years of operation, whereas the initial cost of a conventional powered ship does not include the cost for oil.

Recently, oil costs have risen dramatically. It now costs close to \$25 a barrel to buy and deliver oil to Navy ships. At that rate, it would cost almost \$270 million to provide the amount of oil for a conventionally powered carrier equivalent to the nuclear fuel in the *Nimitz*. That is almost three times the cost of the nuclear fuel for this ship.

Nuclear and conventional ship costs should be compared on a lifetime basis. For example, compare lifetime costs for a nuclear carrier task group with those of a conventional task group. The nuclear carrier increases the task group cost about two percent. Each nuclear escort increases the overall task group cost one percent, so that four nuclear escorts increase the task group cost four percent. Therefore, the lifetime cost for a complete nuclear task group, consisting of a nuclear carrier and its four nuclear escorts, is six percent greater than that of a conventional carrier accompanied by four conventional escorts.

This is merely the peacetime cost. It does not take into account any of the advantages of nuclear power.

Nuclear powered task forces are far less dependent on logistic support. When logistic supply lines are attacked during a real war the decrease in the requirement for ships' fuel for the strike forces will have a compounding beneficial effect. The surviving fuel transportation and storage facilities can then all be concentrated on getting fuel for aircraft and other military vehicles to the forward areas. The escorts that would otherwise be required for the tankers which carry ships' fuel could then be assigned to assuring the safety of other supplies.

A major lesson of World War I, the first war in which fuel oil played a predominant role, was pithily expressed: "The Allies floated to victory on a sea of oil." In World War II also, the supply of oil was a controlling factor in most military operations. Here is a statement about fuel, that points out how lack of oil was instrumental in the defeat of Japan. It is quoted from the Strategic Bombing Survey conducted after the war. This report entitled "Oil in Japan's War" states:

"In every phase of the war, oil determined Japan's strategy and governed the tactical operations of its Navy and Air Force. The collapse of the Japanese war effort was the consequence of their inability to maintain their supply routes.

"The effect of oil shortage on Japanese Naval strategy became devastatingly apparent in the campaign for the Marianas and the Philippines. Japanese fleet units had to be dispersed between the Japanese Inland Sea and Singapore, owing to limited fuel availability and failure to achieve satisfactory coordination between the fleets, contributed substantially to the Japanese defeat. Fuel shortage in the Home Islands deprived the Japanese naval forces fighting off the Philippines of the services of at least three battleships, which together with several aircraft carriers were taken out of service and assigned to duties as port and anti-aircraft vessels because they consumed too much oil."

There are numerous examples where oil shortages have been a critical factor in military operations, examples that appear now to have been forgotten. Unfortunately, history has a way of taking revenge for forgetfulness.

Take the carrier task force again. In the case of a conventional carrier with four conventional escorts, one third of the fuel is used for the carrier, one third for the conventional escorts, and one third for the aircraft. By doing away with the need for fuel for the carrier and its escorts; by making them nuclear powered; only one third the

amount of propulsion fuel—that used by the aircraft—is needed. Further, we design our nuclear carriers with the capacity for almost twice as much aircraft fuel and 50 percent more aircraft ammunition than the latest conventional carrier. This reduction in logistic support becomes especially important when our naval forces are operating away from home during a real war, when they are subject to enemy attack.

When a nuclear carrier is substituted for a conventional carrier, the range of a carrier task group with four conventional escorts is doubled. When two of the four escorts with the nuclear carrier are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is doubled again. When all the escorts are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is essentially unlimited.

For these reasons a nuclear task force is at least 50 percent more effective than a conventional task force.

I am sure you know the maxim learned through the bitter lessons of war that: "The art of war is the art of the logistically feasible." It is the elimination of the requirement for a continuous supply of propulsion fuel that makes nuclear powered warships so valuable.

The areas I have just mentioned represent a tremendous increase in military effectiveness. In my opinion, this effectiveness far outweighs the six percent higher lifetime cost for the all-nuclear carrier task force.

There are many examples where the value of nuclear propulsion for surface warships has been demonstrated in real terms, in every day operational missions of the Fleet. I frequently receive letters from the commanding officers of our nuclear warships telling me of some of these advantages. As one of many examples, for 13 days during July 1971, the *Truxtun*—the frigate that Congress changed to nuclear propulsion in the 1962 program—provided an excellent demonstration of the capability of a nuclear powered ship to perform truly independent missions free of the fuel oil umbilical cord.

While on a special mission, the *Truxtun* steamed 8,600 miles at an average speed of advance of 28 knots, traveling from Subic Bay in the Philippines to Perth, Australia, and crossing the Indian Ocean twice en route. This is the longest period of such high speed operation ever sustained by any ship. This high speed could have been continued for an essentially indefinite period, had there been a need. At the conclusion of her mission, the *Truxtun* was fully ready to undertake protracted combat operations.

In contrast, our most modern oil-fired frigate would have had to refuel at least three times during such a transit, and would have arrived at her destination with close to minimum fuel reserves, unable to conduct extended combat operations. And, of course, there are no tankers normally available in the middle of the Indian Ocean from which to refuel. From a practical standpoint, no nonnuclear ship could have performed the *Truxtun's* mission—in peace or in war—because of the fuel support needed.

Also to be considered in comparing nuclear powered to conventionally powered ships is the availability of fuel reserves during war. I mentioned that the Naval Oil Reserves are now being considered as an emergency source of fuel. These reserves are, therefore, not guaranteed.

The situation is different when we have nuclear fuel as a reserve. What limited our industrial output, and therefore our fighting capacity in World War II was the labor supply. But we can employ labor now—in peacetime—to manufacture nuclear fuel for our nuclear navy, and we can store the fuel in a small area. We would then be assured of having fuel reserve for a long war, and we would not need labor, during the war to manufacture nuclear fuel.

There are events in a nation's history that, to use Thomas Jefferson's phrase, are like "a

fire bell in the night." The recent conflict in the Mid-East was such an event. For the first time, we were in a situation where the Soviet Fleet in the Mediterranean outnumbered the United States Sixth Fleet.

Had the Soviet Mediterranean Fleet been ordered to challenge the Sixth Fleet who would have won? From the limited information available to me, I do not think the answer is entirely clear. Would such a question have been seriously asked ten years ago? Perhaps this thought will give you an inkling of the change that has taken place in the balance of naval power over the past decade.

This change underscores the urgent need we, as an island nation, have to build a Navy strong enough to protect our national interests, and our economic and political survival. To me, it is clear that the striking force ships we build for such a Navy must have nuclear power.

Yet, despite its demonstrated superiority, there is no firm long-range building program to convert our major combatant forces to nuclear power.

I suppose, that to some people, any rate of transition to nuclear power, or to any other new weapon, is unreasonable. But many have taken a stand against nuclear power for the Navy before they even investigated it. Their tendency has been to fit facts into their preconceptions. They have failed to see that the essence of all progress is a shedding of preconceived ideas and accustomed ways of doing things. In the past, this failure has prolonged military ideas beyond their time.

Changes in the Navy often come at a distressingly slow pace. It took two thirds of a century for our Navy to change from sail to steam. In 1814, Robert Fulton designed and built for our Navy the world's first warship propelled by steam. It was named *Demologus*. Over the next 20 years the United States built some 700 steam merchantmen while the U.S. Navy built only one steam vessel.

It might interest you to know that in 1869, 55 years after the *Demologus*, the Navy Department issued a General Order requiring all warships to carry a full set of sails. The concern over cost was so great that specific instructions were issued as to when the steam engines could be run. The order warned naval commanders that:

"They must not be surprised, if they fail to carry out the spirit of this order, if the coal consumed is charged to their account."

After conversion to steam had become a reality we went through another period when there was great reluctance to shift from coal to oil. At the beginning of the 20th century it was generally accepted that oil-fired warships offered substantial military advantages over coal-fired warships. But since they were more expensive, there was great resistance to building them. It took Winston Churchill's command decision as First Sea Lord to give Britain's Royal Navy the position of world leadership in converting warships from coal to oil. As it later turned out, this was a significant factor in Britain's naval superiority in World War I. Churchill said:

"Shocked at the expense, the Admiralty had reverted for two years to 27-knot coal-burning flotillas. It was too late to stop the last bevy of these inferior vessels, but I gave directions to design the new flotilla to realize 35 knots speed without giving up anything in gunpower, torpedoes or seaworthiness. Build slow destroyers? One might as well breed slow race horses!"

When one talks about the delay by the Navy in going from sail to coal, or from coal to oil, everyone today agrees that those responsible were stupid not to make the change faster. As Goethe said: "It is the truth, but not for us." With hindsight they can easily see the traps their predecessors fell into, but they cannot recognize that a generation hence they themselves will be classed along

with the other shortsighted leaders who refused to go from sail to coal, and from coal to oil.

Inertia seems to be endemic to naval development. Curiously, the lethargy is most often felt by the nation which has the greatest navy. On March 4, 1858, the French, on one day, laid the keels of three frigates. These ships were to have iron plates bolted to their sides to protect them against shot and shell—they would be far better than anything the more powerful British Navy possessed. In June of that year a high British naval official reluctantly admitted that his country had to accept the challenge. He said:

"Although I have frequently stated it is not in the interest of Great Britain, possessing as she does so large a navy, to adopt any important change in the construction of ships of war which might have the effect of rendering necessary the introduction of a new class of very costly vessels until such a course is forced upon her by the adoption by foreign powers of formidable ships of a novel character requiring similar ships to cope with them, yet it then becomes a matter not only of expediency but of absolute necessity."

Half a century later, however, another responsible British official argued that his country was wrong to build the *Dreadnought*—the all big-gun battleship which made all other battleships obsolete. He said: Britain "ought never to lead in ship construction, but always to follow with something better."

For a leading navy such an attitude appears to have some merit. It coincides with all the natural instincts to preserve a familiar and comfortable way of life—a way which recalls hard-won victories of the past. Also, this attitude can be defended upon economic grounds because it keeps costs down by preserving existing ships, equipment, and naval skills. But development never ends. To believe that advances can be deferred and that a nation can make up lost ground can be fatal. Such a cast of thought is what Mahan recognized when he wrote: "Finality never will be reached in anything save death . . ."

In each of the instances I have mentioned change was demanded of an organization; change in leadership and in training. The fault was inertia—a comfortable faith that lessons and ways of the past will hold in the trials of the future. In its broadest sense this is an undemanding mental attitude which is opposed to change. It is a vested interest.

Those outside the professional ranks, such as the press, citizens, and Congress can recognize the danger of such blindness—if they but know the facts.

You might properly ask why I, an engineer, am the spokesman for nuclear warships. The answer is that there are two roads which must be traveled to accomplish change in our military: the road of action and the road of words.

I would prefer to devote my energies entirely to engineering. But since no one in the Navy was devoting his effort to the words, I was forced to do both. This was true in 1946; it is still true today. Perhaps, by the next century, the Navy itself will finally realize the importance of nuclear power, but this is not yet the case. It should have come in the 1950's. This is a sad commentary on the lack of foresightedness of all but a few of our naval leaders over the past quarter century.

I would like to suggest that we must—from the standpoint of national safety—avoid proving again the old adage that, "history repeats itself." Congressional concern in this regard has been clearly indicated by a House Armed Services Subcommittee on the Middle East. In its December 1973 report the Subcommittee stated:

"The Committee on Armed Services has in the past consistently urged nuclear pro-

pulsion for naval vessels because of its operational advantages—the virtually unlimited range such power gives a ship. Now nuclear propulsion has become a must because of logistic realities. In addition to the danger of a shortage of oil for ships, the rising cost of oil, when available, has made scrap paper out of past comparative cost estimates for nuclear and conventional power.

"The wisdom of the committee's past position has been borne out by time, and the committee should question carefully the construction of further oil-powered ships where the technology exists to make them nuclear powered."

What must be done? We need a permanent program to build nuclear powered ships—a program that will not be drastically changed every year or two as has happened in the past. Admiral Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and for many years an eloquent proponent of nuclear power for our striking forces, agrees with me that we must build these first line ships during peace.

The excuse for not building better ships is always that they are "more expensive." But all weapons of war are expensive. Cheap weapons will not win us a war. And if we cannot win a war, there is no sense in spending money on weapons at all.

Rarely in naval history have the leaders looked far enough ahead. They generally build ships that they consider to be adequate for the present. That is why, frequently, naval leadership has been replaced when war broke out.

We should be planning now for war that may erupt fifteen or more years from now. Therefore, it is time to establish a firm program for making all new major combatant ships for our striking forces nuclear powered. It is a matter of national priority.

ESTONIAN ANNIVERSARY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1974, I had the pleasure of attending the meeting of the Baltimore Estonians Societies at their commemoration of the 56th anniversary of the Declaration of the Independence of the Republic of Estonia. It is my privilege to share with my colleagues the remarks made at that event by Mrs. Vaike Lugus:

REMARKS BY MRS. VAIKE LUGUS

Distinguished guests, Dear Estonians: Fifty-six years ago our Estonian forefathers declared Estonia independent and its people free.

To commemorate this golden day in Estonian history we gather and celebrate.

Honored guests, I shall not present to you an intellectual analysis of Estonian Republic, its people and government.

I also shall not give a history lecture, but I would like, with your permission to speak about times and people which not long ago were part of your and my reality.

My friends, tonight I am giving my heart the freedom to speak.

To be a true human being, a true Estonian, you have to have heart. Without it, you are dead and lost. You become a "ubi bene ibi patria" patriot, and everything in this world becomes a happy coincidence.

In this case life and its noble endowments become meaningless.

That Estonia became independent, was not a happy coincidence neither was it charity of the world opinion that freed the Estonians but rather their very own courage

and faith that they had kept buried in their hearts for centuries.

They never forgot that once in the beginning of history they were free. They remembered and they never let it go. The Estonian mothers whispered it to their sleeping babies and sang their lullabies about freedom.

The idea of freedom was not an utopian idea but once possessed reality. The harder the suppression the stronger their desire to become free became.

Our forefathers did not lose their freedom for their lack of courage or incompetence but for the brutality and inhumanity.

And we, the modern generation of Estonians, lost Estonia again for the brutality and inhumanity. This time it was represented by the Russian Communists who invaded our country, destroyed our government, and deported our people.

It is pitiful indeed that during the existence of mankind there has existed so little in man's behavior that can be called human.

When in one hand the infinite is the limit of his freedom and the moon and stars are his stepping stones—then on the other hand, he is tied down by thousands of ideological chains and the "iron curtain" is the end of his world."

Our Estonian forefathers did not have very many earthly riches to leave us. Even the geographical location of their country was poor and invited conquering neighbors and blundering nations to be constant visitors. Many of them stayed and exercised their power.

Small indeed was the wealth they had to pass to the next generation but only then if one forgets that the greatness of an individual or a nation does not depend on materialistic things but on the strength of his soul and on the determination of his mind and spirit.

The materialistic strength of the Roman Empire is no more only ruins remain.

The Greeks look sadly at their broken Ionic and Doric columns, the last witnesses of their materialistic greatness. But the greatness of their minds and the power of their thoughts have been branded on the minds of generations yet to be born. Their intellect left permanent impressions on mankind's perception of justice, democracy and art.

Christ, who was born without a kingdom, built the strongest kingdom ever known in men's hearts by faith alone.

Our Estonian ancestors did not build pyramids or conquer other nations. They were the master-builders of character.

Are we really as naive as to believe that whatever we have achieved in Estonia or outside it, we have done it alone without the help of the previous generations.

Could we be able to walk tall and proudly among other people if among our leaders would be found men like Hitler, Stalin and Ivan the Terrible, just to mention a few who have brought shame and dishonor to mankind.

During the proud history of Estonian people our ancestors never committed crimes for which we have to pay.

To be free from previous generations sins and crimes is a great blessing indeed. It is the greatest gift what one nation can leave for the next generations. We were fortunate to receive such a gift.

The question arises—are we able to do the same for the next generation?

Can our young people in the year of 2000 say the same about us? Or do they have to hang their heads in shame because their parents did not know how to live in freedom and help those who were left in Estonia.

Are our young men and women going to forget the language, literature, music and art—the sustaining power of their ancestors because we are too lazy to help them to learn about their heritage.

Who answers all these questions? Time? No, time never gives answers. It only carries the message you and I give.

Therefore it is up to us—you and me. We are the ones history will question. We cannot escape our responsibility. We can never abandon the Estonian people or forget their captivity. They cannot speak for themselves—we can.

Our forefathers passed to us an unblemished page in the history book. Let us keep it this way.

Today is a festive day. It is a day of beautiful memories. This is a day we rejuvenate our spirit and strengthen our soul.

This is the day when we look with pride at our young people and rejoice about their achievements.

This is also a day when we remember the men and women who were our leaders and path finders.

One of such great Estonians was our late President Konstantin Päts. Today we celebrate his hundredth birthday.

Konstantin Päts and Estonian people were twins. They were inseparable, one without the other was an orphan.

He was a man who deeply loved his country and people. He was a leader who was involved in every phase of Estonian life and who had an unlimited faith in Estonian people.

We loved him, and we called upon him when dark days were our companions.

He was an organizer, a planner, a teacher, and a builder. He was a pragmatist who believed that a strong economic foundation was necessary for a vigorous nation.

His life was a dedication for Estonia.

He had to live outside Estonia, and he was sentenced to death by the Russians.

He lived in Switzerland and used every minute of his time there for planning and preparing for Estonian independence.

In 1906 he visited America in search of a place where Estonian political refugees could settle.

One of the few places he visited was Baltimore. American Estonians are proud of this fact, and when we all gather here in 1976 to celebrate Esto '76, we are not coming to a strange place after all because our ancestors have been here before.

And if we recapture the spirit of this great man, we have regained the spirit of 1776.

Konstantin Päts was arrested and deported by the Russian communists. The Estonian people have no information about his fate, but we shall never forget him and his sacrifice.

All over the world Estonians are paying tribute to the man who loved his country and democracy more than his life.

"Per aspera-ad astra" was the motto of the Estonian President.

"Per aspera-ad astra" has become the motto of all Estonians.

Estonian people have steadily and with unwavering determination reached for freedom. The desire to be free and independent will never die in their hearts.

It was not a coincidence that Solzhenitsyn became a champion of freedom and human rights. What else could he become after he met an Estonian lawyer in the prison.

We can never forget that it is our duty to explain, explain and once more explain to the rest of the world the wickedness of the communism and its evil hold of human mind.

We shall demand freedom for Estonia and its people as long as we live.

Much has been given to us and much we must give.

With grateful hearts and gentleness we remember these Estonian men and women who gave their lives, so we can live in freedom.

Gently we lay a wreath of thankfulness

and reverence on the graves of Estonian heroes.

Quietly we lit the memorial candles in our hearts for those who died in Siberia.

May God grant peace to their souls.

We shall never give up freedom.

THE SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, sudden infant death syndrome is a dreaded disease which claims the lives of almost 10,000 babies per year. Congress can no longer turn its back on its responsibility to help affected parents discover the reason behind the mysterious deaths of their infants.

If action is not taken by Congress to make the necessary funds available for research of SIDS—the killer of thousands—there can and will be no hope of terminating or preventing the existence of this frightening disease.

Recently I received a letter from Paul McDermott, executive director of the Advertising Club of Greater Boston, in which he enclosed a copy of a letter from Charles Barr, chairman of the National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death. Mr. Barr's letter best expresses the importance and necessity of SIDS legislation, and I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues. It speaks for itself:

FEBRUARY 15, 1974.

Mr. PAUL McDERMOTT,
Executive Director, the Advertising Club of
Greater Boston, Boston, Mass.

DEAR PAUL: Through efforts such as yours, the Advertising Club of Greater Boston and especially those serving in public service for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death has accomplished in these last twelve months, legislative goals that are literally enormous.

We're so close in our united efforts, but we're not there yet. Our understanding is that Senate Bill S1745 and House Bill HR 11386 have been reported out of joint conference favorably. The report substantially supports the House's recommendations of six (6) million dollars funding over three years for programs, information, counseling and education relating to the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome.

We need more help.

In all bluntness, it's both interesting and personally heartening to discover along the legislative road that so many Massachusetts Congressmen play a very real and substantial part in shaping our National health legislation. We have received the support of so many Congressmen of this Commonwealth on our legislative journey. We hope to receive their continued support.

The Honorable Silvio O. Conte would be an enormous and perhaps final contribution to our efforts. The funding for the above mentioned bills is, relatively, not great. It is small compared to many governmentally supported health programs, and yet it is huge to us when compared to the problem itself.

If HEW flashed a bulletin that a great plague will hit our country in 1974 and absolutely kill 8,000 to 10,000 babies, wrecking the lives of twice as many adults, our gov-

ernment would respond immediately and forcefully.

It will happen in 1974 and the only instrument we now have to, in some degree, harness this devastation, is our bill before our elected officials.

The Foundation is indebted beyond recognition to those in government that have recognized and supported the cause of Sudden Infant Death. We hope this support will continue. We ask your continued help and the continued help of those who might support our efforts.

It has not been a battle, but a process. It hasn't been a plague, but a disease. It won't be a victory, but a satisfaction. Thank you very much for your help.

Best personal regards,

CHARLES T. BARR,

Chairman, National Publicity Committee, National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death.

COST OVERRUNS IN PENTAGON

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, cost overruns have become a way of life for the brass in the Pentagon.

In the last few months both the costs of the Air Force's new B-1 bomber and the F-15 fighter aircraft have jumped a total of \$2.7 billion.

The cost of the Air Force's new F-15 Eagle fighter increased more than \$1.4 billion and the total cost for 749 of the aircraft rose from \$7.86 billion to \$9.27 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon is conveniently trying to blame the Congress for the overruns on this program. It is true that last December Congress decided to reduce the number of planes to be purchased during fiscal year 1974 from 77 to 62. At the same time the Pentagon decided to "restructure" the program by purchasing fewer F-15's than were originally planned in the next several years and buying more planes in later years.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I doubt the Pentagon's claim that restructuring the program caused all the increases and resent the Pentagon's assertion that Congress is at fault. I have asked the GAO to investigate the exact cause of the overrun.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker I suspect the blaming of both Congress and the restructuring of the program is a very thin

smokescreen covering up the Air Force's waste and mismanagement.

Similarly, the Air Force Secretary, John McLucas, admitted in a letter dated March 13, 1974, to the Congress, that the price of the B-1 bomber has risen from \$13.7 billion to \$15 billion, or \$61.5 million per aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong kind of bomber to be building, and when the price tag goes above \$61 million for each plane there is not much question that the taxpayers are being cheated.

I am afraid to report, Mr. Speaker, that the present Air Force estimate for the B-1 bomber is extremely optimistic and undoubtedly too low. The Air Force's estimate on production assumes the inflation rate for 1985 will only be 3.3 percent annually. If this administration's past track record is any indication, that price is clearly too low.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done and be done soon about rapidly escalating weapons costs. An effort must be made by all the military services to simplify by eliminating unnecessary subsystems and using existing missiles, radars and guns rather than developing new ones.

A chart outlining B-1 costs follows:

TOTAL SUMMARY B-1 COST

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Aircraft quantity	1970 dollars		1975 dollars		Then year dollars ¹	
		Total	Unit	Total	Unit	Total	Unit
Sept. 30, 1973 SAR:							
Development.....	3	2,513		2,748		2,788	
Procurement.....	241	7,736	32.1	9,208	38.2	10,884	45.2
Total program.....	244	10,249	42.0	11,956	49.0	13,672	56.0
Oct 11r to SASC (R. & D. Subc):							
Development.....	3	2,513		2,748		2,788	
Procurement.....	241	8,181	33.9	9,738	40.4	11,512	47.8
Total program.....	244	10,694	43.8	12,486	51.2	14,300	58.6
Current estimate:							
Development.....	5	3,030		3,370		3,500	
Procurement.....	239	8,051	33.7	9,583	40.1	11,500	48.1
Total program.....	244	11,081	45.4	12,953	53.1	15,000	61.5

¹ R.D.T. & E. estimate based on escalation rate of about 5 percent. Procurement estimate through fiscal year 1985 based on escalation rate of 3.3 percent.

JOHN A. OSBORNE—UNITED AIR LINES SKYCAP OF THE YEAR

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, Mr. John A. Osborne of Cleveland won United Air Lines Eastern Division's Skycap of the Year Award for 1973. Of the hundreds of skycaps serving United Air Lines passengers in 33 cities of the Eastern United States, Mr. Osborne was singled out for special recognition.

I know from personal experience how richly he deserves this award. Mr. Osborne has been a friend of mine for many years. He started working for United Air Lines on January 1, 1948. He is now lead skycap at Cleveland's Hopkins Airport. Day in and day out John Osborne makes a special effort to greet and assist passengers with a friendly personal style which is his hallmark. As lead skycap he not only directs all the other United skycaps at Cleveland Airport, but he

leads and inspires them with the outstanding example he sets. They can all justly take pride in his achievement.

It is a further reflection on Mr. Osborne's performance that Cleveland Hopkins has captured two of the three Skycap of the Year Awards since the prize was instituted in 1971. He is the best of the best.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CARL D. PERKINS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee recently addressed the annual meeting of the Kentucky Conference of the American Association of University Professors. His remarks were, as they customarily are, perceptive and thought provoking. There is, of

course, no one in the Congress who has done more for American education, including postsecondary education, than Chairman PERKINS, and his views deserve and demand careful attention. In the hope that they will be fully read by all who share this concern for the future of education beyond the high school, Mr. Speaker, I insert the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CARL D. PERKINS

No one who has been as interested and involved in education legislation for the last quarter century as I have, can fail to appreciate the unique and significant contributions the American Association of University Professors has made to American higher education.

Tonight I am therefore most pleased to have an opportunity to meet with and pay my respects to the Kentucky Conference of the Association and its many members who are among the educational leaders of our State.

This is an important meeting for it is taking place at a critical time. We are about to embark upon a period in which I am con-

vinced there will be major debates over the organization and financing of postsecondary education. The initial debates are now being launched in the media, in academic councils, on college campuses and across the dinner table—as well as in state and Federal legislative chambers.

The debate is prompted in part by findings and recommendations of a number of national groups that have recently completed studies on the financing of postsecondary education. Two of these—the Carnegie Commission and Committee on Economic Development—have proposed specific and far-reaching tuition recommendations—which as you know have been the subject of sharp criticism.

A report of a third national group—the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education—provide an analytical framework to compare alternative financing plans, including the plans proposed by the Carnegie Commission and the Committee on Economic Development.

But it seems to me that the debate is prompted more by the economic situation in which we find higher education, than by the studies to which I have referred. One of the resolutions adopted by the 59th Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors last year addresses this issue—the economic crisis in higher education. The resolution states rather succinctly the nature of the crisis:

"The symptoms of an economic crisis in American higher education are becoming more portentous; financial resources of higher education are eroded by inflation, by funding cutbacks and by a reduction in enrollment rates—the real income of faculties is declining."

and the situation has worsened in the ten months since the adoption of your resolution. Indeed, as one observer recently noted, college and university budgets are being put together with more than usual misgivings this year.

Added to the continuing problems relating to the uncertainties of Federal aid, enrollment trends and tuition levels, is the energy crisis—and looming over the entire budget making process is the grim spectre of rapidly escalating inflation. Financial distress in higher education is a term we hear and read more about on almost a daily basis—which ever way we turn.

In dealing with the question of financial distress, we must recognize that we do not at this time have universally agreed upon measures of determining financial conditions in higher education.

Some are appalled by this. I too am appalled, but I will not utilize this as an excuse for lack of action or deferral of action.

The Chief Economist of the American Council on Education recently hit the nail squarely:

"Financial distress is no less real because we lack precise measurements of it. The consequences of the distress are everywhere apparent."

And while we should and must sympathize with—and do something about—the problems confronted by institutional budget-makers, let us not forget the very real financial problems confronting those who are wrestling with budgets at the grassroots level—in the average household. Financial distress in higher education is not confined to institutions. It is shared by students and parents at virtually all income levels.

Because you are on the college campus meeting with students each day, you know this better than I. I know it not only as the father of a college student, but also from the correspondence which has reached my office.

The letters I receive from parents who do not know where to turn make me question the arguments of those who wish to

shift more of the costs of higher education to the beneficiaries of higher education—to students and their families.

It is argued by some that the benefits of postsecondary education accrue largely to the individual rather than to society and that therefore as a matter of equity, a larger share of the increased costs should be borne by students and their families. Such an argument presumes that students and families are able to pay more. Perhaps this is a theory we should consider and debate. It is not one that at this point in time I can accept, and it is one that I know many of my colleagues in the Committee cannot accept.

Let me now turn to the issues and debates in Congress which, in your invitation, you specifically asked me to mention. We are now midway in the life of the 1972 Higher Education Act which was heralded by many in the Spring of 1972 as landmark legislation—as the most significant higher education bill ever enacted.

I so characterized the Act and I continue to hold that view. But midway through the life of this Act I fully understand why some may question these assertions. For clearly to date the promises and potential implicit in the new Act are unfulfilled.

Inadequate funding and, in many instances, total lack of funding, misinterpretation of the statute and of Congressional intent by the Executive Branch, and timing problems have hampered full and proper implementation of the law.

May I cite a few examples.

With regard to inexcusable delays, the Executive Branch has yet to promulgate regulations for the implementation of Title IX of the 1972 Act—which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education.

I know from having reviewed your Resolutions that the American Association of University Professors has an intense interest in this matter, and I am sure you share my concern that twenty months of inaction have elapsed since this provision became the law of the land. I am advised that draft regulations are presently on Secretary Weinberger's desk for review. When they are finally promulgated, an additional 45 to 60 days will be available for public comment.

I urge you to communicate with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Committee on Education and Labor your concerns and recommendations regarding this issue.

I note from your Resolutions also that the Association is concerned for the timeliness of student aid appropriations. Past uncertainties in this regard have caused serious disruptions in the plans and lives of thousands of students. Yet, the student assistance programs administered by the Office of Education are among the few education programs which are presently forward funded. Appropriations to be used in the next academic year were appropriated by the Congress last December 18. Moneys were provided at that time for operation of the Basic Grant Program, the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program, the Direct Loan Program and the College Work-Study Program in academic year 1974-75.

Despite this, the Office of Education has yet to notify colleges and universities of what they will receive. Two and a half months have elapsed—and we are very close to the point in the year when institutions must know what funds will be available to them and subsequently to their students. The delay is inexcusable and we are trying to do all we can to expedite action at the earliest date.

With regard to funding, the battle to establish appropriate levels of spending for higher education continues.

Despite concrete and widespread enthusiasm in the Congress for a greater Federal effort in postsecondary occupational and vocational education and for community col-

lege expansion—and despite apparent enthusiasm in the Executive Branch for such programs—they have not as yet been funded. Again this year the President's budget fails to request funding of these programs.

In the area of student aid, I applaud the Administration's request for full funding of the new Basic Opportunity Grant Program. But I reject the companion recommendation that this be accomplished at the expense of the three college-based student aid programs.

Once again this year we are faced with a budget request from the Administration that would terminate loan assistance under the Direct Student Loan Program and grant assistance under the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant program. And I am confident that once again this year the Congress will reject this scheme.

A direct student loan program administered by Kentucky universities and colleges is essential. We cannot rely, as the Administration suggests, solely on a program of Federal insurance of student loans made by commercial lenders.

Another serious problem is the continued unwillingness of the Executive Branch to support direct general assistance to colleges and universities. You may recall that in the debate leading up to the enacting of the 1972 Act, there was a sharp difference in the Congress and in the country between those favoring increased student aid and those requesting direct institutional aid. The 1972 Act quite properly in my judgment struck a compromise authorizing not only new and improved student aid programs, but also a program of direct institutional grants. Unfortunately, the subsequent funding pattern has not been as balanced. The Administration would have virtually all Federal assistance flow in the form of student assistance. There has been no support and no request for funding of the institutional aid program to date.

What does this mean then in terms of our agenda? There are actually two agendas—the immediate and the long-range. We are now involved in immediate efforts to improve the implementation of the 1972 Act—including efforts designed to secure more adequate funding, and efforts designed to insure administration of programs more directly in line with Congressional intent.

Two matters are of prime concern with regard to the latter. Anyone who is at all close to higher education today is aware of the problems that are now being experienced with the Federally insured student loan program. This is the largest of the Federal student aid programs and it has through the years pumped \$4,565,000,000—over four and a half billion dollars—into the educational pipeline. At a time when college costs and needs are greater than ever, we are experiencing a dramatic decline in the volume of lending.

As is usually the case in any complex program, there is no one single cause for this decline. But it is clear that the new requirement for a needs analysis in the program has had an adverse impact, particularly on students from families with incomes between \$10,000 and \$15,000. Accessibility to the loan program for these students has been sharply curtailed.

In light of these problems, we have on our Committee agenda a bill already favorably considered by one of our Subcommittees to repeal the needs test requirement for students from families with adjusted family incomes of \$15,000 or less.

Despite the opposition of a few in Congress and despite what Administration opposition has been evidenced, I am confident that within the next month, legislation of this type will be enacted.

We have been working and will continue to work on another of the student assistance programs—the new Basic Opportunity Grants program. Again, lack of funding and inept administration at the Federal level has

kept this program from becoming what I know it can become. This is the first year of operation and less than one-tenth of what is needed to fully fund the program is available for expenditure and not even this small amount is being fully utilized.

In addition the program is being operated under unacceptable and inequitable administrative guidelines which, because of timing, we are unable to change.

I should like at this point to be a salesman for the Basic Opportunity Grants Program. It is, as I have said, the Federal program which holds the greatest potential for meeting that oft-stated Congressional intent that no qualified student be denied access to higher education because of financial barriers.

Reflect for just a moment on what a fully funded BOG program would mean to your institution, to your classes and particularly to the hundreds of thousands of needy students.

In theory, every student in postsecondary education—defined in a broad sense—is entitled to a grant of \$1400 minus what his family can reasonably be expected to contribute toward educational expenses.

Indeed, if properly funded and administered, the BOG program in and of itself would go far in easing much of the financial crunch we have been discussing.

We are not at a point where there will be full funding, I fear, but we have made progress. For the coming year, appropriations for the BOG program have gone from this year's level of \$122,000,000 to \$475,000,000. Both freshmen and sophomore students will be eligible next year as compared to only freshmen for the current academic year.

We have also been able to correct a number of inequities in this year's program which were brought about by incorrect administrative interpretations. Students who are Social Security recipients and students from low income families who own a farm or small business were virtually excluded this year from the program. Many, many young men and women in Kentucky were adversely affected by these rulings. We have been able to secure changes in Office of Education regulations which will guarantee the benefits of the program to those students—as was originally intended by the Congress.

On the long-range agenda, as I have mentioned, we are midway through the life of the 1972 Act. The authority for all higher education programs will expire in June of 1974. Our long-term agenda is not as long as we may think.

The recent studies that deal with the administration and financing of postsecondary education mentioned earlier obviously give us a great deal of material to deliberate over, digest and analyze during our consideration of extension legislation.

Our initial planning calls for early and first consideration of student assistance programs. As you know, Federal student assistance, aside from the insured loan program, is dispensed on the basis of need and traditionally, this has meant a dependency on "needs analysis" systems.

Our recent experience with the use of those systems in the insured loan program has heightened Congressional interest in this area, and we will be giving particular attention to the reasonableness and feasibility of continued dependence on such systems.

We are then, as I said initially, at a critical time for higher education. We have before us what I am confident will be a healthy debate on both the form and level of financing for postsecondary education. As these issues are discussed now and in the future in the Congress, it is important that we hear from those who are affected at the local level. The outcome of our deliberations will be determined largely by the response of concerned citizens and informed leaders such as yourselves.

What happens in Washington begins with people. Nothing really gets done unless the people are aroused, and convey their beliefs and opinions to their elected officials.

In the twenty years I have served in the Congress, we have moved through two decades of what can only be considered major victories for American education. I hope this pace can be maintained and that the 1970's become as memorable as the 1960's. This will only come from the united efforts of all who believe in human worth and development and to whom education is a touchstone for this fragile thing we call civilization.

DAVID LAWRENCE OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in times like these, it is well to recall the days of strong and vibrant leaders. Two men very quickly come to mind—Harry Truman and David Lawrence of Pennsylvania. David Lawrence was a dear friend of mine—and of my home State, and, in his memory, I would like to enter here an article by Lawrence Lee of the Pittsburgh Press of February 10, 1974:

STRONG MEN GOT THINGS ROLLING (By Lawrence Lee)

Once upon a time . . .

There was a president.

He was president of the United States.

That was when they had railroads. The country depended on railroads. People traveled by railroads.

If the railroads stopped, the country stopped.

The trainmen refused a new contract. They did not like the terms.

They said: "We will shut down the railroads . . . And to hell with the country."

The owners could not manage their own railroads. They could not lead the trainmen. They could not make things go.

But the country had a president.

NO WORRY ABOUT VOTE

He was president of all the country. He did not worry whether or not his party would get back into office. He did not worry about getting the labor vote.

He did not wear a trainman's cap and get himself photographed grinning with the engineers. He did not ask the owners to pose with him in front of the Capitol steps.

He was in the office to run the country.

He decided he was expected to run it for all the citizens.

Not just for people who call themselves labor.

Not just for people who call themselves management and spend corporation funds for expensive advertisements telling the public how pure and how just and how righteous they are.

He decided to run the country . . . for the men who wanted to work and support their families . . . for the men who had to make a living by traveling on the railroads, not in big bright expensive cars . . . for men and women who had families and who make the country go in spite of Labor and in spite of Management.

So, on Aug. 27, 1950, the president acted. He ordered the Army to take over the railroads. And the Army did it.

The owners howled. The trainmen howled. But the railroads ran. And the country ran. And the trainmen and the owners sulked and

fumed for two years. Then they signed a new contract.

Then the president returned the railroads to the owners, and the country's life kept moving.

And the people knew they had a president.

His name was Harry Truman.

Once upon a time . . .

There was a mayor in Pittsburgh.

He headed a machine. Most nice people do not like machines. But there was much good in the mayor who ran the machine.

He made Pittsburgh run; and the rhythm could be heard across the country.

HE MADE THEM KNOW

He made labor know that labor needs management. He made management know that labor has to have a reasonable wage and fair working conditions.

And the city ran.

He did not sit in City Hall and stick in his thumb and pull out a plum and say, "What a good boy am I."

He ran the city.

And he became governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

And he did not put all of his relatives in office.

He put some good men and women there. And the commonwealth ran.

And his name was David Lawrence.

But that was . . . once upon a time.

AMVETS 1974 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1974, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee was privileged to receive the AMVETS legislative goals for 1974. Cmdr. Berge Avadanian of Massachusetts presented the statement which follows:

STATEMENT OF BERGE AVADANIAN, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMVETS (AMERICAN VETERANS OF W. W. II, KOREA AND VIETNAM)

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Committee:

AMVETS is grateful for the privilege and opportunity of presenting to the Members of this distinguished Committee, our observations and recommendations respecting continuing sound, practical and enduring veterans benefits legislation. In the ever changing social and economic American society, the dedicated actions of this Committee in the interests of the American veteran and his dependents continues to be their greatest assurance of a life with honor and dignity, one which will allow them to make their contribution to the best of their capacities, for the peace, welfare and continued growth of our Great Nation.

This opportunity to present highlights of AMVETS 1974 legislative programs, concerns and hopes is to me, my National Staff, my Officers, our subsidiaries and members, an honor and privilege beyond my adequate description.

At this particular posture, I would like to present our National Executive Director, Leon Sanchez, National Service and Legislative Director, Ron Hartley, and our National Legislative Chairman and Past National Commander, A. Leo Anderson.

It is obvious that the ever changing crucial economic crises of today present difficulties requiring effective, creative and rapid reactions with positive ameliorating measures by this distinguished Committee which has been a hallmark of its efforts in behalf of the

Nation's veteran universe. This understanding and close coordination should contribute positively to substantially reducing the time element usually required in conceiving, considering and evaluating necessary veterans' legislative and programs and their embodiment as concrete legislative proposals. The objectivity, balance and long range responsibility, insures sound veterans benefits legislation. To this end, AMVETS will continue to offer to this Committee its full cooperation and the manpower and assistance resources at every level of our organization for this purpose.

The growth of understanding and respect between this Committee and AMVETS has been of great benefit to our organization, and we are most grateful for the assistance and cooperation extended to us by your capable and highly knowledgeable Staff Director, Mr. Oliver Meadows, and his supporting professional staff technicians.

It has long been the basic legislative policy of AMVETS to seek, insofar as practical, complete equalization of benefits for all veterans.

AMVETS is ever mindful of the relationship of veterans legislation to the other areas of social and economic needs in the Nation today. We believe further that vigilance and continuing effort to protect veteran's interests are not to be submerged by adverse special action groups.

As never before, the unequaled administrative capacity and demonstrated efficiency of the Veterans Administration make it the one agency which should be charged with administering ALL veterans benefits programs. AMVETS believes that the Veterans Administration is capable of taking on any additional responsibilities in the veterans field which may develop in succeeding years.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

We are delighted that The National Cemeteries Act of 1973 was approved as this provides a vehicle with which the Veterans Administration can function in the capacity of adequately servicing the needs of our deceased comrades.

NATIONAL HEALTH CARE

We were further pleased with the January 28, 1974 statement of the President when he stated in his Special Message: "As I look forward to proposing my National Health Care plan—to make more and better health care available to all Americans—it will be more than ever important to take the Veterans Administration's Health Care System into consideration. It is my strong view that it should continue as a system under the Veterans Administration to insure the proper care of eligible veterans. The Veterans Administration now operates the largest civilian medical care system in the world. It is only fitting that it remain one of the best." It is also AMVETS strong view that the Veterans Health Care System should continue under the Veterans Administration to provide medical services exclusively to the Nation's veterans and those dependents who are found to be qualified under recently enacted legislation.

EDUCATION

With respect to education, AMVETS' firm belief has been demonstrated that any federal investment in the training and education of our Nation's veterans and their dependents is a wise and prudent investment in America.

AMVETS fully realize the importance of developing meaningful education and training programs which would further an individual's potential or enhance his employment opportunities, and we greatly appreciate the time and efforts expended in developing and formulating this needed legislation for the betterment of this Nation's veterans.

The G.I. Bill provides educational and training opportunities to eligible veterans

and dependents which, of course, are designed to aid not only the college oriented individual but also those who wish to receive technical or vocational training.

We strongly believe that the educational benefits earned by the American veteran who served in the active military service should have extended time to pursue his education.

AMVETS urges liberalization of the current education restrictions which would assist in the retraining, cross training or refresher training of certain eligible World War II and Post Korean veterans when their occupation was affected by technical changes (or as a result of the energy crisis.) If the returning veteran is to continue his education under the G.I. Bill, there must be a substantial increase in the educational payments. Although it is our belief that a 15% increase is needed, we are delighted to see this Committee has passed a measure to increase the education allowance by 13.6% and extending the eight year delimiting date to ten years.

COMPENSATION

Compensation is another area of deep concern to AMVETS which relates directly to those men and women who became disabled while serving in the active military service of our Armed Forces. Since the latest compensation increase in August 1972, the rate of inflation has increased tremendously. This alarming increase has distressed all veterans and Americans and has drastically eroded the buying power of the once powerful American dollar. The need to increase the compensation rates and to keep them in line with the economy is of vital importance, if the Nation's veterans (service-connected disabled) are to continue to maintain a decent way of living and to stand proud while caring for his family.

In this respect, the disabled veteran has not received a fair shake. AMVETS strongly supports legislation that would allow a minimum 15% increase. We also feel further that favorable consideration for a like increase of 15% should be extended to the widows and children eligible for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation benefits.

NON-SERVICE CONNECTED PENSION

The matter of non-service pension payments recently developed into a shocking economic inequity to a small segment of our nation when over 24,000 veterans and widows of veterans lost their pensions, and over a million pension payments were tragically reduced due to increases in their annuities such as social security.

Many disabled or elderly veterans, dependents of veterans who receive Veterans Administration pension benefits survive only with the addition of other meager retirement annuities or social security payments. When an increase in one benefit due to cost of living adjustments results in the reduction or termination of another benefit, it creates a penalizing effect upon those who are in greatest need. Congress should not tolerate this situation.

AMVETS suggests that more comprehensive and meaningful pension structures be enacted consistent with this Nation's ever changing economic climate.

An AMVET 1973 National Convention Resolution relates to special monthly "housebound" payments. Under current law, an allowance is payable to a veteran in addition to his pension if he is permanently housebound. The requirement for this allowance is contained in Section 502(c) of Title 38, United States Code. In recognition of the plight of the older veteran in need, we strongly urge an amendment to this section of the law so that it would require the payment of the housebound allowance to all veteran pensioners who are 75 years of age or older.

LOAN GUARANTY

Since the creation of the Loan Guaranty Program, many veterans of World War II,

Korea, and Vietnam have taken advantage of their VA guarantee to insured loans to purchase, construct or improve a home. It is a well known fact that if it weren't for this program, many veterans could not afford to buy a home. Until recent years, veterans eligible for entitlement to a Veterans Administration Guaranteed Loan could only buy, build or improve a conventional home. Now, the veteran can get his loan guaranty certificate to purchase a mobile home. AMVETS realizes that with the increasing population many contractors are turning away from single family units, and the trend now shows that condominiums are edging their way into the commercial market. Since the condominium provides the individual family with its own home, while making it economically feasible for a young veteran to buy into a particular unit and with the current economic conditions, the condominium seems a logical alternative in housing and surely could be "home of the future." We urgently request that Congress look into the feasibility of amending Title 38, U.S. Code, Chapter 37, Section 1810 to include condominiums in its provisions to automatically guarantee loans in order that an eligible veteran may secure his own individual residence. This action would also amend section 34 of the National Housing Act which would eliminate VA Regulations 36 (4358). To this end we strongly urge passage of H.R. 9578.

REORGANIZATION OF DVB

We are concerned with the recent information we have received regarding the reorganization of the Department of Veterans' Benefits. One of AMVETS major objectives is to assure that every veteran has the opportunity to receive prompt assistance and action in regards to filing claims with the VA for compensation, pension, education, etc. Consequently, we are fearful that claims files and Rating Boards may be transferred from Regional Offices to one of the Federal Regional Centers and thus delay the timely administrative action involved in claims.

AMVETS urges that this Committee monitor closely the activities related to any reorganization of the Department of Veterans Benefits, thus assuring that this Nation's veterans will continue to receive first class personal assistance on a local basis.

EMPLOYMENT

AMVETS has in previous testimony gone on record in supporting all efforts being made by both governmental and private sectors in their quest to aid America's veterans in their search for gainful employment. Current statistics show a rise in unemployment—for younger veterans (20 to 24 years) unemployment rates rose even faster. It is obvious that the last one on the payroll is the first one off when it comes to job cut backs. Thus, the Vietnam Era veteran is already feeling the pinch of the energy crisis and its resultant unfavorable economic effects. We strongly urge consideration of veterans preference in projects undertaken by State and local governments under current Revenue Sharing and Concentrated Employment and Training legislation. This is a crucial period for the veteran, particularly the handicapped and disadvantaged veteran. Therefore, we strongly feel that every returning serviceman deserves the opportunity to find his place in our economic system.

AMVETS would like to relate its concern in the practice of some agencies within the Federal System which have not fully adhered to the Veterans' Civil Service Preference Act. Among those jobs that have been filled by contract are security guards, messengers and custodians. It is believed that strict compliance with Public Law 92-540, with respect to Chapter 42 which requires mandatory listings of job openings created by federal contracts, will further the cause of the American veteran.

The "Job Bank" and "Job Information De-

livery System" developed and required by the U.S. Department of Labor are generally in conflict with Veterans Preference due to the manner in which they are applied. This is demonstrated by the small fraction of job opening referrals in larger and medium size offices of State Employment Centers. The "Job Bank System" allows only a short file selection period for veterans before job openings are released to the general public and other agencies, and counter or wall postings are based on a "first-come-first-served" process without regard to veteran status, unless it happens to be specified by the prospective employer.

We also believe in strong Veterans Preference and Re-employment Rights Programs which continue to be a deterrent to unjust agency action and guarantees to our Nation's defenders of a full and fair hearing should arbitrary and capricious action be taken.

It is in this spirit that we make the following recommendations.

1. Vigorously enforce all provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended, and any and all efforts to weaken or reduce the beneficial provisions of this legislation.

2. Amend the regulations pertaining to reduction-in-force to include reorganizations, transfers of function, abolishment of jobs, and related actions which permit an agency to place a non-veteran in a position more favorable than a veteran.

3. Amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act to repeal the irrevocability clause so that survivors of deceased veterans can elect or reelect to receive either Federal Employees Compensation Act benefits or other benefits from other government sources which may be of the greater benefits.

4. Continue strong Veterans' Reemployment Rights Program. The veteran who left a job to perform military service must be assured of the right to return to that employment with full rights and benefits, whether he worked for a private business or for the Federal, State, or local government. Therefore, we believe in a strong and adequately funded Veterans Reemployment Rights program which would continue the protection of Federal law that now exists for veterans, reservists, and national guardsmen in private industry—extend that protection to the State and local government area and provide outside recourse to Postal Service employees who have reemployment rights problems. Only with a strong reemployment rights program can our Nation's defenders be protected against losing out in their established civilian careers when they interrupt those careers to serve their country.

Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee, we have intentionally made no reference to the VA Medical Delivery Service in view of the fact that the statement of the Chief Medical Director, Dr. Marc Musser indicated that sufficient funds will be available for operation of the Veterans Administration Medical Program in an effective and prudent manner.

SAVINGS BONDS

I would personally like to thank Congresswoman Margaret Heckler for the assistance she gave in persuading the Department of the Treasury to return over 700,000 veteran owned Series E-Savings Bonds (with a face value of ten million dollars) to their rightful owners.

VETERANS DAY

AMVETS wishes to extend its sincere thanks to this Committee for its efforts of restoring November 11 as Veterans Day. We are gratified that in the past two years, (36) additional states have already voted to celebrate Veterans Day on November 11 as the official State holiday.

ENERGY CRISIS

AMVETS are painfully aware of the severity of the energy crisis and its impact upon

every citizen of this Nation. We are particularly concerned with the adverse effects it is having on the severely handicapped veteran. We must remember that many disabled veterans have to depend upon their private automobiles because their handicaps prevent their use of public transportation.

We, therefore, highly favor a regulation or special legislation that will meet the needs of the handicapped veteran in the event of gasoline or other fuel rationing.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The AMVET organization believes that to keep America free, we must continue to keep it strong. History has proven that any nation wishing to seek its own determination must be willing to defend it. The U.S. has always been the leader among the nations of the world, and it was through our strength that many more crises were not turned into war.

We must not forget that whenever this country has negotiated with aggressive or belligerent nations, the only language they have understood is strength. Unless we can deal from a position of strength, there will be little or no incentive for our aggressors to negotiate. Dr. Kissinger has said it best "Weapons strengthen the hand of the diplomat as well as the hand of the soldier." We are disturbed about the proposed defense budget cutting and its effect on our national security.

AMVETS urge you, the members of this Committee to exert your influence on your colleagues of the House Appropriation Committee regarding an adequate funding of our defense needs.

America's security must never come out as second best.

On March 1, 1974, AMVETS presented testimony before the Subcommittee on Civil Liberties and Administration of Justice on the position of amnesty and a copy of same is attached.

AMNESTY

On March 29, 1974, we will observe a day of honor for the Vietnam Era veterans, marking the anniversary of the last United States combatant to leave Vietnam.

AMVETS realizes that the war in Southeast Asia was this nation's most controversial conflict, with the brunt of its unpopularity being carried by men and women who served in America's Armed Forces during those troubled times. In its strongest of mandates AMVETS has and continues to firmly oppose any legislation that would grant amnesty in any form to those individuals who have shirked their legal and moral obligations to serve their country.

MISSING IN ACTION

AMVETS have not and will not forget those American servicemen who are still listed as Missing in Action in Southeast Asia.

Here it is a year after the so-called official end of the Southeast Asia conflict, and there are still more than 1,200 American families living in anguish and not knowing the true fate of their loved ones.

The AMVETS organization is distressed and angered that the enemy has not given full and acceptable accounting of the Americans Missing in Action, or in returning all the bodies of the sixty servicemen that they themselves claim died in captivity.

Have we forgotten that following the Korean conflict, 389 servicemen were never accounted for? Isn't it our moral and legal obligation to use whatever means possible to learn the fate of those Americans listed as "missing" in Southeast Asia?

AMVETS urgently requests this Committee to use its influence in assuring that a genuine search will be conducted and that sufficient personnel and equipment be furnished in order that the search teams can accomplish their mission.

AMVETS feel that this country, through diplomatic and other peaceful channels

could apply even more pressure to the Communists and compel them to comply with Article 8B of the Paris agreement. Therefore, we again urge each of you to exert your personal and combined influence in this grave matter. Americans must not forget those men not yet accounted for by the Communists.

NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM

We congratulate this Committee for enactment of our longtime legislative goal, The National Cemetery System. We are proud that Rufus H. Wilson, Past National Commander of our organization, is the Director of that program. We recommend that this Committee carefully monitor the development of this new program with the view in mind of expansion, and we assure you that our findings and recommendations will shortly be submitted regarding the report on national cemeteries prepared by the Veterans Administration.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express the sorrow of AMVETS on the untimely deaths of your revered colleagues, Congressman John P. Saylor and Congressman Charles M. Teague. At our 29th National Convention last August, Congressman Saylor was awarded our Silver Helmet Congressional Award. Their dedication will always be remembered and greatly appreciated by AMVETS and by all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I would again like to thank you for granting us the opportunity to appear before you this morning. We of AMVETS pledge our full cooperation and support, and again, thank you.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 69

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I introduced 11 amendments to the bill H.R. 69 which may be offered when the bill comes to the floor. Today I am introducing three more amendments which I may offer at that time:

AMENDMENT No. 12 to H.R. 69, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. PEYSER

Page 28, beginning with line 10, strike out everything down through line 11, page 36, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 102. Section 103 of title I of the Act is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 103. (a) (1) (A) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the purpose of this paragraph an amount equal to not more than 1 per centum of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 134(a) (other than payments under such section to jurisdictions excluded from the term "State" by this subsection). The Commissioner shall allot the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for such grants. In addition, he shall allot from such amount to the Secretary of the Interior—

(i) the amount necessary to make payments pursuant to subparagraph (B); and

(ii) the amount necessary to make payments pursuant to subparagraph (C).

The maximum grant which a local educational agency in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be eligible to receive shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner

determines will best carry out the purposes of this part.

(B) The terms on which payment shall be made to the Department of the Interior shall include provision for payments by the Secretary of the Interior to local educational agencies with respect to out-of-State Indian children in the elementary or secondary schools of such agencies under special contracts with that Department. The amount of any such payment may not exceed, for each such child, one-half the average per pupil expenditure in the State in which the agency is located.

(C) The maximum amount allotted for payments to the Secretary of the Interior under clause (ii) in the third sentence of subparagraph (A) for any fiscal year shall be the amount necessary to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived Indian children on reservations serviced by elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior, as determined pursuant to criteria established by the Commissioner. Such payments shall be made pursuant to an agreement between the Commissioner and the Secretary containing such assurances and terms as the Commissioner determines will best achieve the purposes of this part. Such agreement shall contain (1) an assurance that payments made pursuant to this subparagraph will be used solely for program and projects approved by the Secretary of the Interior which meet the applicable requirements of section 131(a) and that the Department of the Interior will comply in all other respects with the requirements of this title, and (2) provision for carrying out the applicable provisions of sections 131(a) and 133(a) (3).

(2) In any case in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for that purpose are available, the maximum grant which a local educational agency in a State shall be eligible to receive under this part for any fiscal year shall be (except as provided in paragraph (3)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (established pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State except that if the average per pupil expenditure in the State is less than 80 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, such amount shall be 80 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, or if the average per pupil expenditure in the State is more than 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, such amount shall be 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, multiplied by the number of children in the school district of such agency who are aged five to seventeen, inclusive, and are (A) in families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)), (B) all of the number of children in the school district of such agency who are aged five to seventeen, inclusive and who are in families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a state plan approved under Title IV of the Social Security Act, or (C) living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children (other than such institutions operated by the United States) but not counted pursuant to paragraph (7) of this subsection for the purpose of a grant to a State agency, or being supported in foster homes with public funds. In any other case, the maximum grant for any local educational agency in a State shall be determined on the basis of the aggregate maximum amount of such grants for all such agencies in the county or counties in which the school district of the particular agency shall be equal to the Federal percentage of such per pupil expenditure multiplied by

the number of children of such ages in such county or counties who are described in clauses (A), (B), or (C) of the previous sentence, and shall be allocated among those agencies upon such equitable basis as may be determined by the State educational agency in accordance with basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, upon determination by the State educational agency that a local educational agency in the State is unable or unwilling to provide for the special educational needs of children, described in clause (C) of the first sentence of this paragraph, who are living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, the State educational agency shall, if it assumes responsibility for the special educational needs of such children, be eligible to receive the portion of the allocation to such local educational agency which is attributable to such neglected or delinquent children, but if the State educational agency does not assume such responsibility, any other State or local public agency, as determined by regulations established by the Commissioner, which does assume such responsibility shall be eligible to receive such portion of the allocation.

(3) (A) If the maximum amount of the grant determined pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) for any local educational agency is greater than 50 per centum of the sum budgeted by that agency for current expenditures for that year (as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner), such maximum amount shall be reduced to 50 per centum of such budgeted sum.

(B) In the case of local educational agencies which serve in whole or in part the same geographical area, and in the case of a local educational agency which provides free public education for a substantial number of children who reside in the school district of another local educational agency, the State educational agency may allocate the amount of the maximum grants for those agencies among them in such manner as it determines will best carry out the purpose of this part.

(4) The grant which Puerto Rico shall be eligible to receive under this part for a fiscal year shall be the amount arrived at by multiplying the number of children counted under subsection (c) by 80 per centum of (i) the average per pupil expenditure in Puerto Rico or (ii) in the case where such average per pupil expenditure is more than 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States.

(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) A local educational agency shall be eligible for a basic grant for a fiscal year under this part only if it meets the following requirements with respect to the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, described in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the first sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(1) In any case (except as provided in paragraph (3)) in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection as to the number of such children are available on a school district basis, the number of such children in the school district of such local educational agency shall be at least ten.

(2) In any other case, except as provided in paragraph (3), the number of such children in the county which includes such local educational agency's school district shall be at least ten.

(3) In any case in which a county includes a part of the school district of the local educational agency concerned and the Commissioner has not determined that satisfactory

data for the purpose of this subsection are available on a school district basis for all the local educational agencies for all the counties into which the school district of the local educational agency concerned extends, the eligibility requirement with respect to the number of such children for such local educational agency shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner for the purposes of this subsection.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the "Federal percentage" shall be 50 per centum and the "low-income factor" shall be \$3,750 for each fiscal year of this Act, except that no county shall receive less than 95 per centum of the amount they have received for the previous fiscal year.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce. At any time such data for a county are available in the Department of Commerce, such data shall be used in making calculations under this section. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the number of children of such ages from families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, and the number of children of such ages living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, or being supported in foster homes with public funds, on the basis of the caseload data for the month of January of the preceding fiscal year or, to the extent that such data are not available to him before April 1 of the calendar year in which the Secretary's determination is made, then on the basis of the most recent reliable data available to him at the time of such determination.

When requested by the Commissioner, the Secretary of Commerce shall make a special estimate of the number of children of such ages who are from families having an annual income less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) in each county or school district, and the Commissioner is authorized to pay (either in advance or by way of reimbursement) the Secretary of Commerce the cost of making this special estimate. The Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to any request of the chief executive of a State for the collection of additional census information. For purposes of this section, the Secretary shall consider all children who are in correctional institutions to be living in institutions for delinquent children.

(e) For the purpose of this section, "the average per pupil expenditure" in a State, or in the United States, shall be the aggregate current expenditures during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made (or, if satisfactory data for that year are not available at the time of computation, then during the earliest preceding fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available) of all local educational agencies as defined in section 303(6) (A) in the State, or in the United States (which for the purposes of this subsection means the fifty States and the District of Columbia), as the case may be, plus any direct current expenditures by the State for operation of such agencies (without regard to the sources of funds from which either of such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.

Renumber all following sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. PEYSER

Page 28, beginning with line 10, strike out everything down through line 11, p. 36, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 102. Section 103 of Title I of the Act is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 103. (a) (1) (A) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the purpose of this paragraph an amount equal to not more than 1 per centum of the amount appropriated for such year of payments to States under section 134(a) (other than payments under such section to jurisdictions excluded from the term "State" by this subsection). The Commissioner shall allot the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for such grants. In addition, he shall allot from such amount to the Secretary of the Interior—

(i) the amount necessary to make payments pursuant to subparagraph (B); and
(ii) the amount necessary to make payments pursuant to subparagraph (C).

The maximum grant which a local educational agency in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be eligible to receive shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this part.

(B) The terms on which payment shall be made to the Department of the Interior shall include provision for payments by the Secretary of the Interior to local educational agencies with respect to out-of-State Indian children in the elementary or secondary schools of such agencies under special contracts with that Department. The amount of any such payment may not exceed, for each such child, one-half the average per pupil expenditure in the State in which the agency is located.

(C) The maximum amount allotted for payments to the Secretary of the Interior under clause (ii) in the third sentence of subparagraph (A) for any fiscal year shall be the amount necessary to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived Indian children on reservations serviced by elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior, as determined pursuant to criteria established by the Commissioner. Such payments shall be made pursuant to an agreement between the Commissioner and the Secretary containing such assurances and terms as the Commissioner determines will best achieve the purposes of this part. Such agreement shall contain (1) an assurance that payments made pursuant to this subparagraph will be used solely for programs and projects approved by the Secretary of the Interior which meet the applicable requirements of section 3(a) and that the Department of the Interior will comply in all other respects with the requirements of this title, and (2) provision for carrying out the applicable provisions of sections 3(a) and 133(a) (3).

(2) In any case in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for that purpose are available, the maximum grant which a local educational agency in a State shall be eligible to receive under this part for any fiscal year shall be (except as provided in paragraph (3)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (established pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State except that if the average per pupil expenditure in the State is less than the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, such amount shall be the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, or if the average per pupil

expenditure in the State is more than 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, such amount shall be 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, multiplied by the number of children in the school district of such agency who are aged five to seventeen, inclusive, and are (A) in families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)), (B) all of the number of children in the school district of such agency who are aged five to seventeen, inclusive and who are in families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under Title IV of the Social Security Act, or (C) living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children (other than such institutions operated by the United States) but not counted pursuant to paragraph (7) of this subsection for the purpose of a grant to a State agency, or being supported in foster homes with public funds. In any other case, the maximum grant for any local educational agency in a State shall be determined on the basis of the aggregate maximum amount of such grants for all such agencies in the county or counties in which the school district of the particular agency is located, which aggregate maximum amount shall be equal to the Federal percentage of such per pupil expenditure multiplied by the number of children of such ages in such county or counties who are described in clauses (A), (B), or (C) of the previous sentence, and shall be allocated among those agencies upon such equitable basis as may be determined by the State educational agency in accordance with basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, upon determination by the State educational agency that a local educational agency in the State is unable or unwilling to provide for the special educational needs of children, described in clause (C) of the first sentence of this paragraph, who are living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, the State educational agency shall, if it assumes responsibility for the special educational needs of such children, be eligible to receive the portion of the allocation to such local educational agency which is attributable to such neglected or delinquent children, but if the State educational agency does not assume such responsibility, any other State or local public agency, as determined by regulations established by the Commissioner, which does assume such responsibility shall be eligible to receive such portion of the allocation.

(3) (A) If the maximum amount of the grant determined pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) for any local educational agency is greater than 50 per centum of the sum budgeted by that agency for current expenditure for that year (as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner), such maximum amount shall be reduced to 50 per centum of such budgeted sum.

(B) In the case of local educational agencies which serve in whole or in part the same geographical area, and in the case of a local educational agency which provides free public education for a substantial number of children who reside in the school district of another local educational agency, the State educational agency may allocate the amount of the maximum grants for those agencies among them in such manner as it determines will best carry out the purpose of this part.

(4) The grant which Puerto Rico shall be eligible to receive under this part for a fiscal year shall be the amount arrived at by multiplying the number of children counted under subsection (c) by (1) the average per

pupil expenditure in Puerto Rico or (ii) in the case where such average per pupil expenditure is more than 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States.

(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) A local educational agency shall be eligible for a basic grant for a fiscal year under this part only if it meets the following requirements with respect to the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, described in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the first sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(1) In any case (except as provided in paragraph (3)) in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection as to the number of such children are available on a school district basis, the number of such children in the school district of such local educational agency shall be at least ten.

(2) In any other case, except as provided in paragraph (3), the number of such children in the county which includes such local educational agency's school district shall be at least ten.

(3) In any case in which a county includes a part of the school district of the local educational agency concerned and the Commissioner has not determined that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection are available on a school district basis for all the local educational agencies for all the counties into which the school district of the local educational agency concerned extends, the eligibility requirement with respect to the number of such children for such local educational agency shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner for the purposes of this subsection.

(c) For the purposes of this section the "Federal percentage" shall be 50 per centum and the "low-income factor" shall be \$3,750 for each fiscal year of this Act, except that no county shall receive less than 95 per centum of the amount they have received for the previous fiscal year.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce. At any time such data for a county are available in the Department of Commerce, such data shall be used in making calculations under this section. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the number of children of such ages from families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, and the number of children of such ages living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, or being supported in foster homes with public funds, on the basis of the caseload data for the month of January of the preceding fiscal year or, to the extent that such data are not available to him before April 1 of the calendar year in which the Secretary's determination is made, then on the basis of the most recent reliable data available to him at the time of such determination.

When requested by the Commissioner, the Secretary of Commerce shall make a special estimate of the number of children of such ages who are from families having an annual income less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) in each county or school district, and the Commissioner is authorized to pay (either in ad-

vance or by way of reimbursement) the Secretary of Commerce the cost of making this special estimate. The Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to any request of the chief executive of a State for the collection of additional census information. For purposes of this section, the Secretary shall consider all children who are in correctional institutions to be living in institutions for delinquent children.

(e) For the purpose of this section, "the average per pupil expenditure" in a State, or in the United States, shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made (or, if satisfactory data for that year are not available at the time of computation, then during the earliest preceding fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available) of all local educational agencies as declined in section 303 (6) (A) in the State, or in the United States (which for the purposes of this subsection means the fifty States and the District of Columbia), as the case may be, plus any direct current expenditures by the State for operation of such agencies (without regard to the sources of funds from which either of such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.

Renumber all following sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. FEYSER

Page 28, beginning with line 10, strike out everything down through line 11, page 36, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 102. Section 103 of title I of the Act is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 103. (a) (1) (A) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the purpose of this paragraph an amount equal to not more than 1 per centum, of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 134 (a) (other than payments under such section to jurisdictions excluded from the term "State" by this subsection). The Commissioner shall allot the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for such grants. In addition, he shall allot from such amount to the Secretary of the Interior—

(i) the amount necessary to make payments pursuant to subparagraph (B); and

(ii) the amount necessary to make payments pursuant to subparagraph (C). The maximum grant which a local educational agency in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be eligible to receive shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this part.

(B) The terms on which payment shall be made to the Department of the Interior shall include provision for payments by the Secretary of the Interior to local educational agencies with respect to out-of-State Indian children in the elementary or secondary schools of such agencies under special contracts with that Department. The amount of any such payment may not exceed for each such child, one-half the average per pupil expenditure in the State in which the agency is located.

(C) The maximum amount allotted for payments to the Secretary of the Interior under clause (ii) in the third sentence of subparagraph (A) for any fiscal year shall be the amount necessary to meet the special educational needs of deprived Indian children on reservations serviced by elementary

and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior, as determined pursuant to criteria established by the Commissioner. Such payments shall be made pursuant to an agreement between the Commissioner and the Secretary containing such assurances and terms as the Commissioner determines will best achieve the purposes of this part. Such agreement shall contain (1) an assurance that payments made pursuant to this subparagraph will be used solely for programs and projects approved by the Secretary of the Interior which meet the applicable requirements of section 13(a) and that the Department of the Interior will comply in all other respects with the requirements of this title, and (2) provision for carrying out the applicable provisions of sections 131(a) and 133(a) (3).

(2) In any case in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for that purpose are available, the maximum grant which a local educational agency in a State shall be eligible to receive under this part for any fiscal year shall be (except as provided in paragraph (3)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (established pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State except that if the average per pupil expenditure in the State is less than the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, such amount shall be the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, or if the average per pupil expenditure in the State is more than 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, such amount shall be 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, multiplied by the number of children in the school district of such agency who are aged five to seventeen, inclusive, and are (A) in families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)), (B) all of the number of children in the school district of such agency who are aged five to seventeen, inclusive and who are in families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a state plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, or (C) living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children (other than such institutions operated by the United States) but not counted pursuant to paragraph (7) of this subsection for the purpose of a grant to a State agency, or being supported in foster homes with public funds. In any other case, the maximum grant for any local educational agency in a State shall be determined on the basis of the aggregate maximum amount of such grants for all such agencies in the county or counties in which the school district of the particular agency is located, which aggregate maximum amount shall be equal to the Federal percentage of such per pupil expenditure multiplied by the number of children of such ages in such county or counties who are described in clauses (A), (B) or (C) of the previous sentence, and shall be allocated among those agencies upon such equitable basis as may be determined by the State educational agency in accordance with basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, upon determination by the State educational agency that a local educational agency in the State is unable or unwilling to provide for the special educational needs of children, described in clause (C) of the first sentence of this paragraph, who are living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, the State educational agency shall, if it assumes responsibility for the special educational needs of such children, be eligible to receive the portion of the allocation to such local educational agency which is attributable to such neglected or delinquent children,

but if the State educational agency does not assume such responsibility, any other State or local public agency, as determined by regulations established by the Commissioner, which does assume such responsibility shall be eligible to receive such portion of the allocation.

(3) (A) If the maximum amount of the grant determined pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) for any local educational agency is greater than 50 per centum of the sum budgeted by that agency for current expenditures for that year (as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner, such maximum amount shall be reduced to 50 per centum of such budgeted sum.

(B) In the case of local educational agencies which serve in whole or in part the same geographical area, and in the case of a local educational agency which provides free public education for a substantial number of children who reside in the school district of another local educational agency, the State educational agency may allocate the amount of the maximum grants for those agencies among them in such manner as it determines will best carry out the purpose of this part.

(4) The grant which Puerto Rico shall be eligible to receive under this part for a fiscal year shall be the amount arrived at by multiplying the number of children counted under subsection (c) by (i) the average per pupil expenditure in Puerto Rico or (ii) in the case where such average per pupil expenditure is more than 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 130 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States.

(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) A local educational agency shall be eligible for a basic grant for a fiscal year under this part only if it meets the following requirements with respect to the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, described in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the first sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(1) In any case (except as provided in paragraph (3)) in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection as to the number of such children in the school district of such local educational agency shall be at least ten.

(2) In any other case, except as provided in paragraph (3), the number of such children in the county which includes such local educational agency's school district shall be at least ten.

(3) In any case in which a county includes a part of the school district of the local educational agency concerned and the Commissioner has not determined that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection are available on a school district basis for all the local educational agencies for all the counties into which the school district of the local educational agency concerned extends, the eligibility requirement with respect to the number of such children for such local educational agency shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner for the purposes of this subsection.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the "Federal percentage" shall be 40 per centum and the "low-income factor" shall be \$3,750 for each fiscal year of this Act, except that no county shall receive less than 95 per centum of the amount they have received for the previous fiscal year.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) on the basis

of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce. At any time such data for a county are available in the Department of Commerce, such data shall be used in making calculations under this section. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the number of children of such ages from families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, and the number of children of such ages living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, or being supported in foster homes with public funds, on the basis of the caseload data for the month of January of the preceding fiscal year or, to the extent that such data are not available to him before April 1 of the calendar year in which the Secretary's determination is made, then on the basis of the most recent reliable data available to him at the time of such determination.

When requested by the Commissioner, the Secretary of Commerce shall make a special estimate of the number of children of such ages who are from families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) in each county or school district, and the Commissioner is authorized to pay (either in advance or by way of reimbursement) the Secretary of Commerce the cost of making this special estimate. The Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to any request of the chief executive of a State for the collection of additional census information. For purposes of this section, the Secretary shall consider all children who are in correctional institutions to be living in institutions for delinquent children.

(e) For the purpose of this section, "the average per pupil expenditure" in a State, or in the United States, shall be the aggregate current expenditures during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made (or, if satisfactory data for that year are not available at the time of computation, then during the earliest preceding fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available) of all local educational agencies as defined in section 303(6) (A) in the State, or in the United States (which for the purposes of this subsection means the fifty States and the District of Columbia), as the case may be, plus any direct current expenditures by the State for operation of such agencies (without regard to the sources of funds from which either of such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.

Renumber all following sections accordingly.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLINDED VETERANS ASSOCIATION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1974, the National Service Officer of the Blinded Veterans Association, Mr. David Schnair, appeared before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and made some very outstanding recommendations to the committee to help blinded veterans.

For the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress who were not privileged to hear

Mr. Schnair, the text of his statement follows:

BLINDED VETERANS ASSOCIATION (Statement of David L. Schnair)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Blinded Veterans Association, in particular, and all the nation's blinded veterans, in general.

Before turning to a review of the Blinded Veterans Association's legislative program and of our concerns, I would like to give a brief background of the BVA and its objectives. The BVA was founded in March, 1945 as a membership organization of veterans who lost their sight as a result of their service in the Armed Forces of the United States. It was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York in 1947 and chartered by Act of Congress in 1958. Our members include blinded veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korea Conflict, the Vietnam Era and Peacetime Service. Fortunately, the number of living veterans with service-connected blindness is relatively small. However, the problems of the individual blinded veteran and his family in adjusting to blindness can be great. Therefore, the Blinded Veterans Association, since its inception, has concentrated its efforts on assuring the maintenance of high quality rehabilitation services by the Veterans Administration and in motivating and assisting the blinded veteran to take advantage of these services.

Our goal, in effect, is to assist each other to lead as normal a life as possible as productive citizens in our home communities. Our objective and these efforts have been significantly manifested during the past year with the reintroduction of an expanded BVA Field Service Program which operates with funds made available under a contract negotiated with the Veterans Administration in 1972. We indeed are grateful for the opportunity the Veterans Administration funds provide for the BVA to demonstrate the effectiveness blinded veterans can achieve in assisting each other to become productive and useful citizens. Our Field Service Program staff currently includes five blinded veterans: a National Field Service Director supervising its activities from our national office and four Field Representatives. The latter travel throughout the United States seeking out blinded veterans to determine their needs, to acquaint them with available federal, state and local government and other community resources, and to motivate them to take advantage of these services with the goal of becoming gainfully employed and dignified citizens.

In our outreach efforts, the Field Service Program staff also has been conducting an on-going educational program at each Veterans Administration Regional Office and at each Veterans Administration Hospital with a view to assuring that the personnel of these facilities are aware of the capabilities of the blind, potential problems, rehabilitation techniques, and of the wide range of facilities and community resources which are available to serve and assist the blind.

While not ignoring blinded veterans from earlier periods, the staff has concentrated on reaching the approximately 650 Vietnam Era blinded veterans in this first year of the expanded field service. Since March, 1973, the Field Service Director or the Field Representatives have contacted more than two-thirds of these veterans and by June, 1974, we hope to have established contact with all of the known Vietnam Era blinded veterans. The BVA takes considerable satisfaction from the early successes achieved in this activity and looks forward to continuing and fruitful cooperation with the Veterans Administration in the coming years in pursuance of our mutual objective. Now, I would like to describe some of the legislative priorities of the BVA.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION

The loss of sight is many losses. It is expensive and it is a financial as well as physical handicap. In many instances many of us, both old and newly blinded alike, and for many reasons, remain the victims of our handicaps and must live and provide for ourselves and our families on the fixed income of our disability compensation. Because of our disabilities, and conditions stemming from them, many of us are unemployed or underemployed; often our disabilities prevent our wives from obtaining employment to augment the family income, the method used by more and more families to meet the increased cost of living which has risen steadily over the years. For those of us who must make it on the fixed income of our disability compensation, the disparity between our compensation and rising costs begins after the enactment of a compensation increase and widens steadily until it is reduced by a subsequent increase. Except for a very brief period, we are always behind.

Grateful as blinded veterans have been for the disability compensation increases provided over the years as living costs have risen, we feel there now is a very real and urgent need for prompt legislative action providing for additional, larger increases since the cost of living has skyrocketed following enactment of the current disability compensation rates in August, 1972. Between that latter date, when the Consumer Price Index was 125.7, and January, 1974, the index had risen markedly to 139.7, an increase of 14 percentage points within a 16/17-month period. Unfortunately, as living costs still are rising, we have no reason to believe, nor is there much assurance, that the sharp increase in the Consumer Price Index will not continue indefinitely.

The BVA, of course, is very pleased that the Chairman of this Committee and Congressman Teague have respectively introduced H.R. 11469, which would provide for an increase of 15% in disability compensation, and H.R. 12263, providing for a 20% increase. We agree that the 15% increase compares very favorably with the Consumer Price Index statistics. Accordingly, we support the 15% increase as provided in H.R. 11469, as a minimum and with certain modifications as outlined below.

There always has been a lag between the enactment of compensation increases for disabled veterans and their survivors and the continuing rise in the cost of living. This has been particularly significant in the months since the August, 1972 compensation increase. Since every indication is that the Consumer Price Index will continue to spiral upwards, the BVA strongly urges the Congress to enact legislation promptly which will assure that the compensation payable to veterans for service-connected disabilities will keep pace with the continuing increases in the cost of living. We believe this requires the adoption of an automatic cost-of-living system similar to that now applicable to Civil Service personnel, retired government employees and numerous other groups.

We note that, in his March 4th communications to the Chairman and Representative Hammerschmidt, President Nixon recommended a 12% increase in disability compensation, effective March 1, 1974. The President also recommended that future increases in disability compensation be provided by automatic cost-of-living adjustments. While we believe that the 12% increase is inadequate, we fully support both the cost-of-living adjustments, as already indicated, and the March 1st effective date recommended by the President to avoid continuing erosion in the purchasing power of disability compensation as the cost of living continues to rise. If the Congress should conclude not to adopt the automatic cost-of-living adjustment system at this time, Mr. Chairman, we are of the strong

opinion that a much higher increase in disability compensation—at least the 20% provided under H.R. 12263—would be justified, as long as it is effective March 1, 1974. Only by such an anticipatory increase can disabled veterans be provided with a measure of protection against the continuing erosion in the purchasing power of their compensation.

Before proceeding, Mr. Chairman, we wish to indicate our support of that portion of President Nixon's communication which recommends a 16% increase in dependency and compensation, an amount identical to that contained in S. 3072 which has been introduced by Senator Hartke.

SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS

Mr. Chairman, in recent years the continuing number one legislative priority of the BVA, after compensation increases to stay abreast of the cost of living, has been the provision of adequate survivorship benefits for the families of deceased and totally disabled veterans. The BVA feels that a major need of a veteran suffering from a permanent and total service-connected disability is to provide financial security for his survivors despite the inability to obtain adequate insurance and adequate employment, the normal means of creating a suitable estate. At the present time, when a permanent and totally disabled veteran in receipt of disability compensation dies from causes not clearly service-connected, his survivors are not eligible for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation, the system provided when families are deprived of support by the service-connected death of a veteran. The veteran's survivors are left to whatever they may be entitled under the pension system. We in the BVA believe this to be wrong and unconscionable.

A veteran's service-connected disability may make him ineligible for insurance or may make the cost prohibitive. His inability to engage in gainful employment limits the amount of savings he can accumulate and, more importantly, prevents him from building up Social Security benefits available to the rest of the population. Often, the veteran's disability compensation is only barely adequate to provide current living expenses, especially for the veterans with dependent children as well as a wife. Under the circumstances, we think it is the inescapable obligation of the government to assist these veterans and their families in solving this problem occasioned by the veterans' military service.

This Committee will be interested to know that Canada long ago saw fit to provide survivorship protection for the families of its seriously disabled veterans defined as those 50% or more disabled without any means test and without distinction as to the cause of death. Canada also grants the surviving widow of such a veteran the full amount of his disability compensation for one year after his death as a means of assisting her to adjust to new financial circumstances. According to our information, the widow of a Canadian veteran who is rated 100% disabled for service-connected blindness receives a widow's pension of at least \$200 a month. Also, the children's allowances are doubled to the widow on the veteran's death. Thus, we understand that the widow of a Canadian blinded veteran with three dependent children would receive at least \$360 a month. This amount is not related to the cause of the veteran's death nor to his widow's financial resources. The sole criterion for eligibility for these benefits is the veteran's permanent and total service-connected disability. Surely, the United States ought to be able to provide similar protection for the families of its permanently and totally disabled veterans. Thus, the members of the Blinded Veterans Association favor legislation which would pro-

vide for the statutory presumption of service-connected death of severely and totally disabled service-connected veterans. Legislation proposed in H.R. 2477, which we endorsed before this Committee in testimony in the spring of 1973, is designed to meet this vital need, although we would like to suggest some modifications to this Bill which we feel are essential and reasonable.

We believe that entitlement to DIC for the survivors of a veteran having a permanent and total service-connected disability is justified on the basis of the profound effect the veterans' disability has on his capacity to provide for the economic well being of his family after the veteran's death. However, we cannot believe that the disability has had a less profound effect if the veteran dies less than twenty years after the original disability was incurred! Certainly, the needs of the veteran's family are not any less because of his shorter period of disability. Therefore, we would recommend that H.R. 2477 be modified to eliminate the requirement that a veteran must be permanently and totally disabled for at least twenty years in order that his survivors be eligible for DIC. Similarly, we believe that the provisions of H.R. 3017, which would bar DIC payment when the death of a service-connected totally disabled veteran was occasioned by accidental causes having no relationship to the service-connected disability is discriminatory. The veteran and his family most assuredly are still subject to the same problems in creating an adequate estate whether his death is accidental or not. Accordingly, we urgently request that any such provision included in any pending legislation be eliminated.

An alternative in providing security for the survivors of permanent and totally disabled service-connected veterans which we would recommend would be to extend the provisions of Public Law 92-425, promulgated in 1972. This Law established the Survivor Benefit Plan which provides families of certain deceased retired military personnel an annuity up to 55% of their retired pay. While the retired serviceman pays a portion of the cost of the system through deductions from his retired pay, the Government bears a substantial cost of the benefits, particularly for those involving lower grade enlisted personnel. The BVA enthusiastically welcomed the enactment of the Survivor Benefit Plan but feels that this legislation left a glaring inequity which affects a substantial number of our members as well as many other disabled veterans. I refer to the fact that the Plan makes no provision for the survivors of disabled enlisted men of World War II. The reason for this is simple: enlisted personnel were not entitled to disability retirement until the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

We requested in our April, 1973 testimony that this indefensible deficiency be corrected and, since no action has yet been taken, we again urge correction of this deficiency before the present session of Congress adjourns. Every day of delay jeopardizes the financial well-being of families of these disabled servicemen. Our remedial proposal is simple: that the benefits of the Survivorship Plan be extended to all servicemen who are not now eligible because they are not in a retired status and who, at the time of their separation from the service, were determined by the Veterans Administration to have a severely disabled service-connected status. They would be expected to make the same contributions that are chargeable under the Survivor Benefit Plan.

We realize, Mr. Chairman, that there can be a difference of opinion as to whether such a program should be administered by the Department of Defense, which now administers the existing program, or by Veterans Administration. We recognize that

these men are, in fact, disabled veterans, not retired military personnel, and that the legislation we are proposing would not confer retired status on them. But the important thing is not to let such differences stand in the way of the earliest possible corrective action. We say, again, each day's delay means that this one group of families of disabled servicemen is being subjected to major, if not catastrophic, financial penalties as a result of a technicality in the law. We cannot believe that Congress intended such an unfair blow to fall on the survivors of men who sacrificed equally for their country as others whose families are now protected.

We still think, Mr. Chairman, that legislation that would make Dependency and Indemnity Compensation payable to the survivors of deceased permanently and totally disabled veterans has much merit and continue to regard its adoption as a BVA priority. The important thing, of course, is to make available these vitally needed benefits with the least possible delay.

AID AND ATTENDANCE

To our exceeding regret, legislation introduced in previous sessions of Congress to provide an additional aid and attendance allowance to certain service-connected blinded veterans has not yet been acted upon by this Committee. Consequently, we once again ask your urgent consideration of legislation to amend paragraph (r), Section 314, Title 38 of the U.S. Code as contained in H.R. 6137 which was introduced upon request a year ago by Chairman Dorn. This Bill would provide an additional monthly Aid and Attendance Allowance to any veteran whose visual acuity is 5/200 or less and who is otherwise entitled to the compensation authorized under Title 38, Section 314, subsection (1), (m) or (n) or the intermediate rates thereunder.

The BVA's request and justification for this additional allowance is based on several facts, some obvious and others more subtle. We see this additional aid and attendance allowance as a means of becoming more competitive in the job market and in a blinded veteran's opportunity to more fully participate in the world of work. Such an allowance could help blinded veterans in the purchase of transportation to and from work, it could provide funds to obtain reading research services by sighted persons; i.e., it could assist immeasurably in a blinded veteran's ability to hire eyes so that he could meet the requirements often stipulated as a pre-requisite for employment.

It is a well established and obvious fact that, due to his disability, the blinded veteran is immediately cut off from 85% of the means of communication which sighted people enjoy. One must see danger in order to avoid it; the first indication of such danger to a blind person is too late—when the veteran has already fallen and sustained bodily and serious injury. The blind person often needs assistance in finding a restaurant table, in reading menus, in locating street addresses and entrances to buildings.

For all these stated reasons, both obvious and subtle, and for many others the BVA feels that the additional allowance provided under H.R. 6137 is essential in order that the blinded veteran would be compensated for the expense he incurs for aid and attendance in his everyday activities. We urge Congress to take action on this legislation during the present session.

INCREASE AWARDS FOR DISABILITIES IN COMBINATION WITH BLINDNESS

Another inequity which the BVA feels is in need of legislative action during this session of Congress also would involve an amendment to Section 314, Title 38, Resolution No. 28, adopted at our 1971 National Convention, requests the Congress to amend Section 314 to grant compensation under sub-

section (o) for loss or loss of use of a hand or leg when it occurs in combination with blindness. As in the previous instance, similar legislation was introduced at our request by Chairman Dorn a year ago in H.R. 6136 but has not been acted upon by this Committee.

Our request for this legislation is based on the realization that the loss of the tactile sense caused by an artificial hand or foot is considerably more handicapping when it occurs in combination with blindness since such loss deprives the blinded veteran of essential contacts with the environment and that the use of an orthopedic cane to assist a blinded veteran who also has lost a leg deprives him of the use of a long cane as a mobility tool. We strongly endorse the provisions of H.R. 6136 and respectfully urge action on this legislation before this Congress adjourns.

The BVA is equally concerned with the present method used by the Veterans Administration in rating impaired hearing in combination with blindness. It would seem to be obvious that the sense of hearing becomes the principal avenue of information for a blind person and that impaired hearing in combination with blindness compounds problems incident to the pursuit of vocational, social and recreational activities. Therefore, and pursuant to Resolution No. 12 adopted by the BVA in 1971, we respectfully request that the Congress direct the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to take appropriate action to revise the current method of rating impaired hearing in combination with blindness for disability purposes.

Currently, except for a few statutory provisions dealing with loss of hearing in combination with loss of sight, the Veterans Administration Disability Rating Schedule assigns percentages of disability for hearing loss occurring in blinded veterans as if such hearing losses occurred in individuals with normal vision. We strongly feel that the VA's current rating method should be altered in order to eliminate current inequities in the disability rating structure and request the Congress' assistance in achieving this objective.

ELIGIBILITY FOR AUTOMOBILES AND ADAPTIVE EQUIPMENT

In April, 1973, the BVA testified in favor of Bills which would extend to those disabled veterans who served on or after February, 1955, particularly those serving during the Vietnam Era, the same eligibility for the automobile allowance grant as is presently available to disabled veterans who served during World War II and the Korea Conflict. In appearing before this Committee again, we are anxious to reiterate our support of such legislation as embodied in H.R. 5934, H.R. 1633 and H.R. 4491. The BVA is fully in accord with the Veterans Administration's recommendation to remove the present statutory discrimination against veterans of the Vietnam Era which requires that the prescribed disability for this eligibility must be "a direct result of the performance of military duty."

The BVA also would like to express its particular support of that portion of S. 2363, introduced by Senator Hartke, which would amend Section 1002, Title 38, United States Code, to increase the automobile allowance grant to disabled veterans to \$3,300. We fully support the efforts of the Paralyzed Veterans of America in seeking an increase in the amount of this allowance in view of the marked increase in the cost-of-living of this allowance in view of the marked increase in the cost of living subsequent to enactment of the presently authorized \$2,800.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

The BVA joins with other veterans' organizations in supporting all of the provisions of H.R. 12628, the "Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1974",

which would increase the amount of educational assistance to Vietnam Era veterans by 13.6%. We commend the sponsors of this Bill for initiating prompt action in this current session of Congress to improve educational and training benefits for the nation's veterans.

As in the case of the American Legion, we believe that there are justifiable reasons to take a hard look at providing a separate payment, direct to the institution of the veteran's choice, in an amount calculated to cover the cost of tuition, fees, books and other customary charges. We would urge the Members of this Committee to seriously consider this proposal in order that our veterans may have sufficient freedom to attend the educational institution of their choice and that there will be no question that our Vietnam Era veterans will have been treated as fairly and equitably as those veterans who returned from World War II.

ENDORSEMENT OF OTHER PENDING LEGISLATION

Other Bills pending in Congress which are of concern to blinded veterans and which the BVA endorses include H.R. 100 and S. 150. The first of these would make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits. It is our position that veterans should never be penalized in the computation of their pension or compensation as a result of periodic increases in social security benefits. We realize that the present situation in which this is happening is extraordinary; we are sure that Congress did not intend for this to be the case and we urge that the essential action to remedy this conflict be effected at the earliest possible moment. S. 150, introduced by Senator Inouye, provides that the Administrator of Veterans Affairs may furnish outpatient dental services and treatment for a non service-connected disability to any war veteran who has permanent total disability from a service-connected disability.

BVA RESOLUTIONS REQUESTING LEGISLATION

At their 1972 National Convention, the members of the Blinded Veterans Association adopted two Resolutions urging legislation of interest to this Committee on which no action has been taken to date. Copies of these two Resolutions are attached to this Statement for the Committee Members' review and consideration, but we would like to describe them briefly.

Chapter 21, Title 38, United States Code, provides a special housing grant, presently in the amount of \$17,500, the objective of which is to aid certain totally disabled veterans in the purchase or construction of special, adaptive housing to accommodate prosthetic devices for these veterans. Resolution No. 16/72 requested that the BVA secure federal legislation which would extend the provisions of this law to include blinded veterans without their having to suffer any additional disability beyond total service-connected blindness.

Resolution No. 5/72 recommended the establishment of an agency within the VA which would be authorized to make loans directly to the blind and 100% disabled veterans for the purchase of adequate housing. The Resolution further recommended that the loans be of sufficient amount to adequately purchase a home at current market prices and an interest rate of 3 to 5%.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I should like to note that Resolutions adopted by the BVA at our Twenty-Eighth National Convention in 1973 are primarily administrative, as opposed to legislative, in nature. In accordance with Resolution No. 1/73, we have urged the Veterans Administration to establish a fourth Blind Rehabilitation Center at an appropriate location in the southern part of the United States where blinded veterans

will receive the basic rehabilitation which is available at the three present Centers located at West Haven, Connecticut, Hines, Illinois, and Menlo Park, California, respectively. As a result of our Field Service Program activity, the BVA is of the opinion that there is evidence of an increasing need for additional accommodations, in a fourth location, to extend the benefits of the Veterans Administration's fine rehabilitation program to more Vietnam Era blinded veterans.

Resolution No. 2/73, urges the Veterans Administration to initiate an in-house program of training and employment of blinded veterans in the Veterans Administration telephone information service, a program already proven successful in the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration and the Civil Service Commission Job Information Centers. We are pleased that the Veterans Administration is moving ahead with the development of this program as recommended by this particular Resolution.

A major action of our 1973 National Convention was the adoption of Resolution No. 6, which placed the BVA on record as opposing the granting of amnesty to anyone who has been proven a deserter of the Armed Forces of the United States and to those now seeking amnesty and are residing outside the boundaries of the United States in order to avoid serving in the military.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say how very appreciative the entire membership of the Blinded Veterans Association is for the dedicated service and highly important contribution the members of the House Veterans Affairs Committee have rendered to the American veterans. There can be no doubt of the tremendous debt we owe you for the sympathetic role this Committee has played in the development of needed veteran legislation. We sincerely hope that Congress will act favorably on the legislation we have recommended or endorsed in this Statement. We believe this legislation is urgently needed at this time.

Again, I wish to express my gratitude, and the thanks of the entire membership of the Blinded Veterans Association, for the opportunity to appear before you today.

RESOLUTION No 16/72

Whereas, the federal government has enacted into law a special housing grant which is in the amount of \$17,500 and which is designed to aid certain totally disabled veterans in the purchase or construction of special housing designed to accommodate prosthetic devices for these veterans, AND

Whereas, those totally disabled veterans are defined as paraplegics, bilateral amputees and blinded veterans who suffer the loss or loss of use of one lower extremity, AND

Whereas, all other totally disabled veterans have been excluded from the provisions of the U.S. Code, Title 38, Chapter 21, AND

Whereas, blinded veterans are by federal governmental definition legally, totally disabled veterans, AND

Whereas, blinded veterans do need certain safe, necessary and convenient prosthetic devices in their homes, such as special electric wall outlets, railings, sliding doors, intercom system, special toilet facilities, special stairwell construction to prevent serious disabling falls, Braille thermometers, etc. etc. NOW LET IT HEREBY BE

Resolved, that the Blinded Veterans Association, in Convention in Hollywood, California, on this 22d day of July, 1972, secure federal legislation designed to include blinded veterans in U.S. Code, Title 28, Chapter 21, without such blinded veterans having to suffer any additional disability beyond total blindness which is service-connected.

RESOLUTION No 5/72

Whereas, the Veterans Administration will provide a special constructed house free of charge to the paraplegic veteran, AND

Whereas, the Veterans Administration will guarantee 60% of a home mortgage loan or up to \$12,500 for all veterans, AND

Whereas, this policy has proven inadequate to substantially assist the blinded veteran in obtaining adequate housing, AND

Whereas, adequate housing for all citizens is recognized key goal of the American dream, AND

Whereas, adequate housing for the blinded veteran is mandatory if he is to be rehabilitated and his life enhanced to the point where blindness becomes a nuisance instead of a handicap, AND

Whereas, current VA policies place the blinded veteran in the same position as all other 28 million-plus veterans in competing for adequate housing, AND

Whereas, this practice is discriminatory in itself as experience has shown that the blinded veteran is not in a position to compete as an equal with sighted persons on the open housing market, AND

Whereas, if the blinded veteran is to enjoy the full benefits of the American society, the current VA housing policy must be amended in a manner that will contribute immeasurably to assisting the blinded veteran in obtaining adequate housing as smoothly and without undue bureaucratic administrative frustration, THEREFORE BE IT

Resolved, that the Blinded Veterans Association call upon the Veterans Administration to establish an agency within the VA and authorize it to make loans directly to the blind and 100% disabled veterans for the purchase of adequate housing. This agency should be provided with the necessary funds and the loans should be a long-term low interest, non-profitable type with the interest based at a level that will adequately cover the cost of the program. This agency should also provide the veteran with some type of low cost home mortgage insurance either directly or through some type of contracted services, AND BE IT

Further resolved, that the loan be of a sufficient amount to adequately purchase a home at current market prices (\$25,000 to \$30,000 ceiling) and an interest rate of 3 to 5%. (The State of California authorizes certain of its veterans a loan of up to \$35,000; if the state can authorize at this level, the Federal Government should be able to do better.)

ECONOMIC CONTROLS

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, as I have noted before, the present economic controls are a real disaster for the country. Since the time they were imposed, we have reached a record rate of inflation. We have seen shortages of paper, meat, gas, petrochemicals, wood, milk and even freight cars. Unemployment is on the rise as more and more companies are shutting down, primarily due to the fact that with controls, they cannot make a profit.

In spite of all this, it is amazing to me that there are still some who wish to keep the controls in order to maintain the present level of the economy. I should only like to ask those people, do they really want to stabilize us at the current levels listed above? This could only guarantee that the shortages and the rampant inflation would continue. Even the AFL-CIO has finally come to that

conclusion and now advocates the removal of these controls.

Last year, when the matter of extending the economic controls came up on the House floor, I was 1 of only 114 Members who voted against the extension. The reason I did so was because I felt that any extension would lead us to economic chaos. The result of the extension has more than vindicated that position. And I am sure that if we wish to see more unemployment, more inflation, and more shortages, all we will have to do is extend the economic controls for another period of time. As George Santayana so wisely pointed out a long time ago, those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it. Are we going to benefit from the history of the past year, or are we to ignore it?

As the Wall Street Journal observed in its February 14, 1974, editorial:

We've had our flirtation with controls. Now it's time to consign them again to the museum from whence they came along with all the other machines that history has proved unworkable.

I am inserting the Journal's excellent editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 14, 1974]

HOW ABOUT A CLEAN BREAK?

The administration does not want Congress to renew the wage-price control authority of the Economic Stabilization Act, which expires April 30. It has learned that price and wage controls are futile, treacherous and dangerous. That's the good news.

The bad news is that the administration plans to keep a lid on petroleum prices through the Federal Energy Office, to control the cost of medical care—apparently in anticipation of the inflationary effect of its own health care program—and to maintain some kind of jawboning agency, the Cost of Living Council, not entirely happy with the administration's decision, is still quietly pressing for continuing power to enforce existing wage and price agreements, thereby stretching into a club what we were told would merely be "monitoring and review" authority. In other words, we are learning once again how reluctant bureaucrats are to give up any power mechanism, even one that they have concluded is futile, treacherous and dangerous.

By now the administration and almost everyone else who understands the problem knows that price controls have been an economic disaster. They have distorted market forces in a fantastically complex economy, inhibited expansion, masked overstimulation of demand, created shortages, worsened inflationary pressures and created dissatisfactions over wages among working people. But we are now being asked to accept the proposition that while controls have been a disaster it won't hurt to hang onto just a few controls affecting those industries that are politically sensitive.

This is nonsense. Petroleum is a politically sensitive industry because it has developed serious shortages largely because of controls. If there is any single industry that should be relieved of controls it is petroleum—in order that it might again respond to market forces and begin to develop the new capacity that will be needed to overcome the shortages.

As to medical care, federal intervention here helped get us into the controls syndrome in the first place. The enormous and sudden demand that Medicare and Medicaid thrust on the nation's medical care facilities was highly inflationary in the late 1960s. And inflated medical care costs were a major component of the rise in the Cost of Living Index

that Democrats in Congress used in their arguments which won passage of the Economic Stabilization Act.

It is probably true that the Nixon health bill, if it passes Congress, would generate further health care inflation. But that is an argument against massive programs, not an argument for controls. Much of what needs to be done to improve access to adequate medical care in this country can be done more selectively and judiciously rather than in the slam-bang manner that characterized the 1960s. It need not be inflationary, or at least not excessively so, if it is soundly based on some proper means for obtaining revenues and allocating scarce resources like doctors' time.

Beyond that, the administration wants—and the Cost of Living Council is pressing to expand—continuation of some sort of jawboning program. This will perpetuate the myth that businessmen are responsible for inflation and that there have to be government officials around to talk such people out of their nefarious ideas. In fact, it is the other way around. There is a need for responsible people to tell the Congress and government when they are being unwise in the management of the fiscal and monetary affairs that are the fundamental sources of inflation.

For all those reasons it is time to make a clean break. We've had our flirtation with controls. Now it's time to consign them again to the museum from whence they came along with all the other machines that history has proved unworkable.

AN INVITATION TO ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has passed a resolution extending greetings to Alexander Solzhenitsyn and inviting him and his family to come and live in the United States.

This is a commendable gesture on the part of my State. Mr. Solzhenitsyn is an outstanding author who has contributed several major literary works in the past decade to the benefit of the people of Western countries. He has been honored with the Nobel prize, as well as the less tangible, but equally important, admiration of his readers. His sharp criticism of the violations of basic human rights that led to his expulsion from the Soviet Union and the revocation of his citizenship have won him an honorable place in Western history.

I would like to insert for the benefit of my colleagues, the resolution passed on the 19th of February by the State senate, which was also transmitted to Mr. Solzhenitsyn. Even though the famed author has decided to make his home in Switzerland, I believe my colleagues will be interested in noting the action our State has taken welcoming Mr. Solzhenitsyn.

The text follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

(Resolutions extending greetings on behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn, his wife Natalya and his children and inviting him and his family to make their new home in the United States of America.)

Whereas, Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn is an outstanding author and has contributed several major literary works in the past decade, for which he has been honored with the Nobel Prize in literature; and

Whereas, He has been a persistent and sharp critic of policies implemented by the Soviet Socialist government to repress politically dissident views; and

Whereas, He has been in the past a victim of such repressive policies, having been imprisoned during the political dictatorship of Joseph Stalin; and

Whereas, He is now again a victim of such policies, having been recently stripped of his Soviet citizenship, unlawfully deported from his country and sent into permanent exile; and

Whereas, The United States of America has long been a "Mother of Exiles" and has welcomed all those "yearning to be free"; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby extends its greetings, on behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn and his family and invites them to make a new home in the United States of America, where they may enjoy every right and privilege which our Constitution guarantees to the people of this country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the Congress of the United States and to Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn and his family.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COLLEGE OF THE CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF BUF- FALO TO HONOR PETER J. RYBKA

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our lifetimes, we have the privilege of knowing, and we are affected by, outstanding, fellow human beings.

They inspire us. They help shape the attitudes and lives of the people in their communities and in similar pursuits. They seemingly have unlimited capacities to dedicate their energies and their talents for the betterment of others, in the immediate and greater worlds in which they labor.

This Sunday, in my congressional district, the people of western New York will gather to pay tribute to my close, personal friend, and a truly outstanding American, who embodies all of the attributes I have described.

He is Peter J. Rybka, labor and civic leader, union pioneer, public servant, sports fan, devoted family man, father, and grandfather. He will be the recipient of the coveted Bishop's Plaque, awarded annually by the Labor-Management College of the Catholic Diocese of Buffalo, an honor which will be bestowed by the Most Reverend Edward D. Head, Bishop of the Diocese, and the Very Reverend Monsignor Stanley A. Kulpinski, director of the college.

Like many of my constituents and others in our community, Peter Rybka has deep and close cultural ties in Poland, from where his parents emigrated.

His father was a coal miner who emigrated to America with his wife, Sophie, and first settled in the coal mining town of Dupont, Pa., where Peter, the oldest of six children, was born.

At the age of 7, Peter and his parents moved to Buffalo. A year later, when he was only 8, his father was killed in an industrial accident and his mother went to work to support her family.

Her struggle and the hardships of the other members of Peter's family made indelible impressions upon his consciousness. These struggles, he has observed, have helped direct the course of his active involvement to secure opportunities for the less fortunate.

After a limited formal education in parochial elementary and public schools, Peter went to work in a steel mill when he was 15 to help support his mother and his brother, three sisters having fallen victim to a scarlet fever epidemic when he was but 10.

In 1933, he began organizing workers in Buffalo feed mills and other industrial activities.

By hard work and service Peter Rybka rose from union steward, to full-time business representative of the executive board of the Buffalo area AFL-CIO, a post he still holds.

He won election as vice president of the American Federation of Grain Processors. He served on that Council's executive board and later was elected vice president of the succeeding international union, the American Federation of Grain Millers, AFL.

Since 1959, Peter Rybka has served as the full-time vice president of the American Federation of Grain Millers International, responsible for 12 States in the Eastern area.

While pursuing his career and striving for the betterment of his fellow workers and their families, he maintained an active role in western New York political affairs. He served as elected democratic committeemen. He won the Buffalo Council at large seat in 1947 by a record plurality and 111,000 votes of support.

He appointed a fellow trade unionist and another great friend of mine, Stanley M. Makowski, as his personal secretary, a move that contributed to Stan's own distinguished career in public service and his present seat as Buffalo's outstanding mayor.

Peter Rybka went on to serve as the Majority Leader of the Buffalo City Council. And, to this day, he is a vigorous and wise competitor in local, State and Federal election campaigns, playing hard, tough and clean as he did on municipal and semiprofessional baseball teams.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on about Peter Rybka's service on a wide variety of labor committees, his 20 years of dedicated service to the Cheektowaga Zoning Board of Appeals, his contributions to Polish-American relations and other public contributions.

Perhaps, most of all, I am deeply grateful for his consistent help and counsel as a knowledgeable and concerned member of the Maritime Trades Union, Buffalo Port Council.

Peter Rybka's assistance to help secure grain milling and storage contracts from the Agriculture Department, his leadership and cooperative efforts to extend the shipping season of the Great Lakes and the Seaway, his unrelenting and continuing work to retain and expand the Buffalo Port's traditional role as the gateway, shipping point for grain and other commodities, his support for pension protection legislation, for emergency medical care of seafarers and port workers, his untiring work to secure a higher minimum wage and other efforts in behalf of greater wage and employment opportunities for the people of our community have been invaluable to me, personally.

I am proud to know him. I am proud to call him my friend.

I am privileged to salute him before my colleagues and the people of America whom he serves.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 20, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

With Thee is the fountain of life; in Thy light shall we see light.—Psalms 36: 9.

O God of Grace and Lord of Glory who art with us all our days, help us to realize our dependence upon Thee and our constant need of Thy guidance, Thy wisdom, and Thy love. May we always be aware of Thy presence and come to know that with Thee we are ready for every responsibility and equal to every experience.

Let Thy spirit work mightily through-

out our Nation and our world that men and women everywhere may turn to Thee for guidance, for wisdom, and for good will. Give us all grace to listen to Thee that we may not be frustrated by fear nor wearied by worry, but in Thy light may we see light and by Thee be given courage to walk in right ways—for Thy sake and the good of our human family. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2315. An act relating to the compensation of employees of Senate committees.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the amendments of the Sen-