

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO DR. SAM D'AMBOLA

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1974

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in today's society of hustle and bustle, when our working hours and our daily commitments seem to leave us less and less time to pursue our most cherished interests and to share these special skills with others, I wanted to take a moment to bring Dr. Sam D'Ambola's accomplishments to all my colleagues' attention.

"Doc" D'Ambola, of my hometown of Newark, N.J., can almost be described as our community's "renaissance" man. His leadership, his enthusiasm, and his commitment to the students and families of Newark extend into such multifarious areas that one must assume Dr. D'Ambola wastes little time in making the most of each day.

After graduating Barringer High School in Newark in 1940, Seton Hall College in 1947, and Downstate Medical School in 1951, "Doc" D'Ambola conducted both his internship and residency at our city's St. Michael's Hospital. Today he is president of the Essex County Chapter of the American Academy of General Practice, chief of clinics at St. Michael's, a member of the hospital's executive committee, and secretary of the medical staff. Continuing his medical education, in 1970 he became a "diplomat" on the American Board of Family Practice. Thus, from the first day "Doc" D'Ambola entered St. Michael's as a medical intern, he has been a vital part of the hospital's responses to new challenges and developments in its efforts to best meet the health needs of Newark's citizens.

Yet, for Dr. D'Ambola, his expertise in the medical area has been but a part of his service to our people. Throughout his professional studies, "Doc" D'Ambola trained, pursued, and mastered the difficult and technical skills involved in the art of fencing. In 1940, he served as cocaptain of the metropolitan and State championship Barringer team, while in the same year holding the title of individual State champion. At Seton Hall College, he became a member of the eastern intercollegiate championship team. In 1942, he achieved the eastern intercollegiate epee strip "C" title. And, in 1957-58, he was acclaimed as the open State foil champion.

With this remarkable record, Dr. D'Ambola, since 1960, has volunteered his teaching abilities and has served as the head coach of the Essex Catholic High School fencing team. During his tenure, he has compiled an unbelievable 183-12-1 record, captured nine State championships, eight Centruolo Tournament titles, two metropolitan championships, and in the process ran off 107 consecutive victories. Through his efforts, college scholarships were made possible for more than 50 of his students.

On Thursday evening, May 16, "Doc" D'Ambola will retire from his head coach position. The fencing alumni of Essex Catholic are to hold a tribute in his honor. As Dr. D'Ambola looks back on the special memories and experiences he has shared over the years, I am sure his sense of fulfillment for the self-confidence and pride he has helped to build and for the opportunities and challenges he has opened for his students will make this evening a truly unforgettable occasion. To Dr. Sam D'Ambola, my warm congratulations. How well deserved is this forthcoming tribute.

EDWARD F. PRIOR RETIRES AS CONDUCTOR OF MONTEREY PARK CONCERT BAND

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, there are very few occasions these days when one is able to enjoy fine concert music without paying a great deal of money for the pleasure. However, the citizens of southern California have had the privilege of hearing the Monterey Park Concert Band for free for the past 12 years.

The Monterey Park Concert Band was founded and has survived through the generosity and labors of Maj. Edward F. Prior and his wife, Arlis. Back in 1962, after Major Prior was forced by illness to retire from his career as a trumpet soloist, he and his wife decided to organize and finance a concert band which, in addition to performing publicly, would serve as a workshop where musicians could improve their own ability by practicing in a group conducted by Major Prior.

Cards were sent out to some 200 musicians, including retired professionals and semiprofessionals, top-flight amateurs, and students, asking them to volunteer their services for the band. The result was the Monterey Park Concert Band, which gave its first performance in March 1963. Now, 11 years later, the band has over 75 members and is still an all-volunteer effort. Major and Mrs. Prior have poured nearly \$10,000 of their personal funds into this project. The Monterey Park Concert Band has become very well known for its excellence. For 3 years, the band has performed in the annual 12-hour telecast at Christmas time from the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion at the Los Angeles County Music Center. Two of these performances won them Emmy Award nominations.

The success of the band is due in no small part to the talent of Major Prior. He was known as one of the finest trumpet players in the country at a very early age and has studied under many famous trumpet instructors. He has also played with top dance bands and served as Chief of Bands and Music, 5th Army Ground

Forces, while he was in the Army during World War II. Later, he was a member of the Seattle Symphony Orchestra.

The spirit with which Edward and Arlis Prior have dedicated themselves to the Monterey Park Concert Band is truly amazing. To them, every penny of the \$10,000 they have donated and all the work they have put into the band have been worth it. They are repaid, says Major Prior, by "the uplifting feelings of a job well done in seeing the joy of performing good music in the faces of our performers and the happy response from our audiences."

Now, however, Major Prior must retire as conductor because of his health. Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, he has not been able to find a replacement who will conduct without pay, as he did for over 12 years.

There are not many people like Edward and Arlis Prior—people who are willing to give so much of themselves so that others can get enjoyment out of the things they love. On the occasion of his retirement, I would like to extend my heart-felt thanks to Major Prior for making his part of our world a better place to live.

THE HANDICAPPED AND OLDER AMERICANS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, according to 1970 census figures, more than 12 million Americans between the ages of 18 and 64 are disabled, with some 5.3 million working to support themselves and sometimes their families as well. Many of our older Americans over the age of 64 also suffer from impaired vision or hearing or other infirmities. Still other Americans each year are temporarily disabled.

People on crutches and in wheelchairs must have a chance to gain the personal freedom and independence that will allow them the dignity of making it on their own. Often, however, especially if disability comes late in life to the head of a family, dealing with daily life and work can be a difficult and frustrating experience.

We must continue our efforts to break down the barriers—architectural, psychological, and others—that stand in the way of fulfillment and success for the disabled and the elderly.

Of course, no building or bus was designed intentionally to keep the disabled from using it. Yet, barriers inhibiting free access by the disabled do exist, primarily because the architects and engineers who planned these buildings or designed mass transit facilities failed to take handicapped or elderly people into account.

It seems that the building and engineering industries—in developing new models—are considering the particular problems of the handicapped. More ramps and other facilities for the disabled are being installed. Accessibility to the handicapped has been a criterion for federally financed construction for several years. Yet, greater awareness is essential, and programs, such as the one being sponsored by the consumer advocacy council of Greater Hartford, are important sources of needed information and enthusiasm for barrier-free buildings and transit facilities.

It has been my privilege as a Member of Congress to work to help break down barriers impeding the handicapped and the elderly. A measure cosponsored by me and now pending before the Ways and Means Committee would provide tax incentives for the removal of architectural and transportation barriers to the handicapped and the elderly. Enactment of this legislation would be an important step toward doing away with high curbs, narrow and high steps in buildings, buses and trains, and tight hallways and aisles. Hopefully, it will lead to the installation of ramps where they are needed and to a general rethinking of design.

Barriers in transportation facilities are particularly obstructive for the handicapped, since the inability to utilize mass transit can often effectively isolate the disabled from the mainstream of community life. Buses, in addition to subway and railroad cars have not, in the past, been designed to make access possible for people in wheelchairs and for other disabled individuals. Turnstiles and other facilities at stations also cause problems.

A measure I have cosponsored would authorize grants under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to assist States and communities in providing mass transit facilities that are planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of the handicapped and older Americans. The bill would establish access to the elderly and the handicapped as criteria for the construction of federally financed mass transit facilities, and would authorize the funding of studies on how to improve transportation opportunities for the elderly and the handicapped. The legislation would also authorize free or reduced fares for the elderly and the handicapped on airplanes, buses, and trains.

In addition to barriers in buildings and transportation, disabled individuals also face resistance from the attitudes of employers and others who feel that an infirmity rules a person out of employment or other opportunities for which he or she may be well qualified. Since coming to Congress, it has been my opportunity to cosponsor legislation dealing with this psychological barrier standing in the way of the disabled.

Legislation cosponsored by me would prohibit discrimination against the handicapped in their participation in any Federal program. In addition, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 had my strong support, and it was a great pleasure to assist in its drafting as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. I

wanted the bill, which was vetoed by the President, to become law, yet the measure which was finally enacted extended basic Federal programs for the handicapped and authorized the funding of research in this area, as well as expanded training programs for those assisting the handicapped.

I strongly support the efforts of the advocacy council in making people more aware of the barriers impeding the progress of the handicapped and the elderly. Awareness Day and activities like it will lead to a greater understanding of the fact that people in wheelchairs are not different, they are just in wheelchairs. This admirable event has my heartiest endorsement.

WINS RADIO SUPPORTS MINISH-WILLIAMS TRANSIT BILL

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, last month WINS Radio ran an excellent editorial that effectively presents the urgent need for the Minish-Williams transit aid bill. On March 6, the Rules Committee refused to give this bill a rule because the House Public Works Committee pledged to report out its comprehensive transportation package in 6 weeks. The 6 weeks have passed, but no bill has come forward.

The New York City metropolitan area, like other metropolitan areas in our country, is in desperate need of transit operating aid. The Minish-Williams bill would provide this emergency aid. The Public Works Committee bill has many facets affecting both the highway and mass transit programs; one cannot realistically expect enactment of this bill for several more months.

May I urge this House to approve the Minish-Williams bill, an emergency short term measure, now so that immediate aid can be sent to our beleaguered transit systems while the House and Senate Public Works Committees undertake their consideration of the administration's urban transportation program proposal.

Since the March 6 session of the Rules Committee, Chairman MADDEN has indicated that he would give the Public Works Committee 8 weeks from that date to submit its bill. Eight weeks will be up next Wednesday, May 1. If the Public Works Committee bill has not been reported out by then, I hope that the Rules Committee will move expeditiously to submit the Minish-Williams bill to the floor for a vote.

The WINS editorial follows:

NEEDED NOW—THE MINISH-WILLIAMS MASS TRANSIT BILL

(By Robert W. Dickey)

It's unfortunate that the Minish-Williams emergency urban mass transit aid bill now stalled in the House Rules Committee has been pictured primarily as an effort to save the New York City subway fare.

This certainly would be one very desirable accomplishment of the bill, but it also offers aid in many other areas where it is urgently needed.

For example, this bill also would provide the state of New Jersey with 35 million dollars to revitalize its ailing railroad and bus lines. In addition, it would help the buses and commuter lines in Connecticut, Long Island, Westchester, and in other major metropolitan areas around the country.

We think that to dismiss this as a "big city bill" as the Nixon administration and some rural Congressmen have done, completely misses the point of the Minish-Williams bill.

The simple fact is that this legislation is an emergency measure designed to provide immediate help to heavily populated metropolitan areas which already rely heavily on mass transit. These facilities are hardpressed financially at a time when they are in urgent need of improvement to meet the demands of the current fuel shortage.

The Nixon bill, which is being offered as an alternative, is long-range legislation that does not put enough Federal help where it is needed right now.

We think that the Nixon bill might have viability as part of a continuing public transportation improvement program, but Congress should approve, and the President should sign, the Minish-Williams emergency bill without further delay.

END THE SEATBELT IGNITION INTERLOCK NOW

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, for months now I have had a bill pending before the House Commerce Committee to rescind once and for all the impertinent, unreasonable, bureaucratic, and outrageous Department of Transportation regulation requiring all new cars to have front seatbelts and harnesses tied into their automotive ignition systems. This demonstrably dangerous and patently inconvenient nuisance represents big-brotherism at its worst and should be rescinded by this Congress without delay.

Many colleagues are cosponsors of my bill, H.R. 10277, and we are all, collectively growing impatient with the stalling tactics of the subcommittee sitting on this measure. So is the general public as appears from an interesting letter to the editor of the Washington Post printed in today's edition:

BUCHWALD AND SAFETY BELTS

GALES FERRY, CONN.

Art Buchwald's recent column "Fasten Your Belt" addressed the dilemma of the 1974 automobile safety belts. In his own inimitable style, Mr. Buchwald has expressed the frustration which many of us feel whenever we slip behind the wheel of our new cars.

Instead of a reasonably simple and pleasant driving experience, we must strap ourselves and our passengers to some arbitrary position which will allow the engine to be started. Any deviation (or equipment malfunction) produces a wailing tone which can be alleviated only by walking or taking the bus. Thus absurdity is yet one more example of misguided bureaucrats robbing us of our individual liberties.

Certainly life is such a precious commodity that we must continually strive to protect ourselves from needless suffering and death. And certainly automobile safety harnesses reduce collision injuries to car occupants. Yet we must reconcile legitimate concern for automobile safety with the right of each American to choose his own destiny.

Obviously automobile safety equipment should be available to everyone who desires such. My 1970 model car included seat belts as mandatory factory installed equipment, and this seemed to be a satisfactory compromise. There were no ignition interlocks and I was able to choose whether or not I felt it necessary or desirable to fasten my seat belts.

Present automobiles safety devices are not only ludicrous, but potentially dangerous in themselves. The contortions—and I do not exaggerate—which are necessary to properly fasten the safety harness in order to start the engine can very conceivably cause panic and disaster in an emergency situation, such as delivering a pregnant mother to the hospital or removing a car from a burning garage.

I am not sure whether our elected representatives had the opportunity to debate and vote on this particular regulation. Let it be known, however, that there is a growing army of citizens who are fed up with bureaucratic, ill-advised, and personally-restrictive regulations out of the Washington complex.

Let's return some measure of sanity to automobile safety regulations by immediate legislative repeal of safety harness requirements.

EDWIN R. LINZ.

NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, since this week is National Secretaries Week, I think it is appropriate to take time to acknowledge the contributions that our secretaries make to the smooth operation of the Congress.

The theme of National Secretaries Week this year is "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business." I think that is probably demonstrated here in the House as well as anywhere in the country. Speaking for myself, I know that my office would probably grind to a halt in short order—strangled by paper—if it were not for an efficient clerical staff. With the volume of correspondence, records, hearings, files, and other accumulations of paper that are at once the bane and lifeblood of a Congressman's job, it is a shortsighted person indeed who will refer to a member of his or any other staff as "only a secretary." The tremendous administrative burdens generated in any modern, efficient office fall largely on its secretaries, and I want to be sure that they know that their efforts are appreciated. I was reminded of this important event as follows:

RLI;

Remindre—

This is National al secretaries Week. Tomorrow is Thursday. You have 1 xx more day in which too show your appreciation to your dedicated, loyle, accurate, punctual, selfless, and attractive staff.

vary cinserellilly!

OWEN R. CHAFFEE,
Administrative Assistant.

POLICY FOR U.S. NAVY NUCLEAR WARSHIPS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Representative CHARLES BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida, and I have today introduced significant legislation to set policy for the U.S. Navy's nuclear-powered warships.

There is no question that nuclear power for ships has come of age. Our dependence on fossil fuels for fighting ships is threatened by shortages and blockades, and the economy of nuclear propulsion is improving as oil prices continue to rise.

The Bennett-Wilson bill will establish beyond doubt that our Navy is embarking on a program to make its capital ships the most efficient and dependable ships afloat.

I include in my remarks a copy of this Bennett-Wilson bill and a thoughtful article on the need for a nuclear-powered Navy, by the distinguished military writer for Copley News Service, L. Edgar Prina:

H.R. 14364

A bill to establish the policy of the United States of America to modernize the strike forces of the U.S. Navy by requiring nuclear propulsion in new major combatant vessels to take advantage of improved military characteristics accruing from the essentially unlimited high speed endurance provided by nuclear propulsion

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled that:

It is the policy of the United States of America to modernize the strike forces of the United States Navy by the construction of nuclear powered major combatant vessels and to provide for an adequate industrial base for the research, development, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of such vessels. New construction major combatant vessels for the strike forces of the United States Navy authorized subsequent to the date this Act becomes law shall be nuclear powered, except as provided hereafter.

Sec. 2. Definition: For the purposes of this Act, the following definition shall apply:

"Major combatant vessel(s) for the strike forces of the United States Navy" shall mean:

(a) Combatant submarines for strategic and/or tactical missions;

(b) Combatant vessels intended to operate in combat in aircraft carrier task groups (i.e., aircraft carriers and the combatants which accompany them);

(c) Those combatant vessels designed for independent combat missions where essentially unlimited high speed endurance will be of significant military value;

Sec. 3. The Department of Defense shall include in its annual Naval shipbuilding request the following minimum number of nuclear powered major combatant vessels, until such time as Congress determines that an adequate force level exists in any specific category:

(a) Tactical combatant submarines, 5 per year;

(b) Strategic combatant submarines, 2 per year;

(c) Aircraft carriers, 1 per 3 years; and

(d) Major combatants to accompany aircraft carriers, 2 per year;

Sec. 4. The Secretary of Defense shall sub-

mit to Congress each calendar year, at the same time the President submits the budget to Congress under Section 11 of Title 31 United States Code, a written report regarding the application of nuclear propulsion to major combatant vessels for the strike forces of the United States Navy as defined in Section 2 of this Act. The report shall identify contract placement dates for their construction. Further, the report shall identify the Department of Defense plans for construction of nuclear powered major combatant vessels for the succeeding five years and certify whether such plans are adequate to provide a modern striking force for the United States Navy and to maintain the necessary industrial base for design and construction of such vessels.

Sec. 5. Neither the Department of Defense nor the Office of Management and Budget, nor any other executive department or agency, nor any employee thereof shall make any request for authorization or appropriation from Congress, either formally or informally, for construction of any non-nuclear powered major combatant vessels for the strike forces of the United States Navy unless and until:

(a) The President of the United States has fully advised the Congress that construction of nuclear powered vessels for such purpose is not in the national interest;

(b) The Congress, through (i) concurrent resolution or joint resolution, or (ii) by concurrent action of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, has concurred with the President's determination.

Such report of the President to the Congress shall include for consideration by Congress an alternate program of nuclear powered ships with appropriate design, cost and schedule information.

[From the Copley News Service, Apr. 21, 1974]

NAVY WAITS FOR NUCLEAR POWER TO SURFACE

(By L. Edgar Prina)

Nuclear propulsion for U.S. Navy surface warships may be an idea whose time has come.

While the submarine Nautilus first proved ships could steam on the atom 'way back in 1955, there are only five nuclear-powered surface ships in the fleet today. Only one of them has been commissioned since 1967—the frigate California last February.

Now, three recent developments could accelerate the adoption of a long-range program for the construction of nuclear surface combatants. Involving money and personalities, they are:

The skyrocketing prices for petroleum products. Navy distillate fuel costs have almost tripled in the last nine months. A barrel could be purchased for \$5.54 last July; the price April 1 was \$15.50.

Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger's recently declared determination to look at lifetime system costs rather than at procurement costs alone when making major weapons program decisions.

The promotion of Adm. James L. Holloway, III, to be the new Chief of Naval Operations as of June 29. Regarded as a "true believer" in nuclear propulsion, he will be the first CNO to have commanded a nuclear-powered ship, the aircraft carrier Enterprise, and the first officer to have commanded a nuclear ship in combat (against the North Vietnamese, 1965-67).

Although Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, the Navy's renowned nuclear propulsion expert, insists that one "misses the point" if he concentrates on cost rather than effectiveness comparisons, there is little doubt that the higher initial price tag for nuclear surface ships has been the principal factor in the slow pace of their construction.

Today, higher operation and maintenance costs for oil-fired ships, figured over their 30-

year life span, seem to be near the point they would cancel out their lower construction cost.

Asked by a House Armed Services subcommittee last year to give a comparison of the annual cost of fuel between a nuclear and conventional carrier, the Navy reply showed the latter was considerably more expensive.

Accordingly to the Navy, the estimated price for the nuclear fuel which would be initially installed in the attack carrier Carl Vinson (CVN-70) is about \$90 million. The fuel would last for "at least" 13 years of normal operation of the ship.

On the other hand, the Navy said that to carry out the same missions, an oil-fired carrier would consume about 11 million barrels of fuel oil. Figuring a cost of \$5.54 a barrel (as of last July) for distillate fuel oil, \$.25 per barrel storage costs and \$.73 per barrel for the average peacetime costs for delivering oil to ships operating on the high seas, the total tab would be \$13.32 per barrel.

Thus, for the 13 years operation, fuel would cost \$11 million annually for an oil-fired carrier and \$7 million for the nuclear one.

The Navy went on to estimate that if the price of distillate oil climbed to \$10 a barrel, the comparative annual costs would be: oil-fired carrier, \$15 million; nuclear carrier, \$7 million.

But, of course, the Navy, as of April 1, was paying \$15.50 a barrel. If the cost remains at this level—and few are predicting any lowering of prices—the comparative figures would be \$20 million as against \$7 million.

On a 30-year basis, it would cost \$600 million for the purchase, storing and delivery of oil to a single carrier. The cost of the nuclear fuel, based on a price of \$7 million a year, would be \$210 million or \$390 million less than for the oil-fired ship.

Neither Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., Chief of Naval operations, who is pushing for larger numbers of less costly warships, nor Rickover will say it is now less expensive to build and operate a nuclear carrier for 30 years than to build and operate an oil-fired one for the same period.

In fact, Rickover sticks with his statement of March 8 (written in February) when he discussed the lifetime comparative costs of nuclear and conventional ships at the San Diego Press Club.

"The nuclear carrier increases the task group cost about 2 per cent," he said. "Each nuclear escort increases the overall task group cost 1 per cent, so that four nuclear escorts increase the task group cost 4 per cent."

"Therefore, the lifetime cost for a complete nuclear task group consisting of a nuclear carrier and its four nuclear escorts is 6 percent greater than that of a conventional carrier accompanied by four conventional escorts."

As noted above, Rickover believes too much emphasis is placed on cost, particularly when the differential is so small over the lifespan of the ships, and not enough on effectiveness.

"We design our nuclear carriers with the capacity for almost twice as much aircraft fuel and 50 per cent more aircraft ammunition than the latest conventional carrier," he said.

"A nuclear task force is at least 50 per cent more effective than a conventional task force."

Schlesinger, who agrees that the lifetime cost approach is the one to take, conceded that acquisition costs of nuclear ships were far higher than for conventionally powered ones.

"But the operation and maintenance costs, and particularly the (nuclear) fuel costs, are now quite low," he said. "With the increase in the price of fuel (oil), I suspect the cost of operating a nuclear carrier over an extended period of time, over its lifetime, will

be lower than would be the costs of operating a nuclear conventional carrier."

Pentagon aides, who said the secretary believed the savings on fuel would cancel out the higher construction cost of a nuclear carrier, admitted that the Office of Systems Analysis had no study to back him up.

Despite its obvious military advantages, most Navy and defense officials restrain their enthusiasm for nuclear propulsion because of its higher initial costs.

DALEY EXERCISES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a Republican Congressman representing a district in Cook County, Ill., I have my work cut out every year doing battle not only with forces of the AFL-CIO but also the so-called Daley machine. Having never had Mayor Richard J. Daley's support or endorsement, I can attest to the strength of the Cook County Democratic organization.

However, I have been intrigued as have many people across the country by the strength of the mayor within the Democratic Party especially as we look back at the 1972 Democratic National Convention when he was subject to verbal abuse from the far-left elements of his party.

Therefore, I was impressed by the editorial by WBBM Radio 78 in Chicago, on April 8, which I believe to be a very proper complimentary commentary:

RADIO EDITORIAL—DALEY EXERCISES

There was the chairman of the Democratic Party—Bob Strauss. Then there were those three esteemed men from the Senate—Scoop Jackson, Ted Kennedy and George McGovern. Even House Majority Leader Tip O'Neill got in the act. You see, they were all participating in last Thursday night's NBC special on the future of the Democratic Party. But the most interesting man to take part in the discussion was an elected official—not a member of Congress. Nor, for that matter, was he even a big-time governor. He was just our own Mayor—Richard J. Daley.

There he was—the man kicked out of the 1972 Democratic Convention—telling it like it was, is, and will be. When asked, for instance, what would be the key issues in the coming campaigns, he spoke not of Watergate but of the cost of living, inflation, unemployment and health. And when a film clip showed him greeting Nixon on his recent visit to Chicago, the Mayor said he represented all the people in the city—Democratic and Republican—and it was his duty to welcome this President—any President—to Chicago. What's more, he said he respected the office of the Presidency.

All of which explains—maybe—why Daley has survived every political punch and remains today a leader of the Democratic Party and co-author of its future. While we certainly don't agree with everything he does—we do think the Mayor is believable. He says people are worried about high prices and you think he probably is too. He admits he's in awe of the Presidency—and you know you are. He even talks like and lives like the fellow next door. In other words, he's one of the people.

No wonder he's represented them so long and so well.

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE SUEZ CANAL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are asking why the United States is involved in helping to reopen the Suez Canal. While the benefits to the United States from such a reopening are questionable, the gains for the Soviets are quite definite. The Soviets will be able to use the Suez to make their naval presence more felt in the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean.

An editorial in the Mount Vernon, Ohio News, suggests using our mine removal technology as a lever to insure demilitarization of the canal. I believe this idea deserves the attention of the administration.

At this point, I include in the RECORD the editorial "Naval Ban Needed When Suez Reopens" from the Mount Vernon, Ohio News of Wednesday, April 24, 1974. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NAVAL BAN NEEDED WHEN SUEZ REOPENS

The enthusiasm with which the non-Communist world is approaching the task of reopening the Suez Canal turns the clock back more than a century—to 1869 when the newly opened waterway was being universally hailed as "an idea whose time has come." Paralleling camel caravan routes, the canal cut some 4,000 miles from East-West voyages and brought new economic life to each hemisphere.

Fade and dissolve. It now is April 24, 1974. Warring Egyptian and Israeli forces have been separated and work to reopen the canal can begin. A team of U.S. Navy demolition experts has surveyed how best to remove mines from the Suez and explosives from its banks. The United States has pledged \$10 million to finance the task, and U.S. warships are standing by to begin.

And that is only part of the picture. Some 20 nations including Japan, the European nations and the Soviet Union are eagerly offering money and services to President Sadat of Egypt. Industrialists and bankers from throughout the world are surveying the shores of the Suez to plan businesses, industries and recreation areas on a scale that can be considered ambitious, even by the standards of a 20th Century pharaoh. Even Israel is enthusiastic about the prospect of an open Suez Canal with major cities and developments on its banks.

The West believes that Sadat is tilting toward it, away from the Soviet Union. It sees economic benefits from shorter sea lanes and it believes that a heavy Egyptian investment in the Suez region will lessen Sadat's appetite for a war that could destroy it.

There is, however, another side to the coin. It is a fact that the Suez no longer is competing against camel caravans. Apart from some economic advantages to Mediterranean and Indian Ocean ports, a Suez Canal capable of handling 60,000-ton ships is, by and large, insignificant to world commerce. Ambitious plans for a \$7 billion dredging program to permit the Suez to handle 250,000-ton ships are just that and no more.

Politically there are danger signals in presenting Sadat the Suez on a dollar platter. He has given no assurances that the waterway will be internationalized. Indeed, he has already said that Israeli flag ships could not use it, and he gives every indication that

he would use the canal as a trump card to gain further concessions from Israel.

The truth of the matter is that reopening of the Suez would benefit only one major nation—the Soviet Union which would receive the precious gift of an ocean artery from its ports in the Black Sea to the Indian Ocean where it is seeking to dominate the riches of the East.

The least the United States should insist upon, we believe, is that when the Suez is opened all warships should be prohibited from using it. While this would not assure that the Suez will be an instrument of peace, and not imperialism, it would put a modest brake on Soviet aspirations.

Technologically the United States has a major key to the lock on the Suez through its mine-removal knowhow. We should use this as a lever to ensure demilitarization of the waterway.

CENTENNIAL OF UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO

HON. DAVID TOWELL

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, observances are now being planned for the forthcoming centennial of the University of Nevada, Reno, and I would like to take this opportunity to recall some of the more significant steps in the history of this great institution. I highly commend the following to the attention of my colleagues:

The University of Nevada officially opened its doors as a preparatory school in Elko on October 12, 1874. With this kind of beginning the University of Nevada was typical of many small colleges that undertook the challenging tasks of higher education under adverse conditions. The earliest university efforts in Nevada were the products of a long European tradition of university work, an American collegiate tradition, and the Morrill Land Grant Act passed by the Congress in 1862.

In the century since 1874 the University of Nevada has evolved from a one-teacher, seven-student institution meeting in a small brick building into a modern "multiversity," serving more than 20,000 students. The university operations on the Reno campus date from 1886. The College of Agriculture, the College of Engineering, and the Mackay School of Mines are direct descendants of the congressional efforts of the 1860's to stimulate training in agriculture and the mechanic arts. The Colleges of Home Economics, Nursing, and Health Sciences are likewise products—among other things—of Federal Government programs to expand professional education. The College of Arts and Science, Business Administration, and Education have all, from time to time, responded to challenges from the Federal level to enrich the educational offerings available to young people. One of the two main campuses is located in Reno and has been an example of how Federal legislation, State funding, and public support may be com-

bined to provide excellent education for all the people of the State.

The main activities to commemorate the 100th anniversary of founding of the University of Nevada will be held on the Reno campus in the months ahead. A number of events are planned for the late summer and for the academic year 1974-75.

I view the centennial celebration as a kick off of a great second hundred years.

INCOME FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1973

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in line with procedure which I have followed in disclosing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the amounts and sources of all income received by my wife and me over and above my salary as a Member of Congress for each year I have been in Congress up to and including the calendar year 1972, I am hereby making public such information for the calendar year 1973.

The following is an itemized report of such income for 1973:

From a family-owned dairy farm in Leicester Township of Buncombe County, N.C.	\$389.45
From dividends from a variety of stock and bonds (most belong to me; some are owned by my wife)	3,994.40
From interest on purchase money real estate notes; savings deposits; Swannanoa, N.C. Baptist Church bonds; etc.	599.76
From North Carolina Employees' Retirement Fund (based on service as Buncombe County attorney before coming to Congress)	1,251.06
	6,234.67

The stocks and bonds were purchased in western North Carolina at market value and most of them represent investments in North Carolina companies. All of the income mentioned above comes from property investments, and not from the use of my time, all of which is devoted to congressional responsibilities. I am a lawyer by profession but have not engaged in any practice since coming to Congress in 1960.

In addition to the foregoing information, I desire to divulge the amount of Federal and North Carolina State income taxes paid by Mrs. Taylor and me during each of the last 5 years as follows:

	Federal	North Carolina State
1973	\$8,823.22	\$1,928.80
1972	7,388.92	1,864.24
1971	7,789.28	1,907.34
1970	9,694.67	2,021.64
1969	10,641.57	2,012.27

The decreased amount of taxes owed for 1971, 1972, and 1973 resulted mainly from an increase in charitable contributions to colleges, churches, and so forth, which for these 3 years totaled \$16,253.04.

THE PROBLEM WITH LEGAL SERVICES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the name of legal services for the poor, the Office of Economic Opportunity has embarked upon a program of subsidized political agitation.

This point is made by one who has directed the program, Howard Phillips, former Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Phillips notes that—

The present legal services activities . . . are used to finance a nationwide network of nearly 3,000 legal services attorneys, hundreds of organizations, and additional thousands of support personnel who are almost totally free to establish their own priorities for issues to receive attention and access to legal services resources. With nearly \$80 million in support annually from O.E.O. alone, they work full-time, using the judicial system to change public policy.

Recent or pending cases, for example, include a Washington State suit in which attorneys of the Prison Legal Services project argued that their client, imprisoned on a marijuana charge, had been subjected to cruel and unusual punishment and a Pennsylvania suit challenging the detention of a convicted felon accused of committing an additional crime while free on bail. There have, in addition, been suits in New York and Hawaii knocking down the requirement that government employees be citizens of the United States and a class action demanding that an Iowa statute prohibiting the civil service employment of convicted felons be set aside.

The legal services program, as it has been conducted, has served not to meet the legitimate legal needs of poor people but, instead, to stir up litigation for political purposes.

Discussing the legal services bill currently being debated in the Senate, Columnist James J. Kilpatrick notes that—

The bill is an abomination. It is a perversion of the whole concept of giving the poor person a chance at equal justice under the law . . . The Senate bill erects no more than paper barricades against the activism of super-legal eagles who would be free to pursue social reform behind a camouflage of aid to the poor.

I wish to share with my colleagues the analysis by James J. Kilpatrick of the current legal services legislation. It is my view that the entire question of a legal services corporation itself should be carefully examined, for if individuals are being tried in State courts for offenses against State laws, the Federal interest in the entire proceeding remains questionable. Despite any differences I may have with Mr. Kilpatrick on this aspect of the question, I share his views concerning the problems with the current legislation. Following is his column as it appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of March 25, 1974:

LEGAL SERVICES FOR POOR VALID, BUT NOT THIS WAY

WASHINGTON.—It is a familiar rule of parliamentary procedure that a motion to reconsider can be made only by a member of the prevailing faction. Because I have long supported the concept of legal services for the poor, perhaps I am qualified to turn against the bill soon to be reported from a conference committee.

By every indication, the compromise legal services bill will be fairly close to the Nelson-Javits bill approved by the Senate in December. The bill is an abomination. It is a perversion of the whole concept of giving the poor person a chance at equal justice under the law. If the Senate and House should agree to this devious proposition, the President will have to be asked to use his veto power.

In supporting a legal services act, I have been guided by certain principles and observations that seem to me almost beyond dispute. The first is that the concept of equal justice under law is among the greatest ideals of our political system. The second is that our nation has served that concept poorly. Despite impressive improvements in recent years, we still have two systems of law—one for the rich, another for the poor.

A system of federally subsidized legal aid should have but one purpose, and that is to redress the imbalance. The poor family that has been bled into a usurious installment contract should not be helpless at the hands of a well-heeled merchant. The poor person wrongly evicted from his home should have some aid in standing up to the slumlord. The ignorant or illiterate citizen, struggling with the complexities of a highly regulated society, often needs legal advice that he cannot afford.

A revitalized program of federal legal aid ought to have these aims in mind, and these aims only. Because the possibilities for abuse are quite real, a new Legal Services Corporation should be bound down by chains of law. At the very minimum, the corporation should be federally chartered for a limited term of no more than five years, at which time Congress could review the entire operation.

The Senate bill that now prevails is a far cry from the administration's recommendation. It bears no resemblance to a House-approved version that has some faults, but has many virtues also. The Senate bill erects no more than paper barricades against the activism of super-liberal legal eagles who would be free to pursue social reform behind a camouflage of aid to the poor.

These mischievous provisions are not immediately apparent. On the surface, the Senate version seems unalarming. It is only when the bill is examined line by line, as Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina has examined it, that the shortcomings emerge.

Two examples may suffice to indicate the slippery business here afoot. The Senate bill contains a provision that could make available to legal aid attorneys "particular support functions of the federal government, such as the General Services Administration, the federal telecommunications system and other facilities." Helms calls this a "mind-boggling blank check," and it is. This loosely drawn authorization could equip the activist attorneys with everything from office supplies to free long distance telephone service, all at the taxpayers' expense.

For a second example: The House version wisely prohibits the proposed Legal Services Corporation from using private funds for purposes for which public funds could not be spent. The Senate version ominously omits this safeguard.

The concept of equal justice remains valid. But the disappointing and deceptive bill that now heads back toward the Senate floor,

while it doubtless would accomplish many good things, would constitute an invitation to legal activists to come have a ball. This is not the idea. It is not the idea at all.

SPECIAL REPORT ON IMPEACHMENT FROM CONGRESSMAN DANIELSON

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON) and I can certify that his contributions to the work of that committee are important and highly respected by the other 37 members.

Congressman DANIELSON has recently published a "Special Report on Impeachment" for the benefit of his constituents. This remarkable document, Mr. Speaker, is so well prepared and so properly describes the historic work being done by the Judiciary Committee that I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point so that all of the Members can have the benefit of this valuable report:

SPECIAL REPORT ON IMPEACHMENT FROM CONGRESSMAN DANIELSON

CALIFORNIANS ON THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

On the 38-member House Judiciary Committee, which is conducting the impeachment inquiry, there are 21 Democrats and 17 Republicans. Only 21 of the 50 States have Representatives on that Committee. Most of the 21 States have only one Representative on the Committee, but New Jersey has 3, New York has 4 and California has the largest representation with 5. Of the five, two are from Northern California, Democrats Jerome Waldie and Don Edwards. The other three are from our immediate area, Republicans Carols Moorhead of Glendale, and Charles Wiggins of Orange County; and I, your Congressman, am the only Southern California Democrat serving on the Judiciary Committee.

As a Member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have received thousands of communications from constituents, and from other people throughout our Nation, giving me their opinions and asking questions concerning the inquiry which the Judiciary Committee is now conducting as to whether or not President Nixon should be impeached. Many have asked questions as to how the impeachment procedure works, and it is apparent from the majority of the letters that the subject of impeachment is not well understood.

I hope you will find this Special Report on Impeachment both informative and interesting, and that it will answer any questions which you may have on the subject.

IMPEACHMENT—ITS HISTORY, ITS PURPOSE

Impeachment is a very important but seldom-used Constitutional proceeding. It was placed in the United States Constitution by the Founding Fathers, who adopted it from the English law and constitution, where it had been in use for more than 400 years, since the year 1376. The purpose of the impeachment process is to provide a procedure by which a public official can be removed from office when he violates his oath of office, abuses the powers of his office, under-

mines the integrity of his office or of the Constitution, or conducts himself in a manner which makes it grossly unacceptable and grossly incompatible for him to remain in office.

Impeachable conduct may be, but need not be, criminal conduct. The Constitution provides that, in addition to being impeached and removed from office, the person who is impeached may also be tried, convicted and punished if his offense is a violation of the criminal law. Of the 13 impeachments voted by the House since 1789, at least 10 included one or more allegations that did not charge a violation of criminal law.

The fundamental nature of impeachment is different from that of criminal law. The nature and purpose of impeachment is remedial—that is, it is to remove from office a person whose conduct is such that it undermines the integrity of that office or of the Constitution. The nature and purpose of criminal law is to punish a wrongdoer who violates a specific law.

HAVE ANY FEDERAL OFFICIALS EVER BEEN IMPEACHED?

So far as I have been able to ascertain, in the nearly 200 years of our existence as a Nation, the House of Representatives has conducted impeachment inquiries in sixty-nine (69) cases, before the present one. Out of that number of inquiries only thirteen (13) impeachments have been voted by the House, including the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson in 1868. In two instances, the impeached officer resigned prior to trial and the matter was not pursued further. Of the eleven impeachments which were tried in the Senate, four resulted in convictions. All four of these convictions were of Federal judges.

The 13 officials impeached were made up of the following:

One President—Andrew Johnson (1868)—Acquitted;

One United States Senator—Blount (1797)—Expelled from Senate before trial; One Cabinet Officer—Secretary of War Belknap (1876)—Acquitted;

Ten Federal Judges (1803 to 1936)—2 resigned before trial, 4 convicted, and 4 acquitted.

WHAT DOES THE CONSTITUTION SAY ABOUT IMPEACHMENT?

Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution provides that, "The President, Vice President, and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors."

Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution states that, "The House of Representatives . . . shall have the sole Power of Impeachment."

And, Article I, Section 3 of the Constitution describes the Senate's role:

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of Honor, Trust or Profit under the United States; but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Other provisions of the Constitution deny the President the power to grant reprieves and pardons in cases of impeachment (Article II, Section 2), and deny the right to trial by jury in cases of impeachment (Article III, Section 2).

WHAT DOES THE CONSTITUTION MEAN BY IMPEACHMENT?

Impeachment does not automatically remove an official from office. Impeachment is only an accusation. It is a process by which the House of Representatives charges the President, Vice President, or civil officers of the United States with misconduct. The charge of misconduct is made by a majority vote of the House. If the House does not think that grounds for impeachment exist, it will not vote to impeach. If, however, a majority of the House believes that there are such grounds, it will vote for impeachment. A vote to impeach is followed by a trial in the Senate.

After the trial, if two-thirds of the Members present in the Senate vote to convict, the officer is removed from office and may be disqualified from holding any other office in the Government. Conviction by the Senate, however, does not bar subsequent indictment, trial, or judgment of the convicted officer in a court of law.

WHAT IF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE DOES NOT RECOMMEND THAT THE PRESIDENT BE IMPEACHED?

At the conclusion of its inquiry, the Committee on the Judiciary will report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations as it deems proper. It is the prerogative of the House to accept or reject any recommendation made to it by one of its committees. If the committee does not recommend impeachment, the House still can impeach by majority vote.

WHAT HAPPENS IF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE PRESIDENT BE IMPEACHED?

If the Judiciary Committee submits articles of impeachment against the President, the House of Representatives will debate the question on the floor of the House. Under the rules governing the order of business in the House, a direct proposition to impeach is a matter of high privilege and supersedes other business. At the end of the debate, each Member of the House will have the opportunity to vote either for or against impeachment.

IF THE HOUSE VOTES FOR IMPEACHMENT, WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

If a majority of the Members voting favor impeachment of the President, a committee of Members is selected by the Speaker of the House to inform the Senate of the House's vote. A delegation of Representatives from the House, known as "Managers", prosecutes the case before the Senate. The Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court presides over the trial. The actual conduct of the trial is governed by the Senate's rules of procedures for impeachment trials.

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE PRESIDENT IF THE HOUSE IMPEACHES HIM?

Impeachment is only a charge of misconduct. Only if the President were convicted of the charges by the Senate, would he be removed from office. But up until the time he is actually convicted by the Senate, he remains the Chief Executive of our Government, charged with seeing to it that the laws are faithfully executed. If convicted, the President would immediately be removed from office and the Vice President would take his place. There is no appeal. If he is not convicted, by a two-thirds vote, the President would be acquitted, and would remain in office.

WHAT HAPPENS IF THE PRESIDENT RESIGNS?

Many people have called for the President's resignation. Since last October I have predicted that the President may very likely resign. Would there be impeachment after he resigned? Probably not.

In our history, whenever a person subject

to impeachment has resigned, the proceedings have been ended. If the President should resign, it would still be constitutionally possible to impeach and try him, but it is unlikely that this would be done since the main purpose of impeachment, removal from office, would have already been accomplished.

WHAT KIND OF INVESTIGATION IS THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE CONDUCTING?

Numerous and serious allegations have been made against President Nixon and have impaired his capacity to lead the nation and to conduct the important functions of the Executive branch of the Federal government. It is the duty of the Judiciary Committee to examine each and every one of those allegations and to determine whether they should be dropped or pursued further. Only in this way can doubts be resolved and the air of suspicion cleared. Only in this way can the American people be fully informed as to the truth, and only in this way can confidence be restored in the office of the Presidency and the soundness of the American system of government.

In the course of its inquiry, the Judiciary Committee has been investigating the following charges, among others:

- Violation of individual rights by illegal wiretaps, breaking and entering, and Internal Revenue Service harassment;
- Burglary;
- Conspiracy to obstruct justice;
- Obstruction of justice;
- Destruction of evidence;
- Perjury;
- Subornation (procuring to perjury);
- Illegal campaign sabotage;
- Possible bribery in cases where campaign contributions may be linked to favorable government decisions;
- The President's personal finances and income tax returns.

During the process of gathering evidence, the Judiciary Committee has been delayed in its work by the unwillingness of the White House to supply certain evidence. Nevertheless, despite those time-consuming delays, the inquiry has continued and it is expected that the formal presentation of evidence will commence during the first week in May.

In the final analysis, the current impeachment inquiry is a demonstration to the world of the strength of our Constitutional system of self-government. Our nation is testing itself in an inquiry by one co-equal branch of government into serious charges against another branch, as is provided for in our Constitution. Our great nation with its precious freedoms will be stronger, not weaker, as a result of the impeachment proceedings currently being conducted in Congress.

WHAT IS THE ATTITUDE OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TOWARDS THE IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY?

Many Americans believe that the House of Representatives should dispense with any further inquiry, and impeach the President immediately. Others believe that the inquiry should be dropped entirely, no matter what the evidence may eventually show. The duty imposed upon the House of Representatives by the Constitution will not permit either of those options. It is the clear constitutional duty of the House of Representatives to inquire fully, and thoroughly, and fairly into all allegations of misconduct which have been lodged against President Nixon.

The ultimate vote for or against impeachment will probably be the most awesome responsibility that any Member of Congress will ever be called upon to meet. In discharging that constitutional responsibility each Member of Congress must be guided by the evidence, the Constitution, and his own conscience. You have my assurance that this is precisely how I will reach my own

decision. No one can do more, and no one has a right to do less. The American people are entitled to ask that much, and the American people should not accept less.

UNICEF TO AID VIETNAM REDS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the October 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—33097—I warned that UNICEF, a United Nations agency heavily dependent on American financial contributions, was considering giving aid to both North Vietnam and Communist-controlled areas in South Vietnam. Unfortunately this has now come to pass.

According to the New York Times, on April 16 UNICEF announced plans to aid North Vietnam and areas held by the Vietcong in South Vietnam. The 3-year program calls for \$18 million to be spent in the north and \$4.5 million in the south.

Here we have the Vietcong about to receive \$4.5 million, the same Vietcong who are bombing, shelling, and terrorizing innocent civilians in South Vietnam. I find it odd that UNICEF has decided to reward the Communists in Vietnam for starting a war that is still going on.

Since well over one-third of the total revenue received by UNICEF comes from the United States, I am unalterably opposed to UNICEF's proposed contributions. These contributions can only strengthen Hanoi's position in North Vietnam and in the territory it now occupies in South Vietnam. Why should the United States be donating such large sums of money to an organization that is working against our own best interests? Isn't it time that we stopped aiding our enemies?

Following is the text of the New York Times article:

UNICEF PLANS AID TO VIETNAM REDS

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., April 16.—The United Nations Children's Fund announced plans today for aid to North Vietnam and to areas held by the Vietcong in the South.

The 3-year program was described in a report by Henry Labouisse, the fund's director, who called for \$18-million to be spent in the North to help rebuild destroyed schools and \$4.5-million to be spent in the South.

Mr. Labouisse has asked the agency's 30-member board for \$8-million for the program. The balance will come largely from special contributions by governments. More than \$12-million already has been given by European countries, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and Algeria.

Initial approaches to North Vietnam were made through the North Vietnamese Red Cross and were followed by visits by fund representatives to consult members of the Government on working out a program.

The North Vietnamese authorities have agreed to permit more frequent visits by fund representatives and are considering the possibility of a small field-office in Hanoi, Mr. Labouisse reported.

Arrangements for aid to the Vietcong-controlled areas have been moving ahead, but Mr. Labouisse's report suggested that

final plans would have to be worked out between the agency and Vietcong authorities. Vietcong officials were said to be ready to meet with relief officials at Loc Ninh, a city north of Saigon that is a headquarters for the Vietcong government. The Saigon authorities would have to agree to cooperate in permitting staff and supplies to be moved.

THE CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 22

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the United Auto Workers Union has called for the creation of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation as part of a comprehensive energy program for the Nation. Mr. Leonard Woodcock, president of the UAW, in a statement issued on February 15, charged that "the public welfare is being completely ignored" in energy matters and stated that a publicly owned corporation is necessary to break the major oil companies' stranglehold on our Nation's energy resources. The announcement of the UAW's endorsement of the corporation recently appeared in the Washington Star-News and is illustrative of the widespread support for a public oil corporation.

I would like to insert the Star-News article into the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues:

PUBLIC OIL AGENCY PROPOSED BY UAW

The United Auto Workers Union has proposed a comprehensive energy program, even as U.S. automakers were announcing new layoffs affecting nearly 70,000 hourly workers.

The UAW proposal asks formation of an authority that would compete with the large oil companies in exploration and production of oil and a suggestion that oil producing countries buy out the reserves and facilities owned by U.S. oil companies.

UAW President Leonard Woodcock, with more than 100,000 of his UAW members already cut indefinitely from auto payrolls, said yesterday that "the public welfare is being completely ignored."

"Democratic societies cannot tolerate a situation in which a few powerful corporations maintain a stranglehold on the very lifeblood of half the world," he said. "That stranglehold must be broken."

Woodcock said in Detroit that he would actively promote the 37-page report in Washington.

It also calls for nationalization of railroads, limitations on corporation monopolies—including the auto industry—and controls to restrict access to energy reserves by private firms, which develop such reserves for profit.

Ford Motor Co. said yesterday that nearly 16,000 workers face temporary layoffs of one and two weeks and another 1,800 would be idled indefinitely in the next three weeks because of the slump in big car sales.

On Thursday, General Motors announced it was laying off 50,000 workers over the next three weeks, also because big car sales are down. Chrysler Corp. will close a plant next week, idling 4,800 workers.

AFL-CIO President George Meany, meanwhile, said in Miami that the 3.5 percent rise in wholesale prices in January demonstrates "the complete bankruptcy of the administration's so-called price controls program."

"The price tags on food and fuel—basic costs of every American family—are astro-

nomically high and there's no relief in sight," Meany said.

He said that in the last three months, wholesale prices have zoomed at what would be an annual rate of 32.3 percent if they continued on this course.

And the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department, meeting in Miami Beach, yesterday urged Congress to reassert its 1946 goal of achieving "full employment" in the nation, with no more than 2.5 percent of the work force out of work. Last month the jobless rate was 5.2 percent, union officials noted.

THE FLIGHT OF MIGRANT WORKERS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the plight of one of the most vital yet exploited labor forces of our Nation—the migrant worker.

Migrant workers have been relegated to a subservient role, they are victims of every illness of our society—poverty, hunger, disease, prejudice, discrimination, and exploitation, yet Congress and State legislatures throughout our country continue to ignore their vital needs.

Consider for a moment how the energy crisis affects the migrant workers. Entirely dependent upon transportation while following the ripening crops which provide their work, the migrants are doubly burdened by the high fuel costs and fuel shortages. As they travel to secure work, they must pay outrageous fuel prices which cut deeply into their meager wages. Many migrant families, fearing they will be stranded without fuel or money to pay for it, are refusing to leave their homes this spring, as is proven by a U.S. Department of Labor manpower project survey in south Texas which indicates that the fuel shortage may keep 63 percent of the migrant farmworkers from traveling north this season to harvest crops.

Despite the severity of the fuel crisis, this may be the least of their problems. Fuel prices are only the most recent difficulty to be added to the long list of hardships which migrant workers, men, women, and children, chronically endure.

Health conditions continue to be a distressing illustration of the deplorable living conditions migrant workers must face. Flies, pesticides, lack of nourishing food, absence of sanitary facilities, wretched housing, overcrowding, and the forced life style of migration make migrants susceptible to all kinds of physical and emotional afflictions. The mortality rate for instance, from tuberculosis, influenza, pneumonia, and other infectious diseases, is more than twice the national average.

Migrant children, due to the lack of nutritious foods and adequate medical care, often suffer from such poor health during their infant years, that despite subsequent care, the damage is irreversible. Dr. Peter Chase of the University

of Colorado Medical School, treated 300 children under the age of six who live in the migrant flow area between Texas and Colorado. His report included findings that 54 of the children were severely retarded in height, 159 lacked sufficient sight-giving vitamin A, 28 suffered protein malnutrition, 49 had enlarged livers, 29 had eye diseases suggestive of trachoma, and 7 suffered from kwashiorkor—starvation. The parents of these children work from dawn until dusk, yet do not earn enough to provide adequate food and medical care for their families.

Wages received by migrant workers are the lowest of the "working poor"—far less than the minimum wage for industrial workers—and the unpredictability of work due to weather, crop, and soil conditions further cuts into their earning power. In addition, migrant workers are largely excluded from workmen's compensation coverage, thus precluding compensation for an injury or illness received on the job. Considering the increased mechanization of agriculture, increased use of chemical herbicides and pesticides, and the fact that agriculture has become the third most hazardous industry in the United States, with a fatality rate exceeded only by mining and construction work, this in my view, is unconscionable.

The problems of the migrant workers may be overwhelming, but we must not consider them insurmountable. The time has passed for promises, our task is to provide, not later, but now: minimum wage and guidelines for promotion; fringe benefits such as holidays and paid vacations; protections against discrimination in hiring, housing and wages paid; medical, dental, welfare and pension benefits; protection of enforced safety and equipment standards over pesticides used; and service centers established to aid migrant workers with social and legal problems they encounter. To ignore these tasks is to ignore one of the most deplorable situations existing in this country.

COST OF AUTOMOBILE OPERATION

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution requesting the Internal Revenue Service to reevaluate the figure that is presently allowed as a deduction for the business use of an automobile.

Presently, the IRS allows a 12 cents per mile deduction. This figure is based on a 1970 study of the cost of operating an automobile. Since this study, the price of an automobile has increased; the cost of maintenance, accessories, parts, and tires have risen substantially. But more recently we have seen a dramatic rise in the price of gasoline and oil. The 12 cents per mile figure is no longer a realistic measure of the cost of operating an automobile. By using this outdated figure, a taxpayer who makes extensive

use of his automobile for work purposes, will be paying approximately \$100 extra in Federal income taxes.

The resolution I am introducing asks the IRS to use more current cost estimates. The rises in the cost of operating an automobile are seriously affecting the budget of many workers who depend heavily on their car for business purposes. These increased business expenses should be reflected in the individual's income tax return. A more current and realistic figure will more adequately reflect the current costs of operating an automobile.

**SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
JOHN L. McLUCAS ADDRESSES
31ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CON-
FERENCE**

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. Speaker, on April 4, I was privileged to host a Federal procurement and foreign trade conference in my 31st Congressional District to help persons who operate small businesses to obtain contracts from the Federal Government. Dr. John L. McLucas, Secretary of the Air Force, graciously accepted my invitation to address this conference, and his remarks were so topical and instructive that all who attended profited from his observations.

Before becoming Secretary of the Air Force in July of 1973, Dr. McLucas had an outstanding career in both government and business. And, because of his experience as president and founder of a number of businesses, Secretary McLucas is keenly aware of the difficulties confronting small businesses in establishing contracts with the Federal Government.

Sharing with me the opinion that such procurement conferences for the business community are extremely valuable, Secretary McLucas took time from a busy 2-day speaking schedule to address this 31st District conference. And, because his address on this occasion was so relevant to the important economic question of how to increase small businesses' participation in Government contracting, I would like to share his remarks with my colleagues:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY McLUCAS

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am very glad to be here. And I welcome this opportunity to speak to you today. I know that Congressman Wilson, as well as the procurement people from Washington, have gone to a great deal of effort to insure that this meeting is a success.

Another purpose for my being in the Los Angeles area today was to participate in the rollout ceremonies of Northrop's new lightweight fighter prototype—the YF-17. We believe this program will further demonstrate the usefulness of the prototyping concept, and will also allow us to check the possibility of innovative ideas which are too advanced or too unknown to be incorporated

into a priced production program. Finally, it allows the maximum degree of initiative on the part of the contractor. I believe prototyping is important both from the point of view of advancing technology as well as holding down procurement costs. Of course, holding down costs is an objective we all favor, and I can assure you that it is taken very seriously by both DoD and members of Congress.

On Monday and Tuesday I testified before the House Appropriations Committee and this fourth appearance before a Congressional committee completes formal presentation of the Air Force FY 75 budget request. I believe that it and the total DoD budget are prudent and take into consideration the present capability of our adversaries as well as increases in defense research and development, especially in the Soviet Union. It is in this context that we justified further modernization of our Air Force weapons as well as the need to maintain a ready, high quality, all-volunteer force.

I know that many American citizens are concerned about the level of defense spending, but I believe it is necessary to point out that in view of the demands we must meet this is still a cost conscious budget. Although DoD is now requesting \$5.8 billion dollars, in terms of constant dollars this really represents only a halt in the decline of defense funds that has occurred since the peak war year of 1968.

Another way of placing today's defense expenditure in perspective is to use the Gross National Product as a baseline. In 1973, defense spending accounted for 6.0% of the GNP. The 1974 estimate is 5.9%. Ten years ago it was over 8.3%. In World War II it was over 40%. It is certainly true that our GNP has dramatically increased through the years. However, the declining percentage allocated to defense coupled with the erosion from inflation has cut our real defense purchasing power. Defense spending, no matter which yardstick you choose to use, as a percent of federal budget or percent of GNP, is at its lowest point in real buying power since before the Korean conflict.

With the end of our combat involvement in Southeast Asia, we were able to concentrate upon our peacetime goals. But in seeking them we have and must maintain our strength and combat capability. We must also sustain a vigorous R&D program to assure our readiness over the long haul. And this means well trained and highly motivated men and women who are highly professional and who have a real sense of integrity.

A key link between this professional force and the equipment they operate is effective management of the procurement process. And I would emphasize that achieving greater efficiency in procurement is far more critical today as a result of the downward trend in military funding that I have just described. In fact, the only solution within our control is through better management which will allow us to stretch the funds available to us over the number of modern weapons that we can buy without any degradation in necessary quality.

As you are well aware, the procurement process has come under increasing scrutiny from Congress and the public. This concern about how and for what purpose our hardware funds are spent is part of the democratic process and we welcome constructive criticism of this key management function. Purchased goods and services consume a significant portion of defense resources, accounting for 43% of the total Air Force budget in FY 74. However, the amount available for spending on weapons systems has declined substantially in the last six years—from 40% in FY 69 to about 30% in FY 75.

The net effect of this trend on the procurement account is to limit the number of weapon systems and the number of units of

each system that we are able to buy. Budgets may fluctuate slightly, but there has been a downward trend in number of aircraft procured. As an example, our new buy of 110 aircraft in this budget is the lowest since before World War II. However, I might add that we will soon be building the B-1, F-15, and the A-10. Thus, the total aircraft buy is bound to go up somewhat and reverse this trend.

Still the only apparent solution is to find ways of making the acquisition process more efficient. This can only be done in conjunction with you members of the industry. We in government must do our part in improving systems acquisition management, but industry must also become more efficient and produce more for the limited resources that we have.

One area of possible contractor improvement, which General Brown suggested in a speech in September of last year, was that of reducing overhead. For example, prime and subcontractor overhead combined make up almost two-thirds of all contractor costs. I understand that small business has been able to cope with the problem of overhead comparatively successfully. Another important area of contractor performance which the Air Force feels could be improved is that of subcontractor management. Effective action with respect to overhead and subcontractor management would contribute greatly toward reducing overall procurement expenditures and we intend to make a major effort to achieve this goal.

I would like to turn next to what we in government can do toward better conservation of procurement resources. First we must buy only what we need at the lowest overall cost. One application of this maxim which we are now working on is the Design to Cost philosophy of acquiring major weapon systems. Although the concept is not novel, it has been employed on a number of recent developments, including the lightweight fighter. The present emphasis upon design to cost is basically a change in our way of life in acquiring hardware which is more responsive to tighter budgets.

Simply stated, this means that we establish a production unit price goal during the development phase of a weapon system and require contractors to perform design and performance trade-offs to achieve that unit production price. In short, we tell industry what we can afford and industry tells us the best they can build, taking into account trade-offs between cost, performance, and schedule. If the resulting design meets our requirements, we then buy the article that gives us the best technical approach and is closest to that cost goal. Comparison is also envisioned among competing systems as well as within the existing system. I would caution, however, that design to cost is no panacea, and must be selectively applied.

Another related concept receiving more emphasis is Life Cycle Costing. This is a technique that gives proper consideration to future logistics costs. We have to insure that what we buy can be supported economically. The real cost of a weapons system includes more than the acquisition price. We are all familiar in our own lives with instances where we have spent more on the initial purchase of an item, a watch, a television set, or even an automobile for example, because we could expect lower maintenance and operational costs in the future. In the final analysis, it is a balancing of acquisition cost, life cycle costs, and performance requirements, that should determine the design of a system. These parameters, as well as the need to reduce overhead costs, directly affect the Air Force's relationships with its prime contractors; however, you as subcontractors will also find yourselves in an increasingly cost-conscious environment.

Also very important, we need competition to buy at the lowest sound price. We need

the better ideas and ways of doing things that competition forces on us. That is why it makes sense to protect, aid, counsel, and assist small businesses in doing work for us. Without small business there would be very limited competition—and that includes the competition of ideas. We need your ingenuity and inventiveness, as well as your unique and specialized approaches to difficult technical problems. Our industrial base and the national defense could not be what they are today nor could it meet future tasks without you people in small business and large business working together, in partnership with the government.

Another thing we need in order to buy wisely is sound policy and procedure. In this regard some legislative changes would be helpful in making the procurement process more efficient. For example, all of us would benefit if the dollar limit on small purchases were raised from \$2,500 to \$10,000. As an additional step, while reviewing our policies and procedures for the purpose of improving efficiency, we can achieve a sharper separation of what is policy and what is essentially the "nuts and bolts" of procurement.

Even more important for reducing procurement costs, the real challenge is getting and keeping good people. The Air Force today has a total procurement work force of approximately 7,400 people: 4,600 civilians, 1,400 enlisted men, and 1,400 officers. This is the basic resource with which we must, each year, carefully execute over three million procurement actions through which flows that 43% of the entire Air Force budget I mentioned earlier. The responsibility of simultaneously supporting the Air Force mission and safeguarding the taxpayers' dollars is exceeding complex, requiring a very high degree of professionalism and integrity.

Thus we must have people who understand this process and the great variety of laws and administrative regulations upon which it is based—and who are action oriented. We need procurement professionals who know their product, its market and the requirement in order to use the procurement process to develop a sound businesslike approach for acquiring what we need. Material shortages and increasingly longer lead times make it even more essential that we develop a sound business concept which considers the highest achievable technology within the constraints of good business management considerations.

The Sixties saw a continued pushing of the technological base. This was in response to the environment which existed at that time. In today's environment, a sound business approach takes on even greater importance. People who contribute to that approach—effective procurement managers, imaginative contracting officers and competent buyers—will play an increasingly important role in the Seventies and Eighties. Acquisition managers must listen to them and support their decisions.

Before leaving the subject of Air Force procurement, let me point out as we perform these tasks we also help to implement a number of important national domestic policies. In addition to the promotion of Small Business, which is the purpose of this conference, we have stressed enhancing minority business opportunities. To illustrate this point we have already let contracts totaling about \$13 million during the first six months of FY 74 to minority business.

In closing, I would like to thank Congressman Wilson for inviting me to speak to you. I believe it is important for us to consider seriously ways to make better use of our procurement resources. I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you and I am sure that you are receiving helpful information. I know that Don Rellins and his group of

counselors and procurement experts will remain here until you get the answers you need. I hope that we can be of further assistance to you and I hope that you can help us in the future. You have my best wishes for a successful conference.

Thank you.

COMMUNITY CHALLENGE: BARRIERS TO THE HANDICAPPED

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn from Mr. Harold Russell, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, that one of my constituents—Miss Pamela Sue Davis of Americus, Ga.—has won second place in the national "Ability Counts" writing contest sponsored by the Committee.

In advising me of the selection, Mr. Russell noted that Pamela and the four other top national winners, plus the 39 State winners, all high school juniors and seniors, will be guests of honor of the AFL-CIO and the Disabled American Veterans at the annual meeting of the President's Committee to be held here in Washington during May 1-3.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Third District of Georgia, which I am privileged to represent, I would like to take this opportunity to express our deep pride and offer our highest congratulations to Pamela on this outstanding achievement.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend to the attention of our colleagues Pamela's award winning report, entitled "Community Challenge: Barriers to the Handicapped."

Her report reads:

COMMUNITY CHALLENGE: BARRIERS TO THE HANDICAPPED

(By Pamela Sue Davis)

"Tomorrow's symposium on apathy has been cancelled, due to lack of interest." Do the words of this contemporary platitude cause one to laugh, or to think? In actuality, the statement makes a terse comment on a malady which increasingly affects society. Apathy has come of age.

Unconcern always has its consequences. To a handicapped individual, the results can be devastating. Statistics show that one out of seven persons throughout the world is handicapped to some degree.¹ Yet this sizable segment of our population is virtually ignored in many ways by its fellow citizens. Barriers on many levels are allowed to exist, and they undoubtedly contribute to the discouragement of self-confidence and self-sufficiency among the disabled.

On a smaller scale, anyone can examine the situation as it exists in his own community; for each community is a microcosm of society. Here, in Americus, Georgia, we have made many progressive steps in dealing with the handicapped. For example, a training center for the mentally retarded has been established. Organizations, such as Goodwill Industries and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, seek to make

productive citizens out of the disabled. However, many barriers are being overlooked, particularly for the physically disabled. Before we can expect many of our less fortunate to adjust to the job world, we must strive to alleviate any obstacles.

In talking with Mr. Walter Williams of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, I discovered one community problem that needlessly exists. Though generally optimistic about the employment horizon of the handicapped, he deplored the fact that many public facilities are inaccessible to those confined to wheelchairs. Water fountains, public restrooms, phone booths, and other conveniences are taken for granted by most of us; but what frustration they can invoke from a handicapped person!

Consider the following and its implications. Last year, the Americus Jaycees began the construction of ramps in town to increase the mobility of those confined to wheelchairs. Now certain individuals have cited the need for specially marked parking places for those who need access to the ramps. Otherwise, they must alight from their cars and then maneuver their chairs through the streets to reach a ramp. Though the need has been established, nothing has yet been done. Why?

This question continually arises when one studies the ways in which environmental conditions could be improved for the handicapped but are, instead, allowed to remain as they are. Why are our modern conveniences completely useless for a portion of our citizenry? Why must many people remain outside the mainstream of life?

I feel that the public has been lulled into a sense of apathy. In our town and in every town, apathy is present to some extent. It is the product of an overly mechanized, complacent society. Many other reasons are more openly professed. Mr. Williams is aware of this when he admits, "Money is a problem here." It is not the lack of funds so much as it is the inability of concerned groups to receive a share of it for their efforts—another symptom of apathy, really. Funds can be found for any worthwhile endeavor. It is a matter of establishing priorities. A budget can include funds for the disabled; yet the budget often finds itself a scapegoat for a multitude of unanswered requests. Excuses are not enough.

Adequate public facilities are but a small part of a truly compassionate community. From surveying the situation and discussing its ramifications with many individuals, I have concluded that our community has the potential to become a town where the healthy and the disabled can work together. Handicapped people have many obstacles to conquer alone. They must not only compensate for their physical impairments, they must also overcome their own psychological barriers. It is inhumane for a community to impose further, purely structural, barriers, especially when they could so easily be removed. We can start with the small changes, and then progress. It is not a utopian dream to visualize a day when Americus and every community meets the challenge of providing sufficient services and conveniences for all its inhabitants.

Why does apathy continue to exist? Psychologists feel that people are guilty of adopting the attitude: "It couldn't happen to me." Perhaps it could. One thing is certain—"it" has already happened to over twenty-five million Americans.² Are we justified in depriving any one of these twenty-five million of the services and the conveniences which others enjoy? As Edmund Burke once said, "Justice is the greatest concern of man on earth." We must meet the challenge that justice demands. We cannot give the disabled their lost facilities. But we can give them the fruits of our concern.

¹ Howard A. Rusk, "Handicapped", *World Book Encyclopedia*, 1969, v. 9, p. 41.

² *Ibid.*

VOLUNTEER EXPO

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, "A Volunteer Can Make a Difference" is the theme for Prince Georges County Volunteer Expo in connection with National Volunteer Week from April 21-27.

The Prince Georges County school volunteer services is proving that our schools can utilize volunteers to enhance the quality of education. In fact, the results of this program are remarkable. Initiated in 1966 with a total of 15 volunteers, today it numbers over 10,000 volunteers. These volunteers have increased the degree of personal attention given to students, and have increased the interest of a great many students in their schoolwork. The program has turned many students who have poor attendance records into regular class attenders and participants.

The Prince Georges County school system is the 10th largest school system in the country. Over 10,000 volunteers make the volunteer program the second largest program in the country in terms of the number of participants.

Aside from the benefits accrued by the students, the cost of the volunteer program is minimal with the only expense being administrative in nature. In fact it is estimated that if each of the volunteers was paid for his or her services at the minimum wage rate, the cost of the program would run in excess of \$4 million annually.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my full appreciation to those who have given unselfishly of their time and services in order to make the program in Prince Georges County successful.

Additionally, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a poem written by Ms. Marti King, the coordinator of the Prince Georges County volunteer program.

The poem follows:

A VOLUNTEER CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE

(By Marti King)

If you remember that it takes three of my steps to equal one of yours;
If you understand that I must view life at an eye level three feet below yours;
If you can let me try when I am ready instead of pushing me ahead or holding me back;
If you can touch my life with your faith without taking away my need for self-determination;
Then I can grow, and learn and become.

If you remember that it takes time for me to gain the experience in living you've already had;
If you understand that I can only relate to those things which have meaning on my level of maturity;
If you can let me take a step of independence when I can instead of thrusting me out or pulling me back;
If you can touch my life with your hope without destroying my sense of reality;
Then I can grow, and learn and become.

If you can remember it takes courage for me to try again after failure the same as it does for you;

If you understand that I must find out who I am for myself;
If you can let me find my own path when I want to instead of choosing for me the way you think I should go;
If you can touch my life with your love without taking away the space I need to breathe;
Then I can grow, and learn and become.

IF YOU WANT TO BE A MILLIONAIRE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most admired, personable, and able men I have ever known is James E. Davis, chairman of the board of Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., and he recently made a truly outstanding graduation speech at Jacksonville University, which I include hereunder. The commonsense he expressed in his speech the other day, as he received his honorary degree from that university, is both thought-provoking and inspiring:

IF YOU WANT TO BE A MILLIONAIRE

I have allotted myself 21 minutes to make you a millionaire—if I can't do it in that time, you may just have to be happy and poor. In these days when the government endeavors to legislate equality through minimum incomes, regardless of productivity or demonstrated ability, we must assume that you buy the theory that what made the U.S. the greatest nation in the world is an inherent desire of individuals to be "unequal"—to excel others and not depend upon the government. It is important that Jacksonville University produce a new generation of millionaires to take the place of those who have been so generous in the past—the Swishers, the Phillips, Alex Brest, the Wolfsons, the Howards, the Goodings and several others who have been the financial underpinnings of this institution. You, the graduating class, are that generation.

I believe in daydreaming. A dream of what you want to be at 45 or 50 years of age is essential to motivate you. A dream so strong it becomes a plan. For the purpose of my talk, I have assumed your dream may be to become a millionaire. I've looked back over 66 years to try to identify the characteristics and attitudes that I think will help you.

First of all, let me say that it is a highly competitive world and it won't be easy. I went to the Produce Market in Miami at 2:30 a.m. for years and finished taking my telephone orders at 9:00 p.m. each night. If you don't enjoy long hours and hard work and if you can't select a vocation you can eat, drink and sleep, you probably won't make it and neither will your spouse unless he or she is sympathetic and understanding.

Believe me, life is uncertain at best—each of us is just a heartbeat away from eternity. Failure and loss of life stalks us always. Fear is a very essential element of success. My background is in perishable foods where fear is the secret of success. Fear the market will go down—fear you will neglect some detail and your merchandise will be garbage tomorrow. You will soon learn my version of Murphy's Law—anything bad that can happen will happen. Think it through in detail and take steps to prevent catastrophe and minimize damage. Always have an alternate airport in mind for bad weather. You must take big risks to make it big—but you must

run a very scared race. Where there is no chance for failure, there isn't much chance for success. Risk is just another way of saying opportunity.

The greatest design for becoming a millionaire I have ever seen was written by Mr. Eli Witt of Tampa, the Hay-A-Tampa cigar man. Mr. Witt was an invalid, bedridden for many years, but he built a great tobacco and cigarette business. Through his influence from his sick bed atop the old Tampa Terrace Hotel, he held the cigarette tax off in Florida for many years. He summed up his philosophy in two paragraphs which he called "Design for Success." I quote:

"I say to any person, whether he is able or disabled, that if he expects to make a success through government paternalism, he is doomed to disappointment. First, the person must decide definitely and quickly what business he wishes to follow. Then forgetting obstacles and ailments he must apply his mind to learning every detail of that business, in and out, backward and forward. He must not let his love of golf, or tennis, or card playing or gambling, or even his wife, take his eyes from his objective. He must devote day and night to the task of finding out what makes his business tick or what is needed to make it grow.

"In so applying himself, the person with physical handicaps will not have time for worrying or fretting about his lot. He will become so engrossed that the handicaps will be forgotten. I have found it so and I have been happy."

I recommend Mr. Witt's "Design for Success" to you!

Too many Americans in recent years have concluded "We've got it made—no use to work—no use to worry." The truth is—you must be hungry—that's a basic characteristic you must have for success! If you can't be dedicated to producing a better product or service at a lower price, you aren't going to be even a part millionaire. Most humans produce better under stress—not under affluence. This means that if you are poor now, you may have a better chance of becoming a millionaire than the guy who is already one—and has ceased to be motivated—has to remain a millionaire. Productivity is the name of the game and the Japanese are breathing down our necks in an effort to replace the U.S. as the top economic producers in the world today. We cannot cure poverty with money—only productivity cures poverty and not some scheme to pay people who do not produce. The government cannot give anyone anything it doesn't take away from someone else! Whenever one person gets something without earning it, some other person has to earn something without getting it. Try this on yourself and see where it leads to!

A business is known by the people it keeps. The people who get ahead are those who do more than is necessary and keep on doing it.

Whenever you go out to get a job, remember—you never get a second chance to make a good first impression! You may never see the man who hires you again. A lot hinges on his first impression of you. He might not hire you. If 20% of the people associate beards and long hair with hippies and violence, don't run the risk of making a poor impression. A \$1.50 haircut could be parlayed into a million dollars. In our business, we find that if we satisfy the cranky customer, we don't have to worry about the rest. A cranky customer may be a "square", but she is our customer and we intend to keep her.

Of course, the easiest way to become a millionaire is to strike oil, gold or marry money, but assuming you don't do any of these, let's talk about necessary personal traits you should develop.

At the top of the list is character—let's define character as something in your brain or heart that controls what you do when ab-

solutely no one will ever know if you do wrong. It is a trait of personality your wife or husband and your banker will recognize and respect—especially if the banker loans you money. You will have to hire some money in your lifetime if you become a millionaire—and you will have to pay it back. We mentioned that you must take some risks and being able to borrow capital is one of the essential risks.

You must develop good judgment. It has been said that good judgment comes from exercising poor judgment and not making the same mistake twice. Judgment seems to be the ability to make use of experience—and few of us seem to be born with that faculty. We must acquire it. Don't rationalize your mistakes—analyze them coldly and profit by them. Competitors are really good for you in one area—they call painful attention to your mistakes. I believe you will find an important facet of judgment to be the ability to negotiate amiably. Trade hard—but not offensively. Judgment of what a buyer will pay in a sale is very important.

A most desirable characteristic is the ability to handle people—our relations with our associates and even our family. In this field, I think tact is a very important attribute. I recently read that a good supervisor is a guy who can step on your toes without messing up your shine. That's tact!

In developing the ability to handle people, I think you will find fairness is probably the most important ingredient in human relations. Perhaps you have heard the story of the employees chatting one day. One said, "Of course, the boss is mean, but he is fair." The other one said, "What do you mean, he is fair?" The reply was, "Well, he is mean to everyone." That is not the kind of fairness I have in mind when I point out it is important that we have this characteristic. Sincere acts of courtesy are never out of place in any business. I believe you will find a dedicated group is much more productive than one individual, so you must learn to be fair to your associates and work at binding them together, moving toward established goals.

Morale is one of the keystones in any business enterprise. I think it can best be defined as "Faith in the people at the top". You can be a hard boss, and still be liked—but not a nagging boss or a grouchy boss. You must be a boss who stays close enough to his business to know a good job from a poor one—a boss who cuts employees in for some of the "goodies" when it can be done. See that your employees don't refer to you as the "Boss" spelled backwards—double SOB! Encouragement is the all-important ingredient in any enterprise—without encouragement, we wither away and die financially and physically. Don't be afraid to dish out liberal doses of encouragement.

Most important, you can't be a millionaire unless you are a dedicated capitalist, and learn to handle money. Remember, you can't be a millionaire without making and saving \$10,000 first—you crawl before you walk, and so long as you progress every year, that millionaire glint will stay in your eye. To become a capitalist is simple—just maintain the income over the outgo. This is a concept many educational institutions seem to neglect. If we spend more money than we make every week, we are going to be laborers and not capitalists, regardless of education, intelligence or high station. Hire money when you can use it at a profit—never borrow money to live on. Cut your spending or up your earnings. If you can't do this, you will never be a millionaire. If you don't have a financial plan, make it right now. If it involves making good money, take a little bookkeeping so you can understand your own finances, read a financial statement and balance your own checkbook. One year of accounting probably should be required course

for all college graduates if they are going to have a moderately high income.

Your biggest hurdle in business is to get all the factors together and organize them so you can pay the bills out of the receipts. I think I could run almost any business if somebody would pay the bills. This everlasting problem spoils many business enterprises. Most of the downgrading of business is being done by those who can't do this—do not understand the skill required and turn their envious scorn on those who can do it. Our government for many years has been a classic example of inability to pay the bills out of the receipts—and they mess up any business wherever they get their fingers in the pie and eliminate competitive ingenuity.

An important tool of success is keeping your education up to date by reading. The accelerated pace of today's living makes it even more vital. Even with an earned PhD degree, you can be very uneducated within five years. There is no terminal degree in education—it goes on for your entire life. I have assumed that you have found that education comes largely from the written word. Books are an effort by those who went before us to give us the benefit of knowledge, research and experience. The intent was to make it so you would not have to make the same mistakes in a trial and error effort at solving problems. Socrates said, "Employ your time in improving yourself by other men's writings, so that you shall easily come by what others have labored for." Karl Marx said, "History is economics in action—the contest among individuals, groups, classes and states for food, fuel, materials and economic power." Remember, also, that a memory for figures, names and faces in your business is very important.

You must be an innovator—be on a constant search for better ways to do things. To be an innovator, you must be aggressive, tough minded and persistent. If you are a 3.5 student or better and you got that way by writing long-winded dissertations, shake the habit right now. The habit will lead to what we call the "3-page letter complex"—putting on three pages what should go in one paragraph. The ability to make a logical, concise presentation in writing is a "must"—it may be your only approach to a superior who must be made conscious of your abilities. Ability to cut through fluff and verbiage to get at the crux of a problem is precious—if you have it, cultivate it for it could make you a millionaire. Time is the most precious thing in the world—you must have the ability to make use of it efficiently. Another bad phase of the education problem is the "big word syndrome". When I hear a fellow on television start off with a lot of words that I have to look up, I wonder if he is really informing me or just trying to impress me or maybe make me feel stupid. You don't make progress with your associates by making them feel stupid.

The recent elimination of the grain surpluses in the United States may presage a worldwide famine. There are 75 million new mouths in the world to feed every year. Wheat, rice and corn are the staples of the world's diet and tell the tale in the food business. Available grain lands are relatively static compared to the expanding need.

Food production is probably the growth industry of the 70's. I don't believe burdensome, long-term food surpluses will ever exist again in our lives. Basic food production will be much more rewarding than in the past. There is as much dignity in tilling the soil, animal husbandry and forestry as there is in science, music or poetry. If this is not recognized by educated people, we may soon go hungry. If there is a crop failure in Russia, China, Australia, Argentina or the United States, we may find millions of people will starve. Don't overlook forestry, agricul-

ture or food distribution in selecting your vocation.

I don't have to tell you that this is the age of the "goof off"—the era of the half-done job. The Winn-Dixie cashier who doesn't thank you—the mechanic who does not fix your car—the executive whose mind is on the golf course—even students who want crisp courses. Tremendous opportunities exist to do jobs right and satisfied customers will flock to your door if you can do them better than your competition.

Let me remind you of some new and old-fashioned ideas in simple language that you need to adopt as a policy:

1. Honesty is not only the best policy—it is the only one for success in life. Don't give your word carelessly, but if you do, keep it. Keep appointments—be dependable—be on time.

2. A fair day's work for a day's pay and fair pay for a day's work. I've heard that the great inventor, Thomas A. Edison, said, "Genius is 1% inspiration and 99% perspiration."

3. The most dangerous drug of our times is not a hard drug, but a drug called "SFN"—something for nothing. Don't get addicted to it, or you will never be a millionaire.

4. There is no such thing as it can't be done—problems are unsolved opportunities. Someone is going to solve great problems and be liberally rewarded.

5. The "I will" is worth more than the "IQ", but together they are unbeatable. Real motivation to get results will make life interesting.

I have often wondered why some of the millionaires I know were not "A" students—some didn't even finish college, but were highly motivated and tenacious. Proper education undoubtedly would have made it much easier—you have this great advantage. If you desire to become a millionaire, don't have many sidelines—you have a full time job ahead of you.

Now if you aren't the aggressive type, if your plans do not seem to work out, but your health is good and you can digest anything you want to eat, don't be downhearted. A lot of millionaires can't digest their food and would give all they have to have good health. Sometimes success brings indigestion and nerves anyhow, so just be happy. There are counterbalancing things even in success. I think there is wealth in things other than dollars. To be a really good teacher, minister or doctor borders on the divine. My third grade teacher inspired me to believe in myself—I've idolized her since—I still keep in touch. She is 84 years old and a Winn-Dixie stockholder. The satisfaction from this type of life work must be overwhelming.

Each person in the world, no matter how humble, has a sphere of influence—real success consists of expanding that sphere of influence constructively each day.

Let me close by pointing out that opportunity for college graduates has never been greater—more people can afford more goods and services than ever before in history—all signals are A-OK—go for the Jacksonville University Graduating Class of April 21, 1974. You can be a millionaire—don't tell me it can't be done—I've seen it done. I made a similar talk almost 20 years ago and I wondered if it was wasted effort. Two years later, a man came to me and said, "I liked your talk—we think alike. My boss and principal stockholder has just died and I need a new boss and owner." I told him I did not want to be his boss, but if he could manage to become as good an expense man as he was a salesman, I'd show him how to buy the company and I would make an investment with him. He is now several times a millionaire and I am a satisfied stockholder.

In the parlance of the grocery business, there are 57 rules for success—the first one

is to do a good job. Don't worry about the other 56!

MALDEN—A CITY ON THE MOVE

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged by the announcement recently that additional funds for housing programs and for urban renewal were being released by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The impoundment of these funds has created serious difficulties for the cities and towns across this country which rely on Federal funds to develop their communities.

My home city, Malden, provides a fine example of how these funds have been put to use to the benefit of the people. A recent article in the Boston Globe details the efforts of city officials in revitalizing the city. I have had the opportunity to work closely with Mayor Walter J. Kelliher and Redevelopment Administrator John Blake for many years, and I know of their commitment to the city of Malden.

I am especially pleased that, based on figures for the last fiscal year for which there is complete information available, my Seventh Congressional District as a whole received more Federal funds for housing and urban development than any other congressional district in Massachusetts. I hope that this partnership between Federal and local government continues to work as well in the future as it has in the past.

The news article follows:

[From the Boston Evening Globe, Feb. 25, 1974]

MALDEN—A CITY ON THE MOVE

(By Robert Rosenthal)

In 1957, Walter J. Kelliher was elected mayor of Malden. Young families in Malden were moving north to newer, greener communities. The city's business districts were becoming blighted and the city was almost bankrupt.

"I felt at the time," says Mayor Kelliher, "that the hope for cities like Malden lay in establishing relations with the Federal government. They had money and nobody else did."

Urban renewal was the course that Kelliher chose. But the people of Malden didn't feel comfortable with this new term that meant change.

"They knocked me out of the box in 1959," Kelliher said in a recent interview, "but I felt that I was on the right path." In 1961 Kelliher ran again and won. He has not been defeated since and is now serving his seventh consecutive term as mayor.

According to Federal, state, and local officials, Kelliher, 61, is the man most responsible for success of urban renewal in Malden, a city of 56,000.

"Malden is an extremely successful program," according to Linda Ellenbogen, the community development representative for the Housing and Urban Development regional office in Boston.

"In the case of Malden," Miss Ellenbogen said, "the primary reason for the strong program is the mayor. Where you've got the political head of a city pushing for renewal,

and the administration remains stable, you'll have success."

HUD has funded \$53 million for Malden's urban renewal. This money has been used on projects ranging from sewer and water works, renovation of housing and building of civic areas to the building of low income and elderly housing.

Concentrated Code which is funded by HUD and the Redevelopment Authority of Malden, is one of the programs used in the city. Code applies to above-ground renovation of housing, streets, utility lines and planting trees.

In the two residential areas where Code programs have been instituted, Forestdale-Maplewood and Bell Rock-Belmont Hill there has been remarkable compliance.

Forestdale-Maplewood is an area of 618 acres. Under the Code program, each of the 4400 buildings in this area, the vast majority of which are private residences, were inspected starting in 1968.

It was found that 52 percent of the buildings in the area did not meet code specifications. Funds totalling nearly \$4 million were spent in this area and today 98 percent of the buildings meet local fire and sanitary requirements.

Facilitating the improvement in Forestdale-Maplewood were grants of up to \$3500 to home owners.

The Bell Rock-Belmont Hill area was blighted more severely. Of the 864 structures in this 108-acre section, 570 were initially below minimum standards.

In this area, according to John Blake Jr., administrator for the Malden Redevelopment Authority, the city ran into problems because of funding cuts from Washington. Even with these problems, 86.9 percent compliance was met.

"We would have much higher compliance with Code specifications in this area," Blake said, "but HUD can no longer get new funds out of Washington. We've had requests languishing for over a year."

M. Daniel Richardson Jr., area director for HUD, said that a January 5, 1973 Federal ruling, "terminated and suspended every program in the house. It was a basic moratorium on spending. Some projects in the works were not stopped but new applications were."

A revenue sharing bill which has been in the House and Senate for some time will replace the funneling and monitoring action of HUD, according to Richardson.

Linden Highlands is a large outcropping of rock that until last year had been sparsely developed with few residential buildings.

Three years ago the city offered 44 acres of land there for sale to developers for \$1. Contingent in the sale was the building of multi-unit luxury apartments. There were no takers.

The reason was that Linden Highlands had very poor sewage and water facilities. Kelliher was able to swing state and Federal grants, which along with Malden funds, totaled \$3 million. The funds were used to improve sewage, water and roadway systems.

With the improvements, Malden had an attractive piece of land for development. More than 50 developers contacted the city. The city chose the Flatley Company of Braintree.

The land was sold to Flatley in 1972 for \$400,000. They are building a 15-structure, 1024-unit luxury apartment complex.

Today the development is one-third completed and, with no advertising, it is fully occupied. Rents range from \$225 for a studio to \$450 for a three bedroom apartment.

Mark Donovan, director of real estate development for the Flatley Company, said they did not expect this degree of success on the project which has a projected cost of \$26.5 million.

"This is the first urban high density project we've undertaken," Donovan said. "But we decided along with Malden officials to

make a self-contained community on the hill."

In 1972, according to Kelliher, tax revenue from Linden Highlands was \$6,000. By 1975 the city expects to realize over \$1 million.

"The idea behind Linden Highlands," Kelliher said, "represents an attempt to restore an economic balance among the people of the community. The 1970 census showed the median income for Malden to be \$10,500. The median income for residents of the complex is \$24,000."

There have been critics of Kelliher's renewal programs. Mrs. Amelia Miclette ran against Kelliher in last fall's mayoral election, losing 11,399 to 6675. Her campaign was based on the neglect of human needs in Malden.

A 43-year-old mother of five, Mrs. Miclette said, "No doubt the city was turned around in terms of physical development by renewal. It had to happen. But human needs were forgotten."

"Our schools have been neglected," Mrs. Miclette added, "but the real issue is planning for the city of Malden. Are we going to allow ourselves to become a rim of Boston or are we going to make it a human place to live?"

Kelliher admits that there are areas that have been neglected due to emphasis on renewal. He strongly defends his position.

"The city was on the verge of bankruptcy in 1961. I was dealing with a community in trouble. Now Malden is a fairly healthy economic community. Any decision is not popular with everyone. Fact is you still have to deal from a set of priorities."

Suffolk Faulkner was the first major renewal project in Malden. It was a deterioration neighborhood. The entire neighborhood was a financial drain on the city because of the need for police and fire protection.

Suffolk Square, the center of the 213-acre area, was a network of shabby stores, bars, gas stations and vacant lots. A large section was junkyards and marshlands that were used as dumping grounds.

Over \$17 million was used to renew this area. Six hundred families were relocated. Dilapidated and badly deteriorated buildings were torn down.

The area now has 24 new businesses, 94 privately-constructed homes, two nonprofit housing facilities for moderate-income families and a 100-unit development for elderly housing.

All streets and sidewalks were repaved and relaid, new water service systems built, and new sewage and utility lines were introduced.

The 23-acre Charles Street area has also undergone a constructive renewal. It was an overcrowded Neighborhood Renewal Project. * * * been redeveloped as a clean modern light industrial area.

In 1960, a year before the area was cited for renewal, the assessed valuation was \$411,250. Today the valuation of the area is put at \$1,011,300.

One company, the Berkshire Apparel Corp., moved in and employs 500 people in a \$500,000 plant.

The city's prime industrial area is the Malden Industrial Park. Renewal is now underway in this 140-acre area.

The \$19 million being spent here is designed to refurbish an area containing industries that employ 4000 Malden residents.

Much of the area is now flat, razed land. Parcels of it are being bought and redevelopment has begun. Converse Rubber Co., the city's largest employer, is engaged in a \$250,000 rehabilitation project.

Industries that are polluters are being relocated. One firm was even asked to leave the city. Solvent Chemical, a moth ball maker, has large stores of chlorine gas which pose a deadly fire hazard. It is moving to Niagara Falls.

Mayor Kelliher has definite ideas about industrial development and the concept of

renewal. "Too many communities have only one industry," he says. "That's fine if the one industry thrives, but when that industry is in trouble the whole area suffers. We have a broad industrial base here now."

Downtown renewal in Malden is going on in the area referred to as the civic center. Nearly \$14 million was originally funded for this area.

HUD directed, after it was found that this was not enough money to develop the 35 acres, that the project be subdivided into five general areas. The civic center is the first of these areas to be treated.

The civic center, which is under construction, will have a government center building housing municipal offices and the police department plus other governmental agencies. A downtown MBTA station is being built and is expected to be ready in 1975.

The other four areas in this district are in limbo, awaiting funds from Washington.

State-allocated funds to Malden for renewal total \$4,617,774, according to Edmund Mangini, assistant to the state commissioner of urban renewal.

But, according to Mangini, Malden actually has received only \$1,633,059 of the state allocated monies.

Kelliher discussed the need for knowing how to secure funds—"the blood and guts of any project. You have to be a guy who can plead a good case. I like to refer to it as grantsmanship. You've got to know which doors to knock on in Washington."

He continued, "You start off with your own congressmen. Then, depending on which party is in power, you stop off at the appropriate senator. From there, things can be smooth, but you've got to keep the pressure on."

Kelliher has kept the pressure on and the results are visible in Malden.

"I ran for this office with the premise that it is a full time job," he says. "I've done my homework and I know how things get done. Being a mayor doesn't mean that you just sit in a seat."

CONFERENCE REPORT H.R. 3927

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate my support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3927, the Environmental Education Act extension. I feel this report represents an effective compromise, one which will guarantee that this extremely worthwhile program can continue for the next 3 years.

There are those who contend that the great environmental concerns of several years ago are no longer as relevant due to our need to find immediate solutions to our energy crisis. However, this Congress has demonstrated its willingness to find solutions while not abandoning our commitment as a nation to preserving the environment. For example, we passed legislation last year which provides \$50 million in research to develop solar heating and cooling, potentially the most inexhaustible and environmentally sound source of energy we have.

The key to understanding is education. This act was created in 1970 for the purpose of providing comprehensive environmental education activities and courses in schools and organizations throughout the United States so as to

educate both children and adults to the environmental problems which face us today and in the future.

Yet as important as this legislation is to this country, this administration has chosen to provide it with the most meager of funds to such a degree that many worthwhile activities were forced to be scrapped due to lack of funds.

Despite these fiscal adversities and limitations the Environmental Education Act can point with considerable pride to the significant accomplishments it has achieved in the stimulation of public concern and action on ecological issues.

I am pleased to speak on behalf of this legislation. It is a vital bill, it deserves the support of my colleagues and the American people because it is all our environment that we are trying to save.

SMALL BUSINESSMEN NEED HELP FROM CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, America owes much to its small businessmen. The debt is too often forgotten, however, in our preoccupation with giant corporations, big unions, conglomerates, multinational corporations, and agribusiness.

SMALL BUSINESS CONTRIBUTIONS

In our fascination with bigness, Americans often lose sight of the importance of the "smalls"—the small businessman who is the economic and commercial backbone of our communities. Anyone who has walked around a courthouse square in rural America or down most any street in an urban business district is soon made aware of the role the small businessman plays in his community. SBA Administrator Thomas Kleppe recently commented on the significance of the small businessman in America when he said:

Our traditional values of individual initiative, social mobility, and political freedom are significantly dependent upon the strength of the free enterprise system, a system which is itself dependent in large measure upon the maintenance of competition provided by the existence of a large and healthy community of small enterprises.

The contributions of small entrepreneurs to our society are legion. Such technological marvels as the rocket engine, the Polaroid camera, the helicopter, the jet engine, the Xerox process, insulin, the vacuum tube, and countless other production devices and processes have been developed by independent inventors and small firms.

The people of the Ninth Congressional District in southeastern Indiana depend upon the small businessman for most of their daily needs. He contributes to the wide diversity of the economy in our communities. He is independent, civic-minded, resourceful and self-reliant. These are the qualities that go to the

heart of what our Nation is all about. The small businessman has contributed significantly to the quality of life in America. His demise would have an unfortunate and worrisome impact.

That is why I am concerned that so much of what the Government does places a special hardship on the small businessman. He is less apt to be able to absorb higher taxes, inflation, increased wage rates, more paperwork, and tighter Federal regulations. Environmental and consumer legislation often cause him severe problems. All of these governmental actions fall with great force upon the small businessman, and I am persuaded he needs relief and special attention.

In economic terms, the small businessman's impact is enormous. Small businesses comprise 98 percent of the country's total business units, employ 65 percent of the Nation's nongovernmental work force, and produce about 40 percent of our gross national product. In 1972, they were responsible for 29 percent of total government procurement.

SURVIVAL THREATENED

Despite these contributions, small businesses are losing ground rapidly and disastrously to larger firms in terms of market share, assets, and profits. In 270 of 413 manufacturing industries—the business sector where figures are most complete—the 8 largest companies account for 40 percent or more of the value of the shipments from their industry.

In 1960, small- and medium-sized corporations in manufacturing had 50 percent of this sector's assets and were responsible for 41 percent of the profits. By 1970, these firms had only 33 percent of the assets, and by 1972 this had declined to 30 percent of the assets and 28 percent of the profits.

Small businesses are also losing out to the "bigs" in terms of tax liability. Recent studies, including one by my colleague, Congressman VANIK, have shown that the biggest U.S. corporations pay taxes at half the rate paid by small- and medium-sized businesses—26.9 percent versus 51 percent.

Furthermore, the small businessman carries the heaviest portion of the enormous Federal paperwork burden. A firm employing fewer than 50 people, for example, may be required to fill out as many as 75 to 80 different types of forms in the course of a year. For a business with a small office staff, and especially for the "mom and pop" stores, completion of these forms is a tremendously time-consuming and costly operation. Unlike large corporations, they cannot draw on in-house accountants or tax lawyers to handle this work. Small businessmen do it themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite concerned by these developments that so adversely affect small businesses. The small businessman's situation remains tenuous, and the Federal Government should do all that it can to improve his chances for successful operation and growth.

LEGISLATIVE RELIEF

One way to help would be for the Congress to enact the Federal Paperwork

Relief Act, H.R. 12269, which I cosponsored earlier this year with several of my colleagues. This bill requires the General Accounting Office to study how reporting requirements could be reduced and streamlined and to report its findings to the Congress and the Executive, within a year after enactment, for legislative action and administrative improvements. In this way small businessmen would be relieved of the unnecessary portion of an estimated yearly load of 4½ million cubic feet of Federal paperwork. I am hopeful that the House Government Operations Committee, where the bill is now pending, will see fit to take action on it this year.

Another important congressional move of assistance to small firms would be passage of the Small Business Tax Simplification and Reform Act, known as the Evins-Bible bill. I introduced this bill in the 92d Congress, along with more than 100 of my colleagues, and have introduced it again this year as H.R. 14380, in hopes that the Ways and Means Committee will include it in its forthcoming sessions on tax reform. This bill:

Creates a permanent Federal Government committee to make a continuing effort to simplify our tax system, including business taxation.

Restructures downward the tax rates for firms earning less than \$1 million in receipts a year in order to bring the rates more into line with the principle of ability to pay, the principle now applied to individual income taxes.

Encourages the establishment of new small business enterprises.

Promotes modernization, efficiency, and cost reductions for small business with provisions such as a 10-year carryover for small business net operating losses, accumulated earnings tax, and multiple surtax exemptions for certain small businesses under single-family control.

Authorizes a comprehensive study of the factors causing business failures, with recommendations to be made for preventing future failures.

CONCLUSION

The Evins-Bible bill, like the paperwork bill, is just pending, with no action scheduled. I hope this will not be the case for much longer. The challenges and obstacles that small businesses face are not going to disappear of their own accord. Enactment of measures like these is necessary to improve small firms' chances of survival, and would be one small way of thanking small businessmen for their tremendous contribution to the strength of our society and economy.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present to vote on H.R. 11321—Public Safety Officers Benefit Act of 1974. As a cosponsor of similar legislation I am in strong support of this

proposal and would have voted "yea" on final passage.

The law enforcement officer in America has become a target not only for the common criminal seeking to elude the grasp of the law, but also for revolutionary groups who despise the law itself and all who seek to uphold it.

Just as we owe the fullest measure of assistance to the man who daily places his life in danger in combating these forces of crime and revolution, we also owe his family a measure of security in the event he is struck down while performing that duty.

NUCLEAR PROPULSION

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Representative CHARLES BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida, and I introduced a bill to establish for all time a nuclear propulsion policy for major combatant naval ships. The time has come for us to set such a policy, and I believe the Congress will support the provisions of the Bennett-Wilson bill. I include as a portion of my remarks an illuminating column on nuclear propulsion written by the noted columnist, Robert S. Allen:

NUCLEAR PROPULSION

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, APRIL 27.—High-placed authorities apparently "have learned nothing and forgotten nothing."

They are still opposing building nuclear-powered submarines and surface warships. They are resisting this despite two grim realities:

(1) The irrefutable superiority of nuclear power over conventional power; (2) the steady expansion of Russia's nuclear-powered submarine forces—already numerically superior to the U.S.

That's the characteristically outspoken charge of Admiral Hyman Rickover, "father" of this country's nuclear-powered submarines, who throughout most of his notable career has had to overcome powerful Navy resistance to modernization. Only last year, Congress had to take the initiative and promote him to full admiral in order to retain him on active duty.

"Inertia seems to be endemic to naval development," says Rickover. "Although nuclear submarines are now recognized as among the most vital warships we have, opposition to them has continued for over a quarter of a century. In nuclear-powered surface warships the opposition has been even more persistent."

SPELLING IT OUT

Rickover stingingly underscored his blunt rapping of official knuckles with the following scathing details:

A proposal by Defense Department "systems analysts" to "sink ten Polaris submarines to save money."

A Defense Department decision to "stop building any more nuclear submarines after 1970"—that unfortunately was overruled by Congress.

Last year, Congress had to intervene and increase the number of high-speed nuclear attack submarines when the Defense Department balked at that.

In 1971, the Navy scrapped a planned program "to provide each nuclear-powered carrier with its required four nuclear frigates and suspended indefinitely the nuclear frigate construction program." This was done despite the fact that "this was the only type of new combat ship having a fleet air defense capability."

One of two nuclear-powered frigates authorized by Congress was junked by the Defense Department, and construction of the other delayed for two years.

The five nuclear surface warships now in service "came into being only after much pushing and shoving by Congress."

"Reluctance to build nuclear submarines," declared Rickover, "has continued even though the Soviet has surpassed us in numbers of these craft 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."

SAME OLD STORY

Primary basis of the opposition to nuclear power is cost; that nuclear power costs more than conventional.

That's a time-worn argument against modernization, points out Rickover, citing numerous historic instances—going back to 1814, when Robert Fulton designed and built the world's first steam-propelled warship, while the Navy as late as 1869 "required all warships to carry a full set of sails."

"The excuse for not building better ships is always that they are 'more expensive,'" says Rickover. "But all weapons of war are expensive. Cheap weapons will not win a war. And if we can't win a war, there is no sense in spending money on weapons at all."

Sharply assailing the contention that nuclear power is too expensive as compared to conventional power, Rickover makes two telling points:

(1) The cost of all weapons has soared as their capabilities have improved. Examples: The M-16 rifle cost three times as much as the World War II M-1; a C-5 transport plane is over 300 times as expensive as the World War II C-47; the fighter-bombers the Navy has today cost 25 times as much as World War II aircraft.

Asks Rickover sardonically, "Does that mean we should have only four or five planes on our carriers instead of 100?"

(2) Not only are oil costs increasing dramatically, but nuclear and conventional power costs must now be compared on a lifetime cost basis. Example:

"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 that carrier."

"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 four nuclear escorts is six percent greater than that of a conventional carrier accompanied by four conventional escorts."

But that is "merely the peacetime cost," stresses Rickover. It does not take into account the many combat advantages of nuclear power—the immense range of nuclear ships as compared to conventional.

"When a nuclear carrier is substituted for a conventional carrier," points out Rickover, "the range of a carrier task group with four conventional escorts is doubled. When two of the four escorts are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is almost 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."

A GRIM LESSON

Lack of oil played a decisive role in Japan's defeat.

In stressing that, Admiral Rickover notes the following conclusion in a report, "Oil in Japan's War" of the Strategic Bombing Survey: "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 a consequence of their inability to maintain their supply routes to the southern zone."

In striking contrast, Rickover cited the performance of the *Truxton*, nuclear-powered frigate voted by Congress over Pentagon opposition:

"While on a special mission, the *Truxton* steamed 8,600 miles at an average speed of almost 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 a U.S. 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 *Truxton* 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."

Yet despite the repeated demonstrated superiority of nuclear power, the Navy still has no firm long-range program to convert major combatant forces to nuclear power.

Rickover faults the Navy vigorously for this.

"We need a permanent program to build nuclear-powered ships," he asserts, "a program that will not be drastically changed every year or two as has happened in the past. We must build these first-line warships during peace. If war comes, it will be too late."

Representative Bob Wilson, Calif., ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee, vigorously supporting these views, bluntly urged the Navy "to stop living in the past and to start recognizing the needs of the future."

"If we are to learn any lessons from the expanding Soviet naval capability and the current oil crisis," says the veteran legislator, "we must provide nuclear propulsion in all our new warships. Frankly, I can't see how the Navy can even be considering the design of new ships for our aircraft carrier forces which do not have nuclear propulsion."

"Yet the Navy is doing exactly that. It is working on the design of a new class of conventional-powered aircraft carriers and missile ships for our carrier task forces. What they are really doing is wasting taxpayers' money even to be looking at such designs."

THE CONSUMER ENERGY ACT OF 1974

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the Washington Post published an article in the financial section called "Huge

Profit Margins Scored by Oil Majors." In the same edition, but in a different section, another article appeared entitled, "Sawhill Defends Fuel Prices."

Last December, while Americans were being asked to lower their thermostats, reduce their driving speeds, and pay higher prices for gasoline, the major oil companies announced fourth-quarter increases in profits of from 40 to 150 percent. Now at the end of the first quarter of this year, a winter marked by long waiting lines at gas stations, cold homes, and sharply increased prices for the insufficient gas that could be obtained, the majors are reporting new record profits: Gulf Oil Corp.'s profits are up 76 percent, Standard Oil of Indiana's profits are up 81 percent, and I predict the story will be similar from other "majors" as they, too, report their earnings to their shareholders.

The irony of all this is that on the same day these outrageous profit-level increases were reported to the wage earner, whose paycheck was controlled through the periods reported, Mr. John C. Sawhill, the new Administrator of the Federal Energy Office, is seen defending higher profits for the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, this demonstrates once again the need for Congress to roll back oil prices. That is why I am today introducing the Consumer Energy Act of 1974. The bill has six titles the intent of which is to impose a level of fairness into how we deal with the fuel shortages we are experiencing now and are likely to continue experiencing into the future. The six titles are as follow:

Title I: The first title deals with regulatory reform. It proposes to deregulate small producers solely engaged in exploring for, developing, and producing natural gas and oil. But the larger companies would be subject to controls in both the interstate and the intrastate markets. Moreover, this title provides for an annual review of rates and allocation of supplies during times of shortages.

Title II: The second title imposes a rollback of domestic crude oil prices to what they were on December 1, 1973. This date is fair to the consumer and fair to the oil companies which were already enjoying high profits on that date.

Title III: Title III creates the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation which would discover and develop oil and gas deposits on publicly owned lands instead of leasing the mineral rights to major oil companies. This is not a nationalization of the oil industry, but a means of insuring a Federal input in energy development, a means of providing a competitive yardstick for the industry, and a means of increasing the domestic supply of oil and gas at reasonable cost to the consumer.

Title IV: Title IV requires that all oil and gas producers, refiners, and marketers have equal access to pipelines. It also proposes that at least 50 percent of lease sales for drilling rights on Federal land would be made on the basis of royalty rather than bonus bidding.

Title V: This title is for the protection of small businesses such as gasoline stations and home heating oil distributors. It prevents arbitrary termination or nonrenewal of their leases or fran-

chises. It also insures that supplies are fairly allocated to all classes of retailers during times of shortage.

Title VI: The final title of the bill is designed to discourage waste of fuels. It does this by gradually eliminating price advantages, currently given on the basis of large consumption, while permitting the retention of progressive rate structures in which unit price increases with increased quantities consumed.

Mr. Speaker, so that they may be shared with the wide audience they deserve, I insert in the RECORD the two articles from the Washington Post, which point up the need for strong congressional action such as the Consumer Energy Act would provide:

HUGE PROFIT MARGINS SCORED BY OIL MAJORS
(By John Fitzhugh)

NEW YORK.—Leading off a week of oil industry reports, two of the major oil companies announced on Monday first-quarter profits more than 75 per cent higher than a year earlier.

Both companies said overseas operations were responsible for much of the jump. Gulf Oil Corp., one of the country's top five oil firms in terms of sales, said its earnings for the first three months of this year totaled \$290 million, 76 per cent over the \$165 million reported for the same period of 1973, and 26 per cent over the \$230 million in the final quarter of last year.

Standard Oil of Indiana Amoco, which is ranked in the top 10 by sales, reported earnings of \$219 million for the first quarter, up 81 per cent from both the \$121.1 million in the first quarter of 1973 and the \$121 million reported in the last three months of last year.

The company reported overall revenue of \$2.28 billion after revenues of \$1.47 billion in the first quarter of 1973, an increase of 55 per cent.

"I'd go along with predictions that place earnings 50 to 100 per cent above the first quarter of 1973," says Robert Hinckley, an analyst who follows the oil industry for W. E. Hutton & Co., a Wall Street firm.

"On balance this should be another fantastic quarter for the oil industry," says Alan Habact, a securities analyst with the brokerage house of Bache & Co. "I'm looking for large earnings gains, particularly from those with strong domestic operations."

Whereas 1973 was a year when the companies made most of their profit from international operations, other analysts also see the domestic scene as the strongest moneymaker in 1974.

This is because of the rise in domestic crude prices, they say. Crude oil which sold for \$3.90 a barrel a year ago now costs \$5.25 a barrel if it comes from an old well, and up to \$10 a barrel if it springs from a new one.

Under federal price control regulations, prices are restricted for the "old crude"—which accounts for 75 per cent of domestic production—while the "new crude" can rise in price according to demand.

In contrast to private analysts, William Walker, general counsel for the Federal Energy Office, sees "very substantial gains" coming mainly from foreign operations. Price controls should have dampened domestic profits, he reasons.

"Domestic prices have increased only on a dollar-for-dollar basis to reflect increased costs," Walker says, noting that some foreign countries did not have such controls.

During the fourth quarter of last year the companies reported earnings gains ranging from 40 per cent to 150 per cent above the like period of 1972. Exxon's profits were up 59 per cent to \$784 million, for example,

while Gulf's zoomed 153 per cent to \$230 million.

After public clamor and a congressional move to enact a windfall profits tax, the oil companies said the increased earnings were necessary to finance exploration for and development of new energy supplies.

Now the House Ways and Means Committee is about ready to report out the windfall profits tax bill to the floor. Some observers predict a harsh bill because of the higher earnings.

SAWHILL DEFENDS FUEL PRICES

John C. Sawhill, the new federal energy chief, defended the higher fuel prices that have settled in around the country and indicated yesterday they would pay off in increased supplies.

"Prices higher than in years past and substantial but reasonable profits are seen to be vital to our future well-being," he told the Senate Commerce Committee. "Where price elicits new supply, it serves a useful economic function and benefits consumers with increased supply, which ultimately results in lower prices."

Sawhill, appointed last week to the nation's top energy post, predicted that the oil industry's financial statements for the first quarter of 1974 would show a continuing rise in profits, which increased dramatically in 1973.

He also predicted, in comments made to reporters after testifying, that the price of gasoline would not rise "more than a few cents" per gallon.

"Prices are now in the low 50s," he said. "I wouldn't expect them to go over 60 cents." They already have reached that point in some areas of the nation.

Sawhill criticized the proposed Consumer Energy Act which would, among other things, create a federal oil and gas corporation.

"It's been through the genius of our private enterprise system that we've been able to gain control over most of the reserves," he said.

Continuing the administration's arguments for eventual deregulation of the price of natural gas at the wellhead, Sawhill said such control "causes uncertainty and reduces investment in domestic exploration and development."

Sawhill said that in the late 1940s, 30 wildcat wells were needed to find a major field of oil.

"By 1972, 45 and 56 failed to produce a major field. Nine in 10 new field wildcat wells were unsuccessful," he said.

"Low prices in an increasingly high-cost, high-risk industry thus mean that reserves that would be found and produced at higher prices are 'simply left unfound and unproduced,'" he said, quoting Professor Edmund Kitch of the University of Chicago.

Sawhill listed his own suggestions to increase competition. In addition to deregulating the price of natural gas, these were: excluding the major oil companies from joint leasing ventures; equalizing the price of crude oil paid by refiners, and halting the penetration of major oil companies into the retail gasoline market.

Jack Moskowitz, an assistant to the chairman of Common Cause, the citizen's lobby, said that without a federal oil and gas corporation the extent of government control would be to regulate "prices set by a handful of powerful corporations who exercise dominant control at every stage of production and marketing processes."

"The present structure of the petroleum and allied products industry militates against an effective competitive market for oil, gas and other fuels," he said.

Elsewhere, C. O. Peyton, president of Exxon International Co., denied allegations that the firm acted improperly in reducing both direct and indirect deliveries of petroleum products made from Saudi Arabian crude to America's armed forces.

Peyton told the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations that not to comply with the Saudi Arabian demand in October, 1973, for the cutoff would have risked additional cutbacks and embargoes.

TAKING GAS FROM PUMPMAS- TER OZELBURGER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week we will take up measures affecting long-term energy needs. We have certainly had far more rhetoric than progress in energy-related matters.

One of the most entertaining and pertinent columns on policy restrictions on the energy shortage was in the April 7 Chicago Tribune by Michael Killian, a journalist who has the well-deserved reputation for his astute observations.

The article follows:

TAKING GAS FROM PUMPMAS-
TER OZELBURGER

(By Michael Killian)

It is the dark of night. You are rattling along the highway in your "luxury car designed for today's needs" at 55 miles an hour getting 18.5 miles to the gallon. Your tank is nearly empty. There's not a town for miles. Suddenly, you see it. The building with the big garage doors. The gas pumps. The big revolving sign that says: "FOGCO!"

Today, Exxon. Tomorrow, Fogco. The idea comes from Sen. Adlai Stevenson, who is up for reelection this year and who has proposed that the federal government deal with the energy shortage and those outrageous oil company profits in one fell swoop by getting into the oil business itself—well to pump.

This wonderful new outfit would be called the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. George Burditt, who, as nobody seems to know, is Stevenson's Republican opponent, gleefully seized upon the phrase and formed the acronym "Fogco." He didn't stop there.

"How the hell can you expect the federal government to run something like the oil industry," he said, "when it can't even deliver a letter from point A to point B?"

I don't mean to get involved in a senatorial campaign [not that it would make any difference. Illinois politics being what they are, Fogco is probably all that posterity will ever remember Burditt for.] But, as anyone who has ever dealt with a federal agency will attest, Burditt's point really zings in there.

The federally run gas station might have a sign saying FOGCO, but it would not be a big, revolving one. It would be an olive-drab sign with white stenciled lettering, hidden away somewhere behind the tire rack. After FOGCO, it would say something like: "Region C, Area 93, Substation 43027."

After pulling up to the pump, and waiting for some 30 to 45 minutes, you would be greeted by the federally run gas station attendant. Unlike the private industry attendants, who wear greasy overalls and nametags saying Ralph or Mongo, the federal gas station attendant would carry greasy overalls and a name tag saying something like "C. K. Ozelburger, Pumpmaster 3d Class."

Pumpmaster Ozelburger would then inform you that you had pulled up to Pump No. 2, which was not authorized to dispense gas to cars in your category. He would direct you to Pump No. 4, where another pumpmaster would inform you that you actually wanted Pump No. 1. You would then pro-

ceed to Pump No. 1, which you would discover was out of order.

You would then return to Pump No. 2, and slip Ozelburger a fiver. He would then have you fill out a requisition form and take down your Social Security number [all federal employees are trained to do this from birth]. Then he would proceed to fill your tank with gas. If you wanted an oil change or something, you'd have to make an appointment with the substation supervisor, or, better yet, with FOGCO's regional director.

Stevenson's point is that, while the oil companies are making those huge profits, the price of gasoline is skyrocketing. Some people are paying 65 to 79 cents a gallon. The federal government makes no profit, he says, and thus could do everything at cost.

Fine. Have you ever considered what it costs the federal government to do anything? Recall the OEO. Ponder the Post Office.

After filling up your tank, Ozelburger walks up to your window and says: "That'll be \$62.95."

Being a federal employee, he doesn't even say "please."

MAX E. RAGLAND RETIRES FROM THE LA PUENTE CITY COUNCIL

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, La Puente, Calif., a city in my congressional district, has benefited for the past 16 years from the able leadership of Max E. Ragland on its city council. Mr. Ragland was first elected to the city council in 1958, when the city of La Puente was only 2 years old. He has seen the city's population grow from 16,000 to 33,000, and has helped oversee the construction of many projects which have made La Puente into the pleasant community it is today.

Among the projects which have been completed during Mr. Ragland's tenure as city councilman are storm drains for protection against flooding, street lighting for public safety, a public library, a health center, a community recreation center and a very attractive city hall. Probably the most important development, however, was that of the South Hills Square Shopping Center and the Sunkist Shopping Center. For all these accomplishments, Mr. Ragland can claim a great deal of credit.

During his years on the city council, Mr. Ragland served as mayor for one term and as vice mayor for three terms. He was also active on various county and city committees, and has an impressive list of civic activities to his credit, such as the VFW, the American Legion, the Boy Scouts, the La Puente Coordinating Council, the PTA—he received the California Congress PTA Life Membership Award—the Hudson Area Welfare Fund, and several others.

Fortunately for La Puente, Mr. Ragland does not intend to retire completely from public life. His interest in his people and his city is too strong for that. He plans to channel his energy and talent into civic organizations that perform important services in the La Puente area.

I am very grateful to Max Ragland for his dedicated work. I am certain that my

congressional district will be reaping the benefits for years to come.

WHERE THE VETERAN IS KING

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, Assemblyman Lou Cusanovich of California, recently brought a newspaper article to my attention that I believe merits the full attention of my colleagues.

The article, written by Carolyn Goddard, assistant editor of the Las Virgenes Independent, Agoura Valley News, outlines the positive thoughts some veterans have regarding the treatment they have received at the hands of the Sepulveda, Calif., Veterans' Administration hospital.

I am grateful to Assemblyman Cusanovich for bringing this to my attention; I am grateful to Ms. Goddard for giving this the attention it deserves in the press; and I am especially grateful to the veterans who had the fortitude and wisdom to give light to the other side of the issue of treatment at VA hospitals.

I would like to present this very enlightening article for my colleagues' consideration:

WHERE THE VETERAN IS KING

It is not unusual for the minority dissident voice to receive much attention from the various news media. Today's attention getters center around the pickets, the strikes, any expose that lets the skeleton out of the bureaucratic closet. Why not, it's the screaming headlines that sell space and time. That's what the public demands.

Freedom of the press is a privilege, at times abused, sometimes misused, but the fact remains, nowhere else in the world is freedom of speech more enjoyed than in the United States of America.

It is a fact, ask any reporter in any of the media, the highest percentage of "hot tips" come from people who declare to know a big secret about someone else.

Also, a fact, good happenings, positive reactions to any situations are seldom, if ever, called to the attention of those that cover the news. The public has the right to know the true facts of any incident. Any reporter, worth his salt, diligently tries to uncover and report pertinent information covering both sides of the issue.

A fact, anger creates courage to speak out. Satisfaction creates complacency, an attitude of "all's right with my world," it's really not very interesting to anyone else. Perhaps human nature is afraid of strong negative forces breaking their bubble of utopia.

Absolutely factual, in no way, can man, or man's world be perfect. To hide the seamy side of life is equally as ridiculous as failing to recognize the sunny side of the street. No matter how you look at it, where there is smoke, there is fire.

As a matter of fact, realizing anyone who has had the experience of "cutting through governmental red tape and paper work" knows complete frustration, we are especially pleased when the veterans, patients at the Sepulveda Veterans Hospital speak out and ask for equal time to speak out and say, as a matter of fact, here in the Sepulveda Veteran's Hospital, the veteran is a king. As a matter of fact, this opinion deserves headline coverage!

Broke, have a medical problem, hesitant applying to the Veterans Administration for

help? Recent publicity scare you off? Hey, kid you not, governmental red tape and paper work is enough to discourage the most determined individual. Don't take it from me, but, would you believe others, others, like yourself, veterans of the United States of America, your buddies?

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, are patients of the Veterans Administration Hospital, Sepulveda, California. We want you to know, speaking for ourselves, here, in building 2-1-A, we are Very Important Persons.

This is what it is like, being a patient in this V.A. Hospital. Once determined, once eligible, once assigned a bed, you enter another world, a world where the veteran is king pin. The entire personnel is geared toward one common cause, whatever is best for you.

Professional medical care, nothing but the best, not one Doctor, no ego trip involved, but professional consultation, a common cause, the common cause, whatever is best for you.

Never, are you treated as a charity patient, instead, each, and every individual is accepted on his own identity. Patient or help, no one cares, race, creed, or color has no bearing on you, as a person.

You get the feeling, someone really cares, someone really cares for you.

Rules, you, as a man better be able to accept, and want to get well. Otherwise, take a hike, others in need are waiting for your bed.

Talk about spit and polish, our ward would pass white glove inspection. Clean sheets every day, if the situation warrants twice a day.

The grub, chow is a daily ritual, one to look forward to, choice of menus, many of us have never had it so good. Sure our "flop house" degenerates complain, but try and take this caring away from them.

T.L.C. is administered lavishly, (tender loving care), just one part of this great professional team.

And, Buddy, if you ever thought a G.I. was thorough, wait until you get in here. From inside out, not one, but the whole team, makes sure that when you leave all systems are A Okay.

Damn, we all have the right to bitch, both ways. From the Veterans, here at the hospital in Sepulveda, we can only say thank you. This is what today and tomorrow is all about!

Sincerely,

M. Kelly Spellmeyer, WWII, Korea, U.S. Navy;

W. J. Wright, WWII, U.S. Navy;

W. B. Stanton, WWII, U.S. Marine Corps;

W. J. Maloney, WWII, U.S. Navy;

H. Stewart, WWII, U.S. Army;

L. G. Sheets, WWII, U.S. Army;

D. J. Gaudreault, V.N., U.S. Army;

J.D. Hollar, WWI, U.S. Army;

Paul Klein, WWII, U.S. Air Corps;

Frank J. Fourer, WWII, U.S. Army;

Patrick Mahoney, WWII, Coast Guard;

Edwin E. Morris, WWII, U.S. Army;

Dean A. Goddard, WWII Korea, U.S. Navy;

P. L. Stelephr, WWII, U.S.A.F.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, ARIZONA

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as I have done for many years, this spring I sent

a public opinion questionnaire to the constituents of the Second Congressional District of Arizona. More than 50,000 Arizonians responded, a new record for any poll sent out by my office.

I have prepared a report to my constituents on the results and since the subjects covered in the poll are of current interest, I take this opportunity to share the results with my colleagues:

TO THE RESIDENTS OF THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

In March, many of you responded to my questionnaire on the energy crisis, impeachment and the economy. In all, my office received over 50,000 replies. From these, we drew a scientifically selected sample, representing a cross-section of the district by age, sex, political party preference, county of residence and years lived in Arizona.

The following report sums up your responses:

ENERGY-ENVIRONMENT

An overwhelming portion of the district's citizens (78 per cent) consider environmental damage to be as bad in the long run as the energy crisis. They want any increased energy and fuel production tied to environmental safeguards, and oppose relaxing present safeguards in order to solve the energy crisis. Nearly three-fourths also suspect the oil companies of somehow engineering the energy crisis and bidding for higher prices, while 83 per cent declared oil profits are already too high.

IMPEACHMENT

Fully three-fourths of the citizens have either concluded that impeachment by the House and trial by the Senate are justified, or at least want a full House inquiry. There is also strong (68 per cent) sentiment favoring an April 30 windup of the House inquiry. Citizens split about evenly on whether or not the President should resign now, but surprisingly, one in four Republicans favor resignation.

THE ECONOMY

Asked whether the Administration's wage and price controls should be discontinued, retained or strengthened, 41 per cent said controls haven't worked and should be scrapped, a view apparently shared by the President and his Administration, based on their recent actions.

Some additional details of the survey's findings follow:

While most citizens (74 per cent) blamed the oil companies for the energy crisis, 55 per cent also said the crunch was inevitable because of our nation's rates of growth and energy consumption; 45 per cent blamed the environmentalists; 34 per cent accused government, and only 16 per cent blamed the Arabs and their refusal to sell oil to this country.

If rationing gasoline at the rate of 45 gallons per month per licensed driver over 18 years old were necessary, 56 per cent of the citizens said they would support such a plan and 44 per cent would oppose it. Those under 18 years of age differed from the older citizens, dividing evenly on this proposal. This reinforces responses I have received from younger drivers during my visits to high schools and in other meetings with young people in the district. They obviously are reluctant to give up their driving privileges entirely, when older persons would be restricted but not prevented from driving.

Continued private ownership of the oil industry, but with limited government power "to prevent collusion and monopoly and to allocate petroleum products" where needed, was favored by 76 per cent of the citizens. Only 8 per cent favored complete government takeover, and only 16 per cent supported complete freedom from government control.

Environmental damage is just as bad as

the energy crisis, in the view of an overwhelming (78 per cent) majority of the citizens. They support measures to make sure "that we don't ruin the environment" in expanding our fuel production. Only 22 per cent said we should "delay or relax" environmental controls in order to meet energy needs.

On the impeachment question, 40 per cent said impeachment by the House and trial by the Senate are justified, and another 35 per cent said they are uncertain whether the President should be impeached, but feel "sufficient questions have been raised to justify a full inquiry by the House." The remaining 25 per cent said the President has been "unfairly maligned," and we "should get off his back."

Party alignments are revealing. Favoring impeachment were 57 per cent of the Democrats sampled, only 18 per cent of the Republicans and 36 per cent of the independents. Favoring full inquiry were 33 per cent of the Democrats, 36 per cent of the Republicans and 39 per cent of the independents. Saying, "Get off his back," were 10 per cent of the Democrats, 46 per cent of the Republicans and 25 per cent of the independents.

If the House votes impeachment, 68 per cent of the citizens said the President should then be removed from office by the Senate, and 32 per cent disagreed. While 84 per cent of the Democrats and 67 per cent of the independents would favor removal, 56 per cent of the Republicans said the President should remain in office.

Asked whether President Nixon or Vice President Ford could best lead the country for the next three years, citizens were almost evenly split, 51 per cent for the Vice President and 49 per cent for the President. Age is important here, with 55 per cent of those under 18 favoring Mr. Ford and 58 per cent of those 65 or older favoring President Nixon.

Asked whether the President should resign immediately, the citizens are also split almost evenly. Younger citizens are again more likely to favor resignation and the older ones to favor his staying in office. While 69 per cent of the Democrats favor resignation, 26 per cent of the Republicans—more than one in four—say the President should quit.

Several comments come to mind as I examine these findings.

The nature and degree of the President's weakness, and the attitudes on impeachment and resignation, are particularly significant.

Has any former President fallen a hairs-breadth short of the Vice President in the public's confidence? It should be pointed out that Democrats and Republicans divide in exactly opposite proportions on this question, however, with 78 percent of Democrats favoring the Vice President while the same percentage of Republicans favor Mr. Nixon over Mr. Ford. Independents are aligned precisely with the average of the sample, almost evenly divided but leaning slightly toward the Vice President.

It is also significant that one in four supporters of Mr. Nixon's party believe he should resign, and that less than half of the Republicans, 46 per cent, say we should leave him alone.

We have strong sentiment for pursuing the inquiries, at least, if not going the full route to impeachment. Clearly, a major share of the citizens believe the questions raised are serious, deserve answers, and should be pursued by the House. But at the same time a majority also wants the inquiries ended promptly, and endorses the April 30 deadline that some have proposed. It is now clear the deadline won't be met, but I agree that a prompt resolution is important and will work for that goal.

It is also important that people who consider themselves independent lean heavily in the direction of impeachment or full inquiry. Independents, incidentally, account for

one in every four voters in our sample. In effect, we found that the Democrats and Republicans tended to cancel each other out. It is the independents, then, who tip the balance.

On the energy issues, I am heartened that a large majority believes that we must preserve our environment and not back away from our commitments to protect it, while we attempt to expand our fuel and energy output in coming years.

This means Congress and Federal policymakers have a very thin line to walk. The public, in effect, wants to have its environment and to burn it, too. It remains to be seen whether such a pair of potentially contradictory wants can both be satisfied. If it is possible, it does seem that to fill such an order will be costly. Once the costs are more clearly visible, it will be interesting to see whether the public still sets the same demands. I expect public attitudes will prove to be subject to change as we learn more about the costs.

It is revealing that citizens also tend to want government to take a slim, middle road on the question of regulating the oil companies. Strongly as so many citizens feel that the oil industry is somehow responsible for the energy crisis in the first place, a very small number of citizens want complete government takeover.

This, in effect, adds a third condition to the equation. Besides wanting both continued high levels of energy available and high-quality environment, the public wants us to preserve the basic character of a free-enterprise economy.

Some leading thinkers on the subjects of the world's environment and its various shortages and scarcities have been telling us that the only answer will ultimately be less freedom of choice for all of us. It is clear from this survey that the citizens of the Second Congressional District of Arizona are not yet ready to accept that conclusion.

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL.

LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE, MARCH 1, 1974 To the residents of the 2nd Congressional District:

As I have done for many years, I am once again mailing a questionnaire on current issues to all of the residents of the 2nd Congressional District of Arizona. I am doing so in order to find out the views of the people I represent in Congress.

Below and on the back of this sheet are listed 16 questions. I hope you will read them carefully and indicate our choices. Please note that I have provided three columns so that three members of your household may participate in this survey.

You need not list your name or address, although you may do so if you like. However, it would be most helpful if you would fill out the personal data section on the back of this sheet.

Undoubtedly, you will want to qualify some of the simple "yes" or "no" type questions, but keep in mind that is precisely the problem facing Members of Congress as particular bills come to a vote. If you aren't sure of your opinion, simply leave the space blank. It will be counted as "no opinion."

When you're through, please feel free to write me separately on any issue. I want to have your best thinking on these problems. Thank you very much.

MORRIS K. UDALL,
Member of Congress.

A. THE ENERGY CRISIS

Below are five statements (questions 1-5) about the causes of the energy crisis. Please mark which statements you feel are substantially false.

1. The crisis is largely phony. It was caused by the oil companies trying to take

advantage and make higher profits. True, 74 percent; false, 26 percent.

2. Our government caused the crisis by interfering with the free enterprise system and denying the oil companies incentives to produce more oil. True, 34 percent; false, 66 percent.

3. The environmentalists are largely responsible for causing it by slowing down the extraction of oil, coal and other energy sources, delaying the Alaska pipeline and insisting on anti-pollution devices which reduce gasoline mileage. True, 45 percent; false, 55 percent.

4. The crisis occurred because our country has grown so fast and we use more energy than anyone else in the world. It had to happen sooner or later. True, 55 percent; false, 45 percent.

5. The refusal of the Arabs to continue selling oil is a main cause of the energy crisis. True, 16 percent; false, 84 percent.

Additional energy questions:

6. Do you believe the big oil companies are making too much profit on the gasoline and oil they sell?

(a) Yes, they making too much profit. 83 percent.

(b) No, their profits are not out of line. 17 percent.

7. Which of the following things have happened to you as a result of the gasoline shortage?

(a) I had to wait in line at a gas station for more than 15 minutes. 80 percent.

(b) I ran out of gas and had to leave my car because I couldn't find a gas station open. 1 percent.

(c) I had to cancel a trip I had planned because there was no gasoline available. 18 percent.

(d) I have missed work because there wasn't gasoline available. 1 percent.

8. If you knew that there would be gasoline rationing which would guarantee each licensed driver over 18 years of age in your family an average of 45 gallons per month, would you favor or oppose such a system?

(a) Favor rationing plan. 56 percent.

(b) Oppose rationing plan. 44 percent.

9. A number of suggestions have been made as to how we can best deal with the energy situation. Which of these three alternatives is the closest to the way you feel?

(a) The federal government should take over the entire oil industry. 8 percent.

(b) The government should keep hands off. It should allow the free market price system to work so that oil companies have an incentive to find new sources of supply. 16 percent.

(c) Ownership of the industry should remain basically private. But the government should be given limited power to intervene to prevent collusion and monopoly and to allocate petroleum products to areas where they are needed the most. 76 percent.

10. Which of these two statements is the closest to the way you feel?

(a) The energy crisis is so severe that we must delay or relax, if necessary, imposition of environmental controls in order to ensure that we have as much energy as we need. 22 percent.

(b) In the long run, damage to our environment is just as bad as the energy crisis is now. We should make sure that when we expand our domestic production of oil, gas and coal that we don't ruin the environment. 78 percent.

B. IMPEACHMENT

In the last few months, many people have criticized President Nixon's handling of the Watergate situation and say he should be removed from office. Others say he has been unfairly maligned and should be allowed to complete his term. Still others are not sure whether he should remain or be removed, but feel enough questions have been

raised to require a thorough inquiry by Congress.

Under our Constitution, the House of Representatives has the duty to determine whether charges should be brought against the President. This is called "impeachment." If Congress votes to "impeach" (that is, bring charges against) the President, the Senate then must decide whether he should be removed from office. Removal would require a 2/3 vote.

11. Which of these statements is the closest to the way you feel?

(a) I believe the House should impeach the President and send the case to the Senate for a final decision. 40 percent.

(b) I am not certain whether the President should be impeached, but I feel sufficient questions have been raised to justify a full inquiry by the House. 35 percent.

(c) I feel the President has been unfairly maligned. We should get off his back and let him do the job he was elected to do. 25 percent.

12. Regardless of your vote on the question above, if the President is impeached, do you feel the Senate should remove him from office?

(a) Yes, he should be removed from office. 68 percent.

(b) No, he should remain in office. 32 percent.

13. Some people are saying the debate over impeachment is taking too long and that the House should make a decision by some target date, April 30 perhaps, so that both Congress and the President can begin giving full-time attention to the nation's problems. Others say the question of impeachment is so important that the House should take as much of 1974 as it feels is reasonably necessary to make a decision. How do you feel?

(a) The House should conclude its inquiry by April 30. 65 percent.

(b) The House should take as long as is necessary to make the right decision. 34 percent.

14. Regardless of how you personally feel about the President and based on what you've read and heard, do you think President Nixon or Vice President Ford could best lead our country for the next three years?

(a) President Nixon. 49 percent.

(b) Vice President Ford. 51 percent.

15. Do you believe that President Nixon should resign at this time?

(a) Yes, President Nixon should resign. 50 percent.

(b) No, President Nixon should not resign. 50 percent.

C. THE ECONOMY

16. Over the past 2½ years, we've had a series of wage and price controls known as Phases I-IV. Some say such controls are necessary to prevent skyrocketing inflation. Others say such controls have clearly failed and have, in fact, aggravated shortages. Which of the following statements is closest to the way you feel?

(a) The wage-price control system hasn't worked and should be discontinued. As a basic rule, we are better off to let the free market system determine wages and prices. 41 percent.

(b) The system of wage and price controls has had its problems, but, on balance, it has helped check inflation and it should be retained. 19 percent.

(c) We no longer have much of a free market system left. Therefore, the controls should be extended and strengthened to protect ordinary people's income. 40 percent.

This completes the questionnaire except for some personal data I hope you'll provide.

D. PERSONAL DATA

Your Sex: _____ Percent
Male _____ 52
Female _____ 48

Your Age: _____
Under 18 _____ 1
18-25 _____ 13
26-35 _____ 17
36-49 _____ 21
50-64 _____ 29
65+ _____ 19

Your Political Preference: _____
Democratic _____ 45
Republican _____ 29
Independent _____ 26

Your County of Residence: _____
Pima _____ 80
Cochise _____ 16
Pinal _____ 1
Santa Cruz _____ 33

Your Years in Arizona: _____
Less than 1 _____ 7
1-3 _____ 14
3-5 _____ 11
5+ _____ 68

NATIONAL CANCER PROGRAM

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have corresponded with Dr. Frank J. Rauscher, Jr., director of the national cancer program at the National Cancer Institute, regarding scientifically approved but unfunded cancer research grant applications received by NCI during the fiscal years 1973 and 1974. In the April 9, 1974 Record, I inserted for the review of our colleagues a complete listing of approved but unfunded projects for fiscal year 1973, which according to Dr. Rauscher, totaled some \$22,244,959—plus an additional \$29,010,800 in unfunded construction grant applications.

This week I received from Dr. Rauscher a listing of approved but unfunded projects through April 17 of this fiscal year. Dr. Rauscher stated that the total cost to award each of these grant applications would be approximately \$63.6 million. I have been advised by the Government Printing Office that to insert this listing of unfunded fiscal year 1974 projects would consume 14 pages of the Record at a cost of some \$2,926. The excessive cost involved precludes publication but I wish to make this listing available to any of our colleagues who might be interested in copying or reviewing it. Also, I will have it with me during debate on the cancer bill.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in obtaining this information and making it available for public review is to show that there are many excellent cancer research projects which cannot be funded at the levels presently being proposed. For instance, the May issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an item about Dr. Linus Pauling, a former Nobel laureate, a professor at Stanford University and director of the Institute of Orthomolecular Medicine at Menlo, Calif. The article says of Dr. Pauling:

Our country should look upon Dr. Pauling as a valuable national resource, his genius

having unlocked the secret of the relationship between molecular abnormality and hereditary disease when he discovered that sickle-cell anemia arises from a minute abnormality in the molecular structure of hemoglobin. Dr. Pauling's contributions to medicine are so great that all listen when he proposes theories for cancer and health research.

With a career batting average as good as Dr. Pauling's one would imagine that research grants would be thrust upon him. Not so!

We were dismayed to learn that Dr. Pauling was recently turned down on his application for a grant from the National Cancer Institute . . . They (NCI) proposed \$37,000 for two years, but gave the grant such a low priority that it was never funded.

Dr. Pauling is quoted as saying:

The important discoveries are usually the ones that wouldn't be funded by a granting agency.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we will next week be taking up H.R. 13053, the national cancer amendments of 1974, to authorize funding for our Nation's cancer research program for the next 3 years. H.R. 13053 calls for funding at the following levels: \$750 million for fiscal year 1975; \$830 million for fiscal year 1976; and \$985 million for fiscal year 1977.

According to figures compiled by the American Cancer Society, the \$750 million funding level proposed for next year would be more than \$230 million short of the actual appropriations needed. At this point I would like to insert the ACS figures for the information and review of our colleagues:

Incomplete list of NCI needs which would be unmet even if a \$750 mil. budget were allowed in fiscal 1975*

Assumption #1: \$750 mil. NCI budget.
Assumption #2: No new strategic manpower or institutions.

Shortage left after spending \$750 million:

	Million
Research grants	\$151
Grants and contracts to 16 newly designated comprehensive cancer centers needed to provide geographic coverage of U.S. in addition to 12 existing centers	32
Grants to use fully the lesser centers	10
Training and fellowship grants	27
NCI staff addition of 200 persons (would leave per-person workload double the load in 1970)	3
Cancer prevention research	9
Bladder, colon, other organ site task forces	16
Construction	12
Total shortage	260
Minus estimated item overlap	22
Net shortage surveyed	238
\$750 mil. budget assumption	750

Fiscal '75 appropriation needed 988

* Does not cover all NCI areas.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we have recently been presented with a budget request of some \$304 billion. And, of this enormous sum, NCI would receive a microscopic 0.2 percent for the purpose of finding a killer that strikes down more than 900 people in this country every day.

PRESERVING OUR OCEANS

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about preserving the fish stocks and ecological balance of the world's oceans. One group that has taken the lead in the fight to safeguard our oceans is the Oceanus Institute of Manset, Maine.

Because I think my colleagues may be interested in the operations of this organization, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the Bar Harbor Times of March 28, 1974:

[From the Bar Harbor (Maine) Times, Mar. 28, 1974]

ALL PEOPLES OF THE WORLD NOW CLAIMED AS CITIZENS BY OCEANUS

The government of Oceanus, Oceanus being sea areas 3 miles or 5.6 kilometers or more from all coasts in the world, has been continuing its development for the benefit of all.

By the February 5, 1974 act of Oceanus Congress all individuals are now Oceanus Citizens, unless they individually send written renouncement of such and the civil rights Oceanus Citizenship gives them. Thus there are now billions of Oceanus Citizens.

To improve awareness of Oceanus and allow individuals to show their concern for preservation of fish stocks and other ecological balance in the world seas, the Oceanus Institute of Manset-Seawall, Maine is now sending those who send \$1 each an Oceanus ecology emblem patch. The patch shows a globe backed by a perpendicular anchor surrounded by the wording Oceanus "Fellowship & Seamanship" and can be worn on cap, jacket or anywhere by all, especially mariners and conservationists.

The Oceanus Communications Office, addressed 73 Magazine Place, Petersborough, N.H. is now granting Oceanus Radio Amateur licenses and calls to those around the globe who send \$5 and their valid radio amateur licenses from a land-nation. A good number have responded and local radio amateur 'DXers' should be hearing from them soon if not already.

A requirement for operating with an Oceanus Radio Amateur license is that the licensee operate aboard an Oceanus registered craft in Oceanus. The Communications Office therefore also is registering craft under Oceanus Flag while allowing such craft to retain registration under other flags. To acquire Oceanus Flag registration of a craft one need only send \$5, a basic description of craft, type sail rig and/or engines, date built, commercial and/or pleasure use, estimated total value of craft, owner's name and mail address. The Oceanus Flag registration certificate while having a number of advantages will also be a document nice to put on display for a topic of conversation and attractiveness.

Admiral Welles, elected chief executive of Oceanus, says, "Part of seas preservation involves regulation of its inevitable commercial development that will result in billions of dollars of profits. As the most ancient and honorable legal tradition of the seas is that they are the common heritage of all, equitable shares of the profits should be shared with the all represented by Oceanus. Therefore Oceanus will evolve as the arbiter of commercial use of the seas for preservation and other profit to benefit all. Already one business firm has begun paying Oceanus Commercial taxes and other foresighted firms will soon begin doing likewise."

The first firm to begin paying Oceanus commercial use taxes pays only \$25 annually but was given seniority number one that may prove valuable when Oceanus begins granting mineral right leases in its domains under provision that no harmful pollution occur. According to Admiral Ted Welles, Howard Hughes is now considering cooperating with Oceanus to better secure his ocean operations and rights to the minerals he is already mining.

Taxes Oceanus collects will be shared with land-nations recognizing and participating in the Oceanus Constitution government. Oceanus Communications Chancellor Wayne Green during his visit as the invited guest of the King of Jordan discussed Oceanus. Chancellor Green feels it is very likely Jordan will soon recognize and participate in Oceanus.

"Singapore is another good candidate for early recognition and participation in Oceanus," Admiral Welles says, "There are others that have shown interest but these two seem the strongest possibilities. Yet, after the scheduled June 1974 U.N. sponsored Law of the Seas Conference I believe, judging from their poor track record the last two times they met and from the poor agenda of this meeting, a lot of other countries will become interested and more likely go with Oceanus."

"When one studies all the other prospects, Oceanus seems the most sensible and it is best for all individuals too, and after all the seas are their common heritage."

"This June all are invited to participate in the election of Oceanus Congress Representatives. Six people are standing for election to the three world-wide Representative seats and all wishing to vote in this election should send a self-addressed stamped envelope and request for their ballot to Oceanus Congress Record Office, Manset Seawall, Maine. Those Representatives elected will participate in law-making; all are expected to respect in Oceanus domains. Therefore if one doesn't participate they have no legitimate right to complain when they don't like conditions at sea," Admiral Welles says.

The services of the Oceanus Institute, Inc. have been hired to give its talk and movie presentation. Maine's East Sullivan High School and Gordon College in Wenham, Mass. have hired these services most recently. The East Sullivan High School will benefit by this presentation 1 p.m. March 27 and Gordon College 10:15 a.m. April 17.

The Institute's presentation describes our dependence on life in all seas, a solution of our seas plight, and that the Oceanus Constitution world seas government of, by and for all may be the most significant bicentennial celebration of the Spirit of 1776, as Oceanus is the evolution of the successful U.S. Constitution concept founded on the Spirit of Life, Liberty and Pursuit of Happiness for All. Then the presentation shows the color movie "Clean Oil Tankers" giving audiovisual evidence of threatening yet avoidable sea pollution and concludes with questions and discussion.

For more data regarding this call, Admiral Welles. First try (207) 244-6615 or 3941 or (617) 396-8578.

NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, over the years, the Congress has honored many associations, societies, and groups in our country. This week many

governing bodies and organizations, here and abroad, are paying homage to thousands upon thousands of faithful public and private employees, we call secretaries. Unfortunately, the Judiciary Committee was unable to bring a House Joint Resolution to the floor in time to allow the House to join in this celebration. Perhaps next year we can be more considerate of this fine group of people to whom we as individuals owe so much.

The theme of the 23d consecutive annual Secretaries Week, April 21-27, is "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business," sponsored by the National Secretaries Association (International), the world's leading secretarial association. The week will be highlighted on Wednesday, April 24, which is designated as Secretaries Day.

Many Governors and mayors throughout the United States will officially proclaim "Secretaries Week," while their counterparts in Canada do the same. Many Chambers of Commerce also observe Secretaries Week, and service clubs such as Rotary, Lions, and Kiwanis frequently invite secretaries to participate in special programs.

The purpose of Secretaries Week is to bring recognition to secretaries for the vital role they play in business, industry, education, government, and the professions. It also serves to remind secretaries of their responsibilities to their employers and to their profession.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR HOME HEALTH SERVICES ACT

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1974, H.R. 14121, the "Home Health Services Act of 1974," was introduced by 25 Members of this body. As has already been pointed out, this comprehensive legislation is an important first step toward making sure that all older Americans who wish to stay in their own homes can do so, while still counting on assistance when they need it.

H.R. 14121 will give the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare more authority to make grants that would establish and cover the initial operating costs of additional public and nonprofit private agencies to provide home health services. It will also expand the home health care services now available and will provide for grants to public and private agencies for training of professional and paraprofessionals to administer home health services.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 14, 1974, the St. Petersburg Times editorialized upon the need for this kind of legislation. That editorial follows:

HELPING THE ELDERLY

One of the torments for some people confined to nursing homes is that they neither want nor need to be there. But they are because they cannot get the care they require if they stay in their own homes.

A bill, cosponsored by U.S. Rep. Bill Young, R-Pinellas, seems to offer a remedy. Called the Home Health Services Act of 1974, it would give HEW more authority to make grants for new and expanded home health care services.

That's the kind of positive idea we hope Congress will approve. Many elderly would welcome the opportunity to remain relatively independent and self-sufficient in their own homes if they could count on the occasional medical support they need.

Not only would the plan provide for services to be delivered to an individual's home, Young said, it would help to underwrite the costs of training professionals and paraprofessionals who would give the care. At a time when there is also a need to expand employment opportunities in service fields, that is a welcome extra.

TURKISH POPPY BAN

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Special Subcommittee on International Narcotics Control, I have been especially concerned about the plans of the Turkish Government to reestablish the opium poppy crop. To further contribute to the debate on this important matter, I would like to bring the following WPIX editorial on the Turkish poppy ban to the attention of my colleagues:

TURKISH POPPY BAN

When the drug problem was at its very peak, estimates were that about 80 per cent of all heroin available in this country started in the opium poppy fields of Turkey. An enormous amount of diplomatic energy went into getting an agreement from the Turkish government to ban illicit poppy production.

The United States paid more than 35 million dollars to compensate Turkish farmers for their loss of income, and, starting in 1972, the flood of heroin from those fields slowed to a trickle.

Many factors caused the drug crisis to ease in our country, not the least of which was a dawning awareness on the part of young people that the use of heroin was a one-way ticket to hell, but it would be a mistake to think that the trend away from drugs is irreversible. A new crop of potential addicts comes of age every year, and given a cheap supply on the streets, we could easily slip back into the old cycle of experimentation, causing more addicts, who then push a little to support their habits.

Thus it is sad news to hear that the new Turkish government has decided to reestablish the opium poppy crop.

When the ban was being debated three or four years ago, the President was given the authority to cut off all funds, military and foreign aid, to nations which did not cooperate in helping solve the drug problem in the United States. It would be good to remind the Turkish government that the authority still exists.

The Management of WPIX believes that our government must take whatever steps are necessary to dissuade the Turks from this action. It would be a tragedy for the easy supply of heroin to push this nation back into the mire and morass of drug addiction from which we are only now emerging.

We believe that the Administration should make it very clear to the Turkish government that if they choose to go this route,

they may count on the United States for exactly nothing in the future.

We believe that every ounce of economic muscle should be used to prevent what could be a flood of cheap heroin on the streets of our cities.

What's your opinion? We'd like to know.

WHY JOHNNY AND JANE STILL CANNOT READ

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, remedial reading programs are proliferating in our high schools and even in our community colleges and regular universities, albeit sometimes under disguised names. A high school diploma no longer means you are able to read well. One of the causes of this problem, many experts agree, is the use of sight reading—or the infamous Dick and Jane series—which in addition to being frightfully dull, just did not do the job. A complete return to phonics would be helpful, according to the critics of the look-say system, and, therefore, I commend the attention of my colleagues to the story that follows of the efforts of Bettina Rubicam in this regard, who heads up the Reading Reform Foundation. This story, as it appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 22, 1974, follows:

A CRUSADER FOR READING REFORM

(By John H. Vesey)

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ.

Oh, Oh, Oh.

Look, Look, Look.

See Mrs. Rubicam run.

Run, Run, Run.

Chasing Dick and Jane out of Arizona.

At least that's what Mrs. Bettina Hall Rubicam, Arizona's leading phonics evangelist, wants to do—get educators away from the emphasis on the sing-songy Dick and Jane beginning readers. This is the "look-say" sight-reading approach.

Under the name of Bettina Hall, Mrs. Rubicam spent her early career years with the American Opera Company and later was a Broadway star in Gilbert and Sullivan operettas.

That was in the 1920's. She remembers those years in the limelight fondly. "It was a good life," she said simply. She refers to them as her "way back, distant days," with her most enjoyable memory that of the lead in "Carmen." She did it 150 times at the age of 21.

Those were her yesterdays. Now, this dynamic woman who wonders aloud, "How does anyone ever get time to be bored?" is devoting her life to phonics or word decoding.

A READING ALTERNATIVE

That does not mean there is not time for her husband Raymond Rubicam, who retired in 1944 as head of Young and Rubicam International, Inc., a world-famous advertising agency, or their two children Steve and Joan.

To Mrs. Rubicam, any teacher who is not willing at least to consider phonics as a reading alternative "is a brainwashed teacher." She views the "look-say" methods as "look-guess" in practice.

That is why she is using her crystal-clear mezzo-soprano voice to boost phonics and further its use in the public schools.

Born in Providence, R.I., Mrs. Rubicam

still has that refreshing Eastern accent, although she has lived in Arizona since soon after she married in 1940.

She began fighting for phonics in Arizona after reading Rudolph Flesch's book, "Why Johnny Can't Read." In 1960 she helped to organize and became the first president of Arizona Citizens for Strengthening Public School Education.

EFFORTS SWITCHED

Then in 1961 she switched her efforts to the Arizona Reading Reform Foundation, and on July 11, 1972, she was elected president of the national Reading Reform Foundation. She became its national chairman last January, succeeding Watson Washburn, the founder.

In addition to her national chores, Mrs. Rubicam still runs the Arizona foundation out of a storefront office in Scottsdale that she opened last October and furnished entirely with items purchased with trading stamps.

"It's an uphill battle to get basic phonics in the public schools again," she said. "But the situation is improving." As an example, she said, teachers don't have to rely on "boot-leg phonics" anymore but can teach it openly without fear of reprisal.

"Young teachers of today are so fed up with the courses they get that they are hunting openly for ways of improving reading. They are the ones who come to us for help," she said.

DISAGREEMENT RUMBLES

Mrs. Rubicam might not have enough physical clout to punch her way out of the proverbial paper bag. But she has been giving educators out Arizona way a thrashing for not putting their educational weight behind phonics.

Although universities argue they are returning to phonics, Mrs. Rubicam rumbles her disagreement.

"The situation is beginning to change because publishers have had to. But universities still teach teachers to put an emphasis on sight-reading first. They still teach controlled vocabulary and memorization.

"It's this process we've got to eliminate if these children are ever going to spell and read properly," she added.

Ask her about phonics and the effervescent Mrs. Rubicam will speak volumes. For instance: Why is "Dick and Jane" bad?

"Because it has failed too many children. This is obvious when you see how many children need remedial reading," she responded.

LETTERS, SOUNDS COME FIRST

And it has failed mainly because "the process of sight-reading isn't the initial process of reading. That process is knowing that letters have sounds and sounds make words."

Besides, the Dick and Jane approach requires total memorization, she contended. "The brain can't memorize all the words in the English language," so when students come to long words they don't know, "they freeze up," she said.

"They are even taught" to skip over words if they are too difficult and concentrate on the meaning of the sentence.

"Obviously, if we have to tutor kids in this little back room of ours, something's wrong with the look-say method," she concluded.

Although phonics stretches back to Cicero's time, the look-say approach—personified by Dick and Jane—dates only to the 1840's, when Horace Mann tried to convince the Boston schoolmasters that if it could work in the Hartford, Conn., school for deaf and dumb children, it could be applied to normal students.

OLD ARGUMENT APPLIED

"Even back then they told him students shouldn't do sight-reading, because they

substituted words, got frustrated, and couldn't spell anything," Mrs. Rubicam said. "That's exactly what we're saying today," she added. "I hold nothing against sight reading. But I hold a great deal against it as an initial process."

Phonics and sight-reading can work together later "when a child understands his language and the linguistic construction of it. But children can get into bad habits if they start memorizing too early."

"It's far better to start reading off with phonics only and not bring in irregular memorized words until later."

Phonics is on the outside looking in educationally "because of the college of education," Mrs. Rubicam said, her voice bouncing off the walls in the Reading Reform Foundation office.

There is no deep-seated psychological reason universities prefer look-say to phonics; it is greed, pure and simple, Mrs. Rubicam indicated.

COLLEGE PROFITS CHARGED

"Phonics isn't being taught to prospective teachers because it's the college of education that are making millions of dollars from the present system."

She claimed one leading proponent of the look-say approach has made \$2.7 million on publication royalties, and one of its originators has probably made 10 times that amount.

That is why it is "so difficult to make the changeover to phonics," she explained. "The colleges of education are dominating the thinking of the teaching of teachers."

Many local educators don't help "because they have their foot in the camp of the university and want to be considered a good boy," she said.

Those who "step out of line" and support phonics are told "if you persist in your attitude toward phonics, you may not get your doctorate," Mrs. Rubicam claimed. "That's what we're up against. This is a cabal."

MANY EDUCATORS DISAGREE

Educators do not always agree with Mrs. Rubicam. She is used to that.

An official with the Arizona Education Association, which represents nearly 18,000 teachers, accused Mrs. Rubicam of "giving a one-sided approach to phonics" and using her "money and time hassling principals, superintendents, and the State Board of Education to push her brand of phonics."

Commented the official, who preferred not be identified: "She sees phonics as a cure-all to education. It's not a panacea at all. It works well on some kids, but for others, it's not suited at all."

Mrs. Rubicam countered with the argument that schools make reading an almost insurmountable task by "making it out to be such a monster."

But, she added, "If they had started simply, it wouldn't be difficult at all. We have just gotten into too much child psychology. We're trying too hard to find other excuses why the children aren't learning, instead of going ahead and teaching them."

READING AT AGE TWO

Reading, she challenged, should be fun.

This corresponds with what she describes as the best definition of reading she has ever heard. It came from a four-year-old girl who had been reading since she was two because her grandmother was teaching phonics to pupils and the tyke was learning without knowing it.

Asked how she was able to read at such an early age and so well, too, the child replied: "The words just say themselves to me and I couldn't stop them if I wanted to."

Mrs. Rubicam was sold on phonics years ago. But her convictions were reinforced a few months ago by a fourth-grader who had gotten bogged down in reading because the

look-say memorization method had him "shaking in his chair."

A little after-school phonics tutoring in the Reading Reform Foundation's backroom and "he came out one day and asked me: 'Is this all there is to it?'"

TIME FOR A TAX CUT

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the recently released economic figures for the month of May and for the first quarter of 1974 leave us in no doubt that our economy is stumbling into a recession. Worse than that, the economic slump is hitting us at a time of raging inflation, leaving us in the awkward situation some economists call "stagflation."

On the stagnation side, the gross national product sustained a drop of 5.8 percent, annual rate, from the last quarter of 1973 to the first quarter of 1974. This is the most severe drop in GNP in one quarter since the recession of 1958.

On the inflation side, the Consumer Price Index in March showed a 10.2-percent jump over the previous year—the greatest 1-year gain recorded since 1948. In my city of Philadelphia, the CPI showed an ever greater jump—10.9 percent—over the year before.

These figures are depressing enough, but one more statistic really brings home the state of our economy. In March, the average worker with three dependents suffered a drop in real earnings of nearly 1 percent, leaving him with 4.7 percent less in real earnings than he had a year ago.

The administration's current economic policy seems to consist of maintaining restrictive fiscal and monetary policies to combat inflation, while hoping that the economic downturn takes care of itself. This policy offers cold comfort, indeed, to the workingman trying to keep up with his bills, to the family unable to find decent housing it can afford, or to workers facing unemployment.

There are a number of actions that Congress can take to improve the economic situation. In the short term, I believe a tax cut is called for. Specifically, I endorse the concept of raising the personal exemption and providing for an optional tax credit. This proposal would pump several billion dollars into the economy. And the relief would go primarily to the lower- and middle-income brackets—the people who have been hit hardest by the recession-inflation crunch.

For many people, the cost of the necessities of life itself has become a heavy burden. In Philadelphia in the past year the Consumer Price Index has gone up 19.4 percent for food, 19.5 percent for fuel and utilities, and 11.3 percent for housing. A tax cut of the kind I have suggested would give some relief from rising prices and taxes to the people who most need it. It would help the American people through the economic crunch and

it would give our economy the stimulus it needs to rebound from its present weakened state.

I do not believe that a moderate tax cut would appreciably add to our inflation problems. The administration's tight-money, recessionary policies have certainly not stopped inflation. The administration hopes that unemployment will not exceed 6 percent this year. Even if unemployment were allowed to go much higher, it would probably not deflate the economy much.

The problem of inflation can only be addressed in the context of a healthy economy. A tax cut, I believe, would help to restore that health. A number of prominent economists—such as Paul Samuelson, Walter Heller, and Arthur Okun—have endorsed this proposal for getting the economy back on the right track.

I hope that a fairly quick tax cut will be only the first step in taking on the important task of tax reform. The tax cut itself will be a step toward equity by bringing tax relief to those who need it most. Beyond that, we must begin reconsidering all the loopholes and preferences that now riddle our tax structure.

Recent studies of our tax system have confirmed two facts. First, the Federal Government "spends" about \$80 billion a year by allowing that much money to seep through loopholes in the tax code. Second, the great majority of Americans—all but the richest and the poorest—pay about the same fraction of their income in taxes. In other words, when all taxes are considered together, our tax system is not progressive.

These two facts lead me to believe that comprehensive tax reform is both feasible and desirable. An equitable sharing of the tax burden, aside from the question of simple justice, will promote the economic health of the Nation and the fiscal health of the Federal Government.

Comprehensive tax reform will take time to study and enact. But I am hopeful that Congress can in this session enact a partial tax reform measure. A few simple reforms, such as closing the loopholes in the minimum tax, would yield enough revenue to balance a several billion dollar tax cut.

A tax cut now, followed by reform of the tax structure, would be a sound and progressive policy that would do much to restore economic health and to promote equity.

A PERCEPTIVE LOOK AT ARCHITECTURE AND ENERGY CONSERVATION

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had the opportunity to read a fascinating book entitled, "A Bucket of Oil." This book has been prepared by the firm of Caudill, Rowlett & Scott, an outstanding international architectural firm

with headquarters in Houston. "A Bucket of Oil," shows the relationship between architecture and energy conservation. It is interesting and enlightening. In light of the broad energy problems facing our country, I think "A Bucket of Oil" offers a realistic and perceptive view of what can be done. I offer the following introduction from the book as an enticement for all of my colleagues:

THE HUMANISTIC APPROACH TO BUILDING DESIGN FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION

Oil is our new scare word. The symbol of another national, international crisis.

How are we going to keep warm in winter, cool in summer? What will happen to our life style? What will happen to all of us—poor or rich—when the well runs dry?

So many questions. At first too few answers. And then too much crisis and panic-produced thinking.

We think this is one crisis we already have a handle on in architecture. It's both too soon and too late to panic. Who are we? We are members of the CRS (Caudill Rowlett Scott) team, an interdisciplinary group that has been together 27 years trying to design and construct better buildings.

Energy, people and their buildings. That's what this book is all about. Throughout you will find these underlying premises: 1) Buildings today waste energy; 2) through proper design the wasted energy can be saved; 3) energy shapes buildings; 4) buildings shape the way people live, work and play; 5) energy can be saved without sacrificing esthetic and human values.

The energy crisis will obviously force us to cut back. The point is we can use less energy and still have buildings, even better buildings, whose forms and spaces possess architecture.

Buildings consume an incredible amount of energy, about one third of all the energy used in this country. The U.S. National Bureau of Standards people, who are on top of building technology and know what it's all about, say that about forty percent of that energy is wasted. For those of you who like to visualize numbers, that's 65 billion gallon buckets of oil each year wasted.

That's also 65 billion gallon buckets of oil that can be saved if we go about things in the right way.

Frankly, we got suckered into some of the mess we're in today, and not just by the relative amount of oil in the world and our ability to get it. The design profession picked up sloppy methods during the affluent 60's. Our firm, too. If our clients said they wanted all glass walls on the west, our engineers proudly replied: "We can do anything you want done, even make you comfy in a glass box." They were right. All they needed was some cheap fuel. We didn't have this attitude in the fifties. "More is better" crept up on us without our really knowing it. We began to like the superfluous, which we had hated. Buildings in the United States became obese. And did they eat energy!

What can be done? The obvious is to change the "more is better" attitude. We can't go on doing everything people want just because technology makes it possible. Energy is community property. We've learned that the hard way. A bad building which guzzles energy steals from its neighbors. With our attitude back in shape, we can do a better designing job.

That's what this book is about, too. Learning to design buildings to do their job without guzzling energy. Creating a Cadillac building with a Volkswagen engine. Cutting out that 40 percent waste factor.

We are after economy, defined at CRS as "maximum results with minimum means." But we must also realize that economy of energy concerns human life and human

values. We are not giving up on the quality of life to save energy. Rather, we must rethink our life style in terms of energy conservation and other human values. When we spend energy, we want no waste. And when we spend energy, we want full value in return.

We can learn how to save energy—how best to use a bucket of oil. We have the technology. Can we learn to fulfill the needs of the human being at the same time?

Let's go back thirty years. We had oil and gas rationing. We knew what to do when we had no fuel readily available. We walked and used streetcars to get to work. We shut off heat in rooms except those with southern exposure to save oil—simple as that. We put the baby crib in the south bedroom. The sun coming through the windows did most of the heating. The baby was comfortable during very cold days with no oil-generated heat at all—only the heat from the sun. And in the coldest climates. We have past lessons as well as more flexibility than present day living standards suggest for saving energy.

Let's go back twenty-five years. The CRS team designed a so-called "solar house" in Oklahoma City. It wasn't sun powered with solar collectors, nor was it like the U.S. General Services Administration's energy conservation demonstration building in Manchester, New Hampshire, the University of Delaware Solar One house or Prototype One in New Mexico. A solar house back then was one which had a lot of glass to capture the winter sun and a lot of overhangs to keep the sun off during hot summer months—elementary but fundamental. In our solar house, fuel was saved all year round. Part of what we must do in this new energy crisis is not new at all.

After our so-called solar house, the CRS team made its reputation designing little naturally lighted and naturally ventilated schoolhouses.

Economy was what we were after then. The sun and wind were used to save money—not fuel. We argued that light from the sun cost a lot less than light from the power plant. That it took a very large fan to generate air flow to duplicate the effect of a comforting five mile an hour breeze. During these years of saving money by saving fuel, we learned much about the way certain buildings behave under different sky and wind conditions. In fact, we developed some fairly sophisticated methods to predetermine natural lighting and ventilation. The wind tunnel and sky dome at Texas A&M University were kept busy testing models for architects and engineers throughout the U.S. and other countries.

We found how to bounce light off the ground into deep, interior spaces; how to cut building costs by decreasing the perimeter and lowering ceilings, yet have quality natural lighting; how to funnel the cooling wind around the people who use our buildings; how to design pressure walls to ventilate leeward spaces, even reversing the direction of the wind and increasing the velocity. We also learned how to modify the outdoors with wind breaks and sun pockets, using the outside for functional activities. The key is control. And some controls we already know how to use.

The point is simple. Now is the time to recapture knowledge of natural ventilation and natural lighting. We need to be able to design supplementary systems for mechanical and electrical systems—in case the well runs dry.

Is the design profession ready? We know it's technologically possible to design and build energy saving buildings. Whether that will happen is a tough question. Certainly complacency exists in the profession. But there are many outstanding individuals and firms of architects, engineers and planners who are responding to the energy crisis.

In our own firm there is a wonderful atmosphere of excitement about being part of a movement which will result in a new era of building design. We get excited thinking about bringing in new kinds of buildings and new forms of cities. We want a chance to demonstrate what we can do to conserve energy and serve human values. We are capable of responding to the energy crisis if given a chance to innovate.

One problem is codes. Building codes. If the government starts imposing legalized restrictions on creativity, we're sunk. Government decisions—state and federal—will soon be made, significantly affecting how well the design profession will be able to respond to the energy crisis. What is at stake—what kind of codes the several states will have—is important both in and outside of the design profession. It's important for the energy crisis.

Prescription codes are the enemy. We're certainly not opposed to building codes designed to protect health and safety. This isn't the issue. What we fear is a different kind of code. Two kinds need mention here.

Prescription codes prescribe exactly how a something is to be done. Exactly how a building must be built. It's like telling a carpenter he can pound a nail only from a north-northeast angle. Or telling an artist a painting can have only two colors. It's strictly arbitrary. One the reason behind the prescription code becomes invalid, say through an advance in building technology or a new idea, it makes no sense. But, "It's the law, Do it." We should tell you here that the authors and their partners are "battle scarred veterans who have fought code wars in nearly every state of the United States. Lost most of them. Won a few. But very few."

Performance codes, the lesser of evils if we must have codes beyond health and safety protection, dictate what result should be achieved without specifying how to do it. Creativity is at least possible with performance codes.

In November 1973 we attended a Washington, D.C. meeting sponsored by the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards working with the Center for Building Technology of the National Bureau of Standards (NBS). The purpose of the meeting was to evaluate a model federal code then in the works which recognized energy conservation. The federal code is only a model. The individual states, which have the legal authority to pass building codes, are expected to come up with their own codes beginning in 1974.

That meeting is responsible for this book because what we heard there scared us.

Both sponsoring groups, particularly the people in NBS Center for Building Technology, have done a superb job providing alternatives to prescription codes, putting in their place performance codes which encourage, not stifle, creativity. And during the meeting we were greatly impressed with their systematic approach to developing guides.

Things were going great at the meeting for a while. Then, wham. Someone got up and recommended inserting this provision: "Windows in housing projects should not exceed 15 percent of the total wall area." A prescription code. No validity. Strictly arbitrary. Then one man sitting next to us said, "That's too much. We've got to get rid of these glass buildings." That wasn't so bad, but he also said, "The permissible use of glass should be half that." He got a hand of applause. Overreaction at its worst. This sort of thinking would set us back to the dark ages of architectural practice.

What we are saying is that function, beauty and economy can go down the drain along with energy if we are tied to prescription codes. And this is a loss we do not have to suffer because of the energy crisis.

Two cases in point: What happened to us

as designers, and to the people who live and work in our buildings, when even a fairly good idea was translated into a prescription code with the force of law?

First: The more space you have the more energy you need to heat and cool. Makes sense. Yet at least six states in which we built schools passed prescription codes that dictated excessive volume. We encountered this money-wasting regulation first in Texas in the early 50's. The Texas School Building Law from which this requirement came was passed in 1913—on the books nearly forty years. Because of it, millions of dollars in public tax money was wasted. What it actually said was this: "No part of the said classroom or studyhall shall be at a greater distance from the window than twice the height of the top of the window above the floor." Most school teachers would like their classrooms to be at least 28 feet wide, preferably 30. If so, the ceiling would have to be 14 feet high or 15 in the latter case. That's excessive volume—nearly one third more than necessary. The more volume, the more energy.

Second: In a north central state a few years ago, we proposed a highly compact "cold weather schoolhouse". Our clients, the local school board, the teachers and the children, loved the plan. It was circular. The library was the axle for two rings of classrooms. Our heating engineers particularly loved it because it had minimum outside walls. In our estimate we saved 27 percent outside wall over conventional schools built in the state at that time. That would cut the heating load substantially, reducing both the initial cost of the building and later operating costs. What happened? State officials turned it down flat. "Regulations state clearly that each classroom must have windows. Skylights won't do," they said. What a great building that would have been—with minimum energy input. We lost the battle. The state got a school. But one that was thirty years old before it was off the drafting board. Today energy is being wasted in that school because of a regulation.

Parenthetically, one of the most satisfying experiences we had in our long war of combating prescription codes happened just a few years ago in a southern state. The code read something like this: "The amount of glass area should not exceed the area of the largest wall." Admittedly we pulled a dirty. We again submitted a circular building. It drove the core police bananas.

If we are going to have to live with codes, we prefer performance codes. We have a lot of respect for the people who worked up the model federal code. If anyone can come up with a "good" code, they can. But what will happen when each state comes up with its own version?

And, in a sense, even a "good" code is not what we need for the design profession to have a productive, efficient, creative response to the energy crisis. We need freedom to design so we can build highly functional, people-oriented buildings requiring less energy.

To conserve energy, we need to work with principles. And working with principles is a process of re-discovery, not invention. There are principles of design which are as valid today as when the three of us were teaching college architecture years ago. We believe each has as its foundation an underlying principle: function, economy and form are one. And economy includes the economy of energy. By using the following principles which underscore the energy component, we form the basis for designing to conserve energy.

Orientation: If we're careful how we place the building on the site, we can save energy.

Solar heat control: Heat from the sun flows into a building by radiation, convection and conduction. This heat source can be controlled to reduce the amount of energy required to heat and cool a building.

Solar light control: Daylighting saves energy.

Task recognition: When the different heating, cooling and lighting requirements for specific tasks to be done within a building are recognized and acknowledged, savings in energy will result.

Efficiency: Less energy will be required if a building does its job with minimum floor area.

Regionalism: Recognition of a specific region—the climate, terrain, natural growth and local mores—leads to energy conservation.

Wind: Wind will help or hinder physical comfort. Directing and modifying the wind on and within a building can save energy.

Heat flow: When heat flow is caused by conduction, insulation is required to stop it; when heat flow is caused by radiation, a reflective material is required to stop it; and when heat flow is caused by convection, a vacuum or "dead air space" is needed; and, conversely, to cause heat flow, we take away insulation, the reflecting material, or dead air space.

Conditioned outdoors: If you condition outdoor space by modifying the effects of the sun, wind and rain to reduce the inside area, there will be substantial energy savings.

Controls: The ability to cut off the energy flow to certain sections of the building when not in use offers energy saving opportunities.

Comfort: Temperature tolerances differ among various regions. Social, economic background, age, as well as physical make-up of each individual also affect temperature tolerance of the individual. Accordingly comfort standards for all people lose their validity.

Centralization vs. decentralization: Whether the building plant or the heating/cooling system is centralized or decentralized depends upon each individual situation. Neither alternative should be ruled out.

Building geometry: The shape of a building can conserve energy.

Esthetics: A person appreciates a building when he is satisfied physically, emotionally and intellectually. All three must be there because people are never only physical, only emotional, or only intellectual in actual experience. Intellectual understanding of architecture can influence how people react to cold temperatures in a room and vice versa. People will leave a room, for example, that is ugly, cold or confusing, sometimes without knowing exactly which reaction led them to the door. Physical comfort cannot be separated from esthetic comfort.

What's beauty these days? Let's zero in on this last principle. The energy crisis has already changed the notion of beauty. It's difficult to see beauty in buildings that have an inherent craving for energy. The highly admired complex forms of the 60's are losing their eye appeal, too, because people are beginning to realize that the juts, zigzags and extravagant use of outside walls are inefficient forms for saving energy. A new morality of form is emerging.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE TOCKS ISLAND DAM

HON. JOSEPH J. MARAZITI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. MARAZITI. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is looking to Congress to help curb inflation, stop wasteful spending in Government and to protect the environment.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House interested in doing something about these issues of vital concern, testimony I presented to the House Appropriations Committee yesterday in opposition to the Tocks Island Dam.

The Tocks Island Dam is a proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers project which would put a huge impoundment on the main stem of the Delaware. The dam alone is anticipated to cost over \$360 million.

I do not believe the corps can justify this project from a cost/benefit ratio basis, which is required by law. I also believe this project is an environmental hazard, not only to the water quality of the river, but to the total environment of the beautiful Delaware River valley. The Council on Environmental Quality joins me in this view, and opposes the construction of the dam.

I urge those interested in combating inflation and preserving the environment to contact the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Public Works and make your sentiments in opposition to the appropriation of funds for dam construction known.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JOSEPH J. MARAZITI IN OPPOSITION TO THE TOCKS ISLAND DAM

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Subcommittee, once again the issue of the appropriation of funds for the construction of the Tocks Island Dam is before you for consideration.

Once again I am appearing before you, as I did last year, to oppose this project. It still is fiscally irresponsible, unjustified from a cost-benefit-ratio point of view, environmentally dangerous, and unnecessary.

Alternatives still exist for flood control, water supply, power and recreation in the Delaware Basin at far less cost without destroying one of the last free flowing rivers in the East.

Last year this Subcommittee, and its counterpart in the Senate were wise enough to insert language in their Committee reports barring the use of appropriated funds for dam construction until the environmental and cost questions raised by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Delaware River Basin Commission had been resolved.

To date these issues have not been resolved. The Council on Environmental Quality still opposes the dam because of water pollution threats posed by upstream agricultural wastes from New York State and for other problems like municipal sewage treatment control.

Although the 1973 Delaware River Basin Commission Report would make it appear their objections to the project have been satisfied, I personally take issue with their findings on water protection assurances, payments-in-lieu-of taxes, requirements of landuse controls and feeder highways.

CEO STILL OPPOSES THE TOCKS DAM

Let me quote to you from a March 6, 1974 letter I received from Chairman Russell Peterson of the Council on Environmental Quality responding to my February 5th request for the Council on Environmental Quality's position on the water quality issues surrounding the dam:

"... The water quality issues, particularly as they relate to potential eutrophication, have not been resolved.

"... I strongly feel that there is a pressing need to evaluate alternative measures to the Tocks Island Dam project, particularly

to assure that water supply, power and recreation needs of that region can be met in a reasonably effective and economically efficient manner.

"... I am not convinced that a major impoundment is the only solution to the present problems in the Delaware Basin. I believe we must seriously consider alternatives to the Tocks Island Dam project which will not impound a major segment of one of the last free-flowing rivers in the East.

"... Other solutions to the water supply problem have been proposed."

AGRICULTURAL RUNOFF—AN UNRESOLVABLE PROBLEM

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Peterson also discusses the fact that while recently enacted water quality legislation may provide a basis for controlling Delaware River water quality, he states: "It is unreasonable to assume that there will be immediate implementation of necessary control facilities."

It would therefore seem that Chairman Peterson concurs with my earlier testimony which stated Environmental Protection Agency regulations were not adequate to take care of the problem of upstream dairy and poultry runoffs which would undoubtedly cause eutrophication of the proposed reservoir.

Further, I submit the problem of upstream dairy and poultry runoffs can never be solved. Therefore the dam will never be able to be justified because it constitutes a grave pollution hazard from a water quality point of view, to say nothing of the environmental destruction to the Delaware River Valley.

I say this because it is highly unlikely that the tremendous costs associated with developing a sewage treatment system to purify the main stem of the Delaware from upstream agricultural wastes would ever be justified, let alone undertaken by the State of New York.

The costs for such a mammoth undertaking would equal the more than \$1 billion the proposed \$360 million dam plus the recreation area, waste treatment system and other supporting facilities are already projected to cost.

By eliminating the \$360 million, a substantial savings to the tax coffers of the nation could be made. As guardians of the Federal pursestrings, the Subcommittee is well aware of the need to protect taxpayer dollars!

1973 DELAWARE RIVER BASIN REPORT MISLEADING

The 1973 Delaware River Basin Commission Report appears to indicate that the seven reservations put forth by former Governor Cahill of New Jersey have been met. However, as I mentioned before, I don't feel the decentralized sewer system addresses itself to the real pollution problem, which is upstream agricultural runoff.

The report minimizes the potential eutrophication problem resulting from this runoff, and declares that no additional highways would be needed to accommodate the revised recreational facilities because of New Jersey State's action on the Federal highway act legislation.

I contend that the continued need to conserve energy, and gasoline, will cause the Delaware River Valley Recreation Area to become even more appealing as a recreation spot than it ever was because of its close proximity to New York. Visitor loads will undoubtedly be higher than anticipated because of this.

The Commission seems to lightly gloss over the problem of local opposition to state encroachment on home rule prerogatives pertaining to land use controls. Yet, this issue is so volatile that major land use planning legislation which was the results of two years labor by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has been tabled by the House Rules Committee.

A close inspection of the original objections of the State of New Jersey will reveal the majority of the original objections and problems still remain unsolved.

WASTEFUL EXPENDITURES FOR POWER

Concerning the Corp's justification of the Tocks Island Dam from a power generation point of view, I mentioned in my earlier testimony last year that the proposed appropriation of Federal dollars for a pumped storage hydroelectric power station on Kitatinny ridge was a band-aid to stop an energy epidemic that could only be stopped by research providing long term energy solutions.

The energy epidemic I predicted is already upon us. The jump in the price of oil makes the concept of hydroelectric power even more costly and wasteful than it was last year.

Now instead of spending \$4.00 for a barrel of oil, to pump water up the ridge, it will cost \$12.00 and more a barrel to do the same thing. What's worse, the constant generating power plant is tremendously inefficient. It only uses 34% of the energy contained in the fuel oil it burns.

If we are going to put taxpayer dollars into energy, let's put them where they will do the most good in the area to be served.

The energy crisis forces the nation to expend dollars to find long range solutions to our energy needs that I spoke about last year.

Every dollar we spend on power should yield maximum results. We simply cannot afford "wasteful" dollars that the power generation portion of the dam represents.

The limited power that might result from the dam would not be available for at least 10 years after the start of dam construction. Therefore it could in no way alleviate the current energy crisis.

Great progress is now being made in the use of oil shale, coal gasification and liquefaction, and geothermal energy. Tremendous strides are being made in the area of tapping solar energy for use by man.

Rather than wasting energy dollars on Tocks, the emphasis should be on making appropriations available for research and development in these areas, which represent long term solutions to our energy needs.

WATER AND RECREATION ALTERNATIVES EXIST

The Council on Environmental Quality shares my view that viable alternatives to water and recreation exist. When I last testified before the Subcommittee, I believe I proved the point that the present river valley offers at least as many recreational opportunities as the Tocks Island Dam and lake would provide.

Chairman Peterson agrees that the dam without the lake is more than sufficient for recreation purposes.

No less than 11 major impoundments providing major sources of water for municipal use presently exist on the tributaries of the Delaware.

From the West and East branches of the Delaware, through Eastern Pennsylvania to Millville, New Jersey, these major reservoirs serve the water supply needs of this area of the Delaware River valley.

In addition, the state of New Jersey has gone on to provide for its own water resource needs through the construction of smaller reservoirs like Round Valley and Spruce Run.

As I pointed out last time, and ask again, I have yet to be able to find out who is going to benefit from the water at Tocks Reservoir that will amortize the investment.

FLOOD CONTROL

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has used flood control as one of the four bases of their justification for the dam. Although the issue of flood control is admittedly important and must be dealt with, there can be two

roads towards the goal of flood control in the Delaware basin.

The last time I testified before the Subcommittee I mentioned flood control alternatives such as land contouring and the prohibition of construction on the flood plain.

Land use planning will have to become an integral part of the job of communities and states in the years to come. From an ecological point of view it is not impractical to suggest that no further construction be allowed on the Delaware river valley flood plain. To accomplish this goal, the natural flood plain must first be identified.

I think the preservation of this beautiful river valley in its present state is worth the cost of the environmental preservation road to flood control in the basin.

The last major flood in the valley was in 1955. Since then, four major impoundments providing for flood control have been constructed on the tributaries of the Delaware.

Altogether the Prompton, Beltzville, Walter and Jadwin reservoirs comprise a flood control capacity of some 83,099 million gallons of water.

In addition, the Neversink Reservoir, Cannonsville and Pepacton Reservoirs in upstate New York further act to hold back the force of the Delaware in times of high water. In addition, there are some 13 other impoundments on Delaware tributaries besides these.

I feel that with proper management, these impoundments on the tributaries are sufficient to account for the flood control needs of the region.

In addition to the construction of the new impoundments on the tributaries in the 19 years since the 1955 flood, another factor has to be taken into consideration. That is the increased demand of the population explosion on the East Coast upon the waters of the Delaware.

New York State has authority under a Supreme Court Decision to withdraw up to 800 million gallons of water a day from the Delaware. Recently they have been using up to the maximum allotment of their water supply from the river.

As "progress" continues to take its toll on the water resources of the mighty Delaware, it is not unreasonable to suggest that smaller, less costly alternatives on the tributaries of the Delaware will satisfactorily meet the region's flood control needs when combined with the four major reservoirs already constructed since 1955.

We have had no major floods in the Delaware valley since 1955, even though we have had tremendous thunderstorms and torrential rains since then.

It is obvious the lack of a flood is due to a larger number of impoundments on the tributaries of the Delaware. So, in effect, we already have a flood control system.

PROHIBIT FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Chairman, I urge this Subcommittee not to fund money for the construction of the dam, now or in the future.

At the very least, I would urge the members of this Subcommittee to maintain the environmental posture it took last year by including language in their report barring the use of construction funds until the environmental questions have been fully resolved.

I feel such a posture would be fully justified, and backed up not only by the Council on Environmental Quality, but also by the Office of Management and Budget. May I quote in part from a letter from the Office of Management and Budget to Secretary of the Army Howard H. Callaway of February 4, 1974.

In it, Deputy Director Frederick V. Malek states:

"Funds programmed for use in fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for the Tocks Island project will continue to be used only for land ac-

quisition until the outstanding environmental problems associated with the project have been resolved."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee, for your time and attention to my remarks against the construction of the Tocks Island Dam.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Flood Control Act of 1936, before the Federal Government may involve itself in a project of this type, it must first be determined "if the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated costs and if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected." If we consider my foregoing statement, and the economic effect of the Tocks Island project, it is obvious that it is not economically viable and the condition set forth by Federal law is not met.

In evaluating the time stream of benefits and costs, the corps used a discount rate of only 3½ percent. This severely shortchanges the taxpayer. The current rate used by commercial banks is 7.5 percent. The Water Resources Council would set it at 6½ percent and private industry usually looks for a return of 10 percent. Even by minimum standards, there is no justification for evaluating the project at such a low rate of return. Why should we spend our taxpayers dollars on this project when it means excluding a project of higher yield?

Government investment in projects with insufficient discount future benefits when the small dollars invested elsewhere could return 9 to 10 percent is poor fiscal policy. By using a 6½-percent rate for major projects such as Tocks we would still insure the need of our future generations. At the same time it would guard against the approval of economically nonviable projects.

Assuming that the benefit figures projected by the corps are correct, the following table will provide some different figures for economic viability, if more acceptable rates are used. Figures use dare 1970 prices, 100 year life.

[In millions of dollars]					
Benefits	Percent				
	3½	5	7	8	10
Recreation.....	11.708				
Power.....	3.230				
Water supply.....	10.235				
Flood control.....	3.824				
Total.....	28.998	28.998	28.998	28.998	28.998
Cost.....	18.289	26.150	32.054	36.144	44.337
Benefit/cost ratio..	1.6	1.1	.90/1	.80/1	.65/1

The closer we get to a more commercially acceptable rate, the more economically questionable the project becomes.

If we examine the benefits a bit closer it is apparent that they are overstated. Any reduction would even further reduce the benefit/cost ratio.

A very good analysis of the projected benefits was made by the Environmental Defense Fund. Essentially they determined that the benefits to accrue from the project were about 50 percent less than those projected by the Corps of Engineers.

[In millions of dollars]

Benefits	3½ percent	Army Corps	EDF
Recreation.....		11.708	4.408
Power.....		3.230	1.000
Water supply.....		10.235	4.646
Flood control.....		3.824	2.241
Total.....		28.998	12.295

The difference stems from the fact that the corps has overstated the power and water supply benefits by failing to choose the lowest cost alternatives. However, the greatest difference is in the amount of recreation benefits.

The Environmental Defense Fund charges that the corps has overestimated the length of the recreation season; overestimated the value of a recreation day; inaccurately estimated the impact of drought conditions on recreation attendance; underestimated the consequences of inclement weather on recreation attendance, and failed to estimate the net difference in recreation attendance at the area as it exists today and as it would exist at project completion.

If we subtract the annual cost, it becomes apparent that Tocks Island is not an economically sound investment. With a benefit-to-cost ratio of .08 to 1 it certainly does not comply with the requirements of Federal law and therefore should not be undertaken.

Cost/benefit—Tocks Island
(Millions of dollars)

Benefits	3½ %
Recreation	4.408
Power	1.000
Water supply.....	4.646
Flood control.....	2.241
Total benefits.....	12.295
Costs:	
Interest and amortization.....	7.523
Operation and maintenance.....	1.851
Replacements660
Economic losses.....	4.502
Fish and wildlife loss.....	.500
Annual waste treatment costs.....	.674
Investment amortization.....	.677
Total annual costs.....	16.387

Even granting the arguability of the EDF's figures, they are certainly closer than those of the corps. The corps estimates 4.2 million annual visitors over a 98-day season at a value of approximately \$1.35/each. This only nets \$5.670 million—far short of the \$11.7 million in their projections. In order for the Tocks Island project to net \$11.7 million dollars at the recreational day value of \$1.35, the number of annual visitors would have to be over 8½ million, or close to 90,000 people per day for the season. Even if we assume no inclement weather at all, this is more than double the amount of visitors that facilities are planned for.

When it is considered that the Delaware River Basin Commission has limited annual visitation to 4 million, such benefits are impossible.

Of more importance is the fact that none of the sewage facilities or expanded access roads necessary to service Tocks traffic are included in the corps costs. The sewage facilities alone are estimated

at an average cost of \$400 million, and the estimates for expanded road facilities vary in equally staggering amounts.

These costs must be incurred before any of the estimated benefits can accrue. In addition, these costs must, for the most part, be born by the residents of New Jersey. It is inconceivable that these required costs are not calculated in the benefit/cost ratio. If nothing else, the residents of New Jersey should insist that the return on their investment in sewage facilities and roads reflect sound fiscal policy.

Since 1962, when the Tocks Island project was authorized at \$90 million, the estimate has increased to over \$360 million. It must be emphasized that these are only estimates, and as such are not upper limits and certainly are not legally binding. They are essentially open-ended authorizations which transfer all further authority to those who handle the appropriations process. In a time when we are trying to reduce Government spending and promote sound fiscal policy, the fantastic escalation of the Tocks Island estimates could prove to be the source of serious fiscal problems.

I urge that this committee look again at the Tocks Island project with respect to both its environmental and economic impact on the Delaware region and the entire country. I am certain that a complete and unbiased reevaluation of the entire project will expose its inadequacy and result in its termination.

IRS REPLY TO QUESTION ON PRESIDENT'S TAXES

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I asked the Commissioner of Internal Revenue whether the President's voluntary reimbursement of his 1969 underpayment of—according to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation—\$171,055 could be treated as a charitable contribution—deductible from his 1974 taxes—or whether it is subject to application for being refunded to the President any time during the next 2 years.

The Commissioner replied that—

The current position of the Internal Revenue Service is that a voluntary payment of a tax barred by the statute of limitations is an overpayment which will be refunded by the Service upon the filing of a timely claim....

Most of these provisions would be altered in the case that a finding of civil or criminal fraud is made.

The full text of the letter from the Commissioner of the IRS follows:

APRIL 22, 1974.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: This is in reply to your letters of April 8 and April 10, 1974, concerning President Nixon's payment of in-

come taxes for the year 1969. Specifically, you have raised the following questions: (1) whether such payment may be treated as a charitable contribution to the United States Government under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and (2) whether such payment may be refunded under section 6511 of the Code within two years from the date of payment.

Because of the policy of the Internal Revenue Service to protect the privacy of all taxpayers, I am sure that you can appreciate my inability to comment specifically with respect to President Nixon's tax status. However, a general statement of the law and of current Internal Revenue Service policy, as they relate to your questions, might be useful.

The current position of the Internal Revenue Service is that a voluntary payment of a tax barred by the statute of limitations is an overpayment which will be refunded by the Service upon the filing of a timely claim pursuant to section 6511 of the Code. This position is based upon the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954: (1) section 6401 (a), which provides that the payment of a barred tax constitutes an overpayment; and (2) section 6402 (a), which provides that the Commissioner shall, within the applicable period of limitations, refund overpayments. Thus, an amount which is paid as a tax after the expiration of the statutory period of limitations remains a payment of tax subject to refund and is not a voluntary contribution or gift within the meaning of section 170 of the Code. In general, no deduction for a charitable contribution is allowable where the taxpayer may, by his action, obtain a refund of the amount contributed.

It is important to note that a taxpayer will receive no refund unless and until a claim for refund is filed. In addition, any recommended refund, if in excess of \$100,000, must first be reviewed by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. I hope that this letter has been helpful to you.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,

DONALD C. ALEXANDER.

DETROIT GETS TOP RATING—FOR CRIME

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, sad days indeed, have fallen upon Michigan's largest city, Detroit. It was known that the homicide rate was high and "Motor town" was rapidly becoming known as "murder town," but this most recent study released by the Department of Justice purports to show that Detroit is among the most crime ridden cities in the Nation and indeed ranks first in many categories of crime. The article from the Sunday News of April 14, 1974 follows:

[From the Sunday News Apr. 14, 1974]
DETROIT GETS TOP RATING—FOR CRIME
(By John E. Peterson)

WASHINGTON.—In 1972, almost four-fifths of all of the businesses in Detroit were either burglarized or robbed, and nearly a third of the city's households were the targets of burglary and theft.

Sound incredible?

Perhaps, but those somewhat astounding

statistics are contained in a \$10 million Justice Department report purporting to show that actual crime is two to three times higher than reported crime in Detroit, Chicago, New York and Los Angeles, and five times higher in Philadelphia.

The report, scheduled for official release Sunday, was based on interviews conducted by U.S. Census Bureau census takers with some 25,000 persons and 2,000 businesses in each of the nation's five largest cities.

The survey, commissioned by the National Crime Panel of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), claims to show that 3.1 million crimes occurred in those cities in 1972, even though the cities' police departments reported a total of only 1.2 million crimes.

Detroit led four of the major categories contained in the report. Among them:

Detroit had the highest rate of serious crime—68 per 1,000 persons—while Philadelphia had 63, Chicago 56; Los Angeles 53, and New York 36.

Detroit had the highest rate per household of burglary, 174 per 1,000 households, compared with 148 for Los Angeles, 118 for Chicago, 109 for Philadelphia and 68 for New York.

Detroit had the highest rate for burglaries of businesses, 615 per 1,000, compared with 390 for Philadelphia, 328 for New York, 317 for Chicago and 311 for Los Angeles.

Detroit had the highest rate of robbery of businesses, 179 per 1,000, compared with 116 for Philadelphia, 103 for New York, 77 for Chicago and 47 for Los Angeles.

Those figures are particularly startling when compared with the crimes actually tallied by the Detroit Police Department in 1972.

While Detroit police recorded 129,647 serious crimes that year, the National Crime Panel's survey claims there were actually 345,600.

In 1972, Detroit police recorded 42,563 burglaries of households and businesses. The survey claims there were actually 109,800.

Detroit Police Commissioner Philip G. Tannan, informed of the report's findings last week, declined to comment on them until he could thoroughly study the report.

But Donald F. Santarelli, chief administrator of the LEAA, said at a press briefing Thursday that he had "no doubts whatsoever" about the authenticity of the report's statistics.

"This is a completely new way to measure crime," he said. "For the first time in history, we have an accurate measurement of crime . . . right from the victim's mouth, which has been qualified in an unassailable manner."

Santarelli said the Census Bureau used at least 150 census takers in each city, when it conducted the interviews during the first three months of 1973. No one under 12 was interviewed.

"These were all trained census bureau personnel," he said, "and they used the latest, the very latest techniques," he emphasized. "Of course, not all these statistics are hard ones because they rely on human memory, but they still are the most accurate measurements we've ever had."

The report, Santarelli said, shows conclusively that people don't report crime "because it isn't worth it, they don't believe the criminal justice system works well enough to make it worthwhile."

"This survey tells us just how turned off people are to the criminal justice system," he said.

"We must try to turn them on again. We must bring consumerism to criminal justice."

Santarelli seemed confused at times during questioning by newsmen, many of whom openly told him they were skeptical of the report's findings.

At one point, he said, "This report virtu-

ally renders the FBI's Uniform Crime Report obsolete," but seconds later, he conceded that "there's really no way to compare the two reports . . . like apples and oranges."

Asked why murder was not included among the serious crimes surveyed by the panel, Santarelli said:

"All of our statistics are based on interviews with the victims, but of course, we couldn't interview a dead person."

Each of the 125,000 persons interviewed in the massive survey of the five cities was asked to respond to 238 questions in a 20-page questionnaire.

The questions ranged from ones on attitudes, such as "Is there anything you don't like about this neighborhood?" to ones about actual crimes, such as "Did anyone beat you up, attack you or hit you with something, such as a rock or bottle during the last 12 months?"

The questions covered rape, robbery, larceny, assault, burglary and auto theft.

According to the survey, about 45 percent of the 3.1 million criminal acts that it was told about were carried out against individuals, 40 percent against households and 15 percent against businesses.

Thefts constituted a majority of all crimes against persons, while about a third of all personal incidents involved violence.

In at least three-fourths of the crimes involving or threatening violence, the confrontation was between strangers, the reports said.

Minorities, including blacks and Spanish-Americans, were the victims of robbery and aggravated assault at much higher rates than whites, the report said.

Other findings contained in the report were:

Los Angeles and Philadelphia had the highest rate of assault, 34 per 1,000, followed by Detroit with 33, Chicago with 26 and New York with 10.

Detroit led in robbery and attempted robbery with injury against individuals, 32 per 1,000 compared with 28 for Philadelphia, 26 for Chicago, 24 for New York and 16 for Los Angeles.

Detroit also was high in attempted assaults with weapons, recording 12 per 1,000 persons, while Los Angeles and Philadelphia had 10 such incidents per 1,000 persons, followed by Chicago with eight and New York with six. Santarelli said there were no clear-cut explanations for many of the findings in the report.

"Why is there such a wide disparity of crime between New York and Philadelphia, two cities only 90 miles apart?" he asked.

"In funding this study, the LEAA's goal is to spark questions like that in the minds of criminal justice planners, administrators and enforcement personnel, and then generate programs and projects to provide effective answers," he said.

Santarelli observed that the survey found that the most frequent reasons given for not reporting crime were: Nothing could be done because of lack of proof, 34 percent; not important enough, 28 percent; police would not want to be bothered, 8 percent; too inconvenient, 5 percent; private or personal matter, 4 percent; and afraid of reprisal, 2 percent.

APPRECIATION SHOWN FOR SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the economy of Rhode Island

suffered a stunning blow when the Department of Defense ordered huge cutbacks in the naval facilities at Quonset, Davisville, and Newport. With the loss of the Navy, the largest single employer in Rhode Island, prophets of doom speedily arose to voice dire forebodings. Once again, as it has since the days of founder Roger Williams, the resilient spirit inherent in the character of Rhode Islanders bounced up to confront adversity and turn it to advantage.

With courage and initiative, the citizens took positive action toward economic recovery, first seeking aid from the appropriate Federal agencies, such as the Small Business Administration.

In similar circumstances, Federal agencies proffering help are often abused and slandered by the populace, and rarely accorded the smallest degree of gratitude or acknowledgement. From Newport, R.I., one of the hardest hit areas in the naval cutbacks, Councilman Lawrence E. Newsome has extended thanks and appreciation for the Small Business Administration's endeavors on behalf of that city. I would like to acquaint my colleagues with the sentiments of Newport, Mr. Newsome, and all Rhode Island, as addressed to Mr. Thomas S. Kleppe, Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

NEWPORT, R.I., March 31, 1974.

MR. THOMAS S. KLEPPE,
Administrator, Small Business Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLEPPE: It has been almost a year since the Department of Defense announced the cutback in Newport, Rhode Island, and I felt this was a good time to reflect on what has been accomplished during the past year to facilitate our economic recovery.

As a city official who has been deeply involved in improving the business climate, I thought you would be interested in one of the foremost impressions that has been left with the City Council. From the day of the disestablishment announcement we have received more attention and cooperation from the Small Business Administration than all the other agencies combined. The direction we have received has made our job much easier.

We would especially like to thank Dan Koehler of the Washington Office and locally, Charley Fogarty and his team including Ed Migliaccio and Sal DeSimone. These gentlemen have made countless trips to Newport to participate in workshops, meetings, and individual conferences. Their understanding and expertise have been warmly welcomed by the City Council and especially by the small business community. It is hoped that this cooperation will continue as long as there are small business people in Newport who need your help.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE E. NEWSOME.

WHY I BELIEVE RICHARD NIXON SHOULD BE IMPEACHED

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today, 6 months after President

Nixon fired Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox, the American people are deeply troubled. Public opinion surveys show that the vast majority of Americans believe Richard Nixon was involved in at least some aspects of the Watergate coverup, and do not believe that he is being honest in his statements about the missing and erased tapes. If, in fact, Richard Nixon is innocent of the charges against him, he is entitled to have these doubts dispelled, not only for his own sake, but also so that millions of American citizens can once again maintain a modicum of faith in the integrity of the officials they elect to high public office. If, on the other hand, Richard Nixon has been lying to us about the various allegations against him, he must be removed from office and replaced with someone who can command the basic respect which Americans should have for their highest Government official.

The Founding Fathers of our Nation, in their great wisdom, provided a means for resolving such a situation right in the U.S. Constitution. When there exists substantial evidence of wrongdoing on the part of the President, the Vice President, or a civil officer of the United States, the House of Representatives is empowered to "impeach" the official before the Senate. "Impeachment" merely means to accuse one of an offense, and requires a majority vote in the House. The Senate then must weigh the evidence and find the accused innocent or guilty. A two-thirds majority of all Senators present for the vote is required for a conviction, in which case the official is removed from office. Otherwise, he is found innocent, as President Andrew Johnson was when he was impeached a century ago, and continues to hold office.

The charges against Mr. Nixon are serious enough, and the evidence that has thus far been revealed against him is substantial enough, that a majority of the American people do not believe his claims of innocence. The only way in which we can settle the matter is through a trial in the Senate, and that requires that Mr. Nixon first be impeached by the House of Representatives.

JAMAICA PLAIN YOUTH WEEK

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, a number of community organizations in Boston sponsor the Annual Jamaica Plain Youth Week. Mr. Jack Doherty, founder of the event, has fashioned this into a genuine opportunity for all concerned individuals and organization to serve Jamaica Plain youngsters. I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a recent article from the Jamaica Plain Tribune describing the preparations for this event:

YOUTH WEEK PLANNED APRIL 13-21

The sixth Annual Jamaica Plain Youth Week will be held April 13-21, and sponsored by a number of agencies in the community.

This "Spectacular" will be open to all youth of Jamaica Plain from the ages seven to seventeen and those who go to school in Jamaica Plain. Kicking off the events will be dress contest, swimming and basketball commence at noon on April 13th. Jack Doherty, the parade chairman and co-founder of Youth Week, has appointed Cmdr. Thomas Kelly, District 16 VFW, as the Grand Marshall of this affair. The list of events during youth week are as follows—Street hockey, bowling, one on one basketball, road and bike races, Ping-Pong, talent show, and ugly dress contest, swimming and basketball competition, an essay contest, field and track events, pass-punt and kick contest, photography exhibits, arts and crafts exhibits, and to follow up the events, an award and banquet night. All applications forms are to be returned to us as soon as possible so the planning committee can make all the necessary arrangements.

Application forms are available through the schools in the community as well as the Youth Resource Center up at Curtis Hall, and the Youth Office at ESAC, 169 Amory street, also at the Agassiz and Hennigan Community schools.

For those that are interested in contributing financially to the Youth Week events or those interested in volunteering their services, contact Jack Doherty at 524-7000 or Bonnie Gorman at 524-2555.

Members of the general planning committee include: John Grady, Paul McInerney, Jack Doherty, Jim Knoop, Gen, Chairman, Bonnie Gorman, Pablo Cruz, Chops Porter, Rick Capistrano, Mary Phinney, Billy Hughes and Don Watson.

Final preparations are being made for the Jamaica Plain Youth Week Talent Show to be held at 2 p.m. on 13 April at the Agassiz Community School Auditorium. The 13th is going to be a very full day for Jamaica Plain Youth with the kick-off parade commencing at noon—terminating at the Agassiz School where the Fun Fair then gets under way, providing exciting entertainment for the remainder of the day.

The major highlight of this Fun Fair will be the Talent Show which is open to all youth, seven to seventeen. The booking prerequisite is none other than a desire to have fun! Any and all forms of talent—from dance to drama and from songs to spoons. So come one-come all—but come soon. It is important that you "book" your engagement by Monday 7 April. This can be done in two ways: either call Bonnie Gorman at 524-2555, or submit your application to your local Community School, Curtis Hall Youth Resource Center, or to ESAC.

Concurrently there will be an all day exhibit at the Agassiz of Art Treasures produced by Jamaica Plain Youth throughout the year. Display items will include photography, canvases, various artifacts and "pop art". We encourage any and all struggling artists to submit media material to the art department of the Youth Week Committee by Wednesday, 9 April. Space can be secured by calling Bonnie at 524-2555.

IS GRAND JURY SYSTEM IN NEED OF OVERHAULING?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the use of the grand jury has not only been subject to a great deal of discussion as a result of the Watergate-related indictments but the increasing controversy

over the procedures of the Grand Jury prosecutors as related to its use in local as well as Federal courts.

The Suburbanite Economist, an independent newspaper chain serving Chicago and its suburbs, is known for its thoughtful and very prudent editorial style. Therefore, I believe its lead editorial of April 7, on this subject merits careful consideration:

IS GRAND JURY SYSTEM IN NEED OF
OVERHAULING?

Has the purpose of the Grand jury system been perverted?

This is a question that is the cause of increasing discussion among laymen as well as lawyers.

When the Grand jury was inserted in our judicial system—England, which provided the framework for our government, doesn't have grand juries—the purpose was to provide a buffer between the citizen and tyrannical officials. Before a person could be brought to trial an impartial panel of citizens would consider the charges and determine if there were sufficient evidence to justify a trial. This would prevent harassment of innocent citizens by a prosecutor who for personal or political reasons decided to bring charges.

Now, however, we hear frequent expressions of opinion that the Grand jury is no longer proving such a barrier, that it is putty in the hands of a strong prosecutor and that the publicity resulting from an indictment leaves an indelible impression among the general public that the accused is guilty, regardless of the outcome of the actual trial.

As we hear them, the complaints stem from the fact that when one appears before the Grand jury he is not permitted to have a lawyer present to counsel him, he can answer only the questions put to him and may not offer information in his behalf unless permitted to do so. This gives the prosecutor wide leeway in asking damaging questions of the "when did you quit beating your wife?" nature.

In fact, it is becoming not uncommon for lawyers to advise their clients to "take the fifth" instead of appear before the Grand jury. They believe the cards are so stacked against the person being investigated that they are better off to risk the onus that comes from refusing to testify. Thus, it is apparently a matter of opinion whether one suffers more from an actual indictment or from taking advantage of the fifth amendment, which permits refusal to answer questions on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

That such opinions exist, in whatever small degree, are cause for a speed-up of studies underway to improve the Grand jury system.

When citizens who wish only to speak the truth are deterred from doing so because of a fear that they will be badgered and denied an opportunity to properly defend themselves, there is something wrong with our judicial system and it should be corrected.

THE THICKER SOLES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I realize that, as a political person, I am treading on perilous grounds in the field of fashion.

But I do think that a constituent of mine has some interesting, and perhaps valid, comments which deserve more than my limited notice.

He calls attention to two new styles which he claims run counter to the national needs at this particular time. One is the "platform" heels and soles of today's supposedly chic shoes, both men's and women's. The other is the exaggerated cuffs that have appeared on trousers and slacks.

The superthick shoes, my constituent contends, are using up much needed materials for no good economic purpose at a time of growing scarcities, thus driving prices up and causing concern among suppliers of leather, rubber, and synthetic materials to say nothing of the glee among commodity speculators. He asks:

Why, of all times, must we have these strange shoe styles right now? If there were any sense to the situation, then shoe soles and heels these days would have a minimum of depth. One pair of the new shoes must take enough material to make two or three pairs of ordinary shoes.

The constituent has nothing to say about the effects of the "platforms" on the wearer, although I have noticed claims that, by making one less agile, they could cause falls and injuries. But this is for hospital reports to determine. The heavy consumption of materials is, however, obvious.

The wide trouser cuff, and also the "flare" style which has been in vogue for some time, must command millions of extra yards of material and be responsible, in large part, for the strain on our cotton crop and synthetic production. Why have these fashions bobbed up now? Is there a plot involved to distress further the hard-pressed American economy?

The answers are not easy to find, as a rule, there is little commonsense in the world of fashion or in what the fashion market will accept. Styles change, sometimes on whim, and what was in favor one season becomes an outmoded thing the next, and there appears to be no set rule by which the transformations are planned, or in which they take place. So it is not surprising that we find, as we do now, scarce materials being used up for no reasonable purpose. And there is nothing, of course, that can be done about it except to meet the higher costs which such violation of economics brings about.

However, there is one consoling thought which my constituent, a troubled man, has not experienced, or so I believe. If materials do get shorter and shorter in supply and costs higher and higher, the owner of "platform" shoes will be in good position to walk out of the consequences. It will be years before he or she will need half soles and new heels. And, too, the wider cuffs on pants could provide, if needed, a ready source of patch materials for worn-out seats. So I am not too concerned about all this except to enter, for the record, a plea for the style-setters to be more aware than they seem to be of the overall economic condition.

A REMEMBRANCE

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I attended a dedication of an ambulance for use in Israel. The equivalent of the Red Cross in Israel is the Red Magen David, which literally translated is the Red Star of David. That ambulance had been purchased by the membership of the Flatbush Park Jewish Center and the Tel Chai Chapter A.R.M.D. in my district.

It was dedicated to the memory of three young Israelis, Elazar Nahalon, Yehudah Pakula, and Hanoeh Durlacher, who fell in the defense of their nation in the Yom Kippur War. One of their close comrades made the speech of dedication, in which he touched upon the memory and inspiration of his three comrades. In it he simply but eloquently describes them.

Rabbi David S. Halpern, the spiritual leader of the center, also delivered a moving tribute of these brave young men.

Each of them was painfully young, deeply motivated and earnestly selfless in love of country and desire to serve. One need not have served in combat, but insisted on doing so, and as a result met his death.

All represented the unquenchable spirit which motivates the people of Israel. All perished for an ideal they believed in: the inviolability and viability of their land of Israel.

Their sacrifice and how it was described by their friend, Binyamin Ben-Yitzchak, is worth sharing with other members of this body. I include it here.

SPEECH OF DEDICATION

(By Rabbi David S. Halpern)

Today we are gathered here to dedicate an ambulance to the Red Magen David. The ambulance will be inscribed with the names: Elazar Nahalon, Yehudah Pakula, and Hanoeh Durlacher, three boys who lived in Kibbutz S'Deh Eliyahu and gave their lives during the Yom Kippur War. I will tell you a bit about each one.

I went to school with Hanoeh; he was in my class. We were very close, and his loss was hard on me. Although a mine injury lowered his military profile after the six day war, he worked hard and dedicated himself to remaining an officer in the Army. When the Yom Kippur War broke out, Hanoeh was not required to take part in combat, but he remained in the fight. He died on Simchat Torah, and like Moshe Rabanu, on his birthday. Just before his death, he had promised his fellow soldiers that he would return to finish the Hakafot, with a Torah taken from the new settlement of Ramat Magshimim, but he never did . . .

Elazar was younger than I. He was a close friend of my brother, Rafael. He was a pilot and at the time of his death, was returning with a helicopter full of wounded soldiers, but they, too, never returned . . .

I never met Yehuda, but he represented the soul of Israel. He was not Israeli born, but was born and raised in Melbourne, Australia. He came to the Kibbutz Ulpan just three years ago, and decided to remain and join the Army. He was killed on the Suez

Canal on the very first day of the war. When his parents learned of his death in Australia, they came to the Kibbutz and in spite of their sorrow, remained to work and help out because of the shortage in manpower.

The dedication of the ambulance today stands for life. These boys, Elazar Nahalon, Yehudah Pakula, and Hanoeh Durlacher, who died for Eretz Israel, represent all those who died for this cause. In behalf of Kibbutz S'Deh Eliyahu, I wish to express my sincere appreciation for this honor. I am sure that in some way, this will be a comfort to their families and will preserve their memories L'Olam.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO INCREASE THE MILEAGE ALLOWANCE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES USING THEIR PRIVATE AUTOMOBILES TO CARRY OUT GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide the Administrator of the General Services Administration with the authority to increase the mileage allowance for Federal employees who use their private automobiles on Government business. With the recent dramatic increases in the cost of gasoline, as well as the reduced mileage per gallon achieved by new cars due to antipollution devices, the cost of operating an automobile has increased substantially. In response to the rising cost, the GSA Administrator recently raised the allowance to 12 cents per mile which is the highest mileage rate allowed under existing law.

Since recent studies have demonstrated that the cost of operating a standard size automobile is now at least 14.4 cents per mile, and may be as high as 16.5 cents per mile, the bill I am introducing today will grant the GSA Administrator the authority to increase the mileage allowance up to as much as 17 cents per mile.

I want to make it clear that my legislation would not mandate an immediate increase to 17 cents per mile. It would merely increase the statutory ceiling on the mileage allowance from the present 12 cents to 17 cents. The Administrator would have the discretion to set the actual allowance in accordance with automobile operating costs at any given time.

The General Services Administration recently conducted a study which indicated that the average cost of operating a standard size automobile is 14.4 cents per mile. This figure was based on the operating costs in suburban Baltimore, an area which is believed to reflect the average prices, taxes, and road and driving conditions of the Nation as a whole. However, the study also points out that the costs of driving in many other metropolitan areas, such as Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York, are considerably higher than 14.4 cents per mile. In addition, the American Automobile Association

has recently estimated that the cost of driving has climbed to an average of 16.5 cents per mile for most motorists. Since neither the GSA nor the AAA studies reflect the most recent increases in the price of gasoline, it is my judgment that a ceiling of 17 cents is quite reasonable.

The law states that Federal employees can use their private automobiles to carry out government business when it best suits the needs of the Government. Thus, Federal workers use their private automobiles only when their destination is inaccessible by public transportation or the cost of public transportation is greater than the cost of using their private automobiles. It is clearly the Government which benefits from this law, and not the individual Federal employee.

Since Federal workers are aiding the Government by agreeing to use their private automobiles on Government business, we should not tolerate these employees losing money by utilizing their own automobiles. Yet both the GSA and the American Automobile Association studies demonstrate that a considerable amount of money is currently being lost by the thousands of Federal employees who use their private automobiles for Government business. This is clearly inequitable. I urge the Congress to promptly enact my legislation so that Federal employees can receive just compensation for the expenses incurred while operating their automobiles to carry out governmental responsibilities.

SOVIET GIANT THREATENS INDIVIDUALITY OF TINY BALTIC STATES

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in order to provide more information to my colleagues regarding the situation and sufferings taking place in the Baltic States, I would like to submit the following article from the March 17, 1974, issue of the Los Angeles Times, written by Murray Seeger. The article speaks eloquently for itself:

SOVIET GIANT THREATENS INDIVIDUALITY OF TINY BALTIC STATES

(By Murray Seeger)

TALLINN, ESTONIA.—The Soviet Union says it is composed of 15 constituent republics, but the United States and other Western governments maintain that there are only 12 Soviet republics.

The difference is the three small republics on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

In the terms of Kremlin propaganda, "Soviet power came" to the three small countries in 1940 primarily to attempt to end the threat of Nazi takeovers and to avert dangers to the national security of the Soviet Union.

Stalin had been given a free hand to do what he wanted with the small countries by terms of the treaty he signed with Hitler in 1939. Although Finland to the north lost territory to the Soviet Union after the short, bit-

ter war of 1939-40, it preserved its independence and smashed Moscow's military reputation.

The three Baltic states, which like Finland had been part of the old Russian Empire before the 1917 Bolshevik revolution, had enjoyed only 23 years of independence when Soviet troops took over in 1940. A year later, the Nazis made the question moot by sweeping north through the three nations in the rush to surround Leningrad.

Now, nearly 30 years after the Soviet armies restored the Kremlin's hegemony over the Baltic states, the three small republics still preserve in remarkable strength their own cultures and characteristics—which are as different from each other as they are from the Soviet Union.

In general terms, Lithuania has managed best to preserve its cultural inheritance while Latvia appears to be in most danger of disappearing as a national entity. Estonia stands some place in between—still filled with unique atmosphere and cultural resilience, but endangered.

In each country, there are brave souls who speak out for more autonomy within the Soviet system or outright independence but—given the domination of all official means of communication by the Communist Party and Soviet government—their voices are heard only faintly outside their borders.

There are thousands of others whose resentment of domination by "the Russians" is very deep. The Soviet Union has been more subtle in its efforts to dominate the small Baltic nationalities than some other groups have been, but the effects are nearly the same as with the Czar's notorious "Russification" campaigns in the days of the empire.

A young Baltic native said recently that "in a lot of places they will have a native in the top job but there is usually a Russian in the second job, watching the fellow on top."

None of the three Baltic states has a strong overseas ally to plead its case, only scattered islands of emigres who fled either at the time of the original Stalinist takeover or at the time of the Soviet army's return after the defeat of the Nazis.

Stalin destroyed the indigenous anti-Soviet leadership with terror campaigns that included prison, death sentences and exile.

After the tyrant's death, Khrushchev commuted most of the nationalists' sentences but only a few prisoners made it back to their homes, where they provided bitter object lessons to any younger citizens who might have considered challenging the Kremlin's authority.

The Soviets apparently thought the passage of time would make the new life under Moscow rule more attractive to the younger generation than it was to their parents. But many Baltic youths have proved to be strongly nationalist in spirit and unimpressed with the accomplishments of Soviet power.

"After the war, life was pretty difficult," a young woman said. "Things are much better now and the Russians tell us it is because of them."

"But we know we work harder than they do. Food is much better here than in Russia but clothing is not very good yet—it is bad all over the Soviet Union."

In order to blunt the edge of the nationalists' interests in independence, Communist Party leaders continually talk about what they consider the failings of the "nationalist bourgeois" governments of the 1920s and 1930s.

They never tell how Stalin forced the three small countries to accept the stationing of Soviet troops on their territory and fatally intimidated their elected governments.

Kremlin spokesmen blame "imperialist interference" and counter-revolutionaries for preventing the Communists from taking power in the republics in 1917, when they did in Russia. They emphasize that the So-

viet army chased the Nazis out in 1944—and they expect continued payments of gratitude.

"The restoration of Soviet power in Latvia and its joining the fraternal family of the U.S.S.R. peoples marked a radical turn in the destinies of the Lettish people who won for themselves genuine freedom and independence, true national sovereignty," said August Voss, chief of the Latvian Communists.

Similar explanations are given by the Communist bosses of Estonia and Lithuania—along with impressive figures to show that the three republics have prospered as members of the Soviet Union.

From behind the walls of secrecy and the controlled press organs, however, dissenting arguments are heard.

Seventeen Latvian Communists in 1972, for instance, sent a letter to Western Communist parties, pleading for support. The anonymous writer said that deportations of Latvians and importations of non-Latvians had reduced the native population from 62% in 1959 to 57% in 1970.

Only 300 of 1,500 officials in the Latvian Ministry of Internal Affairs—the police and security agency—were Latvians, and many other imported officials spoke only in Russian, the writers said.

"There are firms where the Latvians are in an absolute majority, but if there is only one Russian among them, he will demand that all business be conducted in Russian and his demand is heeded. If it is not, the whole firm is accused of nationalism," the party members said.

Both the Latvians and Estonians, who have very low birthrates, have resisted the development of new major industries within their borders because they know new factories would have to be staffed with imported Slavic labor—Russian, Ukrainian or Byelorussian.

In Lithuania, where the Roman Catholic Church provides a rallying point for nationalist sentiment, underground spokesmen have also attacked the Moscow propaganda line about the benefits of Soviet power.

One of the many anti-Kremlin petitions signed by thousands of Lithuanians in recent years referred to a "national calamity."

"In the years of Soviet power in Lithuania, such vices as juvenile crime, alcoholism and suicide have grown ten-fold and divorces and abortions have taken on threatening proportions as well," the January, 1972, message said.

"The further we are removed from the Christian past, the clearer become the terrible consequences of forcible atheistic upbringing and the more widespread becomes an inhuman way of life deprived of God and religion."

All three of the republics have higher standards of living than central Russia. Stores are generally cleaner and better stocked and merchandise made in the republics is better than much of the output of factories in other parts of the country.

Although they are grouped geographically, there are cultural cross-currents that tend to keep the three little republics apart.

The Lithuanian and Latvian languages, for instance, are related, but the people are different because the Latvians were Lutherans dominated by Sweden and Germany for centuries.

The Lithuanians became Catholics and shared a long, close relationship with Poland and have a proud history as a one-time Eastern European power.

Estonia shares the "coffee culture" of Latvia from its similar German-Swedish-Lutheran history but its language is completely different, coming from the same small family as Finnish.

For Stalin, seizing the Baltics was a step to restoring the old borders of the Russian empire. They traditionally were a buffer for

the Russian heartland against invasions from the north and west.

But the ancient enemy of the north, Sweden, threatens no one now and the attacker from the west, Germany, is a leading partner in what the Kremlin calls the "new era" of peaceful relations in Europe.

This change in history opens the question of the legitimacy of Soviet control over the Baltic states—a question on which there has never been a free expression of the natives' wishes.

Unfortunately, except for statements by such Kremlin critics as Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Andrei Sakharov, a few brave nationalists and the small, scattered family of emigres, the question is seldom raised.

VARYING LEVELS OF ETHNIC PURITY

The three small Baltic states have shown different strengths in maintaining their ethnic purity against inroads by other nationalities, especially the Russians.

The Russian penetration has been most pronounced in the cities. In Riga, capital of Latvia, there are more Russians (43%) than Latvians (40%). Tallinn is about 35% Russian and 56% Estonian. Vilnius is 24% Russian and 43% Lithuanian.

The chart shows the ethnic composition of the countries in 1959 and 1970, percentage of growth of the local ethnic populations, and the total population.

	Ethnic (percent)		Russian (percent)		Ethnic growth (1959-70) (percent)		Population (in millions)	
	1959	1970	1959	1970	1959-70		1959	1970
Estonia.....	74.6	68.0	20.0	24.0	0.2	1.2	1.35	
Latvia.....	62.0	56.8	26.1	29.8	.2	2.1	2.36	
Lithuania.....	79.3	84.1	8.8	8.6	1.2	2.7	3.1	

THE CONGRESSIONAL DILEMMA OVER INFLATION CONTROLS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the approaching expiration at midnight next Tuesday of the Economic Stabilization Act, providing authority for price and wage controls, is a matter of grave concern to many Members of Congress and to others who foresee in the months ahead an even worse surge of inflation than the one we have experienced in the past 15 months. The latest statistics on cost-of-living increases and the indications of a recession already underway sent shudders throughout the economy this week. The Democratic caucus of the Senate, according to news reports this morning, has now called for extension of the Economic Stabilization Act in at least some form before next Tuesday.

As a ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, author of the 1969 Credit Control Act, and co-author of the 1970 Economic Stabilization Act, I have been an advocate for many years of standby economic controls authority to enable a President to act forcefully to meet inflation dangers before they get out of hand. But, as I explained today at a luncheon meeting of the National Capital Democratic Club, there is absolutely no faith among the people of this country any longer in President Nixon's desire, willingness, or

ability to use control powers fairly and effectively. This is our dilemma—and the Nation's.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks my speech this afternoon, as follows:

THE CONGRESSIONAL DILEMMA OVER INFLATION CONTROLS

(By Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN)

If politics were only a great game—a kind of sports spectacular in which two teams battle for the championship before wildly partisan fans—this would be a time for all Democrats to be caught up in a frenzy of delight over the points being scored by our side over a battered and bleeding opposition. Democratic candidates for Congress have won almost every special election—and they were all seats held for years, and even for generations, by Republicans.

I am sure all of us here are deeply gratified that the voters in these traditionally Republican districts have reacted as they have to the events of the past 17 months since the last general election. Had they reacted otherwise, and followed their customary voting patterns, we could only wonder whether the American people had shut their eyes to reality and deadened their consciences with political tranquilizers.

We are, as I said, deeply gratified by these Democratic victories, but we are by no means caught up in any frenzy of delight over the circumstances in our national life which were responsible for bringing into the Congress Democrats to fill the seats held for so many years by the late John Saylor in Pennsylvania, by Jerry Ford and Jim Harvey in Michigan and by Bill Keating in Ohio. We had good candidates, well-known and well-qualified and politically experienced Democrats, carrying our party's colors in those battles, and they waged shrewd and hard-hitting campaigns; but it is significant that they all have publicly thanked President Nixon for making their victories possible in districts where Democrats, no matter how well qualified, had not been able to make a dent for a long time.

It is not surprising, therefore, that more and more leading Republicans in Congress and in the states are calling for the President's resignation before November, lest four of every five remaining Republican seats in the House and Senate are similarly overturned in November.

We can sympathize with the plight of the Republicans but we are not "wallowing" in it, any more than we are "wallowing" in Watergate, to use the Presidents' terms. This is not a hockey game or a football game in which every blunder of the other team evokes from all the fans on our side a roar of bloodthirsty cheering.

I know that a lot of conservatives in this country still feel that the Democrats are intent on destroying a Republic President for political advantage—that all we are interested in is overturning the results of the 1972 election. If that suspicion were valid, we would hardly have joined so overwhelmingly in ratifying the nomination of Jerry Ford as Vice President but would have kept Speaker Albert in the position of next-in-line to the Presidency. And we all know that Speaker Albert himself was the most insistent Member of Congress in making the Twenty-Fifth Amendment work effectively in elevating a Republican to the Vice Presidency. Furthermore, the care and caution reflected in the House's approach to the impeachment issue are further evidence that we are not trying to play games in order to overturn the 1972 election.

EROSION OF CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

In fact, we are being criticized by many impatient Americans, including many Republicans, for not acting faster on the impeachment issue.

But in the meantime—and this is an aspect of our national condition which should worry us the most—the excesses and blunders and omissions and malfeasances and crimes and cover-ups and subversions of the Constitution penetrated by leaders of this Administration have done far more than undermine the confidence of the American people in a President—in this President. They have eroded if not undermined the confidence of the American people in our form of government and in the honesty and integrity of virtually everyone in public life.

And, as a result, some powers which a President *should* have in order to function effectively in dealing with deep-seated and far-reaching problems confronting the American nation in a world of churning turmoil are being denied to President Nixon and may, for many years hereafter, be denied to any President for fear of the re-emergence of a Watergate mentality in positions of highest power. Of course, we can hardly be surprised by this public erosion of confidence in the office of the Presidency today.

We have painfully learned many lessons that we dare not forget—that Presidents are not automatically made omniscient or saintly or selfless merely by having been elected to that office. They are fallible and they must be watched critically and held accountable. That is being done today. But our dilemma is that when we have a President in whom public confidence is lacking, how do we provide him with the powers he should have and then make sure those powers are used properly? Congress cannot administer the laws and cannot make the day-to-day judgment in every area of national policy.

OPPORTUNITIES TO RAISE PRICES FURTHER

I want to discuss this today from the standpoint of one of the most critical areas of national concern—the economy of this country.

Barring unexpected action in the Congress between now and the end of the month—and any action in the Congress in that period of time on this issue would indeed be unexpected even with the horrifying new inflation statistics issued last week—the American economy in less than a week will be left to its own devices and to the free play of the market place for the first time since August 15, 1971.

The overwhelming majority of the American people—certainly all of business and virtually all of organized labor and most individual citizens—seems to regard the end of the price and wage control program on April 30 as not only inevitable but advisable.

I don't know how each of you feels about it, but I am terribly concerned over what this decision is going to mean to this country, not only in the weeks and months ahead, but into the foreseeable future.

One needs no crystal ball to see looming ahead after May 1 a tremendous surge in many prices and wages. True, not much of our economy is now under price control regulations. The Administration has been vigorously pursuing, for the past year, a policy of broad scale decontrol for industries which have pledged themselves for specified periods of time not to raise prices. But aside from the fact that these short-term agreements would be hard to police under any circumstances, the fact is that after May 1 there will be no authority left in the Federal Government to hold a club over the heads of most segments of the economy which are experiencing such strong product demand that they can easily raise their prices substantially and get away with it in the market place.

Up to now wage inflation has been sharply controlled, but how much longer can we expect wages to stay down? The wage controls which have been in effect since August of

1971 have been far more effective than the price controls, and wage rates have not kept pace with inflation. Labor leaders, therefore, are going to be under tremendous pressure from their members to seek not only "catch-up" wage increases but "go-ahead" wage increases as well.

Workers feel they have a lot of lost ground to make up and no one can really blame them for having this attitude—they are behind. Living standards for wage earners have fallen in the past year as they have for the elderly, the poor, and everyone on fixed incomes.

AN AMERICAN POLITICAL TRAGEDY

What should Congress do under those circumstances? On the surface, the logical answer would appear to be for Congress to extend immediately the authority to impose price and wage controls, so they would be on hand and available for use when and if the controls are deemed necessary to prevent an even more catastrophic surge in the inflation spiral. But Congress obviously is in no mood and of no mind to take this supposedly logical step. Both the House Banking and Currency Committee and the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs have voted decisively to table all legislation calling for an extension of the control authority beyond April 30.

Why? The answer to that question—like many answers these days to the agonizing questions facing the American people—lies in the character of the man who sits in the White House.

Democratic Congresses beginning in December of 1969 have given to Richard Nixon more power than any president has ever had in our history to deal with problems of inflation. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the darkest days of World War II, did not possess all of the powers that Richard Nixon has had for the past four years in coping with inflation. Harry Truman during the Korean War also lacked many of the powers we have given to Richard Nixon. Many of these powers have not been used at all; others which have been used have been used *abominably*.

No, one—not industry or business, and certainly not labor, or the majority of the American people—has any confidence left in President Nixon's desire or willingness to use effective instruments of governmental policy to stop the inflation spiral which is destroying the economic base and vitality of this country. They just don't trust the man to do it right.

And this is an American tragedy, an American political tragedy. If we made a practice of impeaching Presidents for failure to lead our country boldly and courageously and intelligently through periods of economic peril, then certainly what has happened to the economy of this country in this past year would be an impeachable offense. But just as a Democratic Congress did not impeach Herbert Hoover because of deep-seated despair over his economic policies, it is unlikely that the Democratic 93rd Congress would impeach Richard Nixon on grounds of economic policy blunders. So I am not discussing this issue in terms of impeachable offenses; my point is that even if Watergate had never been discovered or had never occurred, and even if corruption in the highest levels of government had not been disclosed, and even if the integrity of the highest officials had not been brought into question in such excruciating ways, we would still be in a national crisis because of the economic failures of this Administration.

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT CONTROLS

Regardless of the outcome of the impeachment investigation, and regardless of the increasing possibility of the President's resignation—as more and more Republican

leaders anticipate the wreckage of their party's political hopes in the coming November election if President Nixon remains in office—a crushing blow, and one which will have long-lasting effects, has already been dealt to the confidence of the American people in the ability of their national government to deal with the bread and butter issues of prices, wages, rents, and interest rates. Because of President Nixon's inept use of his vast economic powers, many of which are now expiring, there is a great possibility that for many years into the future, the public will look upon the whole idea of economic controls as a so-called noble experiment—like the Prohibition Amendment to our Constitution—as something that *can't* work.

That misconception is now being nurtured assiduously by many groups in the economy that have always wished it so—that controls *can't* work. It is more than 21 years since President Eisenhower lifted the Korean War control program and discouraged Congress from renewing the authority for controls even on a standby basis. President Eisenhower issued a very cryptic press release at the time saying that the controls were being ended because "they did not work." Aside from the fact that his characterization of the Korean War controls was not accurate, not true, millions upon millions of Americans have been born and have grown to adulthood since 1953 and have no knowledge whatsoever of the effective manner in which the Korean War controls were used by President Truman. Many, many millions of Americans now of voting age and older have no knowledge of the manner in which the economy was held from rampaging inflation during the worst war in our history, from 1941 through most of 1945.

ORIGIN OF STANDBY CONTROLS LAW

So when the controls die next week, we will not only see a general feeling of resignation on the part of the American people that very little has been lost by the demise of an ineffective and inequitable economic controls program, but I think it will be a long time before the public, and the Congress, will again be ready to provide standby authority to any Chief Executive to use when necessary in coping with severe dislocations in our economy which lead to the kind of dislocations and inflation which controls *properly used, could combat*.

That worries me as much as anything about our current economic problems.

I remember, during my first term in the Congress, that I joined with and supported a Republican Senator from Indiana, Homer Capehart, then the Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in urging the adoption of standby economic powers to be used by a President in periods of inflation emergency. Eisenhower discouraged Senator Capehart from pushing such legislation and it died quickly in the Republican 83rd Congress. From time to time since then, some of us worked hard to enact *standby* economic protection powers to enable the government to deal with soaring prices brought about by unusual circumstances in the economy. This effort finally succeeded in the enactment in 1969 of the Credit Control Act which placed in the hands of the President and the Federal Reserve Board the power to regulate the terms and conditions of any form of credit in the United States.

That Act has never been put into effect, despite ruinous inflation in interest rates. But our success in passing it in 1969 led to the enactment of the standby price and wage control authority in 1970, exactly one year to the day before President Nixon—who had vigorously opposed the legislation—finally put it into effect with a great flourish on August 15, 1971, with not a men-

tion, of course, of the fact that it was legislation passed by a Democratic Congress over his objection.

DISASTROUS PHASE III PROGRAM IN JANUARY,
1973

The freeze of August, 1971 worked—it worked! It stopped the inflation surge. From then until the end of 1972, the use of economic controls contained inflation in a very effective manner. Phase II worked. But in January of 1973, the Nixon Administration junked the effective controls of Phase II and went to the disastrous decontrol of Phase III, holding wages still under tight rein but letting prices run virtually unchecked. And we were told—oh how confidently we were told—that inflation had been tamed and the free market would quickly restore stability to the economy. But within a few months it was obvious that Phase III had turned into a disaster.

So in late March and early April of 1973—only one year ago—we tried to salvage the Economic Stabilization program by recommending legislation from the House Banking and Currency Committee to roll back all prices and interest rates to the levels in effect at the start of Phase III, January 11, 1973. We were overwhelmingly defeated on the House Floor by a combination of virtually all of the Republicans in the House plus many of the Democrats from the farming areas who were reveling at that time in a great rise of farm prices and what appeared to be unprecedented prosperity in the nation's agriculture. The farmer, we were told, was finally getting a "fair price" for his products. No one seemed to be mindful of the fact that at the same time the farmer's crop prices were going up, the farmer's costs of production were following suit—his feed costs, his fertilizer costs, his machinery costs, his interest rates.

"INDEPENDENT SPECIAL PROSECUTOR" OF
INFLATION

And now we are in an economic crisis in which farmers are going broke, housing is at an almost complete standstill, small business is unable to afford credit, living standards generally have fallen, our school districts and colleges are going bankrupt, we are by all accounts heading into a recession while prices continue to surge.

And in a week we will be without power in the Executive to use any controls except the ones the Administration has refused to use at all—the credit controls.

As long as we have in office a President in whom the public has no faith or confidence in his ability to act fairly to combat inflation, few people want to give him any power to act. How, then, do we get through the remaining months—or years—of a Nixon Presidency under those circumstances? The solution, it seems to me, is to impose on this faltering Administration a division of responsibility—as was done in the required establishment of an independent special prosecutor in the Watergate investigation—to deal with our inflation crisis. Anti-inflation specialists in whom the people can have confidence must be brought into the Executive Department—either by the President acting in consultation with Democratic leaders, as he would undoubtedly do in case of war, or by insistence of Congress through legislation—to solve this problem before it destroys our economy in so-called "double-digit" inflation.

In the present atmosphere, we can enact necessary controls legislation *only* if that legislation is going to be administered by people who believe in what they are supposed to be doing and who will have the independence to do their jobs for *all* of the country without fear or favoritism. I offer this as an idea. The alternative seems to be to do nothing.

TRIBUTE TO BRUCE SHANKS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Pulitzer Prize winning editorial cartoonist Bruce McKinley Shanks of the Buffalo Evening News has retired after 41 years as a staff artist, and his incisive commentaries will be greatly missed.

A Buffalo native, his cartooning ability became evident in high school, although he had no formal art training. Many of his nearly 7,000 editorial cartoons were reproduced around the Nation and around the world, and all of my colleagues would recognize some of his work. As the occasional subject—although not always a flattered one—of his pen, I can attest to his timely deftness in editorial interpretation.

I would like to share with you Editorial Page Editor Millard Browne's warm tribute to Bruce Shanks. He will be missed in Buffalo, but he retires with heartiest best wishes for his well-deserved new leisure. We will be looking forward to seeing the promised contributions again from time to time:

SHANKS ERA AT NEWS DRAWS TO CLOSE

(By Millard C. Browne)

An era ends for this editorial page today with the printing of Bruce Shanks' farewell cartoon—on the day after he had already folded his drawing board and stolen quietly away with his wife to a well-earned retirement in a Florida condominium.

It has been a long and happy era for The News and its readers, for Shanks fans who have seen him reprinted all over the world, and, most of all, for every one of us at The News who has worked most closely with him.

Even now, we wouldn't dare to lay it on too thick, because if there is anything Bruce Shanks hates it is a lot of fuss and attention—and we're still depending on him for contributions, from retirement—lots of them, as the spirit moves him after he gets settled.

But it won't be the same. There won't be the daily give-and-take, the argument about whether to keep or change this or that little nuance in the background, the brainstorming together to come up with just the right caption.

And there won't be the chance any more to marvel each day at one of the most creative minds and prolific talents in this business—and to choose from a whole smorgasbord of roughly sketched ideas the one that seems most on target to be inked and shaded in finished form as that day's cartoon.

That has been one of the most prized delights of editing this page through much of the Shanks era, and of working at the next desk through the rest of it. It has been the chore that starts each day—arriving at the office about 7:15 AM to find Bruce raring to get going at his drawing board. A dozen sketches are all spread out on the table, ready for selection or ready to trigger a discussion of some slight adaptation—or of how to get an editorialized cartoon hold on some big new overnight development in the news.

There may be some newspaper offices where the editorial cartoonist can draw whatever he likes. But in most cases there is a process something like ours, in which the editors choose from among a variety of offerings in order to make sure that each day's cartoon is somewhere within the same ballpark as that newspaper's editorial policy.

At The News, we have always regarded the editorial cartoon as speaking—at least in its idea content—for The News as well as for the artist who draws it. On many occasions, in fact, the cartoonist and editorial writers have closely co-ordinated their thinking to achieve a one-two punch on important issues.

In general, while they all have wide latitude to generate and follow through on their own ideas, the whole operation involves a lot of teamwork—and in this Bruce Shanks, through all his years here, has assuredly been the Superstar of our team.

The proofs of that abound in all the thousands upon thousands of times his on-the-beam cartoons have been reprinted elsewhere, literally on every continent of the globe: in the presidential and Supreme Court chambers where his originals hang; in the Pulitzer Prize for a famous 1957 cartoon on reform in the labor movement; in the score or more of Freedoms Foundation and other awards he has won.

Thumbing back through the whole 23-year portfolio of Shanks cartoons, each of us at The News would probably pick a different favorite, just as many readers would.

One of Shanks' own favorites, he confessed during a reminiscent moment the other day, was drawn just 20 years ago when the Senate and the country were first beginning to stand up to the phenomenon known as "McCarthyism." Captioned "Ebbtide," that cartoon showed the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy sitting high and dry in a rowboat atop a little rock protruding from a moonlit sea.

A more recent favorite of the cartoonist himself is his January 1973 comment on the ending of the Vietnam War, "Wonder Who Won?" My own favorite, for stark eloquence, is his "Empty Bowl," also reprinted here—as it has been in scores of other places.

Probably the public favorite—distributed in the thousands of copies among schoolchildren over the years—was not really an editorial cartoon at all, but a marvelous Lincoln's Birthday tribute to the Great Emancipator, a brooding portrait of Lincoln composed entirely of a darkly and lightly shaded transcription of the full text of the Gettysburg Address.

In enumerating the Shanks strong points, anyone familiar with his work would rate him among the very top in his field as an artistic craftsman, and certainly as a witty idea factory. What you had to work closely with him to appreciate, however, was his absolutely amazing speed and facility at both roughing out an idea and at polishing it, under pressure, into a completely finished cartoon.

One of Bruce's greatest joys, indeed, especially in his most recent years, was working under deadline pressure to produce a cartoon on a "today" story for the first edition of the paper.

That happened probably far more often than most readers realized—and it certainly kept The News far ahead of most newspapers with cartoon comments on spot news developments. Never did that particular Shanks gift for timeliness come through more dramatically than on the tragic morning of June 5, 1968, when Sen. Robert F. Kennedy was suddenly shot in a Los Angeles hotel.

The event itself occurred a little after 2 AM, California time—or 5 AM Buffalo time. I first heard the news on a 6 AM radio broadcast and, rushing to work, found Shanks at the office at 7:10 with an idea all sketched and ready to start drawing for that day's paper. One problem was that no one then knew how serious the wound would prove to be, whether Sen. Kennedy would live or die, whether the event should be portrayed as an assassination, or as a near-fatal attempt.

But Bruce's cartoon covered all possibilities. And, printed on the day when Bobby Kennedy hovered between life and death, it still stands up as one of the most eloquent

editorial cartoons of that or any year. It's the one printed here, called "Shame of a Nation," showing three terrible bullet holes in an American flag—one for JFK, one for Martin Luther King, one for RFK.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST SPEAKS TO NATIONAL ISSUES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two position papers put out by the National Council of the Churches of Christ. These papers, which I place in the Record for your information, have been adopted by the governing board of the council, which includes representatives from 31 Protestant and Orthodox communions.

The first statement, "The Indochina War, Healing the Divisions of the Nation" speaks out on the long debated question of amnesty and puts the whole concept in perspective.

The second statement is entitled the "Resolution on Impeachment of the President of the United States." As the resolution states,

If impeachment is recommended by the Committee, we urge the House of Representatives to act expeditiously and present a bill of particulars on impeachment to the Senate so that the President may have his "day in court" with full opportunity to restore confidence in the office of the President of the United States.

The two statements are as follows:

[National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.]

POLICY STATEMENT ON THE INDOCHINA WAR: HEALING THE DIVISIONS OF THE NATION (Adopted by the General Board, December 2, 1972)

The war in Indochina has brought great destruction to three nations of Southeast Asia. Hundreds of thousands of persons have been killed, wounded or made homeless; the cultures have been disrupted; the landscape has been destroyed. The people of the United States must work for the rebuilding of Indochina, and the churches must take a sacrificial part in the reconstruction. But in this statement we will consider the harm which has recoiled upon this nation and its people.

The war in Indochina, the longest in the history of the United States, has also rent the fabric of American society. President Lincoln, responding to the hurts and disjunctions of another conflict, called upon the people of America to "bind up the nation's wounds." Tragically, the attention of the nation was too soon diverted from this task. Recrimination and injustice consequently lasted for an entire century. There is the danger that the American people will be similarly diverted today from the tasks of healing the nation.

The crisis of the war in Indochina is fundamentally one of conscience. Some Americans thought the war just and necessary, while others thought it an immoral and tragic mistake. Likewise, some young men served in the armed forces, while others resisted participation.

These differences have not always been accepted as permissible divergences of public opinion or even as legitimate exercise of conscience. Instead they have led to slander, recrimination, and the accusation that the basic ideals of the nation have been forsaken.

Consequently, families and friends have been divided by differing opinions on the conflict. For example, it is not unusual for parents to have one son who fought in Indochina, while another emigrated to Canada. Almost every aspect of American life has been affected by dissension over the war. The divisions between races, ethnic groups, age levels, and life styles have been widened as a result of it.

Not only has the whole nation suffered from division over the war, but those who served and those who resisted participation have especially suffered. Over 55,000 Americans have been killed in Indochina. Over 400 have been prisoners of war, held in North Vietnam—some for a very long time.

The veterans of the Vietnam era have also been hurt. Because the Selective Service System exempted and deferred many white, middle-class and educated men, those of non-white and lower economic backgrounds filled a disproportionate share of the ranks of the armed forces. Consequently, many of the problems of the veterans of the Vietnam era result from their backgrounds—approximately 20% of them return without a high school education and their unemployment rate is substantially higher than for others in the same age bracket.

The nation is not using its resources to meet the needs of veterans as substantially as it did after World War II. Many Vietnam era veterans are therefore hurt, frustrated and angry because not only is their nation not showing gratitude toward those who served, but it also appears to be ignoring and rejecting them.

Deep scars were also inflicted on those who believed the war immoral and refused to participate in it. Over 60,000 persons, both draft resisters and deserters, have become exiles in other nations. More than 100,000 men have been prosecuted for draft violations. Untold numbers of draft resisters and deserters have gone underground to avoid prosecution. Although most have returned, or have been captured, over 350,000 members of the armed forces deserted during the Vietnam era.

More than 300,000 Vietnam era veterans have received less-than-honorable discharges, a stigma they will bear for the rest of their lives. Some have been convicted by courts martial for crimes which would be considered felonies by civilian courts, but the actions of the overwhelming majority would either be misdemeanors or would carry no penalty at all in civilian life. The majority of less-than-honorable discharges result not from the decision of a courts martial, but by the order of a commanding officer. Had these men and women not been in the military service, their records would not have been permanently marred by this imputation of wrong-doing.

At this time of national distress, we should remember that God is our final judge; He alone is Lord of the conscience. We will stand at the last awaiting His judgment and needing His mercy. Our human system of justice is not designed to separate the righteous from the unrighteous in any such final sense, but merely to maintain the safety and welfare of the human community. It exceeds its function when it divides the community and stigmatizes some citizens because of past views and actions which no longer pose a threat to the safety of the community, if indeed they ever did.

Healing the lesions in our society left by the war in Indochina will require human compassion and political forbearance. The

war was begun despite the protests of a substantial minority of the American people and continued despite the reservation of a majority. Some young men and women agreed with the majority—that the war was a mistake. Believing that it was also unjust and immoral, they refused to participate in it and thus incurred varying degrees of legal jeopardy. To hunt them down and prosecute them now is to add vindictiveness to victimization, neither of which is a proper basis for imposing criminal penalties and will only increase rather than heal the nation's hurts.

We further recognize the need for reconciliation on this issue within the Church. There have been Christians who entered the armed forces believing that the cause in Indochina was right and just. Other Christians have held opposite views which led them to resist the war and the draft.

We believe that Christ works in His Church, calling us together to be one body as a sign of His intention for the whole human family. His reconciling love overcomes mistrust and suspicion and heals hurt and pain. Christ calls us to new Being, both personally and corporately.

As He calls those in His Church to be reconciled, so we covet for America the experience of reconciliation. For reconciliation to begin, however, certain actions are necessary.

Genuine reconciliation demands that amnesty be granted to all who are in legal jeopardy because of the war in Indochina. The only exception would be for those who have committed acts of violence against persons, and even these cases should be reviewed individually to determine if amnesty is appropriate.

Such amnesty would include:

- (a) draft resisters and deserters who have exiled themselves to other countries;
- (b) those currently in prison or military stockades, those on probation, those who have served their sentences, and those who are subject to prosecution for violations of the draft or military law;
- (c) draft resisters and deserters who have gone underground to avoid prosecution;
- (d) Vietnam era veterans with less-than-honorable discharges;
- (e) those who have committed civilian acts of resistance to the war or are being prosecuted upon allegations of the same.

God alone knows what actually motivates the actions of persons, and few act for one reason alone. Therefore, we feel it unwise to attempt to judge the motives of those to be given amnesty, just as we do not presume to judge the motives of those who were in the armed forces. For instance, we do not believe that draft resisters and deserters deserve different treatment, since the latter would be penalized simply because their convictions may have changed after entering the service, rather than before.

We view amnesty not as a matter of forgiveness, pardon, or clemency, but as a "blessed act of oblivion," the law's own way of undoing what the law itself has done.

Reconciliation further requires creating the possibility of new lives for those Americans hurt by the war in Indochina. Veterans should have adequate help for their unemployment, education, and health needs. To accomplish this will require the interest and response of all institutions in the United States. In addition, veterans' benefits provided by federal and state governments should be increased to a level at least comparable to those afforded veterans of World War II.

The Church at all levels needs to make its healing ministry available to veterans. Prisoners of war and those incarcerated in United States prisons also will require the development of opportunities to help them live fulfilling lives. In addition those Americans whose needs were not met but were

even exacerbated because resources of the nation were diverted to the war effort, require the special attention of our nation. By granting amnesty and providing opportunities for those hurt by the war in Indochina, we would begin to repair some of the damage to our nation inflicted by that war.

[National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.]

RESOLUTION ON IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(Adopted by the Governing Board, February 28, 1974)

The Gospel compels us to be concerned about the moral and ethical condition of the nation in which we live. To remain silent is to abdicate the responsibility to which we are called and in effect to approve and consent to the existing situation.

This nation is laboring under a heavy burden of protracted doubt and loss of confidence in its highest magistrate, the President of the United States. Both the President and the people are entitled to an early resolution of that impasse through the procedure provided by the Constitution.

In our judgment, the charges leveled against the President are sufficient in number and severity that the only way they can be resolved in fairness both to the President and the American people is for the Senate to examine them in the manner provided by the Constitution. It is apparent to many citizens that the President has abused or permitted those who serve his will to abuse the prerogatives of his office and infringe upon the rights and protections guaranteed every person by the Constitution. Individuals directly and personally answerable to the President have authorized or engaged in illegal wiretaps, burglary, the secret bombing of Cambodia and falsification of military records, instructions to commit perjury for alleged national security reasons, the obstruction of justice and corruption of the election process.

The House of Representatives has initiated the process through the present investigation by its Judiciary Committee. If impeachment is recommended by the Committee, we urge the House of Representatives to act expeditiously and present a bill of particulars called an impeachment to the Senate so that the President may have his "day in court" with full opportunity to restore confidence in the office of the President of the United States.

Although this will be a trying experience for the people of the United States, a nation is only as strong as the moral will it can muster to face its internal problems and resolve them through the orderly processes provided by its farsighted founders.

In this process, these things should be kept in mind:

1. Impeachment and "trial" are designed to protect the state;
2. The Presidency, whose prerogatives the incumbent is purporting to protect, is not the property of successive Presidents but of the people, and they are entitled to an accounting without concealments or evasions;
3. The President cannot—in the final analysis—avoid responsibility for the actions of persons whom he appoints and can remove at will; to claim ignorance of their activities does not avoid responsibility but demonstrates unwillingness or incapacity to exercise it competently.

Based on Policy Statements: The National Council of Churches Views Its Task in Christian Life and Work, May 16, 1951; The Hartford Appeal, February 25, 1959; and Human Rights, December 6, 1963.

"DÉTENTE"—STRATEGY FOR COMMUNIST CONQUEST

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I fear many in this country and the free world have been deceived by the illusion of a détente between the United States and the Communist world. Others have been becoming disillusioned because of recent events such as the Soviets pressuring the Arabs to institute the oil embargo against our country, and their continuing agitation to keep Syria from settling its military conflict with Israel. Still others warned against the entire concept of détente from the outset.

My weekly column for April 12 demonstrated from the philosophy of the world communist movement the impossibility of any lasting reduction of tensions by the Communists.

In the April 20 issue of the AFL-CIO News, liberal columnist John P. Roche quotes both Lenin and Chinese Premier Chou En-lai to make the same point.

The two columns follow:

LASTING DÉTENTE POSSIBLE WITH THE COMMUNISTS?

Détente is defined as "a relaxation of strained relations or tensions (as between nations)." A world tired of war has been talking about détente between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and Communist China since President Nixon visited both those countries.

Soviet agitation of the Arab countries to initiate and continue an oil embargo against us led many to believe that the détente is but one-sided.

Sincere peace initiatives are not to be condemned, but we must know the thinking of the men with whom peace is sought. This is not understood by everyone where the Communists are concerned. Too many people think Communist countries have communism within their borders. Communist propaganda is not responsible for this mistake. The Communists always proclaim that so far they only have socialist societies, with socialist governments and socialist economics. For example, the Soviet newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (Red Star) put it very plainly on December 5, 1973 in an editorial lauding "Constitution Day" in the U.S.S.R.:

"Under the leadership of the Communist Party, a developed socialist society has been built in the Soviet Union, the equal nations and nationalities have united into an indivisible monolith and true people's power is triumphing. The further flourishing of socialist democracy is augmenting these historic achievements and accelerating our advance along the path toward the cherished goal—communism."

The Communists took over Russia in 1917, yet they still only have socialism, still are on "the path toward the cherished goal—communism." Why?

The answer to that why also tells us a lasting détente with them is impossible. The answer is that Communists believe communism will be the final stage of human society. They teach that socialism is the

next to last stage, a transition from capitalism. They say communism will be stateless, but that it cannot supplant socialism until there is no longer any capitalist society anywhere on earth. By their definition, capitalism is bent on conquest. Therefore, a state structure—a socialist one—must be maintained for defensive purposes against capitalist states such as our own. Thus, for the Communists to achieve their ultimate goal of communism the United States must be changed from a capitalist society into a socialist one. Hence, they can never desist from forcing that change upon us. This involves subjecting us to total government control!

SOVIETS USE FACADE OF DÉTENTE TO LULL WESTERN GOVERNMENTS

(By John P. Roche)

Though the story may be mythical, it is too good not to be true. When the first member of the newly formed U.S. Weather Bureau arrived at a town in central Kansas, where his headquarters were located, he promptly got his instruments and went to work. Something seemed odd—the barometer was acting eccentrically—and suddenly he recalled his manual and the material on predicting tornados. Sure enough, the instruments seemed to be suggesting a "cyclone." He rushed out to warn the townspeople. They thought he was some kind of a nut, until the tornado hit. Then they went looking for the weather man to lynch him for "his" tornado.

I have some of the feelings he must have had as I read my correspondence from readers on the subject of détente. A surprising number of these missives accuse me of undermining reconciliation with the Soviet Union. The reasoning is a bit obscure, but generally it comes down to the proposition that if we all believed hard enough in détente, it would come true. The trouble is, from where I sit, if we all believed hard enough in détente, the Soviets would take us to the cleaners.

This is not just my paranoid imagination, "brain-washed by Cold War myths," as one reader charitably put it. The thing that drives me to desperation on occasion is that all you have to do is read what Moscow, and for that matter Peking, has to say on the nature and utility of détente. If they kept their intentions secret, I might have more respect for my critics. But, since Lenin's time, they have laid the cards face up on the table: détente is a technique designed to lull and gull the capitalist world.

Let us go back to the words of the master, Lenin. For background we must realize that Russia, after the Revolution and "war communism," was an economic shambles. Lenin accepted Bukharin's proposition that capitalism should be allowed to operate in the USSR under careful political supervision, designed to prevent the growth of a strong capitalist class. The New Economic Policy (NEP) was set up and the welcome sign put out for foreign entrepreneurs.

However, the NEP gave Lenin political problems with his own troops. In contemporary jargon, the Bolshevik "hawks" (led by Trotsky) accused Lenin of selling out Marxism. Without getting involved in the esoteric debate, Lenin felt called upon to placate his critics and did so by accusing them of naivete, of not being tactically flexible. He pointed out that the capitalists would compete to sell the Bolsheviks the rope for hanging capitalism.

He meant it. In his "Private Notes, 1921," he elaborated the point, not without scorn for capitalist stupidity. "The capitalists of the entire world, and their governments, in the rush to conquer Soviet markets will close

their eyes to the . . . realities, and will thus turn into Blind Deaf-Mutes. They will open credits which will serve as a support for the Communist Party—even in their own countries, and will provide us with essentially needed materials and technology which will restore our military industries, essential for our future victorious attacks on our suppliers . . . they will be working for the preparation of their own suicides."

Let us skip to Moscow and Izvestia, Nov. 27, 1973. Concerned that détente might lead to a sense of popular relaxation, the paper vigorously called for vigilance: "The Marxist-Leninist ideology is waging an offensive against bourgeois and revisionist ideology along the whole front. Under conditions of the relaxation of tension we are faced with a crucial task: To make full use of the opportunities being opened up for a future offensive against bourgeois and revisionist ideology."

Radio Moscow, in Arabic, called upon the Arabs to take advantage of détente, which allegedly had weakened American ties with Israel.

This could go on indefinitely, but students pay tuition for that dubious benefit. Let me just wind up with a few words from Henry Kissinger's pal, Chinese Premier Chou En-lai, speaking to a banquet for visiting Cambodian Communists. The Red Chinese claim to be the authentic Leninists, and Chou was in that tradition: "The revolutionary people do not at all believe in so-called lasting peace or a generation of peace."

"So long as imperialism exists, revolution and war are inevitable."

I didn't say it—he did. Please don't hang the weather man.

CHECKBOOK DIPLOMACY AND SHARE-THE-WEALTH DÉTENTE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it does not take a degree in higher mathematics to add up the costs to the American taxpayers of the "peace settlement" of the October Middle East war. A pencil and paper will do nicely. This little exercise in simple addition will give those citizens who have recently signed their names to IRS form 1040 a whole new perspective into the workings of "checkbook diplomacy" and "share-the-wealth détente."

The first figure to write down is \$2,200 million. Label this item "Emergency military loans to Israel during the October war." Congress, in approving this amount last fall, specified that \$700 million should be repaid. However, highly placed sources in the administration revealed recently that the entire amount soon will be considered as a free gift to Tel Aviv, at the insistence of the State Department. Chalk one up for Dr. Kissinger's checkbook, drawn on the taxpayers' account.

Now, jot down under the heading, "Foreign aid to Egypt to cover the costs of renewing diplomatic relations," the sum of \$250 million. Of this amount, \$20 million will be used to clear war debris from the Suez Canal, \$80 million for farm and industrial credit sales, and \$150 million to rebuild war-damaged Egyptian property. Despite the fact that diplomatic relations were broken at Egypt's

request 6½ years ago, some \$34 million in U.S. aid has gone to Cairo during the last 2 years alone.

Include another \$29 million to build and fortify a U.S. military installation on the tiny speck of land in the Indian Ocean called Diego Garcia. This is necessary, says the Pentagon, to keep an eye on the Russian ships going through the Suez Canal, after we reopen it for navigation.

Deposit two additional checks to Dr. Kissinger's credit.

Now write down \$350 million under the column headed "Israel." Label \$50 million of this "security assistance" and \$300 million as "military credit sales." Label Dr. Kissinger "a bigtime spender with taxpayers' money."

Make a note of \$207.5 million for "foreign aid to Jordan." Credit \$100 million of it as outright military aid gifts, with \$30 million as military credits and \$77.5 million in economic aid.

Under the heading, "Middle East Slush Fund—the State Department prefers to call it a special requirements fund—write down \$100 million. This is Dr. Kissinger's "miscellaneous détente kitty" to be used to bankroll the U.N.'s peacekeeping forces, refugee aid, and various development projects.

Now draw a line and total the figures. Of course, there are other "low profile accounts" tucked away in the massive State Department budget, but these are the largest ones. My arithmetic places the known total of money siphoned from the U.S. Treasury into the Middle East at \$3,136 million.

In announcing his proposed budget for foreign aid spending for fiscal year 1975, President Nixon said that the \$5,180 million he wants Congress to give him and Dr. Kissinger is "the minimum essential to support the responsible and constructive American role of international leadership and cooperation." This request by the President is a staggering 72-percent increase over present foreign aid spending levels.

If this is the "minimum" amount our Government thinks we should lavishly hand out overseas, heaven help the beleaguered American worker and taxpayer if the State Department ever demands the "maximum" to buy more "détente victories."

Any Member of Congress who has a shred of fiscal responsibility or any respect for the current domestic situation, knows what his answer to this global giveaway will be. It is a loud "No."

NIXON AND LINCOLN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the assaults on the Nixon administration resulting from its Watergate difficulties have forced the President into a defensive posture.

One of Mr. Nixon's favorite approaches in these, his most turbulent

days, is to appeal to history. Recently the President quoted President Lincoln, perhaps in an effort to liken his unpopularity to that of the Civil War President. This latest tactic has triggered a bemused reaction from eminent historians, including David Donald, whose "Getting Right With Lincoln," an essay in his *Lincoln Reconsidered*, traces the tradition of Presidents' appeals to Lincoln to justify their policies.

Richard Harris, a writer who has consistently captured the nuances and tone of political America, commented on Mr. Nixon's remarks in the *New Yorker* and concluded—

History may find that the most dangerous enemies of the United States in the period since the Civil War were the Nixon administration's highest officials and the President himself. And history may also find that the greatness of this Nation was most severely tested by the manner in which its people turned inward to cleanse its corruption.

Mr. Harris' article follows:

NIXON AND LINCOLN

(By Richard Harris)

"The judgment of the world is usually wrong in the beginning, and it takes centuries to correct it," Tolstoy wrote. But in the case of Lincoln the world was right from the start. . . . The greatness of Napoleon, Caesar, or Washington is only moonlight by the sun of Lincoln. His example is universal and will last thousands of years." Tolstoy was in his thirties during the American Civil War, and nearly half a century later, on the hundredth anniversary of Lincoln's birth, he asked, "Now, why was Lincoln so great that he overshadows all other national heroes?" The answer was: "Because he loved his enemies as himself, and because he was a universal individualist who wanted to see himself in the world—not the world in himself;" because of his "peculiar moral power" and the "greatness of his character;" and, probably most of all, because "he was one who wanted to be great through his smallness."

At the hundred-and-sixty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's birth, President Nixon turned up, unannounced, at the Lincoln Memorial to speak to the crowd of a few hundred people who had come there at lunch hour to pay tribute to the Great Emancipator. Mr. Nixon began his speech by asking much the same question Tolstoy had: "Why, why is Lincoln, of all the American Presidents, more revered not only in America but in the world?" The President's answer was that Lincoln "freed the slaves," he "saved the Union," he "died of an assassin's bullet just at the height of his career," he had "humility," "humor," "feeling and kindness for people," and he possessed "perhaps more than anything else the strength, the poise under pressure." Then Mr. Nixon said, "When we examine the American Presidents, it is quite clear that no President in history has been more vilified or was more vilified during the time he was President than Lincoln. Those who knew him, his secretaries, have written that he was very deeply hurt by what was said about him and drawn about him, but on the other hand, Lincoln had that great strength of character never to display it, always to stand tall and strong and firm no matter how harsh or unfair the criticism might be."

Some of the reporters who accompanied the President to the Memorial concluded that he meant to compare his current ordeal to President Lincoln's ordeal during the Civil War—and, possibly, to suggest that history may compare the two men favorably in other ways. The parallel ignores history. While it is true that Lincoln was bitterly hated and reviled during his Presidency, it is also

true that he was widely loved and honored at the same time. During the height of the worst attacks on him, in 1864, he was re-elected by a majority of two hundred and twelve electoral votes to twenty-one for his popular Democratic opponent, General George B. McClellan. If President Nixon were running for reelection at a comparable time of vilification—this year—he would probably not get any electoral votes at all.

If, indeed, President Nixon meant to draw a comparison between Lincoln and himself, another flaw in the parallel could be found in the two Presidents' personal reactions to public criticism. President Nixon has used or allowed others to use his immense official power to silence and destroy his detractors and opponents—through wiretapping, and bugging, physical surveillance, tax audits, bribery, and trumped-up criminal prosecutions. When these criminal acts were revealed, Mr. Nixon responded to critics of his conduct—members of the press, for the most part—through innuendo, smear, and vilification, and when these tactics failed, he tried to convince the people that their concern about Watergate was the creation of his political enemies. It is difficult to know whether these responses were examples of what he meant by "poise under pressure." It is clear, though, that he believes he has such poise, for he has written a book about it and often reminds us that he is always the coolest man in the room. We cannot now determine just how strong and firm Lincoln was in the face of personal attacks. "As a general rule, I abstain from reading the reports of attacks upon myself, wishing not to be provoked by that to which I cannot properly offer an answer," he said in his last public address. Of course, it is difficult for a President to respond "properly" to unfair criticism in public, and Presidents with dignity and courage have not responded at all. In private, a President is entitled to rage or whine or joke as he pleases about such matters. We all know that Lincoln chose the last course. When an old friend from Illinois asked him how it felt to be President, he said, "You have heard about the man tarred and feathered and ridden out of town on a rail? A man in the crowd asked him how he liked it, and his reply was that if it wasn't for the honor of the thing, he would much rather walk."

"The particular factor that I would like to address . . . has to do with Lincoln's vision about America's role in the world," President Nixon said at the Memorial. "What we sometimes forget is that Abraham Lincoln was a world statesman at the time that America was not a world power. Here on these walls are inscribed many of his very familiar sayings [sic]. One from the Second Inaugural comes to mind when Lincoln said, 'To do all that we may to achieve and to cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and between all nations.' This is Lincoln one hundred and ten years ago." These words would scarcely have made Lincoln a world statesman even if he had spoken them, and he did not—at least, not in that way. What he said, in the words chiselled in marble above Mr. Nixon's head, was "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations." Mr. Nixon's remarks were written by his aides and rewritten by the President.

The distortions were small but far from trivial, for they altered Lincoln's intent. Lincoln's statement was a modest, and largely rhetorical, expression of the hope that America would remain at peace "with all nations"—a hope expressed by nearly all Presidents before and after him. Nixon's state-

ment was a concocted claim that his role as Lincoln's historical heir compels him to forge a peace "between all nations." From what history tells us about Lincoln, it seems that he was primarily concerned about restoring the integrity and purpose of the nation he led. But President Nixon would change history for us, in order to justify his own quite different concern. Such changes are characteristic of his public statements. A little twist here, a tiny alteration there, an addition or omission elsewhere, and in the end the essential meaning has been fundamentally transformed into a falsehood. And, of course, no lie is small when it is spoken by a President.

The President's obsession with foreign affairs at the sacrifice of even the most pressing domestic concern—Watergate, above all, right now—has led him to seek an exceedingly peculiar resolution of his political problems. Lee W. Huebner, who had been a speech writer for the President since he took office, recently quit his job, and in an interview he said that one of the main reasons for the President's determination not to resign was his conviction that he would finally be saved from disgrace by an unusual set of constituents—the leaders of other nations. "He looks to that foreign audience," Huebner went on. "Emotionally, that's kind of the center of things for him, and it's where he hopes to make his mark in history. As long as they are willing to deal with him, to take his word seriously, he feels that he is in a strong position." Of course, once those leaders see how dependent on them he is—and surely they must have by now—he is their pawn, and thereby jeopardizes the one form of national security that he has most fervently promised the American people, Mr. Nixon's reliance on a foreign political base suggests that he has come to believe the unbelievable—that he can do what no other person in history has been able to do, and bring "a generation of peace" to the entire world. It is a dangerous delusion. His utensils—balance of power and detente—are rusty and fragile. They depend on circumstance, and no one can predict circumstances tomorrow or next month, let alone a decade or a generation from now. While easing international tensions is important, nothing better illustrates the flimsy nature of the existing detente than the intrusive and belligerent acts of the Soviet Union last fall during the war in the Middle East, which has long and clearly been a vital sphere of interest for the West. And nothing could be more perilous for Americans than to be lulled into believing that a totalitarian state like the Soviet Union will not grab all the power it can when it can.

In the speech at the Memorial, President Nixon continued, "When America, torn by civil strife, and when America, even after it was united with both the North and the South working together to build a greater country, could not and would not even play a great role in the world for years and years to come, and yet Lincoln with the mystical sense of destiny and vision saw it all ahead when he said, 'Ours is earth's last, best hope.'" Once again, these are not quite Lincoln's words, and that was not at all his meaning. The misquoted speech that Mr. Nixon referred to dealt almost entirely with the subject of slavery and Lincoln's proposal for emancipation by way of a Constitutional amendment. At the end of the speech, Lincoln said, "Fellow-citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this Administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. We say we are for the Union. The world will not forget that we say this. We know how to save the Union. The world knows we do know

how to save it. We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth." If Lincoln envisioned "a great role in the world" for America, it was as an example—of decency and opportunity and freedom—to mankind.

"And now we come to today, one hundred and ten years later," Mr. Nixon continued. "Even Lincoln would have marvelled if he were living today. This nation now, the strongest nation in the world, the richest nation by far in the world, and a nation greatly respected all over the world, and the question he would have asked, as we must ask ourselves, is how will history look back on our time? What did we do with our strength? What did we do with our wealth? Did we use it only for ourselves, or did we recognize as Lincoln recognized that we had a destiny far beyond this great nation, looking out over the whole wide world?" Lincoln's major speeches and letters have almost nothing to say about the world outside the United States, except to report a couple of times to Congress that his Administration was doing its best to keep various European governments from intruding in our affairs. (One of Lincoln's few other remarks on the outside world—in his address to a committee from the New York Workingmen's Association, on March 21, 1864—would not be of much political use at home, but it might come in handy the next time President Nixon visits the Kremlin: "The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues, and kindreds.") As Lincoln repeatedly made clear, his chief aim—in fact, his only aim—was to preserve the Union. But President Nixon has turned away from the Republic that Lincoln saved, and asks the people to avert their eyes from his Administration's betrayal of "the last, best hope of earth" while he forges a grand alliance with those who have enslaved hundreds of millions.

Any generally accepted list of "great" American Presidents would include Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, and possibly Truman. These men possessed a unique American genius, which might be best described by the word "humanitarian." They had passionate and compassionate minds, and their political goal was to add to human freedom—not in some abstract or rhetorical way but practically, through giving ordinary men and women a better chance to fulfill themselves. Lincoln probably stated this goal as well as anyone, in a special message to Congress shortly after the outbreak of the Civil War: "This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start, and a fair chance in the race of life." Mr. Nixon has rarely displayed this kind of attitude, politically or personally. The scant attention he has devoted to domestic concerns—that is, the immediate well-being of the people he was chosen to serve—has usually revealed, instead, an authoritarian instinct, a desire to oppress rather than to liberate men. The other day, for instance, he ordered his latest Attorney General to press Congress for passage of a law restoring the death penalty for a variety of crimes. During the Civil War, a lawyer interceded with Lincoln on behalf of a seaman who he believed had been unjustly convicted of manslaughter. Lincoln listened to the story, then said, "It must be referred to the Attorney General, but I guess it will be all right, for me and

the Attorney General's very chickenhearted." In addition to being compassionate men, the great Presidents have been men of Lincoln's personal integrity. A friend of Lincoln's who had set up a bank under the new National Bank Act wrote to the President to offer him a chance to buy some stock in the venture. Lincoln wrote back to thank him and decline, saying he realized that stock in a solid national bank was a good investment, but explaining that as President he felt he should not profit from a law passed under his Administration. Later, the banker said, "He seemed to wish to avoid even the appearance of evil."

In Mr. Nixon's speech, he told his audience, "These thoughts come to mind that Lincoln might well have advised us: One, that . . . America always used its strength, certainly in this century at least, used its strength to defend freedom and never to destroy it, to keep the peace and to defend the peace and never to break it." Historians of the future may find this statement puzzling, in light of our activities in Guatemala, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. "I think Lincoln also would have had this admonition to his fellow-Americans on such an occasion as this in this particular period in our history," Mr. Nixon went on. "He would have hoped that America with its strength and its wealth would not turn away from greatness, despite the fact that some other nations in the world turn inward, failing to assume their responsibilities for building a peaceful world. Lincoln would have said, a great nation, a strong nation, a rich nation, and a great people will use their strength and their wealth to build a world in which peace and freedom can survive for themselves and for others as well. This, I think, is the Lincoln heritage for today. It is the Lincoln admonition for tomorrow and I would trust for the next generation and perhaps for the next century." Others might feel that the Lincoln heritage is, and will remain, what it has always been—to protect the Republic against its domestic enemies with patience and decency under law. History may find that the most dangerous enemies of the United States in the period since the Civil War were the Nixon Administration's highest officials and the President himself. And history may also find that the greatness of this nation was most severely tested by the manner in which its people turned inward to cleanse its corruption.

"I conclude simply by paraphrasing what Lincoln said so many years ago so much more eloquently, we could meanly lose what is mankind's last, best hope for peace and freedom, but we could also nobly save it," President Nixon said at the close of the memorial service. "Abraham Lincoln, who saved the Union, would say to us today, let this great Union, North, South, East, and West, now save the cause of peace and freedom for the whole world." Abraham Lincoln might be more inclined to warn us about a leader who would attempt to save his own political life and lose his nation's soul.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT LEOPOLDO BENITES AT THE OPENING SESSION OF THE SIXTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 9 the United Nations' General Assembly

commenced its sixth special session to discuss the formidable problems relating to the world's raw materials and resources. President Leopoldo Benites of Ecuador opened the meeting with a very concise statement of the session's goals. He emphasized that the deliberations would represent a milestone in the history of the United Nations "not so much because of what we derive from it—because we cannot expect too much with such a broad subject and in so short a time—but because, from today onwards, it will be necessary to devise a completely new approach to international economic problems, a critical reformulation of the guiding principles and a restructuring of cooperation among States."

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues share my great interest in this session of the U.N. Therefore, I am including the complete text of President Benites' statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT OF SIXTH SPECIAL SESSION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY, LEOPOLDO BENITES (ECUADOR), AT OPENING MEETING OF SESSION

Following is the text of a statement by Leopoldo Benites (Ecuador), newly elected President of the sixth special session of the General Assembly, prepared for delivery at the opening meeting of the session this afternoon:

It is with sincere emotion that I thank you for the honour you have conferred upon me by electing me to preside at the sixth special session of the General Assembly, and I believe I am correctly interpreting the feelings of the Chairmen of the Main Committees and of the representatives of the States elected to serve as Vice-Chairmen, if I express their gratitude to you on their behalf.

I consider it an invariable moral principle that every honour conferred entails an implicit duty. It is my duty to conduct your deliberations with objectivity, impartiality and fairness. I promise you that I will fulfil it.

I can assure you, with no flattery intended but rather as a serious warning, that, in my opinion, the sixth special session which we open today is one of those that represents a milestone in the history of our Organization, not so much because of what we derive from it—because we cannot expect too much with such a broad subject and in so short a time—but because, from today onwards, it will be necessary to devise a completely new approach to international economic problems, a critical reformulation of the guiding principles and a restructuring of co-operation among States.

In the last few months, we have witnessed an extremely interesting phenomenon: the unexpected effect produced by a single economic measure on the structure of international relations.

Firstly, the vulnerability of power relationships—of both economic and political power—which are based on the idea of the dependence of the producers of essential raw materials on the countries better equipped to process them, has been demonstrated. This is even more significant when we consider that some 25 developing countries have between 80 and 90 per cent of the total reserves of the essential raw materials for the industry of the more developed or, if you will, the better equipped countries. This will necessitate a reformulation of the problems in such a way that, by replacing confrontation by co-operation, effective and flexible solutions may be found.

A second inevitable consequence will be a change in the simplistic schemes which served as an instrument of development. In the light of recent events the differences in degrees of development, which cannot now be

frozen by applying arbitrary designations, have become more marked. But these very differences will necessitate greater interdependence, more effective development of the forms of international solidarity and the search for means of preserving the unity of the developing world.

The impact of recent events on the inflationary process, on balance-of-payments disequilibria and on the high cost of living will—if a major disaster is to be averted—necessitate new approaches to the problems and more imaginative and creative solutions. The United Nations, as the centre for co-ordinating international co-operation, will have to make maximum use of the capacities both of its own bodies and of the specialized agencies.

We are faced with the challenge of many formidable problems which demand new solutions. In such a short time it cannot be hoped that such solutions can be found during the special session we are now opening, but it can be hoped that general principles and guidelines will be established for achieving them.

Allow me to express the hope that constructive co-operation will replace confrontation and that solidarity will replace isolation. The recent events have demonstrated the growing interdependence of States and their indissoluble links within the international community. They have also demonstrated that solutions cannot be found by grouping together economic forces in virtual battlefronts and that coexistence based on arbitrarily laying down the law has no place in the complex world of today. The United Nations, which is constitutionally the centre of international economic and social co-ordination, must therefore find new solutions for the new problems if we sincerely wish to avoid a crisis whose results are unpredictable. It will depend on our efforts whether we start today to advance towards the creative co-operation which will produce those solutions, or whether we leave the world beset with fear of a total, inevitable and dramatic crisis.

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE DIPLOMACY THROUGH SPORTS

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, in March, Alan A. Reich, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, spoke at the International Studies Association Conference in St. Louis on how sports help to further international understanding. His speech focused on the way sports helps nations communicate internationally on an informal and nongovernmental basis. He pointed out that sports opens doors to societies and leaders, provides a two-way exchange between different peoples, enhances the understanding and appreciation of another nation's values and culture, and develops a basis for continued communication and cooperation.

At a time when the United States is actively engaged in improving and strengthening our relations with other governments, I think it is significant that sports have played and continue to play an important part in what Deputy Assistant Secretary Reich calls "people-to-people diplomacy."

The title of Mr. Reich's speech is "International Understanding and People-to-People Diplomacy Through Sports." This is such an interesting and informative speech that I want to share it with my colleagues:

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE DIPLOMACY THROUGH SPORTS

It is a privilege to speak before the International Studies Association on furthering understanding through sports. This meeting will be, I am sure, a significant landmark in the process of engaging more fully American social scientists in exploring ways of enhancing the contribution of sports to international mutual understanding.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE DIPLOMACY

Diplomacy has gone public. Many foreign offices no longer confine themselves to speaking with other foreign offices for peoples; they help and encourage peoples to speak for themselves across national boundaries. People-to-people communication has become a dominant force in international relations throughout the world.

Technological advances have made nuclear war a threat to mankind's existence. Fortunately, new initiatives and agreements in the disarmament field offer hope that the deadly cycle of weapons build-up will be broken. Prospects for increased government-to-government cooperation look better today than at any time since World War II. The great powers are focusing on areas of common concern and not only on their differences. The results appear promising.

In the past few years, social scientists increasingly have studied the relevance of informal, nongovernmental communications activities to matters of war and peace. As you know, research scholars are developing a more scientific base for these transnational cross-cultural communications activities. Their research suggests that the existence of informal communications tends to reduce the level of tension when conflicts of interest occur and contributes to a climate of opinion in which conflicts may be negotiated more effectively. Second, their research indicates that informal relationships create a greater openness in individual attitudes toward other nations, peoples, and cultures. These predispositions also lead to greater readiness to communicate and to resolve differences peaceably. Third, social scientists tell us that international cooperation and two-way exchange contribute to world-mindedness and to an internationalist perspective on what otherwise might be viewed as purely national problems. Finally, international people-to-people relationships help develop enduring networks of communication which cut across boundaries and reduce the likelihood of polarization along political or nationalist lines.

ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE IN INFORMAL COMMUNICATION

When you think of the State Department's conduct of our international affairs, people-to-people diplomacy and exchange-of-persons programs may not come immediately to mind. It is, nonetheless, a significant Department activity carried out with 126 nations of the world.

I would like to elaborate on the State Department's cultural relations program. The exciting, challenging job of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs is to use its resources to reinforce the work of American individuals and organizations who want to help construct the foundation of better relationships with the rest of the world. The Bureau also coordinates, as necessary, the activities of other government agencies with international exchange programs in such fields as health, education, social welfare, transportation, agriculture, military training, and urban planning.

There are several major elements in the

Department's cultural relations program. Annually, some 5,000 professors, lecturers, and scholars are exchanged to and from the United States. The international visitor program brings to this country about 1,500 foreign leaders and potential leaders annually for orientation tours of 4-6 weeks duration. Each year we send abroad several leading performing arts groups and athletic stars. For example, recently we sent the New York City Ballet to the Soviet Union and the Philadelphia Philharmonic to the People's Republic of China; this month, in response to requests from several countries, we sent a tennis teaching team to the Near East. We also send some 150 U.S. lecturers abroad annually for brief lecture tours.

PRIVATELY SPONSORED EXCHANGES

We in the Department of State are aware our programs represent only a portion of the total private-public participation of Americans in exchanges aimed at furthering international mutual understanding. Service organizations, professional associations of doctors, lawyers, journalists, municipal administrations, and others link their members with counterparts throughout the world.

More than 40 national sports organizations carry on international programs involving their athletes in competition, demonstrations, and coaching clinics here and abroad. Several youth organizations conduct international exchanges with nearly 5,000 American and foreign teenage participants each year.

Numerous foundations, businesses, and institutions throughout America facilitate the private studies of many of the nearly 150,000 foreign students who come to the United States annually and approximately half that number of Americans who study abroad each year. Private American performing arts groups tour other countries; reciprocal opportunities are offered to counterpart groups from abroad.

Many People-to-People organizations actively promote and carry out meaningful exchanges; 480 American cities are linked through the Sister City Program with communities in 68 countries of the world.

COMMUNICATING INTERNATIONALLY THROUGH SPORTS

So much for people-to-people relations and international communication in general; what about sports, in particular? In this decade we have witnessed some of the most significant international sports events in history; some have made history. Although the Munich Olympic disaster, the Central America soccer war, and other occasional untoward events have tested our convictions about sports and international understanding, research suggests sports work against stereotypes and misconceptions in general. Lasting impressions reinforce the common humanity of sports over the long term. Our term is the long term in creating a favorable climate for international cooperation. I should like to comment on the ways in which sports, as a universal language, can further international understanding.

Sports open doors to societies and key leaders. They pave the way for expanded contact—cultural, economic, and political. The table-tennis exchanges with the People's Republic of China are outstanding examples in which U.S. athletes have been involved.

Sports provide an example of friendly competition and give-and-take, two-way interchange which hopefully will characterize and lead to other types of friendly relationships between nations. Even when competition becomes intense, the fact that the activity continues within the context of rules and controls can demonstrate the capacity for endurance of our ideals. I think more research is needed on this subject.

Sports convey on a person-to-person basis and through the media to the broader public

a sense of commonness of interest shared with other peoples across political boundaries.

Sports enhance understanding of another nation's values and culture, so important but often absent in many forms of international communication. These qualities include determination and self-sacrifice, individual effort as well as teamwork, wholesomeness, empathy, good sportsmanship, and a sense of fair play. Sports thus can help to improve perceptions of other peoples and to close the gap between myth and reality.

In many countries, and especially the less-developed ones sports serves as a unifying force in helping overcome traditional tribal and linguistic pluralism. Heads of State in Africa, for example, have encouraged sports development for this reason. They also have promoted sports as a cohesive force for unity in the continent as a whole.

Sports organizations, in administering international sports activities, develop the bases for ongoing communication and cooperation. In this work, the numerous sports associations, as nongovernmental groups, are symbols of the freedom of peoples to organize themselves, to travel and communicate across national boundaries, and to work together to carry forward freely their own interests. They further the ideals of freedom. They also help develop leadership which is needed especially by the developing nations as they struggle to reduce the gap between the have and have-not peoples of the world.

I could illustrate each of these values of international sports with many examples, as I am sure you could. We also could cite cases in which negative results were realized. But on balance, the many thousands of ongoing interactions in sports annually are a tremendous force for good in the world. For all these reasons, the U.S. State Department has a serious commitment to international sports.

THE ROLE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT IN SPORTS

Since sports in the United States is a non-governmental activity, the State Department's role reflects this basic concept in international sports. As I mentioned earlier, our interest is in furthering international mutual understanding and communication over the long term. As part of the official U.S. cultural relations, our sports office in the Department carries out, in cooperation with the USIA and cultural officers in our embassies, a small, high-quality, and we hope catalytic, program. We provide policy guidance as necessary to the other federal agencies carrying out international sports programs. The Peace Corps currently has more than 100 U.S. coaches serving abroad on request of host nations. The Department of Defense carries out a world-wide military sports program with foreign military counterparts of 52 countries.

On request of other nations, each year we send a small number of teaching teams of outstanding athletes and coaches abroad to conduct demonstrations and clinics and teach sports administration. We bring several sports administrators annually to the United States for orientation programs as recommended by our embassies. Occasionally we arrange to "pick up" a U.S. group participating in a sports event abroad and send them on a goodwill tour into additional countries. When, for example, the Coca Cola Company sponsored an AAU international swimming meet in London, after the meet we sent four small teams of U.S. participants into Eastern Europe and North Africa. Our sports office, in cooperation with the embassies concerned, evaluates Department-sponsored tours to improve planning for future activities.

The Department also makes a few small seed money grants each year as an inducement to selected organizations in raising private funds to carry out their programs more effectively. Reflecting our interest in two-

way interchange, we recently assisted the Partners of the Americas to develop a program of sending a group of basketball coaches to Latin America and bringing soccer coaches to their partner U.S. states.

In addition to these programs, we facilitate private efforts, when possible, by providing briefings on the cultural and political situation in countries to be visited, by offering suggestions for cooperative programming, by assisting with overseas communications or by furnishing guidance on international affairs. In response to requests for guidance from private organizations, our sports office has contracted for preparation of a manual on "how to conduct a successful international sports tour." We hope it will be helpful to private groups requesting it. Our Consulate General in Munich furnished considerable planning assistance to the U.S. Olympic Committee over a period of months. Thousands of Americans will be involved in the Olympic Development program as well as in the 1976 Olympic Games when 7,000 athletes from 122 nations will participate. We may be called upon to provide facilitative assistance.

There are thousands of privately-sponsored international sports activities annually involving trips to and from the United States of athletes, coaches, and administrators. It is in our national interest—in the U.S. taxpayers' interest—to help ensure that these activities do in fact contribute to the maximum extent possible, to better international mutual understanding.

I frequently have been asked by leaders of private U.S. sports organizations what more they might do, beyond what they already are doing, to further international understanding. You might be interested in 12 suggestions I offer to them for their consideration and action:

1. Help strengthen the Olympic movement, including the Olympic development program.
2. Strengthen the ties which bind us with other peoples by actively participating in international sports associations.
3. Encourage excellence in all aspects of international interchange.
4. Ensure that participants conduct themselves as representatives of their country.
5. Develop cooperative programming with other private organizations such as People-to-People Sports Committee, Partners of the Americas, Operation Cross-Roads Africa, Sister Cities International, youth, and community service organizations.
6. Seek greater public visibility through the media to expose the maximum number of people here and abroad to the international goodwill generated.
7. Help insure U.S. participants in international sports interchange gain advance understanding of important cultural differences and political realities.
8. Seek facilitative and financial assistance of U.S. companies operating internationally, since they have an interest in carrying out public service activities abroad as they do in the United States.
9. Develop and carry out international sports events in support of disaster relief, which also serves to dramatize the humanity of sports.
10. Encourage and publicize the participation of international federation representatives at sports events to dramatize the universality of sports and its contribution to international understanding.
11. Assist other nations as requested in building their counterpart sports organizations to ensure ongoing interchange.
12. Provide home hospitality, in cooperation with community organizations, for international sports visitors to the United States.

We receive inquiries occasionally about State Department policies or guidelines concerning sports. One of our most important policies with respect to international sports is to encourage and assist while at the same

time seeking to preserve and encourage the private sector initiative, vigor, diversity and dynamism which are America's strengths. Sports in the United States is best handled and managed by the private sector—not the government. Therefore, our facilitative role in helping U.S. sports organizations carry on their own international programs effectively is our most important one. Aside from encouraging but not controlling effective international communication through sports, we have very few policies. I would mention, however, the following:

The Department of State supports the Olympic movement and encourages the pursuit of the Olympic ideals. We hold with the Olympic precept that it is not winning, but participating well that, over the long term, will contribute most to enhancing international understanding and cooperation. We cooperate with the U.S. Olympic Committee in carrying out their Olympic development program.

The U.S. supports the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the principle of opposing discrimination. Sports should advance the ideals of individual dignity and human rights without regard to race, sex, color, or creed. In late 1972, the United States voted with the majority of nations in the General Assembly to uphold this principle in sports. On that occasion we noted with regret that some national and international sports organizations continued sports interchange with South Africa involving teams closed to otherwise qualified athletes because of their race and color. At that time we urged U.S. sports organizations to follow this principle.

We encourage increased participation by women athletes in international sports.

We encourage and facilitate actions which will result in the greatest possible contribution to international mutual understanding and which will minimize possible misunderstanding. We urge American sportsmen going abroad to view themselves as representatives of their country, to act accordingly, and to avoid poor sportsmanship which can reflect adversely on themselves and all Americans.

We assist, on request, private organizations and groups in understanding the political realities which may be important to them and to the United States in their international activities. We encourage private U.S. organizations in their dealings with sports organizations of other nations, and particularly those with highly-centralized governments and sports ministries, to become acquainted with relevant international rules and with negotiating techniques employed by their international counterparts so as to not put American sportsmen and organizers at a disadvantage.

In our own international sports programming, we attempt to be responsive to requests of other nations seeking American athletes, administrators, and coaches, rather than forcing our expertise and exports on them.

In the few international sports tours we sponsor, we concentrate on geographic areas of the world where communication is limited and where privately-sponsored programs are less likely to go.

We prefer to sponsor teaching teams of coaches and athletes who can work together with their international counterparts rather than competitions which can create aggressive or hostile feelings. To the extent we sponsor international competitive activities, we prefer to do so in those sports less likely to produce confrontation. We prefer to encourage and carry out programs which result in two-way interchange and dialogue.

We endeavor to carry out an evenhanded policy with respect to the private sports organizations in the United States. We cooperate appropriately with all groups contributing to international mutual understanding. The inter-organizational jurisdictional disputes on occasion create difficulty for the

Department of State and embarrassment to all Americans; we take pains to not exacerbate or become involved in their problems and to take into account the rules of the many U.S. and international sports organizations. At the same time, we do not hesitate to ask them to cooperate with each other and with us in the national interest.

As with people in other sectors of American life whom we seek to bring into contact with international counterparts to further mutual understanding, we sponsor and encourage excellence. To do otherwise can be insulting to hosts abroad and demeaning to ourselves.

I am grateful to the International Studies Association and the International Society for Educational, Cultural, and Scientific Interchange for taking the leadership in expanding the scholarly interest in this key international activity. There is certain to be a radiating impact from this conference leading to greater cooperative efforts of the U.S. academic and sports communities to increase international mutual understanding. I would only urge full speed ahead as you address these issues so important to all of us.

Thank you for your continuing work to further the ideals of sports worldwide and in the process for helping to build the human foundations for the structure of peace.

THE ENERGY CRISIS IS NOT A CRISIS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, there is still a great deal of discussion about the energy shortage we have experienced. The April 1974 issue of the *Alternative* contains the following article about the energy crisis. I think that my colleagues in Congress will find the following article interesting:

[From the *Alternative*, April 1974]

THE ENERGY CRISIS IS NOT A CRISIS

(By Timothy J. Wheeler)

In the year 301 A.D., the emperor Diocletian called a press conference. "Unprincipled greed," he said, had caused food prices to go up eightfold recently, and as Emperor of all the people, it was his duty to bring prices and wages into line. He had therefore issued a total edict that "commanded cheapness" in many hundreds of commodities and put ceilings on wages in almost every occupation, with the death penalty for offenders.

Did comprehensive wage-price controls, enforced with the death penalty, stop inflation? Not exactly. Thirteen years later the historian Lactantius reported the results of Diocletian's edict: "After the many oppressions which he had put in practice had brought a general dearth upon the empire, he then set himself to regulate the prices of all vendible things. There was much bloodshed upon very slight and trifling accounts; and the people brought provisions no more to markets, since they could not get a reasonable price for them; and this increased the dearth so much that at last, after many had died by it, the law itself was laid aside." In a word, Rome starved.

In the year 1971 A.D., eleven days after promising that he would never impose wage-price controls,² the emperor Richard called a press conference to announce that he had

Footnotes at end of article.

issued an edict imposing controls on most prices and wages.⁴

Did general wage and price controls, enforced by the Internal Revenue Service,⁵ stop inflation? Not exactly. Two years later the historian Timothy observed that Richard's edict had brought a general dearth upon the empire. Among the goods reported in short supply after the imposition of controls were: wheat, beef, corn, soybeans, fish, pork, milk, cheese, bacon, chickens, turkeys, salmon, raisins, potatoes, dried fruit, mayonnaise, cat-sup, peaches, margarine, canned vegetables, canned meats, asparagus, artichokes, lobster, frozen berries, green beans, peas, apricots, Spam, cooking oil, baked beans, potato chips, onions, quail eggs, truffles, prawns, turtle meat, pitted cherries, capers, juniper berries, king crab, frogs, earthworms, lumber, paper, steel, horses, rules, copper, pet food, business forms, cow gallstones, cement, aluminum, machine tools, heavy machinery, plastics, detergents, fertilizers, hay, drill pipe, coal, hydroelectric power, and a large number of parts, supplies, and minerals for business and industry.⁶ And, of course, petroleum—the energy crisis. . . . *and the people brought provisions no more to market since they could not get a reasonable price for them.*

There seem to be a great number of people who don't know what is causing the energy crisis. I am not one of them, and if you are, you did not read our little history lesson with your thinking-cap on.

Shortages are a novelty in this land of plenty. Understandably, many people blame the oil companies, or greedy capitalists, or them damn Arabs for the energy crisis. Possibly so, if we were only short of oil. But we need another sort of explanation for shortages of many different goods at once. Them Arabs can stop selling oil to the United States, but they can't cause shortages of beef, or coal or quail eggs.

A shortage means not enough supply to meet demand. When there is one shortage, the problem is not enough supply (dried up wells or Arabs). When there are many shortages, the problem in common is too much demand (a dollar blizzard). In other words, apart from the Arab oil embargo,⁷ the oil shortages has little or nothing to do with the oil industry,⁸ and everything to do with the surplus of dollars. We may conclude without doubt that the energy crisis originated in the money factories of Washington, D.C. The principal villain is inflation.

Inflation alone, however, does not cause shortages, at least not right away.⁹ It robs widows and orphans, damages contracts, invites mismanagement, undermines morality (yes, it does), encourages shoddy merchandise, raises hell with the economy, causes depressions, and makes politicians wealthy, but that is another story.

What we need to know here is that inflation is an increase (an inflating) in the money supply—legal counterfeiting. The more money (or anything) there is in circulation, the less it is worth. So, as the government money factories keep producing more money,¹⁰ the price of the dollar goes down and down, meaning that the dollar price of beef and coal and everything else goes up and up. When prices rise, tempers rise. As things get worse, the government promises to "fight inflation,"¹¹ and the stage is set for the emperor to call his press conference.

Shortages never occur in the free market because prices can (and do) fluctuate to reflect changes in the supply and demand. When there is a greater demand for widgets, either 1) widget makers will make more widgets to satisfy the demand, or 2) the price of widgets will rise and demand will fall until supply and demand are again in balance and trading resumes. In either case, supply is sufficient to meet demand at the market price and there is no shortage.¹² You could not cause a shortage even if Uncle Howard left you enough money to buy up

99 percent of the world's widgets or gold or quail eggs.¹³

Shortages occur only when prices are fixed at a level below what the market says they should be. Naturally, more buyers want to buy at these bargain prices, but fewer sellers are willing to sell. There is not enough supply to meet demand at the government-fixed price, and that is what we call a shortage.

Competition eliminates the possibility of fixing prices in the open market—regardless of what you may have heard about monopolists, profiteers, price collusions, or sharpies who corner the widget market. To fix prices, you have to destroy the market—overrule the continuous bargaining by millions of traders that keeps the goods moving by adjusting prices. It takes power and a lot of it to thwart these millions of traders and enforce fixed prices.¹⁴ The only force strong enough to do it is the law—police power. Government and only government has the power to fix prices and cause shortages.

Now we have pinned down the two principal causes of the energy crisis: government counterfeiting (inflation) and government price fixing. The first debases the currency and causes commodity prices to rise; the second foolishly attempts to suppress these price rises by force, and only succeeds in keeping goods off the market. Massive government regulation of oil and related industries makes matters a lot worse, but that need not be discussed here.¹⁵

To sum up: there is an energy crisis, but it is strictly artificial and man-made. It is caused by Emperor Richard's policies. It could be cured overnight by reversing those policies and letting the market function.

The emperor Richard knows all this. He knows he caused the oil shortage, and he knows he could end it tomorrow. Yet he does not do so. He believes his policies should remain in effect even if it causes the public inconvenience and hardship. The energy crisis, you see, is not a crisis at all. It is official U.S. government policy.

Why? Why does the government persist in policies it knows to be harmful to the public? Why is it an article of faith among politicians of both parties to keep oil prices fixed at artificially low levels, even though it causes shortages? These can be vexing questions if you trust politicians and believe the government is benevolent.

Such questions are less troublesome if you assume, realistically, that the principal business of the government is looking after the government, i.e., the care and feeding of politicians. Its policies are therefore shaped not by what is good for the public, but by what is necessary to stay in power. Call this cynicism if you want to, but it also helps to observe that the government is in business to fight miseries, not to cure them. If it cured our miseries, it would be out of a job. Since the job pays more than \$450,000,000,000 a year (federal, state, and local)—with superb prospects for advancement—few of our miseries are likely to be cured by politicians. Indeed, politicians welcome and occasionally contrive new miseries for the public, since they can increase their wealth, prestige, and power by promising to "fight" this new evil. Emperor Richard's "fight" against inflation seems to be along these lines.

In my opinion, the government persists in its "energy crisis" policies because it is politically expedient. Gasoline and fuel oil prices affect almost everybody. Low prices are more popular than high prices. Therefore, the politicians promise to fight for low prices. They argue that lifting price controls would send gasoline prices out of reach of the poor—and after all, the poor are just as entitled to buy gasoline as the rich.¹⁶ They promise to develop new sources of oil. And if the shortage persists, they still promise that everyone will get his "fair share" by—"reluctantly" of course—imposing gasoline rationing. Every one of the promises will be

fulfilled with your money, and they will all help keep the energy crisis going and politicians employed.

Here is a sample of the prevailing political rhetoric: (Washington-AP)—"Proposals to lift price controls from natural gas could cost consumers an extra \$18 billion annually in increased fuel costs, Representative Les Aspin (D-Wis.) said yesterday. He said that natural gas deregulation 'amounts to nothing less than a multibillion-dollar profit grab by giant oil companies. . . .'"

Representative Aspin is really pitchin' it. The fact is, he and his colleagues have already grabbed the \$18 billion, and a lot more, with inflation. Every new dollar the federal government creates is a dollar stolen out of the economy. You and I have to cover these losses by paying higher consumer prices.¹⁷

Deregulating, freeing the market from the politicians' stranglehold, would make gasoline, fuel oil, and natural gas available again in plentiful supply. You would be able to buy "your share"—all you want and can afford. You would indeed have to pay more for it: not because the giant oil companies are ripping you off, but because the government is. The value of the dollar has been falling since 1862.¹⁸

But lifting wage-price controls would also mean less power and wealth for politicians, and they won't permit it. Politicians have been playing these games for millennia as we have seen, and they have invented an awful lot of ways to perpetuate and cover up the wholesale larceny that is the standard of excellence in their profession. The race has been on ever since King Glogg discovered he could take your money—without the risk of getting clubbed—by calling it taxation. Since that sorry day, politicians have invented indirect taxes (taxes hidden in the price of goods), progressive taxes, inflation-counterfeiting (a tax on capital), tax withholding (so you won't notice), and other refinements. They have also invented national emergencies, wars, austerity programs, rationing, and such to force you to lower your standard of living to what it should be after they've cleaned you out. No sacrifice you can make is too great to keep this noble enterprise afloat. So turn down your thermostat, drive at 55 mph, stop visiting grandma on Sundays, and stop bitching about it.

The price of a commodity, not bureaucrats, should tell you how to use it. If the price is low, you use it freely. If it is high, you have to conserve. By lifting controls and letting the dollar sink, the government would automatically promote the conservation of scarce energy. In the face of high petroleum prices, people would turn down their thermostats, drive slower, form car pools, and so on without being told by Washington, D.C. By retaining controls, the government is actually encouraging fuel wastage. And the next step, gasoline rationing, is much more wasteful.

You may as well get used to it all. So long as inflation and wage-price controls remain the operative federal policy, there will be general shortages, including of course the "energy crisis." How long this will go on, I don't know. But look what happened to Diocletian's Rome.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Politicians always blame the greedy and the profiteers when the public refuses to accept debauched currency at its face value; and as you can see, they have been doing it for millennia. Actually, the statement can be taken at face value referring to the greed of Diocletian and his predecessors who had, over two centuries, debased the Roman denarius from nearly pure silver to 99.98 percent base metal—in effect, the denarius was inflated to 1/4700 its former value. Here is what the Second Continental Congress had to say in November 1776, five months after it began

issuing worthless paper "Continentials" to finance the Revolutionary War: "... any person who shall hereafter be so lost to all virtue and regard for his country as to refuse to receive said bills in payment, or obstruct and discourage the currency or circulation thereof ... shall be deemed ... an enemy of his country."

² Lactantius is referring to the welfare state, reckless inflation, and crushing taxes. Nowadays, we call these "progress," not "oppressions."

³ When the Administration later promised there would be no gasoline rationing, the nation's supply of gas cans sold out in a few days.

⁴ "The lesson that government price fixing doesn't work is never learned"—Richard M. Nixon, 1956.

⁵ A police agency.

⁶ I am not making this up. In the interests of even-handed justice, I can also report that those goods reported in plentiful supply over the same period were: sunflower seeds, paper money, taxes, and political rhetoric.

⁷ Shutting off, temporarily, between 5 and 10 percent of our usual supply (published figures vary)—not enough to cause serious dislocations.

⁸ If further evidence is needed, available U.S. oil supplies are, in the middle of the crisis, at or near record highs.

⁹ Over the long term, inflation seriously damages productive capacity by encouraging misinvestment. This restricts supply, and will cause shortages if price controls are in effect, or even higher prices if there are no controls. Either way it can prompt politicians to declare an emergency and impose controls on nonpoliticians.

¹⁰ Unfortunately, nobody throws used money out with the rest of the garbage. The supply keeps growing, and its value sinks accordingly.

¹¹ A classic case of the government's unfailing preference to fight an evil instead of curing it. In this case, the government solemnly pledges to "fight" inflation when all it need do is *stop inflating*. Don't bother telling your representatives to stop inflating. They would sooner dishonor their mothers.

¹² The market is nonstop bargaining by buyers and sellers, both seeking the best price they can get. These traders, the experts in supply (what's for sale) and demand (what people will pay money for) will find the right (mutually agreeable to both) price to keep the goods moving. Their livelihood depends on it. So long as the traders can strike a bargain at whatever price they choose, goods will be readily exchanged and no shortage will develop. The goods stop moving and shortages (or surpluses) commence when the price is fixed by law at a point where either buyer or seller refuses to trade.

¹³ When you try to cause a shortage by cornering the widget market, you will be bidding against all other widget buyers in the world. The higher you raise your bid, the more the other buyers will drop out of the bidding and order Ajax Patented Widget Substitutes, or go into dry goods. Finally you bid the price of widgets up to \$17,000 a dozen. Every garage and attic in the world is ransacked for old widgets to sell to you. You succeed in buying every widget except those owned by that economic hobbyist in Vermont and the fine Smithsonian collection. Is there a shortage of widgets? At \$17,000 a dozen? Don't be silly.

¹⁴ Politicians' efforts to thwart traders are never entirely successful. There are always some who would rather trade than obey the law. This is called, notably by politicians, a black market, it works just like a free market, except that black market traders get much higher profit margins and prices to cover the risk of being fined or jailed. This situation is tailor-made for the entrepreneurs of the Mob, who live outside the law anyway. Thus criminals follow the govern-

ment and its economic interventions the way grackles follow a horse pecking at the manure.

¹⁵ Government regulation tend to cause industrial senility, hamper production, and create privilege and monopoly; and in all cases it causes prices to rise. Somebody has to pay for everything the regulators order, and it turns out to be you and I. I started to do a list of the government's regulatory attentions to the petroleum industry: all the way from the Santa Barbara channel and the North Slope oilfields to your empty gas tank. After the list got to be three pages long, I was too ill to continue, and resolved never to make it public. All this regulatory meddling was justified in the first place by the argument that it would prevent economic crises. You can see how well it prevented the energy crisis.

¹⁶ The learned say that present oil shortages translate into gasoline prices of no more than 55-70 cents per gallon. The poor, like the rest of us, could conserve and buy less. It seems absurd to argue that they could not afford gasoline at such prices, especially if they can afford an automobile. I know from experience that the argument is false. Stationed in Europe a dozen years ago, I could buy gasoline from the Army, tax free, for 12 cents a gallon, but the Europeans had to pay 70-90 cents a gallon; it was sold by the litre. The Europeans were far worse off economically than American poor are today, but they managed very well despite an "unaffordable" price of gasoline. They adjusted to the circumstances with small cars, motorcycles, bicycles, and hitchhiking.

¹⁷ Theft losses are deductible on federal income taxes. It would be interesting to deduct inflation as a test case.

¹⁸ The year honest Abe Lincoln invented greenbacks. The Supreme Court legalized them seventeen years later, notwithstanding that the framers of the Constitution had specifically denied to both federal and state governments the power to print paper money. The paper money in your pocket is still not constitutional. Come to think of it, it's not even money.

FRESHPERSON POWER

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and my colleagues in the House of Representatives a speech I gave on April 1, 1974, before the New York Women in Communications on "Freshperson Power":

FRESHPERSON POWER

Recent years have seen all kinds of people on the outskirts of power flexing their muscles. We hear of black power, senior power, women power, Indian power—to name a few.

I would like to discuss a new aspect of this phenomenon—freshman power. Or shouldn't we call it "freshperson" power? In these liberated days, the words "freshman" or "freshwoman" would seem too restrictive. But more important, "freshperson" carries a delightful dual connotation. It implies newness and new approaches, and it also suggests a wholesome impertinence and impatience.

The freshperson is not a novel phenomenon. But it is one that, unfortunately, has not received proper political or sociological attention—yet. Let me explore with you some of the main features of freshperson power.

I hope I won't be accused of being too unscientific if I pick myself—a rather unrandom selection—as an example.

The easiest way to detect a freshperson around the halls of Congress is to see which offices still have lights on after 6 p.m. Freshpersons are those who still haven't learned a fundamental Congressional maxim that was succinctly explained to me by a senior member: "The way you get along is to do the minimum."

The second characteristic is a singular reluctance to accept the ancient wisdom that you can't accomplish a thing in Congress until you have years of seniority under your belt (and pushing out your stomach), or a committee chairmanship to crown your head with grey.

So, freshperson power comes about when people follow the maxims they were taught in elementary school: hard work and using your head will get results.

Let me give you a good example of how a freshperson operates. When, in February 1973, the President of the United States announces a massive bombing of Cambodia, your first reaction after shock and dismay is to pull out your Constitution. (Freshpersons, it turns out, have the troublesome habit of keeping that document handy and referring to it often.) You search in vain through the Constitution for any provision authorizing the President to commit U.S. forces to hostilities without Congressional approval. And you come to the inescapable conclusion that the bombing is illegal. You don't simply rely on the language of the Constitution. You go back to the debates of the Founding Fathers, and you understand in very stark terms what they meant by the system of checks and balances. You realize quickly that the President's claim of unilateral war-making power gives him absolute power over life and death—and you know that the Founding Fathers never intended to concentrate that kind of power in any one person, or even any one branch of government. You realize the horrible distortion of budgetary priorities that occurs when a President, unchecked, can commit tax dollars to a war that he creates, leaving less of the federal budgetary pie for such things as education, health care, energy research, and the like.

When you realize too that the legislative process can't act in time to stop the war, you don't throw up your hands in despair and give up. You don't issue press releases or simply make statements on the floor of the Congress. You don't do what another Congressional sage suggests—something that is "quick and political," but produces no results. You do what I did: you search the case law carefully, and you decide that the courts have the power to halt an illegal Presidential war. And so you go to court.

You're sure that your case has a good chance of winning, although your Congressional colleagues pooch-pooch it, and your supporters wince at your going out on a limb.

But then the decision comes, and, for the first time in history, a court rules that a Presidential war is unconstitutional. An injunction is issued and it actually goes into effect for about four hours. Marshall overruled his decision. You are bouyed and elated by Douglas' decision, by his willingness to insist on the Supreme Court's duty to restrain illegal Executive action, and by his humanitarian determination to prevent any further deaths from occurring as a result of illegal Presidential action.

Unfortunately, Douglas' warning becomes tragically prophetic when mistaken bombing—which occurred once the injunction was lifted—kills hundreds of Cambodian allies.

You get defeated: You see a Supreme Court racing to shrink from a confrontation with the President—and, in so doing, sidestepping its own procedural regulations. But you also have a victory—a landmark Court decision and the education of the American public

not only about political courage, but also about the constitutional restraints on Presidential war-making authority.

Freshperson power also depends on the adage ignorance is bliss—you remain oblivious to the suggestion that a newcomer can't, and shouldn't even try to, get a bill passed. So when you are faced with the prospect that a Code of Federal Evidence will automatically go into effect you undauntedly lobby your colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to enact your bill to stop the Rules. The stakes are pretty high—Those rules would have created an official Secrets Doctrine (and would have permitted a President's claim of Executive privilege to go unchallenged even in the courts.) The Rules also would have abrogated any newsman's privilege in federal courts and would have undermined state shield laws in the process.

This audience knows perhaps better than anyone else the significant role that a free press and free media have played in exposing official abuses and corruption—from Watergate and the President on down. So your bill is passed—

A freshperson is not only willing to confront the President when he abuses his power and the Supreme Court when it issues bad rules of Evidence; but is also impatient with bureaucracy, with red tape trammeling helpless people in its web. And so you fight absurd and inhumane bureaucratic decisions.

You get the State Department to reverse itself and grant a one-day visa for a visiting Latin American scholar to appear at a scholarly conference at Queens College. You battle the Treasury Department and Social Security Administration so persistently that they agree to issue EMERGENCY checks to 7,000 of the most helpless New Yorkers, the poverty-stricken elderly and disabled whose singular misfortune was that their new SSI checks were never delivered to them. They would have otherwise been relegated to starvation and despair for weeks until the new checks could be delivered.

And, of course, the surest clue to a freshperson is someone who asks the simple Question—WHY?

For some inexplicable reason, a freshperson never seems to outgrow the obsession with asking fundamental questions. So, for example, when the Secretary of Interior appears at hearings on leasing federally-owned, off-shore oil lands, ask him why the government charges a mere 16+2/3 percent royalty while some Arab countries are charging a 60 percent royalty. The question produces great consternation. And the answer you get, "We have always done it that way." Undaunted, you ask, "Is there any other justification for the figure-economic, business or political?" The answer is, "No, just history." Since billions of dollars of government giveaways to the oil companies may be involved, you request the General Accounting Office to investigate government royalty charges.

When your elderly constituents come to your District Office to complain that Medicare keeps cutting back on their reimbursements, and that they are often left with unreimbursed doctors' bills of thousands of dollars, you ask—WHY. You find that last year New York City's Medicare recipients lost \$70 million in payments, and you find that two out of three New Yorkers are penalized while only one out two people in other states are in the same position. You ask for a GAO investigation of this problem.

Both off-shore royalties and Medicare problems have been around for years, but no one seemed to get around to questioning these matters and finding out what should be done to correct them.

Let me not, however, leave you with the impression that freshpersons are infallible. Sometimes—although rarely—you do make mistakes. If you are innocent enough to assume that a President will never conduct

himself so as to be impeached—and many freshpersons are innocent in that way—you say when committee assignments come up, as I did, that you don't want to be on the Judiciary Committee because that's not where the action is going to be. But the older and wiser heads—hardbitten and cynical—know better and put you on that committee. And, so, despite yourself, you find yourself in the middle of history.

What is the moral of this story? (Keep fighting—and I'm addressing each of you here tonight when I say this.)

Freshperson power—to be serious about this term for a moment—is not limited to newcomers. Instead, it is open to anyone with the willingness to ask hard questions, the persistence to avoid the stereotyped roles created for you, the courage to challenge dishonesty and arrogance, the compassion to confront the callousness that assaults us, and an impatience with the status quo.

Women especially are newcomers in spirit to the establishment of power. We have not yet been corrupted by defeat, frustration and the participation in the cynical abuse of authority.

The battle for a decent society is there to win. I call on all of you to join me in the fight.

For us as women as for all freshpersons, the power is there to shape a truly just and decent society.

THE CRISIS IS IN UNDERSTANDING

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the problems of inflation and recession are weighing heavily on the minds of the citizens of the United States, I think it is time we put in perspective these problems and consider the place of private enterprise and its meaning to the people of this country. The following views of Mr. Earl W. McMunn, for the Ohio Farmer, present the status of our situation with decided clarity and insight. I would hope my colleagues would read and reflect upon Mr. McMunn's ideas as I find them pertinent to the issues at hand:

THE CRISIS IS IN UNDERSTANDING

(By Earl W. McMunn)

What's bothering you most these days? Probably inflation and the energy shortage. These are questions which concern people all over the country. Ours is an economy which runs on oil. And everyone is hurt by inflation.

There may be agreement on the questions. But people in positions of power are poles apart with the answers. There is good reason for this. The questions we face are largely economic in nature. But we are trying to apply political answers.

Economics is simple and easy to understand. It's only when we confuse economic thinking with political expediency that the going becomes difficult. And all too often the solution falls to work.

Ours is an economic system built around one simple word. That word is production. It is the boundless production of the American private enterprise system which has given us the world's highest living standard. Nothing like it has ever succeeded in lifting so many people to high levels of affluence.

This production did not come by chance. Neither was it the result of government

planning or edict. It was the result of another simple word. That word was profit. Our incentive-oriented system offered rewards in the form of profits. And profits benefited all the people of this country by encouraging production of the things they wanted.

It's no accident that seven percent of the world's people use a third of the world's energy. Or, that we have almost 40 percent of the world's television sets and almost 45 percent of the world's motor cars. Or, that we use a third of the world's electricity, or a fourth of the world's steel and fly almost 60 percent of the commercial air miles. This is the affluence our incentive economic system has produced.

Now we are in a time of crisis. But the real crisis is not in inflation or a shortage of energy. These are but two of the symptoms. The real question is whether enough people understand the system which has provided their good living and the measures which are eroding it away.

During recent months the halls of Congress have reverberated with debate about energy supplies and food prices. But all the rhetoric has not put an extra gallon of gasoline into any tank or an extra steer into any feedlot. Some of the political solutions have made it more difficult to do either of these things.

The truth is that too many people don't understand that production is the only cure for shortages. And, that profit incentives will increase production if we but give them a chance to operate.

Price performs like the governor on a well-tuned engine. Each shift in price is a signal between the producers and consumers. Higher prices flash the message for more production. Lagging prices are an indication that too much product is going to market.

Government price controls are the political panacea which prevents the governor from operating. Messages which keep supply and demand in balance no longer get through. Then, control advocates blame the incentive enterprise system—never the roadblocks they have thrown in the way.

Rationing is no cure for shortages. It only spreads the misery. That's all it ever accomplishes, even when it can be made to work. And human nature being what it is, you can't often make it spread the shortages in an even-handed manner.

Our incentive enterprise system is under attack from two kinds of people. Some know what they are doing, and others do not. Those who know what they are doing include members of the "radical left." They believe in socialism where the people are directed by the heavy hand of government and there is no freedom to operate your business as you think best. This idea won't sell to freedom-loving people—so it is disguised under a variety of misleading labels.

The people who don't know what they are doing may be more benevolent, but are just as dangerous. With friends like these, you don't need enemies! A political solution that wrecks the economy is no help to anyone. Let's look at a few recent examples:

Little more than a year ago some consumers decided meat was too expensive. Egged on by "consumer advocates" and some elements of the press, they staged the meat boycott. This, in spite of the fact that food was then just about the best buy in the history of the nation.

The idea was to pressure livestock prices downward. What was the result? You know the answer. Livestock producers got the message, but not what the agitators had intended. The message was that consumers weren't willing to pay an incentive to get increased production. Why produce more, if your product isn't in demand. Producers sent sows carrying unborn pigs for this year's meat supply to market in record numbers. Supply lines were disrupted. Meat now costs

more than it would have cost without the boycott.

Now we're going through the same thing with energy supplies. It isn't that we are out of fuel. Remember, we use a third of the world's total. We'd like to use more, and people have the money to pay for it. The supply of available money is greater than the supply of fuel. That is our trouble. But, what do we do? We try to hold down prices, and insist that everyone gets some.

This accomplishes two things. They are both bad, if we expect to solve our economic problem. Holding down the price stifles production. It also encourages unnecessary use.

Here's a solution with political sex appeal. People want cheap fuel, just as they want cheap food, cheap automobiles, and everything else. "Let's roll back prices and give them what they want." It's not until the scheme fails that the people realize they have been duped again. It all goes back to the simple principle that government has no wealth to give. Wealth comes only from productive work.

Attempts to help consumers by controlling prices are not new. The idea has been tried by rulers throughout recorded history—always with the same disastrous results.

The Romans tried it more than 1,700 years ago. Emperor Diocletian was famous for at least two reasons. He attempted to exterminate the Christians. He also tried to control wages and prices. He failed in both attempts.

Diocletian issued an edict freezing wages and prices. The penalty for any "chiseler" was death. But the scheme failed, just as it always has done. One historian of the time wrote:

"The people no longer brought provisions to market since they could not get a reasonable price . . . and many died . . . and the law was laid aside."

Americans deserve better than this. Our heritage of abundance was created by production and profits. Only incredible economic illiteracy can lead us to fumble away this birthright for a mess of pottage.

But the temptation to offer political panaceas for economic ills is always with us. Often it is almost irresistible. Isn't it the duty of the government to provide for our every need? What about the threats to "get" any Congressman who fails to comply?

So we accept continuing doses of unsound economics. Inflation results when the supply of money increases faster than the supply of goods. Where do we get that extra money? The federal government is the major source. Government spending is greater than income. Printing press money makes up the difference.

It's little wonder that our national debt has soared to something like half a trillion dollars. And it hasn't stopped there.

But the sad truth is that some of the leading spenders are most vocal in deploring the inflation they have helped to create. Their cures—more government spending and controls on profits. That's like trying to douse a raging fire with gasoline!

Recent polls reveal a high degree of disenchantment with government in general, and specifically with the performance of Congress. Perhaps the idea is getting around that excess government spending creates inflation. That good living is the result of production. And, that you can't get production without profits.

Our incentive system is a sturdy creation. But there is a limit to the abuse it can take. It can be made to founder with large enough doses of political meddling. This is when the advocates of socialism will move in with proposals to nationalize one industry after another. Always "to protect the people," of course. It can happen if we fail to understand the incentive system and what it does

for people. This is why economic illiteracy may be our most critical national problem. It can lead to destruction of the system that has served people so well!

DEMAGOG VOICE ON VIET VETS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, recent public opinion polls show politicians to be held in extremely low esteem by the American public. I submit that the following article by John D. Lofton, Jr., goes a long way toward explaining some of the reasons why. The total lack of respect for our Vietnam veterans displayed by the chairman of the Senate Veterans' Committee is indeed sickening. If our public officials display such demagoguery and total lack of integrity, is it any wonder many of them are held in such low esteem by the American people?

[From Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, April 11, 1974]

DEMAGOG VOICE ON VIET VETS

WASHINGTON.—I don't know about you, but to me there's something stomach-turning about those who did so much to undermine the efforts of our fighting men when they were at war in Indochina, to be hollering about the lack of support for these same men now that they're home.

There's something nauseating about these people who denounced as criminal and immoral the efforts of over two and a half million American servicemen to help an ally resist Communist aggression, now to be lamenting the fact and wondering why no ticker-tape parades have welcomed back our returned Vietnam veterans.

Can it really be that those who worked so hard to misrepresent, lie about and distort the real role of the U.S. in Southeast Asia do not realize that they are in large part responsible for the degree of indifference, skepticism and downright hostility that has greeted our returned vets?

Exceptionally sickening has been the performance of the chairman of the Senate Veterans Committee, Sen. Vance Hartke. Presiding over a hearing recently, the Indiana Democrat whipped a group of returned Vietnam vets into a frenzy with raw-meat rhetoric.

Waving an "Honor Vietnam Veterans" bumper sticker, he cried: "A bumper sticker won't pay your tuition. It also won't put any food on the table. You can't eat bumper stickers, can you?"

The vets roared.

Hartke is good at this sort of demagoguery. It was he who, as a stalking horse of Endicott Peabody in the 1972 New Hampshire primary, denounced the impoundment of certain medical funds, telling a pregnant woman in Exeter:

"If you should get rubella and your baby should have any mental retardation, it will be Richard Nixon's fault."

The great irony is that while he may be gung-ho for our vets now that they are home, while they were in Vietnam he did nothing but malign their efforts even going so far as to suggest that our Prisoners of War be forgotten and left to rot in their prisons.

When our men were fighting and dying, Hartke criticized the U.S. for staying too long in Vietnam and having "perpetuated too many horrors." Our air and naval forces he attacked as "devastating" the lands of

Indochina, "killing and making homeless tens of thousands of innocent civilians in the process." He characterized the war as being fought simply to prop up South Vietnamese President Thieu, "a two-bit dictator."

But the senator's most shocking suggestion was that our POWs be forgotten about.

Meeting with a group of high school students in Washington on March 3, 1971, Hartke was asked how a get-out-of-Vietnam resolution he sponsored related to getting our POWs back. He replied:

"I don't know what happens to American POWs. How do POWs get to be POWs except for having us involved in an undeclared war?"

When a student responded by saying: "We just can't leave them there," Hartke asked, "Why not?" When the student shot back in disbelief "Why not?" there was an uproar with another student exclaiming, "Oh my God."

Hartke then said: "Oh, I know you are shocked, that shocks you. How are you going to get them back? Are you going to go? We've made one attempt," he said, in a reference to the unsuccessful raid by U.S. forces on the Son Tay prison camp near Hanoi.

So, as I say, when people like Sen. Hartke, or Sen. George McGovern wonder why our Vietnam veterans have not been welcomed home as heroes, they have to look no further than their own speeches about the war.

The New York Times has editorialized: "Vietnam was an unpopular war; but that does not diminish the nation's debt to those who served in it."

But the Times is wrong. In making the war unpopular, those who did so have diminished the nation's debt to its Vietnam veterans. And for this they should forever be ashamed.

PRESIDENT JUST LIKE ANYBODY ELSE?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Monday, April 22, 1974 edition of the Peoria Journal Star has some rather pointed comments with respect to the manner in which the President is being treated as we move along in the seemingly interminable Watergate investigation. I commend the editorial's message to my colleagues and place it in the RECORD at this point:

PRESIDENT JUST LIKE ANYBODY ELSE?

The President of the United States is a man like other men. Right? He is not above the law. Right? He is not entitled to special consideration or special treatment. Right?

He is answerable and subject to the law like anybody else. Right?

Then, how come unlike everybody else his talks with his lawyers are not confidential, he or his associates can not utilize the Fifth amendment, rules of evidence do not apply when he is under investigation, privacy of preliminary investigation before charges are made do not apply, he is not entitled to a presumption of innocence until proven guilty, it is fair to not only discuss the case and "try it" in press and public, and it is even fair to raise money and stage campaigns for his conviction?

Guilty or innocent, the President is not like other men in that the position he holds is unique, and it exposes him to unique demands, unique responsibilities, and unique expenses, as well.

Richard Nixon is not entitled to normal protections that apply to all the rest of us. That's a fact.

But he is entitled to some of the special protections as well as some of the special exposures and disadvantages that also go with the office. His detractors, however, argue it both ways.

They have taken advantage of the argument that he's "like everybody else" when that assists in injuring him, and have taken advantage of the argument that his is a special case not like anyone else when that assists in injuring him.

The Watergate is and was a disgraceful affair.

Two wrongs don't make a right.

Much of what we are doing adds disgrace to disgrace, and we do not purge ourselves by making a sacrificial goat of the President. We compound the black page in our history—and we create conditions for which we will get the bill, later.

It has been said that most of our problems were caused and created by past "solutions"—and we are now laying by a considerable store of future problems that we don't really need.

FUEL CONSERVATION BENEFITS FROM HIGH ALTITUDE FLIGHT

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, many Federal regulations governing aviation are often based on policies which may be outdated and deserve reevaluation and reappraisal. Mr. Harry B. Combs, president of the Gates Learjet Corp., Wichita, Kans., spoke recently to the Society of Automotive Engineers 1974 National Business Aircraft Meeting and Engineering Display. Mr. Combs' topic was "Fuel Conservation Benefits from High Altitude Flight." He called on the Federal Aviation Administration to change its stand with respect to high altitude flight for any civil jet structurally capable of operating at such altitudes.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of Mr. Combs' address which was made in Wichita on April 3, 1974:

FUEL CONSERVATION BENEFITS FROM HIGH ALTITUDE FLIGHT

(Remarks by Harry B. Combs, president, Gates Learjet Corp.)

Although the fuel problem appears to be easing off, I'm sure we all realize the constraints will be with us for a long time to come. For this reason, my subject this morning seems particularly pertinent to our present and future needs.

Since the early experiments in high altitude, long distance flight of the 1930's, most of the benefits have been self-evident. Pronounced fuel savings as well as substantial increases in speed were achieved almost immediately—first with the geared supercharged reciprocating engines and later with the turboprops, the turbojet, and the fanjet.

Today our engineers estimate that during the cruise segment of jet flight, a fuel savings of approximately 20% is achieved for every 5,000 feet of altitude up to 50,000 feet. This is indeed a very substantial saving and it alone should cause us to look carefully at the possibilities of high altitude operations.

Fuel savings, of course, are not the only benefit of altitude. Line of sight radio trans-

mission significantly increases communication and navigational capabilities. There is also the obvious benefit of over-the-weather flight. If permitted, most jets could fly above the tropopause—that invisible line dividing the turbulent troposphere from the relatively stable stratosphere.

It is in the stratosphere where, for all practical purposes, the lapse rate ceases. And with the exception of convection thrusts of an occasional thunderhead this high sky is virtually free from storm conditions.

Those who pilot high performance jets know the tremendous feeling of elation and comfort and relief when at 40,000 to 41,000 feet they burst out of the turbulence and condensation of the troposphere into the smooth, eternal sunshine or starlight of the stratosphere. Here, too, with only a few notable jet stream exceptions, headwinds of any great intensity are seldom incurred.

And last but not least, high altitude flight must somehow be a solution to our ever-increasing traffic problems.

It is interesting to note that our air traffic control system requires horizontal separation of five miles—yet permits a vertical separation of less than one half mile. It's almost as if the system denied the fundamental fact that the airplane is a three dimensional vehicle. This disparity is heightened by the accuracy of conventional OMNI facilities which, before the advent of area navigation, forced the concentration of traffic into corridors, leaving vast lateral spaces unoccupied.

I think it safe to say that virtually all long ranging airline operations are concentrated in cruising altitudes between 29,000 and 39,000 feet, leaving open an almost unlimited canopy of sky above. It would seem obvious that aircraft manufacturers who follow man's dream of improving his capability are compelled to explore the potentials of high altitude flight. This becomes especially clear if we accept the principle that we are approaching a speed limit for business aircraft, at least in the present state of the art.

The problems and costs of supersonic flight are so great that for the next two decades it is doubtful general aviation will invade the field.

True, there has been a great deal of talk about building business jets in the transonic range—particularly in the .95 mach regime. But a hard look at the problem pretty well shatters this dream. It is far more difficult to build an airplane capable of cruising in the .95 to the 1.2 mach category than it is to build a true supersonic aircraft, because some component parts of such an aircraft are forced within the transonic range to obey the aerodynamic laws of subsonic speeds and some the laws of supersonic flow. As a result, the aircraft becomes neither fish nor fowl and ends up an engineering nightmare.

For this reason, I submit that it will be a long time before we cruise in excess of .89 or .89 mach with any economically viable and acceptable business jet. We are very near that capability now.

We can, of course, improve ranges by increasing our propulsion efficiency or by making provisions for additional fuel, or both. But if there is a speed constraint we will eventually reach range limits through cabin comfort restrictions. This leaves only the frontier of altitude where the fuel savings alone are so significant that the potential demands vigorous exploration. Let's see how we are progressing.

In August 1972 one business jet manufacturer considered increasing the maximum flight altitude of its aircraft to 47,000 feet. It wrote to FAA, then about a year later withdrew its request, reportedly as a result of FAA medical experiments documenting the catastrophic consequences of explosive decompression. One summary titled "Physiological Considerations for Certification Of Aircraft For Flight Above 40,000 Feet"

will curl your hair. It refers to live tests on human subjects that very nearly ended in disaster, only the rapid restoration of oxygen supply prevented permanent brain damage.

The report states in part: "It must be concluded that the operation of light civil jet aircraft to an altitude of 45,000 feet as currently permitted is, at best, only marginal should a decompression occur to the flight altitude of the aircraft. The body of research indicates it would not be in the best interest of safety to increase the permissible maximum flight altitude to 47,000 feet."

What happens to the human body when it runs out of oxygen—collapse of all consciousness, the rolling back of the eyes, the brain damage—is nothing new. And you don't have to go to 45,000 feet. Holding a man six inches under water for three minutes will produce similar horrors. Moreover, sudden decompression is not a phenomenon unique to high altitudes. The DC-10 over France suffered a pressure failure below 15,000 feet. It was totally destroyed with a loss of 346 lives.

Before I take further exception, not to the FAA study's format but to its nonobjective conclusions, let me qualify myself as a witness.

Although I'm a member of the Mach 2 Club, I'm not an engineer. Although I'm a rated jet pilot, I'm not a physiologist. Rather, I base my qualifications for constructive criticism on the fact that I belong to a select group of individuals who comprise less than two and a half percent of the earth's total population. I'm a privileged member of the "Support The World" group. I am a U.S. federal income taxpayer, along with 77,000,000 other Americans.

Our membership in this exclusive club is strictly on an involuntary basis. Very strong, effective coercive means are used to keep our dues current. In fact, the dues are so confiscatory that many of us work most of the year for nothing. They let us keep the equivalent of only three or four months of our annual pay checks.

The American taxpayer individually and collectively is bearing the heaviest financial burden of any people in the history of civilization. Yet we can be thankful for one thing. As Winston Churchill said, "Democracy is the worst possible form of government except when you compare it with any other." We can also be thankful that under our system we still have the right to criticize our government. We pay dearly for this right, so let's use it.

We must also remember that government always comes after the fact. If it hadn't been for two boys in a bicycle shop in Dayton, Ohio, there wouldn't be an FAA. Somebody had to build an airplane, then along came the government to tell us how it should be built. And how to operate it. And they are still telling us. But industry must take the lead and make something before government steps in to regulate it. So it seems only proper that we have at least a small voice in how the government should regulate the products we create. Because if we don't, there won't be anything left to regulate.

With this thought in mind, I submit that medical evidence alone should not serve as the rationale for regulatory limitations of aircraft performance capabilities. The truth of the matter is simply that the report I quoted merely told us only one thing: namely, man cannot survive outside his natural environment without adequate life support systems. This we already knew. We didn't need a lengthy FAA medical summary to tell us so.

I suggest that the government's approach is wrong. I believe that FAA's attitude should be that manufacturers must prove how flight above 45,000 feet can be done safely, not that operations at those high altitudes are so hazardous we should never venture there. It's estimated that if an aircraft windshield shat-

ters at 275 knots it will kill the crew. Should we limit jet speeds to 275 knots or build a windshield that will hold up at much greater speeds?

It's frightening to think how you might look if you lose all oxygen at 45,000 feet. But if you lose a wing at 500 feet, you won't look so good either. Should we say don't fly at all because if the wing comes off, we'll be dead? We've known that for a long time. That's why we build wings that won't fail. And if we intend to fly high, we must build a pressure vessel that won't decompress. If it were not possible to do this, we would never have put a man on the moon.

If we are going to build a pressurized vehicle it should be built so it will not suddenly decompress and its fail-safe capability should be demonstrated at any altitude. It's a lot like building a bridge. You don't build it with another bridge underneath. You build the first bridge so that it won't fail.

In addition to structural strength, we should also demonstrate that duality of pressurization equipment, such as pumps and inlet and outlet valves and regulators, can insure as much consistency of environment as say the principle of dual engines or dual electronics guarantees other forms of flight safety.

I submit that the FAA should change its arbitrary stand with respect to high altitude flight or any other type of operational activity involving the promise of additional aircraft capability.

Instead, the agency should adopt a positive constructive attitude of—"Show us that you can make it safe." This is a progressive approach and one for which I guess I put up my money when I joined that exclusive taxpayers club.

BLACK LUNG CLINIC 1974

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined with the Social Security Administration in holding the second annual black lung clinic at the VFW hall in Lonaconing, Md. The 1-day clinic provided former miners and their families the opportunity to meet with a team of specialists to discuss black lung claims and filing guidance. There are currently over 4,000 Allegany and Garrett County residents receiving such benefits, under Public Law 92-303.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the dedicated and understanding men and women who assisted the claimants at the clinic and who made the meeting the success that it was. These include Mr. Hugh Johnson, Assistant to the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, and his Baltimore representatives at the clinic: Miss Helen Harvey and Mr. Larry Ageloff. Representatives of the Cumberland Social Security Office included the Director, Mr. James Robertson as well as Frank Tomko, Glenn Mueller, and David Linn. The Department of Labor was represented by Mr. Frank D'Marino who aided individuals filing for black lung claims for the first time.

I know you join me in expressing appreciation to all these public servants for a job well done.

REPRESENTATIVE LESTER L. WOLFF REPORTS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to keep my constituents informed of the legislation on which I am working and to keep them up-to-date on the progress, in Washington, of issues that concern them, I print, at my own expense, a newsletter that is sent to every postal patron in the Sixth Congressional District of New York. Most recently, I wrote to them about the grievous state of the economy and the skyrocketing cost of living, unemployment, and inflation. I included in that newsletter the steps I have taken in this regard to help alleviate these conditions and I also wrote to them about my most recent efforts on behalf of the Vietnam veteran. I am including a copy of this newsletter in the hopes that it can benefit my distinguished colleagues:

NEWSLETTER

Dear Friend and Constituent,

I wish I were able to report to you that inflation was waning, that cost of living increases and unemployment were diminishing, but I cannot. Our economy will not take a turn for the better until this nation balances the scales of supply and demand and sees to it that its domestic needs are met at prices the consumer can afford. To do this, we must curb the vast export programs of oil and agricultural products that have resulted in shortages and the erosion of the American pocketbook at home.

In my ongoing effort to combat rising prices and shortages at the food markets and the attendant hardships and inconveniences being encountered by the housewife in providing for the family table (the result of foreign grain deals, especially with the Soviet Union and Red China) I introduced HR10844, the Export Priorities Act, to regulate the export of agricultural commodities and to mandate that minimum carryovers of these commodities be assured the domestic market before overseas shipments are made. We must provide food for the American table in sufficient supply and at reasonable prices before we ship abroad.

My bill, supported in the House by 80 co-sponsors, both Democrats and Republicans, has caused some grain exporters to delay deliveries of overseas contracts, a move that temporarily has slowed down the projected price increase for bread to as much as a dollar a loaf.

With these economic problems on the domestic front, we cannot afford to permit a continuation of the cavalier manner in which many aspects of our foreign aid program are handled. Specifically, I refer to the Executive agreement with India to forgive \$2.2 billion in debts owed the United States by the Indian government. This Executive agreement was entered into by Ambassador Moynihan and the Indian government without any prior consultation with Congress, even though it was Congress that originally authorized the selling of food to India at a price to be repaid in Indian rupees.

I have authored an amendment which was included in the recently passed Foreign Assistance Act to return to Congress the right to control any and all settlements, cancellations and renegotiations of foreign aid loans by requiring the Secretary of State to first gain Congress' concurrence before any agreements are concluded.

It is incredible to me that in light of our domestic problems over inflation and skyrocketing costs, steps are not being taken to, not only bolster our own economy, but to end this practice of simply wiping out foreign debts to nations that make no effort to cooperate with us in solving some of our difficulties both here at home and abroad.

WOLFF AIMS TO UPGRADE EDUCATION BENEFITS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

The new GI Bill unanimously passed by Congress marks a breakthrough in this nation's heretofore often myopic treatment of Vietnam veterans as it increases the education subsistence allowance by 13.6 percent and extends the benefits eligibility time period from eight to ten years. These are significant and long overdue improvements, but they fall short of what I believe is needed to meet our national commitment to these men who fought so hard and so long in an unpopular war.

I am deeply concerned for the future of the hundreds of thousands of Vietnam veterans who for financial reasons are unable to take advantage of their new GI Bill simply because they cannot meet initial tuition costs. Particularly affected are those vets who live in states with high public education costs, such as New York, where tuition expenses average well in excess of \$750.

My comprehensive Vietnam Era Veterans Educational Benefits Act, co-sponsored now by many members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which I am the downstate NY member, would ease some of these difficulties that prevent veterans from gaining a higher education. Hearings on this measure are now underway before the full veterans committee.

In brief, this measure I have introduced would amend the GI Bill to provide for payment by the Veterans Administration of tuition costs in excess of \$400 per school year to a maximum of \$1,000. A second provision would permit a veteran to draw his 36-month educational subsistence allowance in larger amounts over a shorter period of time. (For example, if his subsistence allowance is \$220 a month for 36 months, he could draw \$440 a month for 18 months.)

It is my firm conviction that we ultimately must upgrade the benefits we afford our Vietnam veterans to a level that is on par with the educational opportunities we provide World War II veterans. All Americans, I believe, will agree with me that we cannot shirk our responsibility to the Vietnam veteran and that we must honor our obligation by offering him every available opportunity to attain an enriching and productive life. He has earned our gratitude and respect—we owe him a chance at tomorrow.

LEGISLATION DELAY ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1974

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the Indian Affairs Subcommittee had announced hearings for next Monday and Tuesday, April 29 and 30, on two bills of major importance to the Indian community.

Hearings were scheduled on April 29 on House Joint Resolution 881, the American Indian Policy Review Commission, and on April 30, on S. 1017, the Indian contracting-educational reform bill. Unfortunately, we have had to cancel those meetings.

The full Interior Committee is in the

midst of consideration of H.R. 11500, the surface mining bill, and we in the full committee are working diligently to get this legislation to the floor as soon as possible. Because of the scheduled Democratic Caucus next Wednesday and Thursday, which will prohibit the full committee from meeting, the

full committee will meet on Monday and Tuesday on the surface mining bill.

I am sorry this will mean delay in considering what I believe to be progressive legislation in the area of Indian affairs. However, these hearings will be rescheduled as soon as our schedule permits.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 29, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Let every person be subject to the governing authorities.—Romans 13:1.

Our thanks to Thee, O God, for the help and guidance of Thy Spirit through the centuries and for Thy presence in our world now.

Our thanks to Thee for the land Thou has given us and for those who serve as our leaders. Guide us now through the troubled waters in which we move. For the Members of this body we pray—the House of Representatives of the United States of America. Keep their consciences alive, their spirits alert, their minds open, and their bodies able and willing to follow Thy way of love.

In Thy name. 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 24, 1974, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12109. An act to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to clarify the provision relating to the referendum on the issue of the advisory neighborhood councils.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dicks) through this legislative week, because of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WE SHOULD NOT RENEW WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

(Mr. ROUSSELOT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH) has just suggested that we should renew Federal wage and price controls. I think the exact opposite action is required. I believe it has been proven that the Government cannot manage the vast number of daily decisions relating to wages and prices in this country and that, in fact, the wage and price control mechanism has contributed mightily to the inflationary impact which we are now suffering.

Mr. Speaker, the very fact that these consumer prices that the gentleman from New York mentions have gone up is the direct result of the fact that wage and price controls are being taken off now. The unnatural pressures that have built up under those economic controls has occurred as a result of those arbitrary lids and controls. Now, the free marketplace is beginning to work again. The Congress caused the problem when it originally instituted wage and price controls in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I could not disagree with my colleague more. Evidently, the Committee on Banking and Currency does not agree with Mr. KOCH either, because it voted 21 to 10 to discontinue wage and price controls.

THIS IS POSTAL REFORM?

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in opposing the so-called Postal Reform Act of 1970, I predicted on this floor that the new Postal Service would be self-sustaining—"completely free of deficit—as long as it has a pipeline out the back door pumping up money from the public well."

I am not at all pleased that this prophecy is being fulfilled.

In this fiscal year which ends June 30, the Postal Service has already received appropriations from the Federal Treasury of \$1,478 million. Just before Easter the House voted a further nest egg of \$230 million. An additional supplemental of \$284 million is being incubated. Assuming final action on these two supplementals, the Federal Treasury will have pumped nearly \$2 billion of Federal tax revenue into the Postal Service in fiscal 1974. Yet incredible as it may seem, even with this massive Federal payment, the Postal Service estimates a net operating loss of \$385 million for fiscal 1974.

This means that in the third full year of operation of the new Postal Corpora-

tion, the total deficit—the difference between operating revenues and operating expenses—amounts to nearly \$2.4 billion. This is exactly twice as much as the largest "revenue gap" which ever existed in the old Post Office Department—\$1.2 billion in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I seriously question that the Nation can afford this new "self-supporting Postal Service."

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE FROM 29TH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

(Mr. KING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matters.)

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, in mid-February I submitted my annual questionnaire to the residents of the 29th Congressional District of New York. I have, to date, received a very heavy response to this poll and have just received the tabulated results which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Since more than 20,000 persons responded to the poll, I believe the questionnaire virtually constitute a referendum of the district, and I have found it to be an excellent antidote to pressure mail.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the tabulated results of my 1974 questionnaire:

1. Do you believe that sufficient proof of wrongdoing by President Nixon has been presented to warrant impeachment? Yes, 48%; no, 52%.
2. Do you favor proposals to finance Presidential and Congressional election campaigns from tax money? Yes, 43%; no, 57%.
3. Do you believe the United States should give Russia and China the same beneficial trade status that non-communist countries are given? Yes, 36%; no, 64%.
4. Do you think the Federal government should provide a health insurance program to everyone, even if it meant higher taxes? Yes, 46%; no, 54%.
5. Do you think Congress should allow drilling of oil on the outer continental shelf (in the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Oceans)? Yes, 86%; no, 14%.
6. Do you approve of the new farm bill establishing a floor under agricultural prices? Yes, 53%; no, 47%.
7. Should the U.S. impose export controls on feed grains and other scarce commodities until our domestic needs are filled? Yes, 95%; no, 5%.
8. Should Congress adopt a strictly enforced limit on total federal spending each year? Yes, 85%; no, 15%.
9. Do you think the President should be compelled to spend all funds appropriated by Congress? Yes, 31%; no, 69%.
10. Do you believe network television fairly